

Annual Report for Assessment of Outcomes  
Sign Language Interpretation Program  
May 31, 2011

**To complete this Assessment Report**, please address the questions below, and send to [learningassessment@pcc.edu](mailto:learningassessment@pcc.edu) by **June 20, 2011**; subject line: REPORT Assessment [SAC]

***We revisited the curriculum in Sign Language Interpretation Program and added a significant emphasis on comparative analysis. Instructors are relying less across the board on memorization and more on case studies, discussions and critical analyses.***

2. Identify the outcomes assessed this year, and describe the methods used.

***The outcome assessed this year is: "Build on the foundation of knowledge of the interpreting process, cultural differences, and Deaf culture, through feedback and critical self-reflection, and continually improve as an interpreter while deepening familiarity with and understanding of Deaf culture."***

- a. Describe the method(s) you used.

***We looked carefully at work produced in the following courses: ITP 131 Deaf Culture, ITP 272 Interpreting Process III, ITP 279 Mock Interpreting I. The assessments coming out of those courses we considered include Self-Reflective Journal, Interpreting Performance Assessments, Essay Exams, Critical Analyses of Cultures and Cultural Differences.***

***These assessments were carried out on the 22 students in the first-year cohort. The assessments were evaluated by the two full-time faculty leading the program.***

- b. Results: What did you learn?

***All but two of the 22 students demonstrated an appropriate basic understanding of the major differences between deaf and hearing culture. Of course our aspiration is that all students meet the standard. We identified reading deficiencies in the two unsuccessful students this fall and we are getting them remedial help. So we have now added a diagnostic reading and writing assessment at the beginning of the first term, so that students can get help right away if they need it.***

***A close analysis of the reflective journals in Process and in Mock Interpreting showed ample evidence of the students' increasingly sophisticated analysis of the interpreting process and their role in it. They demonstrated that they are continually building on their foundation of knowledge about interpreting and cultural differences. The journals also documented that they are making good use of the feedback they are getting to continually make progress, not only toward this specific outcome, but also toward the other outcomes as well.***

***Students' achievement of this outcome, as it has been established, is not only essential for students completing the interpreting degree or certificate, but also those who choose instead to pursue the Deaf Studies certificate.***

***The assessments in Process III showed that 15 of the 22 students are making appropriate progress developing the linguistic and social skills necessary for professional interpreting. Comparing the journals of the 15 students who are on track with the 7 who lag behind shows that the unsuccessful students are spending considerably less time off campus in the deaf community.***

3. Identify any changes that should, as a result of this assessment, be implemented towards improving students' attainment of outcomes.

***The establishment of a diagnostic reading and writing assessment at the beginning of the first term is one example of a change triggered by this assessment.***

***To address the deficiencies we uncovered in student contact with the deaf community, we are instituting these changes:***

***a. make tutoring in the Sign Language Interpreting Program mandatory for those who are not meeting the standards.***

***b. create and disseminate more information about a wider variety of ways in which students can connect with the deaf community.***

***c. Use regular assessments, to diagnose student deficiencies and develop improvement plans earlier in the first year.***