Course Assessment in a Box, Version II

Course Assessment in a Box is a practical tool for you to conduct assessment of course Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). By following these simple steps, using assessment tools you already use to evaluate student work, you can easily produce a course assessment of SLOs.

These steps align with the course SLO assessment page in the CurricUNET Program Review Module. Once the steps are completed, simply attach it to your Program Review.

1. Number and name of the course being assessed:
   ASL140 / Deaf Education 330

2. List all the Course SLOs from the Course Outline of Record:
   1. Define terminology used in the field of deaf education;
   2. Trace the historical roots of the education of deaf children;
   3. Examine the rationale and scope of the major provisions in P.L. 94-142;
   4. Evaluate the impact of hearing loss on language acquisition and family dynamics;
   5. Differentiate various communication, language, and education placement options available for deaf children;
   6. Present key concerns related to the experiences of deaf people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds;
   7. Identify the most common disabilities occurring in multiple-handicapped deaf children and cite possible causes;
   8. Describe the general vocational picture for deaf adults in the past and present;
   9. Discuss and debate the current issues surrounding deaf education and the Deaf Community.

3. If you have had any dialogue about the Course SLOs amongst faculty who teach this course, please describe it here (leave blank if there has been no specific dialogue):
   The course SLOs were developed in conjunction with Bunny Klopping who also teaches this course from time to time.

4. List the SLO(s) you are assessing in this particular instance:
   Define terminology used in the field of deaf education;

5. Describe the assessment strategy or tool that addresses the SLO(s):
   Pretest and Posttest

NOTE: Try to use assessment strategies you are already using to evaluate student work as part of your grading system. Examples: Rubrics for Evaluating Projects or Assignments, Portfolio Evaluation, Culminating Projects, Final Exams, Writing Assignments, Performance Assessment, Department Testing, Pre and Post Tests, Vendor or Industry Certification Examinations, Indirect Assessments (Student Surveys, Focus Group Discussions, Interviews), or others....

6. Describe how the criteria or standards in this assessment tool link to the SLO(s) being assessed:
Students were asked to define terms that are commonly used in the field of deaf education. Being familiar with these terms indicates knowledge of the most pressing issues in deaf education.

7. By looking holistically at the results from all students, describe your findings:

The class average jumped from 16% on the pretest (range 0% - 32%) to 79% on the posttest (range 61% to 98%).

8. Describe faculty dialogue (if any) involved in the assessment process:

While all students were able to improve their scores, only few deaf/hh students were able to get a grade above C. The low-performing deaf/hh students did not utilize the tutorial services in the lab. These students need to be encouraged to be receptive about getting additional help to improve their grades.

9. Based on an analysis of your findings and dialogue, describe revisions (if any) in curriculum or teaching strategies implemented to promote student success:

Information about tutorial services and other resources on campus needs to be emphasized to students who could benefit from them. This will be accomplished by noting these resources in the green sheet and announcements made in the class repeatedly throughout the semester.

10. After the improvements are implemented, describe the results:

All deaf/hh students in class earned grades above “C”. The final grades for deaf students in the spring 2013 class were 94, 93, 93, 92, 89, 89, 86, 81, 80, 73, 70, and 70. While the results are impressive, we do not know for sure how much difference tutorial services had on their grades.