



## SLO Assessment Cycle for SIGN 2

*Elementary American Sign Language (Second Quarter)* SLO Modified: [10/20/2010]

### Kevin Glapion's Team Members:

1. [Tiffany Uhri](#) (x) SIGN
2. [David Rawson](#) (x) SIGN

**Additional Team members not on list/notes about team:**

**Additional Notes:**

### Outcomes:

**Outcome 1: Statement** Modified: [10/22/2010]

Student will continue to construct and apply the principles of American Sign Language grammatical structures.

### Assessment Cycle Records:

**Outcome 1: Assessment Planning** Modified: [10/19/2010]

#### Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Spring 2010

Assessors: Tiffany Uhri

Assessment Tools: Exams

Sections being assessed: 62

**Outcome 1: Reflect & Enhance** Modified: [11/18/2010]

**Number of people involved in Phase III: 3**

**Changes:**

#### Methods:

An embedded assessment approach was used in which items from two mid-quarter exams were selected to measure student's ability to construct and apply the principles of ASL. The criteria chosen to evaluate student's ability to construct and apply the principles of ASL were their proficiency with Language Function and Language Structures. These two constructs were represented from particular items/ questions chosen from the two exams. An item response analysis approach was used and mean averages were computered for each of the assessment items/ questions to determine students competencies (on the two constructs) in comparison to course standards of proficiency: above average (80 to 100), average (70 to 79), and below average standards (69 and below).

#### Summary:

The results indicate that when students are exposed to more drills and repetition they presented an increase in their ability to construct and apply ASL grammar. Importantly, students, on the follow-up exam, during week 7, demonstrated greater communicative competence in their ability to interpret and record directions in English, which were provided in ASL. Students also presented greater proficiency in their capacity to record and interpret conversational "requests" in English. The results demonstrated an improvement in student's ability to distinguish the language structure and function of English and ASL.

#### Enhancement (Part I):

As a result of the student learning assessment, the following changes have been introduced into the classroom curriculum: greater emphasis on exercises, which improve ASL grammar production and receptivity, in areas such as, giving directions and making requests. Additionally, students will engage in more interactive drills in which students are actively translating English to ASL and vice versa. Also, lesson planning and on-going assessment focus will be targeted on how well students are grasping concepts (and their need for repetition) before moving on to the next topic.

#### Enhancement (Part II):

A ASL video course program (such as the Bravo Beginning ASL Video Course- \$599.00), which would allow students to engage in "lab" drills and exercises, would provide students an "out of class" (independent and self-directed) opportunity to improve their grammar production and receptivity. This form of lab experience is often associated with ASL.

curriculum, providing students with additional practice options, but presently due to the lack of ASL video course programming this additional reinforcement asset is not offered here at De Anza.

To enhance student awareness of Deaf Culture and the linguistic differences between English/ verbal communication and ASL, the following additional resources (videos) are needed to supplement the curriculum:

See What I mean: Difference between Deaf and Hearing Cultures, 2nd Edition(2009)- \$59.95

Sound of Fury (2009)- \$20.00

---

[ Number of Outcomes for SIGN 2: 1 ]