

Bakersfield College

SLO and Assessment Plan Matrix

SLO	Assessment Plan for each SLO (Describe)	Results/Decisions
<p>AUO- Disabled Student Programs & Services (DSP&S) provides the support to Bakersfield College to ensure that students with disabilities have equal access to the college and its educational programs and services; assists the college with compliance to regulations and policies relating to students with disabilities; and provides support services and academic accommodations that allow students with disabilities to participate on an equal basis with their non-disabled peers in an accessible environment.</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Effective Fall 2010— Implemented new process in the coordination of sign language interpreting services to deaf students. It involved a more focused effort in grouping multiple students in courses to better utilize the limited pool of sign language interpreters. ○ Deaf student’s educational plans were reviewed individually which led to the formation of a master educational plan for the semester. The master educational plan was used to create cohorts of deaf students utilizing sign language interpreting services. Two goals: 1) meet the college’s obligation in providing access to students who are deaf through use of sign language interpreting services; 2) students completion of their educational plans. ○ Fall 2010--17 students utilizing sign language interpreters were grouped in 14 different courses. <p>SURVEY OF DEAF STUDENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fall of 2010—At the conclusion of the Fall 2010 term, DSP&S Deaf Services Coordinator/Advisor met with deaf students who were in the cohorts to assist them in completing a 14 question written survey. The goal of the survey was to obtain outcomes on the recent implementation. Due to deaf students’ primary language being ASL, there was a need to meet with the deaf students one-on-one for any clarification needed. ○ Eight (8) students completed surveys out of the 17 students who were grouped in the cohort. ○ The 8 students participated in the survey, a total of 23 surveys were completed (a survey for each course they were in that had multiple deaf students). Students were adamant about their inability to complete a single survey representing the entire semester experience as they were in different cohorts based on their courses. At the time of the survey, students stated that their opinions are different depending on the course, peers, and language used 	<p>Survey Questions/Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is helpful to have other deaf or hard of hearing students in the same class with me. 69% -Strongly agree/Agree 26% - Neutral 5% - Strongly disagree/Disagree ○ I wanted to take another course, but could not because of scheduling by the DSPS office. 31% -Strongly agree/Agree 32% - Neutral 37% - Strongly disagree/Disagree ○ The interpreter signed in a way that I could understand. 68% -Strongly agree/Agree 32% - Neutral 0% - Strongly Disagree/Disagree ○ I dropped or wanted to drop this course because of the other deaf and hard of hearing students in the class. 5% -Strongly agree/Agree 5% - Neutral 90% - Strongly disagree/Disagree ○ I had trouble understanding the interpreter because they signed too much like English for other students in the class 21% -Strongly agree/Agree 15% - Neutral 64% - Strongly disagree/Disagree ○ It is important to me to take classes with other deaf and hard of hearing students. 42% -Strongly agree/Agree 42% - Neutral 16% - Strongly disagree/Disagree ○ I prefer that interpreters in my classes sign in more English word order and mouth English vocabulary. 22% -Strongly agree/Agree 25% - Neutral 53% - Strongly disagree/Disagree ○ I could not ask the teacher questions because the interpreter was busy interpreting for other students in the class.

by interpreters/peers. Students wanted to complete a survey for each course which was appropriate to do so.

- 4 of the 23 completed surveys were set aside as they were not courses with multiple students (non-cohorts).
- A total of **19 surveys were completed** that represent students' experience within a cohort. The results are based on these 19 completed surveys.
- Results are rounded to the nearest whole percentage.

GRADES EARNED AMONG DEAF STUDENTS:

- Fall 2010--Final grades earned by students in cohorts were also extracted in comparing previous semesters prior to the implementation.

32% -Strongly agree/Agree

31% - Neutral

37% - Strongly disagree/Disagree

- I am satisfied with the way my classes were scheduled.

74% -Strongly agree/Agree

26% - Neutral

0% - Strongly disagree/Disagree

- It is distracting to have other deaf and hard of hearing students in class with me.

16% -Strongly agree/Agree

36% - Neutral

48% - Disagree/Strongly disagree

- I was able to take classes on days and at times that I wanted.

69% -Strongly agree/Agree

26% - Neutral

5% - Strongly disagree/Disagree

- I had trouble understanding the interpreter because they signed too much like ASL for other students in the class.

21% - Strongly agree/Agree

11% - Neutral

68% - Strongly disagree/Disagree

- The class often split into small groups and the interpreter was not able to interpret for each student.

16% -Strongly agree/Agree

53% - Neutral

31% - Strongly disagree/Disagree

- I think I will pass this class.

69% -Strongly agree/Agree

20% - Neutral

11% - Strongly disagree/Disagree

Student written Comments reflected on survey (typed verbatim from survey)

- Sometimes my interpreter signs a bit both ASL and English, it kind of me make confused. And I don't like use English because it make me don't not understand anything. It makes me that I didn't learn anything in the Class.
- I felt this class was too hard for me use 2 different interpreting styles. I love(interpreter name removed by DSC) and I think she is an amazing signer but I found I understood...(interpreter name removed by DSC) Only because I don't fully understand ASL. I am way more English and I would prefer to keep it that way because I read the teachers lips and watch the interpreter. With an ASL interpreter it was way too much added stress and

confusing. I never fully understood the tasks given for the assignments until I took extra time to speak one on one with the teacher. It was a huge conflict with my schedule and lost time I could have used for the actual assignment.

- The other deaf students were very curious and constantly asked questions while the teacher was talking. The other students were chatting and not paying attention to the teacher. It was distracting.
- One interpreter disappeared and I received a new interpreter. The change was difficult because I had to review made-up signs that I had discussed w/ the previous interpreter. I prefer the previous interpreter than the new one because I felt understanding and comfort from her.
- It was hard to speak up in class because of the speed of both interpreter and the teacher. I was distracted when other deaf students were talking at the same time as the interpreters and teachers were.
- The videotape is unnecessary.
- Should have had 2 interpreters in this class, because, because split into groups. Should also have 2 interpreters in lecture because only one is there and sometimes too tired because of 4 hours class. Sometime when tired, not getting all information from teacher lecture. I don't want to always work with other deaf students because I want to interact with other people than deaf. Because I need that skills to interact with not only deaf and hard of hearing but also hearing people for when I go and applied for job. Should also have a sub interpreter for when the original interpreter is sick or absent. Because I tend to fail the test the next day on the lecture given the day before. I hate the videotape because do not have time to review it and could not get the information on the lecture for the test the next day.
- His class was a little easier to understand as opposed to my other class. Only because interpreter tried really hard to interpret more English for my sake. Also it was easier because there was only one other deaf person in the class which meant less distracting and interrupting the interpreter. Nonetheless, I struggles with math because even though the interpreter (name removed by DSC) tried her best to sign English it still did not fit w/how the teacher was saying things when I'd read his lips and that confused me so much. Situations like this really do not help me especially when it is a subject that I already struggle with.

Grade Results:

○ **Cohort - Grade Outcomes (Fall 2010)**

Based on final grades for cohort courses using interpreters

32 courses resulting in

62% (20 courses) = A, B, or C

31% (10 courses*) = D, F

3% (1 course) = W

3% (1 course) = I

*Note- 4 of the earned "D" were in English or ENSL

○ **Prior to Cohort – Grade Outcomes**

Based on final grades prior to cohorts for courses using interpreters

Summer 2010

8 courses resulting in

75% (6 courses) = A, B, or C

25% (2 courses) = W

Spring 2010

45 courses resulting in

64% (29 courses) = A,B,or C

16% (7 courses*) = D or F

20% (9 courses) = W

*Note- 2 of the earned "D" were in English or ENSL

*Note-The 'W's' earned were based on two deaf students (husband/wife) who withdrew from their courses to move out of state.

Fall 2009

44 courses resulting in

80 % (35 courses) = A, B, C

16% (7 courses*) = D, F

5% (2 courses) = W

*Note- 2 of the earned 'D' were in English or ENSL

Fall 2008

32 courses resulting in

56% (18 courses) = A, B, C

22% (7 courses) = D, F

19% (6 courses) = W

3% (1 course) = IP

*Note-3 of the 7 courses earned D/F were in English or ENSL

SUMMARY OF RESULTS:

Survey Questions/Answers:

- 21% of students reported trouble understanding interpreter due to “too much like English” or “too much like ASL” (21% reported this in both cases)
- 68% of students reported “Interpreter signed in a way that I could understand” (68% Strongly Agree/Agree; 32% Neutral; 0% Strongly disagree/Disagree)
- 69% of students reported it was “helpful to have other deaf or hard of hearing students in the same class with me” (69% Strongly Agree/Agree; 26% Neutral; 5% Strongly disagree/Disagree)
- 74% of the students reported they were “satisfied with the way my classes were scheduled” (74% Strongly Agree/Agree; 26% Neutral; 0% Strongly disagree/Disagree)
- 69% of the students reported they were “able to take classes on days and at times that I wanted” (69% Strongly Agree/Agree; 26% Neutral; 5% Strongly disagree/Disagree)
- 32% of the students reported they “could not ask the teacher questions because the interpreter was busy interpreting for other students in the class” (32% Strongly Agree/Agree; 31% Neutral; 37% Strongly Disagree/Disagree)

Student Written Comments:

- ASL vs. English based interpreting within Cohort—causing ‘struggle’, ‘confusion’ and ‘stress’ for some students who are stronger in one vs. the other
- Students ‘chatting’ or “talking” within cohorts during lecture causing distraction for student(s).
- Speed of “interpreter and teacher” made it difficult to speak up as it was too fast

Grades:

Cohorts: Fall 2010	Fall 2009
Total of 32 courses	Total of 44 courses
62% (20 courses) = A, B,C	80% (35 courses) = A, B,C
31% (10 courses) = D, F	16% (7 courses) = D, F

Notes:

- Cohorts required following Student’s Educational Plans as they were used in the development of the Master Educational Plan for Fall 2010. Whereas, classes chosen during the fall 2009 by students were not all based on student’s educational plans allowing more freedom to choose different types of courses.
- Fall 2010 was the first cohort group and comparing to prior fall semester (80% earning A,B,C), at first glance it appears that the Cohort had a severe negative impact to deaf students’ success. Yet, we researched prior semester’s grades (see below) and they reflect similar fall 2010 grades. We are interested in seeing grades earned at the conclusion of the second cohort of deaf students (Spring 2011 term).

Cohorts: Fall 2010	Spring 2010
Total of 32 courses	Total of 45 courses
62% (20 courses) = A, B,C	64% (29 courses) = A, B,C
31% (10 courses) = D, F	16% (7 courses) = D, F

Notes:

- Cohorts required following Student’s Educational Plans as they were used in the development of the Master Educational Plan for Fall 2010. Whereas, classes chosen during fall 2009 by students were not all based on student’s educational plans allowing more freedom to choose different types of courses.
- Deaf students’ primary language is not English nor do they hear the spoken language due to their auditory disability. As a group they face more challenges in English/ENSL classes since their primary language is visually based (ex. ASL) [More research and support is needed in addressing this gap that exists among our deaf student population due to their disability]. Out of the 31% earning D/F within the Fall 2010 cohort, 4 of the 10 courses were English/ENSL classes. Out of the 16% earning D/F within the Spring 2010 term, 2 of the

7 courses were English/ENSL classes.

- We show 9 more courses with grades A, B, C's prior to the implementation of cohorts, but percentage wise they are similar (62% and 64%).

Cohorts: Fall 2010	Fall 2008
Total of 32 courses	Total of 32 courses
62% (20 courses) = A, B,C	56 % (18 courses) = A, B,C
31% (10 courses) = D, F	22% (7 courses) = D, F

Notes:

- Cohorts required following Student's Educational Plans as they were used in the development of the Master Educational Plan for fall 2010. Whereas, classes chosen during the fall 2008 by students were not all based on student's educational plans allowing more freedom to choose different types of courses.
- Both terms are closely similar in grades.

DECISIONS:

The ability to understand the delivery of instruction is an essential component to learning. As we address deaf students' utilization of sign language interpreters in cohorts, ADA requires access to communication to be an effective mode of delivery.

- Surveying this cohort was delivered through written survey and was interpreted directly by the DSP&S Advisor/Coordinator to the deaf student. We will seek other methods of communicating future surveys to students as our goal is to minimize the "Neutral" responses within the survey.
- We will review grades earned among second group of cohort students at the conclusion of Spring 2011 semester to compare with grades earned in Fall 2010 (cohort students) and compare to grades from previous semesters. Again, Cohorts using a Master Educational Plan was implemented as of Fall 2010 semester.
- Based on written comments reflected in students' surveys, wherein the issue of ASL vs. English based interpreting needs is identified, as we meet with students, we'll be more conscientious about this area in helping us to form cohorts more adequately. This will not only address ADA requirement in the delivery of effective communication but

will also improve student success rates among deaf students.

- Provide in-service training to our sign language interpreters to help address the following:
 - Interpreters to work with Instructors more closely as instructors may not be aware of “chatting” among cohort of students
 - Inform students at the start of each term that Interpreters’ role will involve voicing what students are saying. Interpreters are to follow through and voice what students are saying in class.
 - Be conscientious of instructors’ fast pace communication when signing. Allowance for interpreters to ask to slow down.