Executive Summary of the 2012 Senior Literacy Assessment

* Goals of the Senior Literacy Assessment:
* Engage faculty in professional development regarding assessing literacy
* Provide data about Gallaudet graduating seniors that can be used for institutional and program improvement
* Provide data that can be used by appropriate groups to establish target literacy performance levels for Gallaudet undergraduates
* Describe the changes in Gallaudet student writing performance as they progress through the undergraduate curriculum
* Recommend improvements to future assessment processes
* Senior Writing Assessment begun in Spr., 2009; Senior ASL Assessment begun in Spr., 2011
* 2012 Products and Evaluators
  + Slight decline in the total number of departments submitting their seniors’ written English products (158 v. 131)
  + Submission of ASL products rose significantly compared to previous year (16 v. 58)
  + ASL Evaluators expanded beyond only ASL Program Faculty
* 2012 Departmental Participation
* **English** = Art, ASL-DST, Biology, Business, Chemistry/Physics, Communication Studies, Education, Family and Child Studies, Government, History, Honors, International Studies, Math and Computer Science, Physical Education and Recreation, Psychology, Liberal Studies, Social Work, Sociology
* **ASL** = ASL-DST, Biology, Communication Studies, Education, Family and Child Studies, Honors, Math and Computer Science, Physical Education and Recreation, Psychology, and Liberal Studies
* Over the period of two assessment cycles (Springs 2011 and 2012), one department (ASL & Deaf Studies) has consistently submitted products for both English and ASL assessment.
* Average and Range Across all Programs
* ASL and English products were each rated in five parallel criterion areas on a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 being the lowest score and 4 the highest. The rubrics for ASL was adapted from the AACU Value Rubric for Oral Presentation, while the rubric for written English used this year (for the first time) was the AACU Written Communication Value Rubric.
* ASL
* The lowest performance in ASL for all senior students across the eight departments was in the area of Supporting Material and Central Message.
* Language was the criterion area in which the most students scored a 3 or higher on their ASL products, followed closely by Delivery.
* There were dramatic differences in mean scores among Departments. Students in the departments of Education, FCS, and ASL-DST received 3 or higher more often than students in other departments.
* **English**
* Across all departments, the highest percentages of students scored a 3 or higher on their written English products in the areas of Context and Purpose for Writing and Content Development, closely followed by Genre and Disciplinary Conventions. The lowest mean for all senior students across the departments was in the area of Sources and Evidence (2.6). This criterion area parallels Supporting Materials criteria for the ASL products which also had the lowest mean.
  + There were dramatic differences in mean scores among Departments. Students in the departments of Biology, History, Honors, International Studies, Liberal Studies, Sociology, and Theatre had a higher number of criterion areas in which they received 3 or higher than did other departments.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **WRITTEN ENGLISH** | | |  | **ASL PRESENTATION** | | |
| **Criterion Area** | **Mean** | **Range** |  | **Criterion Area** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| Context and purpose for writing | 3.0 | 1.5-4.0 | Organization | 2.4 | 2.1-2.8 |
| Content development | 2.9 | 1.8-4.0 | Language | 2.4 | 1.3-3.2 |
| Genre and disciplinary conventions | 2.9 | 1.7-4.0 | Delivery | 2.4 | 1.8-3.1 |
| Sources and evidence | 2.7 | 1.1-4.0 | Supporting Material | 2.0 | 1.0-3.3 |
| Control of syntax and mechanics | 2.7 | 1.5-4.0 | Central Message | 2.1 | 1.0-2.5 |

**Next Steps**

* Assure early in the academic year that Department Chairs are aware of the expectations for assessment of literacy outcomes during the senior year so that every Department and Program can provide English and ASL products for senior literacy assessment (OAQ/Deans)
* Increase the pool of faculty assessors for ASL and English products. Continue to offer professional development opportunities for assessing (and for developing) written English and ASL Presentation skills (Faculty Development/ASL-DS Dept/English Dept
* Changes in rubrics used make it difficult to establish targets and to assess institutional process from year to year. There is a need to establish a formal consensus (e.g., through CUE) regarding the agreed upon rubric to be used for assessment of institutional outcomes (CUE/Senate)
* Assess our progress on Senior Literacy Assessment in the following ways:
  + # of seniors for whom both English and ASL products are submitted for assessment
  + # of Programs that submit both English and ASL products for assessment
  + # of faculty that participate in the Literacy assessment calibration sessions for senior assessment
  + # of Programs represented in the Literacy assessment calibration sessions for senior assessment
  + # of seniors who achieve scores at established target levels