

ASL/Interpreting Instructional Program Review
September 2002-December 2002

Instructional Program Review Committee:

- Byron Bridges
- Lynn Beaman
- Nathie Marbury
- Amanda Levy
- Gary Morris
- Heather Currey
- Melissa Kallina

Section 1: Statement of Purpose

The Interpreter Preparation Program is an interdisciplinary program that can lead to the award of Certificate or Associate of Applied Science in Interpreting. The purpose of these programs is to thoroughly prepare students for a variety of careers in interpreting and/or to prepare students for continuation of their educational goals at a four-year institution.

Section 2: Vision Summary

The interpreting profession is a dynamic and growing field of study. Being a relatively new field, there are limited opportunities for formal education in the area of sign language interpreting. Here at ACC we strive to offer a great education and new opportunities for future and current interpreters. With the passing of the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990, the use of interpreters for deaf and hard of hearing individuals has dramatically increased. In the next five years, the Interpreter Preparation Program must both expand its course offerings, methods of instruction, and facilities in order to meet the rising demand for sign language interpreters.

First, as funds become available, we need to open at least one new full-time faculty position. With our growing number of students in each class and being forced to turn away a large number of students each semester, we desperately need more staff in order to create more sections of our current courses. We would love for the Interpreter Preparation Program to expand, produce more graduates, and be able to accommodate every student, but with the current amount of staff, it is impossible. The Interpreter Program is currently functioning with the minimum amount of staff that it needs. Additions in staff would help accommodate the students' need for ASL and Interpreting classes.

Also, our program as a whole will need to change with technology in the next five years. For example, as video interpreting becomes more popular in the field of interpreting, the Interpreter Preparation Program will need to train future interpreters for this type of interpreting and incorporate this into the curriculum. Other changes in curriculum will naturally occur within the next five years as more research is done in the area of sign language interpreting. The Interpreter Program also expects to produce more vocabulary videotapes for ASL students to gain new vocabulary and practice their skills at home. This videotape production has multiple benefits. It will not only benefit the students' learning, but it will also help with funding of the program.

Another expected expansion would be in regards to the ASL/Interpreting Lab. If the number of students continues to increase, we will need to expand the lab to serve these students. The lab will also gradually change by increasing the variety of practice videotapes offered in the lab as new videos become available. As video technology transitions from VHS to DVD, the lab will possibly have to transition as well by purchasing DVDs and DVD equipment. Because technology changes so rapidly, it is somewhat difficult to envision how it will affect the program five years from now.

Regardless, the Interpreter Preparation Program will do it's best to keep up with changing technology.

Overall, the vision for the program five years from now is that we will be growing, changing as needed, and functioning comfortably. The goal is to foster a great Interpreting Program that produces skilled interpreters while meeting the needs of the students, the deaf community, and reflecting positively on Austin Community College.

Section 3: Identification of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats

The SWOT session was conducted on October 4, 2002 to explore the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the Interpreter Preparation Program. The meeting notes are in Appendix A, and below is a summary of each of the areas.

Strengths:

One of the primary strengths of the Interpreter Preparation Program is the faculty and staff we have teaching in the program. We have a diverse staff, which benefits the students in that they are able to experience different styles of signing throughout the program. The quality of the teachers is excellent and currently all the teachers we have are native or near-native users. Our two full-time faculty members are well known and well respected in the deaf community nationwide.

Another strength of the program is the wonderful support and coordination within the department. The Interpreter Preparation Program is part of the Human Services department and the communication and support from the entire department has been essential to the growth of the Interpreter Preparation Program.

An important strength to be noted is the accessibility of the program to the students. The cost of the program is low and courses are offered at a variety of campuses with a good balance of morning, afternoon, and night classes. One of the unique features the Interpreter Preparation Program can offer is the ASL/Interpreting Lab. A native signer for one-on-one tutoring staffs the lab or students can practice individually with the help of the videotaping equipment and television equipment provided in the lab. The lab is open 20 hours/week at varied times to accommodate student's schedules. The program is fortunate also to be located here in Austin where the Texas School for the Deaf is located and in a city where the deaf community is very large.

Other strengths that were mentioned during the SWOT include the quality of students in the program, student satisfaction with the program, and the fact that the program has been continuously growing since it began in 1997. The curriculum used in the program was also praised for its quality and the fact that the curriculum is now standardized and is used by all instructors. It was also mentioned that the community awareness of the program and the contact hours a student receives outside of class are of great benefit to the program.

Weaknesses:

One of the biggest weaknesses of the program at this time is not having enough full-time faculty members in the ASL/Interpreting program. The program is working on a minimum amount of teachers at present and will not be able to grow with the current number of staff. This creates other weaknesses mentioned such as needing to increase the number of sections offered in the summer, needing a wider variety of instructors, and needing to make the classes smaller in size. None of these weaknesses can be fixed until more full-time faculty positions are created. Also related to this need of more staff is the Instructional Associate position we currently have in the lab. We offer 20 hours per week each semester for the lab to be open for students. Although we try to accommodate all students' schedules, it is simply impossible to meet all the student's needs by opening the lab only 20 hours per week.

The second important weakness to consider is Rio Grande Campus. Our program could expand and grow, but is limited by the number of classrooms available here at RGC. Our classes become full and we have to turn students away without giving them other options to choose from. Only a handful of our classes are offered at other campuses, thus forcing the students to attend classes at RGC. This is a constant complaint from students and teachers alike due to the extremely limited parking spaces here at Rio Grande.

Thirdly, our public relations and advertisement of the Interpreter Preparation Program is poor. Students are constantly calling in asking about the program and explaining that they can't find the information on the internet or the location of the program in the catalog or schedule. There needs to be better communication about the program and more education about what our program entails.

There were other weaknesses mentioned that were not deemed quite as important as the above mentioned. One weakness being the fact that many of the classes taken for the Interpreter Program are non-transferable. There are also a few staff issues to consider. Even though there is a standardized syllabus, some of the instructors don't follow it completely. The instructors also need to require more lab hours and "hands-on" practice for their students.

Opportunities:

Many opportunities present themselves to the Interpreter Preparation Program in the coming months and years for which the program should be poised to take advantage. One of the most important being that the demand for interpreters is on the rise and the field of interpreting is constantly growing and expanding.

Another great opportunity is the amount of resources we have in Austin. There are deaf churches, the deaf school, and a huge deaf community here in Austin. We currently take advantage of this opportunity somewhat, but we could use our resources even more.

An opportunity in the far future is perhaps moving our program to a location on a different campus. This would solve one of our weaknesses of being on a limited campus with space issues. This would allow for more class space and more lab space.

Publicity is also an opportunity for us. Because of the interpreting demand, there are many people out there who want to learn ASL and become an interpreter, but just don't know where to go. If we took the opportunity to publicize better we would have more growth and could more meet the need of the community. One way that was mentioned to take advantage of this opportunity is to have more workshops for the deaf community thereby getting the information about the program out to the community.

A couple of other opportunities present themselves as well. In the near future it is probable that interpreters will be required to have an associate's degree or a bachelor's. Therefore, more people will want to enroll in the interpreting program to obtain a degree. Also, each year the quality of the graduates seems to be improving, which increases the pay level of the interpreters we are producing thereby giving them a higher earning power. Finally, one last opportunity we have in the program is technology related. Currently in our lab we have hundreds of videotapes for our students to watch and improve their skills. As the technology increases and DVDs are on the horizon, one opportunity we will have is to change our lab to match technology and replace the VHS tapes with DVDs.

Threats:

One of the major threats to the Interpreter Preparation Program is the threat of not being able to expand. This will impact the program significantly. Without enough staff to teach classes, without an accommodating location, and without an accommodating budget, we will be hard pressed to meet the needs of the students. If we can't meet the student's needs, someone else will. University of Texas has ASL classes that could be a threat to our program if we fail to meet the student's needs here at ACC. At San Antonio College there is also talk of a BA in Interpreting beginning in Fall 2003. This could be a major threat in that this would be the first college in Texas to offer a Bachelor's Degree in this field.

Another threat associated with money is the fact that the Instructional Associate position that staffs our lab is paid by grant money and is not on "hard" money yet. This gives the feeling of instability and could be a major threat to the program if that position was lost.

A third threat is the tax referendum coming up shortly. If this bond does not pass, it could have a significant impact and negative effect in our program.

Another possible threat could be a change in administration. Right now in the Interpreting Program, we have incredible support for our program through our administrators. They understand the program and fully comprehend all of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats listed here. They are highly involved and provide

so much support for our instructors in the ASL/Interpreting classes. If this situation was to change for the worse, this could become a major threat to the program.

Other threats mentioned included the threat of a tuition increase, the threat of losing interpreter assistants due to lack of funding, the threat of high school ASL programs not being equal to college level classes, and finally, the threat of not keeping close connections between the interpreter services here at ACC and the Interpreting Program.

Section 4: Summary Analysis of Core Indicators of Effectiveness

Need: Does the Program address a verifiable need of students, the community, or society?

The Interpreter Preparation Program fills a valuable position for students and for the Austin community as a whole. The associate degree and two certificate programs within our department reflect the labor market demands within the industry. According to labor market statistics in the year 2000, there were 22,000 interpreters/translators in the United States. Austin Community College alone employs 84 interpreters for its deaf clientele, 11 of those 84 graduated from the program here. The projected change of employment from 2000-2010 is rated "faster than average" by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. (Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Handbook)

For the past three years the Interpreter Preparation Program has had a steady increase in the number of sections being offered. The program has grown from offering a total of 34 sections in 1999 to offering 50 sections in 2002. All of these sections have consistently been filled and even overloaded to accommodate the number of students wanting to take American Sign Language and Interpreting classes.

Using figures provided by the Office for Institutional Effectiveness (OIE), student enrollment in the American Sign Language and Interpreting classes increased from 287 students in 1999 to 381 students in 2002. Of those students enrolled in our department, 23 graduated from the Interpreting Program between FY99 and FY02. This figure is somewhat misleading due to the fact that many of the students enrolled took American Sign Language classes only, and did not continue on through the interpreting program. The Interpreting Program is relatively new in that the first graduates of the program were in the Summer of 1999. On a positive note, despite the seemingly low numbers of graduates, the placement rates of students for that same time period has been consistently high, with an average of 90% of graduates finding employment.

Analyzing the results of the Adult Learner follow-up study for 99-00, one finds that the majority of the students who were surveyed (69.6%) within the Interpreter Preparation Program were employed upon graduation and did not pursue additional higher education. One of the main reasons for this is due to the fact that there are only a handful of Bachelor Degree programs for Interpreting throughout the United States. However, in the same time frame, there was a moderate amount (21.7%) of students that sought

additional higher education and were employed. Very few (4.3%) of the students sought additional higher education and were not employed.

As stated earlier, labor market statistics report that careers in the field of sign language interpreting are on the rise. There is an increasing need for not only *more* interpreters, but also *more qualified* interpreters. The Interpreter Preparation Program is meeting this need in that the program itself is growing every year and the quality of students graduating from the program seems to improve every year as well. With the Interpreter Preparation Program in its fourth year of graduates, it has established a solid foundation beginning in American Sign Language: Beginning I and continuing throughout the entire Interpreting Program.

Austin Community College is well placed to serve the training needs of the community. No other Interpreter Preparation Program exists in Austin and its surrounding areas. The nearest programs are located in San Antonio and Waco. With the large Deaf community also located here in Austin, this enhances the experience for the students and helps to generate jobs for students in this area upon graduation.

Cost – Within the Context of the College’s mission, is the cost of the program justified?

The Interpreter Preparation Program is a fairly low-budget program. When the program began and the ASL/Interpreting Lab was setup, the approximate total cost was \$30,000. Since that time, the program has spent very little to maintain the TV/VCRs, video cameras, and other equipment in the lab. While we expect to replace old or worn out equipment in the future, at present the program needs are modest. With the exception of adding one new Instructional Associate to run the lab, the budget for the program has remained static for two years. Although the College used to collect data on average cost/section of courses, this data is no longer available.

Program Effectiveness: Are the teaching, learning, course, program, student and student support outcomes of this program of the best possible outcome?

Program Effectiveness: Student Achievement

Fourteen courses comprise the program courses for the Interpreter Preparation Program (ASL and Interpreting courses). Using Grade Distribution data for Fall 2000-Spring 2002 provided by OIE, the mastery rate of students (measured by those students achieving a grade of A, B, or C) ranges from a low of 74.9% to a high of 89.3%. The median mastery rate of the 14 courses is 80.26%, or conversely, a non-mastery rate of 18.83%. Giving the disclaimer that the College only has norms for 1997, ACC’s average of Non-mastery as defined by grades of D or F was 29.5% for 1997. The withdrawal rates of students from ASL/Interpreting courses averages 10.68% compared to the 20.5% ACC average. In general terms, it seems safe to say that on average, students in

ASL/Interpreting courses do as well as students in other ACC courses, and that students in our courses persist to a greater extent than students across the College.

The number of students completing degree/certificate requirements for the Interpreter Preparation Program has steadily increased through the years from a low of 3 graduates the first year (1999) to a high of 11 in 2002. Many students take American Sign Language classes to fulfill a foreign language requirement or for personal reasons (i.e. they work with someone who is deaf or have someone in their family who is deaf). Some of these students enter the ASL classes, unaware that ACC offers an Interpreting Program, and find they have a love for the language and continue in the program. Being a relatively new program, high growth is expected in the next few years as the reputation of the Interpreting Program spreads.

State records provided by the Texas Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing indicate that of the seven that graduated from Fall 2000-Fall 2001, four of them attempted the Level 1 Interpreting test. It should be noted that the remaining three graduates received an American Sign Language Studies certificate. This certificate is not designed for someone who wants to become an interpreter and does not prepare you for such. The certificate teaches the basics of ASL and assists in communicating with deaf individuals, but not interpreting for them. To summarize, 100% of the students who graduated in order to become an interpreter took the state test. Of those four, two passed, one failed, and one student's results were not available because the results applied to the following year. For the known results, 66.6% passed the Level 1 interpreting test. More current results were not available.

Program Effectiveness: Student Retention

Student retention is measured based on two factors: 1) withdrawal rates for courses and 2) completion rates of declared majors with intent to complete a degree/certificate. As previously stated in the Student Achievement section, the withdrawal rate for SLNG courses averages a 10.68%, which is below the College norm. The second factor cannot be analyzed, as the college intent data is not yet available.

Program Effectiveness: Student Outcomes

The indicators for student outcomes are those factors previously discussed: job placement rates and program graduates. College statistics (THECB 2000 Program Profile) show that of the 3 graduates in 1999-2000, 100% were employed. The Interpreting Program graduates totaled approximately 3% of ACC's total graduates for 99-00. As mentioned before, these were the first graduates of the Interpreter Preparation Program and no data has been collected for graduates after this time. Similarly, no program data has been collected to measure standardized proficiency rates through long-term longitudinal studies.

Program Effectiveness: Access

Courses within the Interpreting Program are offered at the Rio Grande and Pinnacle campuses, Highland Business Center, and the San Marcos Center. Our courses are very evenly split between morning, afternoon and evening sections. This is optimal for those students who are working a full-time or part-time job as well as attending school. The Interpreter Preparation Program's beginning courses (American Sign Language I-IV) are offered each semester, including the summer, with a variety of times and sections to choose from. For example, American Sign Language: Beginning I, had 8 sections being offered in the Fall 2002 semester, and could be taken at 4 different locations. Additionally, the more specialized interpreting classes are alternated between fall and spring semesters, with four courses being offered Fall only, four courses being offered Spring only, and one course being offered Summer only.

Taking the 10 graduates we have of the Interpreter Preparation Program Associate's degree and certificate, student records indicates that 60% completed degrees or certificates within two or one year respectively. Of those remaining, the majority completed their programs with an additional year of study. Only one of the graduates took longer than three years to complete a program. (One note: Records were counted from the date of the first program requirement with the prerequisites having already been met. Some students had courses in other degree plans, or in developmental studies earlier in their academic careers.)

In the time period studied by OIE (Fall 1999-Spring 2001), no classes within the Interpreter Preparation Program were cancelled. Enrollment in sections from semester to semester remains relatively stable for the time period studied. From Fall 2000-Spring 2002, the studies indicate that the ASL/Interpreting classes were in fairly high demand with an average of 20.5 students enrolled per section. Being that the section limit is between 18-22 students for the majority of the Interpreting Program's courses, these statistics show that we are meeting the needs of the community. One detail to consider, however, is the fact that we have been forced to turn students away and not allow them to take a class because it is not only full, but has been overloaded to accommodate the need. For example, in the Spring and Summer of 2001, 77 students were turned away and did not find another class. Comparatively, in the Spring and Summer of 2002, 86 students were turned away and did not find another class. There is a concern for the Interpreting Program that this pattern will continue and students will not have their needs met without further sections being added.

The students enrolled in the Interpreter Preparation Program are predominantly female (81.8%) which is reflective of the profession, although higher than the College average of 54.3%. Most students in the program, 79%, are white. Other ethnicity breakdowns are seen in Table 1:

Table 1

Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	International
SLNG 3.1%	SLNG 12%	SLNG 3.7%	SLNG 2.6%	SLNG 0%
College 6.6%	College 20.6%	College 6%	College .7%	College 1.4%

When looking at enrollment information based on Special Populations, Interpreting students are represented in each of the areas analyzed. Table 2 summarized the data on Access by Special Populations.

Table 2

Economically Disadvantaged	Individuals w/ Disabilities	Academically Disadvantaged	Non-Traditional Majors
9%	11%	4%	21%

College-wide data concerning access by Special Populations reflect a 9% enrollment of economically disadvantaged students; 11% individuals with disabilities; and 4% academically disadvantaged. (THECB 1999-2000 Annual Data Profile)

When reviewing the most recent course evaluation summaries on file (1999-2001), students report positive responses regarding the accessibility of the course content. Indicators of satisfaction with accessibility of course content include factors related to the clarity of the instructional materials and the overall climate of the course. Records were reviewed for five faculty members teaching during this time (on either a full or part time basis). When rating the overall climate and instructional materials for the courses, the average for the ASL and Interpreting classes was a rating of 5.77 out of a possible 6.0. When asking students if they would recommend these instructors to students, 83% of them said yes. Hence it appears that the core courses taught by our faculty are found to be accessible to the students in the presentation of the material and the classroom environment.

Overall, the courses within the Interpreter Preparation Program seem accessible to the majority of students and small barriers exist from within the College to deter successful completion. Students in the program face many external challenges that may serve as barriers as well - the need to work, raising children, and a lack of early academic preparation – yet the majority overcome these barriers and successfully complete their courses.

Program Effectiveness: Curriculum

During the past two years the Interpreter Preparation Program completed the WCEM conversion. All degree programs were revised in Fall 2000, and copies are on file of the revision in the department office. The one change was the addition of an Arts/Humanities requirement and a Speech requirement to comply with the general education requirements implemented by the State Legislature. Two other revisions exist

as well. In Fall 1998, the Voice and Diction course was removed as a requirement and Special Topics: ASL V was added. In 2002, ASL VI was added as a requirement.

All course syllabi include learning outcomes that reflect the course objectives. SCANS criteria are integrated into course requirements. Current course syllabi are on file with the Program Coordinator.

The Interpreter Preparation Program has a 14 member Advisory Committee that meets annually to discuss curriculum issues. The advisory committee minutes are maintained and posted annually. The most recent review of the curriculum by the external advisory committee was on October 4, 2002.

The ASL/Interpreting department is fairly self-sufficient and requires little in the way of specialized outside instructional resources. Our students have access to library material, and many of the articles, videotapes, and books relevant to the study of sign language. Our ASL/Interpreting lab here at Rio Grande Campus is also a great benefit to the students. It provides them with the availability to practice interpreting or vocabulary using videotapes, practice videotaping themselves to evaluate their improvement, and provides them with a knowledgeable lab associate for one-on-one practice or questions. The lab is open 20 hrs/week at varied times each semester to accommodate almost any students' schedule.

The ASL/Interpreting department provides courses that have a broad appeal to students in other areas of study. Although statistics are not kept on the academic majors of students who take ASL and Interpreting classes, many students inform us that they are taking ASL for a foreign language requirement or for general interest.

The 2002-2003 ACC Catalog has up-to-date content on the Interpreter Preparation Program courses. No errors were found upon analysis of the catalog degree plans or course descriptions.

As of Fall 2002, all of the ASL/Interpreting classes are offered in a 16-week format only. While the majority of courses are offered on a twice/week basis, five courses throughout the year are offered on a once/week format.

Program Effectiveness: Technology

Technology plays a significant role in the Interpreter Preparation Program. Beginning in American Sign Language I, the students are required to watch videotapes related to class in the lab or in the library. At this first level of signing, the students are also required to sign different presentations or projects and to record themselves on videotape. This teaching method is required for the vast majority of our courses; therefore, the lab plays a vital role in the students' education and improvement. Our lab is open 20 hrs/week and is staffed by our instructional associate who runs the lab and teaches ASL classes. We currently have no distance learning classes offered due to the highly visual nature of the sign language classes.

Program Effectiveness: Faculty

All full-time faculty members within the ASL/Interpreting department meet SACS standards. The use of adjunct instructors is necessary with some courses, and these instructors, while holding appropriate licenses and certifications, do not all meet the 18-hour graduate hour rule for SACS. All adjunct faculty members do, however, meet the guideline exceptions based on education and expertise in the subject area.

With the exception of one new instructional associate to the department in 2001, the department has virtually remained the same. As of Fall 2002, the ASL/Interpreting department had 2 full-time faculty, 1 instructional associate who works 20 hrs in the lab and teaches three classes, and 6 other adjunct faculty members to accommodate the number of sections offered.

The College has implemented a new policy for faculty development activities. Full-time faculty members are required to complete 12 hours of faculty development activities each year. This requirement started in FY01 and all faculty members met this requirement. Faculty members within the Interpreter Preparation Program also hold State certifications in their areas of specialization, which necessitate additional continuing education activities for re-certification. Hence, in addition to College sponsored professional development activities such as teaching workshops, technology training, and curriculum development activities, faculty members pursue additional continuing education through professional conferences.

Student evaluations of the courses indicate that our instructors are well liked and respected. Faculty members received high marks for keeping the courses relevant and interesting, the activities well organized, and the classroom environment stimulating and encouraging. A review of five faculty records (1999-2001) indicates that 83% students would recommend our faculty to other students as compared to the college average of 88%. Just glancing through and taking one comment from each of the five teachers evaluated, you see comments such as “I would recommend her in a heartbeat with no hesitation”; “Very best teacher I have ever had”; “She really wants us to do well and takes the time to ensure our success”; “He is great and I love the class”; “I think she is an excellent teacher”. In all cases, student evaluations of instruction were within or exceeded the acceptable range, as evidenced by the ranking given to the faculty members by the supervisor on the evaluation summary form.

In addition to student evaluations, the College has also implemented a new policy on faculty evaluations. Each faculty member must submit a teaching portfolio yearly to be reviewed by the faculty member’s supervisor. The portfolio gives the faculty member and the supervisor an opportunity to review student evaluations, instructional activities, and professional development plans.

Program Effectiveness: Diversity

As described in the 'Access' section of this document, students enrolled in and graduating from the Interpreter Preparation Program are predominantly white women. (See Table 1 for demographics of enrollees.) Of the graduates in 99-00, 67% were white and 33% were black. Our staff, including full-time and adjunct faculty, consists of 87.5% white individuals and 12.5% black individuals. To compare gender, our staff consists of 62.5% females and 37.5% males.

Program Effectiveness: Student Satisfaction

Student course evaluations suggest that students are satisfied with the ASL and Interpreting courses. As described in previous sections of this report, students give our faculty high marks for course relevance, instructional presentation, and classroom climate.

According to the OIE Graduate Follow-Up Survey Results (99-01), the majority of graduates were employed 35 or more hours/week and their certificate/degree was not required for the job, but used the training in their jobs. Only one student could not find a job in their chosen field. When asked how well ACC's education prepared them for work or further education, 82% ranked it as 'excellent' or 'satisfactory', while the remaining 18% ranked it as 'good only in some areas'.

Program Effectiveness: Employer Satisfaction

Of the students who were found when surveyed in 1999-00, 91% report being employed. In reviewing minutes from the 2001 Interpreter Preparation Program Advisory Board meeting, many employers of interpreters that are on the committee recommended that ACC incorporate a Signing Exact English 2 class into the curriculum. There was also a recommendation for a more specialized class in deaf/blind interpreting. Overall, employers were satisfied, but had a few welcome suggestions. Nothing was mentioned of needing more graduates from the program, but it was noted that the quality of the program was improving.

Program Effectiveness: Transfer Institution Satisfaction

Of the 23 1999-2000 graduate and non-returning students that responded, 4 of those transferred to a public institution. In percentage terms, that is 17.4% as compared with ACC's average transfer rate of 33.9%.

Section 5: Institutional Effectiveness Measures

Three institutional measures are identified (see below) with the primary consideration of increasing the enrollment in the Interpreter Preparation Program.

Effectiveness Measure #1. Outcome title: Student enrollment

Intended Outcome	The number of students enrolled in SLNG will be higher in FY03 than FY02.
Criteria	Two introductory interpreting courses (SLNG 2401 and SLNG 2315) will have a 10% rise in enrollment in FY03 than FY02.
Methodology	Using Datatel, track the number of enrollees in SLNG 2401 and SLNG 2315.

Effectiveness Measure #2. Outcome title: Program marketing

Intended Outcome	The Interpreter Preparation Program will become more visible to internal and external customers.
Criteria	Marketing efforts will increase by 20% in FY03 as compared to FY02.
Methodology	Documentation of print advertisements. Documentation of number of videotapes sold. Documentation of public presentations by faculty.

Effectiveness Measure #3. Outcome title: Employer satisfaction

Intended Outcome	Local employers will report satisfaction with graduates of the IPP.
Criteria	At least 85% of employers when surveyed will report favorable satisfaction with program graduates.
Methodology	Data received from internal survey sent to local employers known to hire interpreting graduates.

Section 6: Recommendations

1. Create a new full-time faculty position to teach ASL and Interpreting courses in order to decrease faculty overloads and meet the rising number of students entering ASL classes.
2. Expand our program and the number of graduates by increasing our number of students in the ASL/Interpreting Program.
3. Collaborate with local high schools in order to advertise the Interpreter Preparation Program to high school students.

4. Create more American Sign Language vocabulary videotapes with the goal of the videos benefiting the students' education as well as benefiting the program's funding.
5. Expand our ASL/Interpreting lab in order to serve more students and increase the lab resources to provide a better variety of practice videotapes for students.
6. Train current and future ASL teachers, high school and college, in order to produce a higher quality of ASL students entering into college Interpreting Programs and graduating from Interpreting Programs.
7. Offer up to eight interpreting classes in combined credit and non-credit format.

Section 7: Action Plans

The following seven action plans are based on a 4-year system as follows:

- Year 1: Fall 2003-Summer 2004
- Year 2: Fall 2004-Summer 2005
- Year 3: Fall 2005-Summer 2006
- Year 4: Fall 2006-Summer 2007

(Summer 2003 is included in Year 1 in several places because of the need for immediate action.)

Recommendation 1: Create one new full-time faculty position to teach ASL and Interpreting courses in order to decrease faculty overloads and meet the rising number of students entering ASL classes.

Year	Actions	Target Date	Responsible
1	Include a request for a full-time faculty member in the master plan.	Summer	DC
2	If needed, include a request for a full-time faculty member in the master plan.	Summer	DC
3	If needed, include a request for a full-time faculty member in the master plan.	Summer	DC
4	Evaluate actions and develop new action plan if full-time position has still not yet been opened.	Summer	DC

Recommendation 2: Expand our program and the number of graduates by increasing our number of students in the ASL/Interpreting Program.

Year	Action Plan	Target Date	Responsible
1	Continue to have faculty advertise and set up booths to represent ACC at the conferences/workshops they attend.	2003	Faculty
	Coordinate with the Texas School for the Deaf to recruit more hearing individuals teaching classes at TSD that might be interested in taking some interpreting classes or improving their general signing skills.	2003	Faculty
2	Develop a website for the Interpreter Program to advertise the program and reach a higher number of possible enrollees.	Fall 2004/Spring 2005	IT services, Faculty, DC
3	Begin investigating opportunities to advertise such as: conventions, workshops, businesses, job fairs, service agencies, on the radio, through the newspaper, on the ACC TV channel, and on a program called "Austin Deaf World" on TV.	Fall 2005	DC/Faculty
4	Evaluate and compare number of students enrolled and number of students graduated from the program in 2002 compared with 2005.	Summer 2007	DC/Faculty

Recommendation 3: Collaborate with local high schools in order to advertise the Interpreter Preparation Program to high school students.

Year	Action Plan	Target Date	Responsible
1	Research local high schools and find out which schools offer ASL classes.	Fall 2003	Faculty
	Contact 50% of the local high schools with ASL programs and set up a time to visit their classes.	Spring 2004	Faculty
	Visit 50% of high schools with an ASL program at the time decided and present information on ACC's Interpreter Preparation Program.	Spring 2004	Faculty
2	Contact the remaining 50% of local high schools with ASL programs and set up a time to visit their classes.	Spring 2005	Faculty
	Visit the remaining 50% of high schools with an ASL program at the time decided and present information on ACC's Interpreter Preparation Program.	Spring 2005	Faculty
3	Contact Year 1 high schools that still offer ASL classes and set up a time to visit their classes.	Spring 2006	Faculty
	Visit Year 1 high schools with ASL programs at the time decided and present information on ACC's Interpreter Preparation Program.	Spring 2006	Faculty
4	Contact Year 2 high schools that still offer ASL classes and set up a time to visit their classes.	Spring 2007	Faculty
	Visit Year 2 high schools with ASL programs at the time decided and present information on ACC's Interpreter Preparation Program.	Spring 2007	Faculty
	Evaluate whether marketing strategies have yielded greater student enrollment.	Summer 2007	Faculty/DC

Recommendation 4: Create more American Sign Language vocabulary videotapes with the goal of the videos benefiting the students' education as well as benefiting the program's funding.

Year	Action Plan	Target Date	Responsible
1	Continue marketing current beginner level videotapes.	Fall 2003	DC/Faculty
	Sign contract with Sign Enhancers to market videos nationwide.	Fall 2003	DC/Faculty
2	Research and collect materials and information for producing intermediate level videotapes.	Fall 2004	Faculty
3	Explore possibilities of using DVD rather than VHS.	Fall 2005	Faculty
	Coordinate with video services at Pinnacle campus to produce an intermediate level set of videotapes.	Spring 2006	Faculty
4	Market new intermediate level videos.	Fall 2006	Faculty
	Evaluate the progress and sales of both levels of videotapes to determine success.	Summer 2006	DC/Faculty

Recommendation 5: Expand our ASL/Interpreting lab in order to serve more students and increase the lab resources to provide a better variety of practice videotapes for students.

Year	Action Plan	Target Date	Responsible
1	<p>Include a request for a full-time lab assistant in the Master Plan.</p> <p>Include a request for equipment and improvement of the lab in the Master Plan and through Perkins funds.</p> <p>Include a request in the facilities plan for more lab space to accommodate a higher number of students.</p>	<p>Summer 2003</p> <p>Summer 2003</p> <p>Fall 2003</p>	<p>DC</p> <p>DC</p> <p>DC</p>
2	<p>Research new technology and how to accommodate the lab for this new technology. Example: DVD equipment replacing VHS equipment. CD equipment replacing audiocassette equipment.</p> <p>If needed, include a request in the facilities plan for more lab space to accommodate a higher number of students.</p>	<p>Fall 2004</p> <p>Fall 2004</p>	<p>DC/Faculty</p> <p>DC</p>
3	<p>Seek funding to begin replacing equipment in the lab with the new technology that is available.</p> <p>If needed, include a request in the facilities plan for more lab space to accommodate a higher number of students.</p>	<p>Fall 2005</p> <p>Fall 2005</p>	<p>DC/Faculty</p> <p>DC</p>
4	<p>Evaluate the use of the lab and how successful it is at accommodating students and faculty.</p>	<p>Spring 2007</p>	<p>DC/Faculty</p>

Recommendation 6: Train current and future ASL teachers, high school and college, in order to produce a higher quality of ASL students entering into college Interpreting Programs and graduating from Interpreting Programs.

Year	Action Plan	Target Date	Responsible
1	Plan and host a weeklong ASL Teacher Training Workshop for current and future high school and college ASL teachers.	Summer 2003	Faculty
	Advertise this workshop to high school ASL teachers while visiting their campuses.	Spring 2004	Faculty
	Locate outside speakers to present at the annual Teacher Training Workshop.	Summer 2004	Faculty
	Continue to work with American Sign Language Teacher's Association (ASLTA) to help provide this weeklong yearly workshop.	Summer 2004	Faculty
2	Plan and host a weeklong ASL Teacher Training Workshop for current and future high school and college ASL teachers.	Summer 2005	Faculty
	Research creating 2 separate annual workshops. One for high school ASL teachers and one for post-secondary ASL teachers.	Summer 2005	Faculty
3	Plan and host a weeklong ASL Teacher Training Workshop for current and future high school ASL teachers.	Summer 2006	Faculty
	Plan and host a weeklong ASL Teacher Training Workshop for current and future college ASL teachers.	Summer 2006	Faculty
4	Evaluate attendance and successfulness of each workshop and determine the future need for such workshops.	Fall 2006	DC/Faculty

Recommendation 7: Offer up to eight interpreting classes in combined credit and non-credit format.

Year	Action Plan	Target Date	Responsible
2	Talk to continuing education staff about adding continuing education classes.	Fall 2004	DC
	Offer combined classes.	Spring 2005	DC/Continuing Education Coordinator
3	Market continuing education classes to Level 1 interpreters.	Fall 2005	DC/Faculty
	Evaluate attendance and success of combined classes.	Summer 2006	DC/Faculty

**Appendix A
SWOT results**

**Human Resources SWOT
October 4, 2002
Attendees**

Byron Bridges	Chair
Lynn Beaman	Chair
Nathie Marbury	Full-time Faculty
Gary Morris	Instructional Associate
Heather Currey	Level 1 Interpreter (Former Student)
Melissa Kallina	Level 3 Interpreter (Former Student)
Amanda Levy	Level 2 Interpreter (Former Student)

SWOT Analysis
October 4, 2002

(Items bolded were deemed by participants to be the most important.)

Strengths

- **Variety of class times/places**
- **Resources – information, videotapes, deaf school in Austin, deaf community in Austin**
- **Faculty/Staff – variety, quality, diversity**
- **Support/coordination between faculty, task force, adjunct, college**
- **Lab space, use of lab, access to teaching assistants**
- **Number of sections offered**
- **ASL teachers are (nearly) native users**
- **Low cost of program (for student)**
- Co-teaching opportunities
- College support
- Part of faculty/staff
- Opportunity for private tutoring
- Curriculum is standardized
- Quality of curriculum
- Coordination between Texas school of deaf (TSD) and ACC program
- Program growing (student-wise)
- Communication access (Interpreter services)
- Lab Assistants
- Number of contact hours/credit hours in interpreter program
- The lecture/lab breakdown gives students access
- Quality of students – motivated
- Student satisfaction with program
- ASL variety of times
- Community awareness of program

Weaknesses

- **Number of full-time faculty – not enough**
- **Need more diversity student-wise (more males, minorities)**
- **Rio Grande - space issues (classes, parking), main location classes offered**
- **Public relations – location of program in catalog**
- **Not enough lab hours, IA's**
- **ASL classes are too big (should be around 14 students)**
- Not enough space for videotaping
- Not enough sections with an interpreter
- Classes fill up – have to turn away students
- Class location
- Faculty should require more lab hours
- Number of sections during summer (need to add a session for each summer term)
- Some faculty don't follow curriculum
- Need to educate people about the program
- Interpreter services and sign language programs can coordinate better
- Need more variety of signers (for different classes)
- Transfer hours – not many options

Opportunities

- **High demand for interpreters**
- **Resources – deaf school in Austin, churches, deaf community**
- **Moving the program to a different location (class/lab space)**
- **Education in field can transfer to other areas (counselors)**
- Publicity
- Technology – DVD's
- Bringing in students that do not know SLNG
- Interpreters might be required to have associate degree/bachelors
- Higher level certificate – increased earning power
- Workshops for deaf community

Threats

- **Not being able to expand program (staff, location, money)**
- **IA's paid by soft money (grants)**
- **Change of administration**
- **Rio Grande (and its associated drawbacks)**
- **Tax referendum not passing**
- **Losing students to San Antonio College (maybe Fall 03)**
- Losing students to UT ASL program
- Interpreter myths – people thinking no need for program
- Tuition increase
- Disconnect between interpreter services and IPR (Interpreter prep program)
- High school ASL programs – quality is low (students not prepared)
- Threat of budget cuts (affects expansion)
- Threat of losing interpreter assistants