

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): Masters in French

Department: Languages, Literatures, and Cultures

Degree or Certificate Level: M.A.

College/School: Arts and Sciences

Date (Month/Year): September 2023

Assessment Contact: Lois Cassandra Hamrick

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2023

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2016

Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization or subject to state/licensure requirements? We follow the standards established by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. The AATF does not "accredit" programs.

If yes, please share how this affects the program's assessment process (e.g., number of learning outcomes assessed, mandated exams or other assessment methods, schedule or timing of assessment, etc.):

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please provide the complete list of the program's learning outcome statements and **bold** the SLOs assessed in this cycle.)

The "complete list of the program's learning outcome statements" include the following: 1. "Student can demonstrate mastery of three areas of French and Francophone literature and culture before and after 1900." 2. **"Student will demonstrate a command of written and oral French."** 3. "Student will demonstrate the ability to analyze, formulate, and express concepts clearly in French." 4. "Student can produce an original scholarly essay in French that provides ample evidence of skill in conducting literary research, performing literary analysis, and writing in a convincing and well-organized fashion."

In our 2023 assessment report, the emphasis is on the student's command of *oral French* rather than on both oral and written communicative skills. We have modified the oral rubric this year in order to be able to assess more closely the oral component in the program. A copy of this rubric can be found at the end of this report.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe the artifacts in detail, identify the course(s) in which they were collected, and if they are from program majors/graduates and/or other students. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

During academic year 2022-2023, graduate courses included "Writers of Memory", "Age of Enlightenment", "Voices of Empowerment". All courses were given in-person on the home campus. Artifacts of graduate student learning varied according to the subject. For example, in the case of "Writers of Memory", autobiographical narratives were delivered orally. Joint and single class presentations of secondary sources had as their objective the formal delivery of information and research.

In the "Age of Enlightenment" course, students demonstrated the quality of their spoken French and ability to present clear arguments using authentic texts of the period. A rubric based on the values that are an integral part of the general rubric attached to this report was used to assess the student's proficiency in the targeted area.

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (please do not just refer to the assessment plan).

The artifacts of student learning and the outcomes produced were evaluated according to models or rubrics developed in conjunction with the objectives of the course and with which the students were familiar. Also taken into consideration were our own means of assessing the M.A. learning outcomes and the assessment process that was created for that purpose. In fact, the rubric or instrument of measurement basically served as the internal organizer for the course in each case. At the same time, it provided the groundwork for the evaluation of student learning.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

The positive results of the overall assessment of French graduate students' learning outcomes can be seen in the table below. In all cases, students met the expected outcomes.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you? Address both a) learning gaps and possible curricular or pedagogical remedies, and b) strengths of curriculum and pedagogy.

The data produced during the assessment shows that the curriculum and the pedagogy that currently underlie the program have been effective and motivating for our graduate students.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss the results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

Findings from this assessment have been shared in our French faculty meetings and have served to plan for curricular programming in conjunction with new initiatives such as the Microcredentials at the undergrad level that will be available beginning next Fall (2024).

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies

- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites
- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Student learning outcomes
- Artifacts of student learning
- Evaluation process
- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

We regularly use findings from this annual assessment to ameliorate our program. In this case, the assessment has brought energy and purpose to the overall renewal that our undergraduate program is undergoing and the development of new courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

See comments above.

7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of previous assessment data?

Please see above, 6B. These changes are still on-going.

B. How has the change/have these changes identified in 7A been assessed?

Assessment instruments were built into the courses at the time they were created.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

The findings have been positive. Please see the discussion above.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

We need to see how any of the recent changes will benefit our situation.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., artifact prompts, rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted/appended into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document. Thank you. Please see the attachment below.

French M.A. Assessment, 2022-2023

This year’s annual assessment of the French graduate program has focused on *Learning Outcomes* in the area of French Oral production. To meet the required level of Oral proficiency, students must attain the level of “**Meets expectations**” on the language proficiency scale developed by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). To meet the oral outcomes in French, students must at the very least **Meet Expectations** as indicated below in all four Criteria categories. To be assessed as **Exceeding Expectations**, a simple majority of marked checkboxes in **Exceeds Expectations** category is required. Students having more than two marked checkboxes “**Does Not Meet Expectations**” will not have met the Student Outcome.

To meet the oral French outcomes, students must at the very least **Meet Expectations** as indicated below in all four Criteria categories. To be assessed as **Exceeding Expectations**, a simple majority of marked checkboxes in **Exceeds Expectations** category is required. Students having more than two marked checkboxes “**Does Not Meet Expectations**” will not have met the Student Outcome.

Please see below the results of the Oral proficiency evaluation for the year 2023-2024:

Total number of grad students assessed	Outcome & skill Assessed (see rubric)	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectations
3	<i>Language Function</i>	3 (100%)		0 (0%)
3	<i>Text Type</i>	2 (66%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
3	<i>Comprehensibility</i>	2 (66%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
3	<i>Language Control</i>	3 (100%)		0 (0%)

See the last page for the Rubric used to evaluate levels of oral proficiency.

***Rubric:**

French M.A. Assessment Tool for evaluating Oral Proficiency (9/2023)

SLO 1 – Oral part: the M.A. graduate in French will be able to “demonstrate a command of [...] oral expression in French.”

This assessment concerns specifically the oral component of the SLO 1. The capacity to interact in spoken French is understood in this program as being able to communicate successfully at the Advanced level range according to the standards set by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). The direct assessment of the oral component is measured in courses in conjunction with the specific context and topic at hand. These may include interactive discussion, presentations, reports, and debate on specific questions including a range of issues and topics requiring both concrete as well as abstract thought and expression.

To meet the oral French outcomes, students must at the very least **Meet Expectations** as indicated below in all four Criteria categories. To be assessed as **Exceeding Expectations**, a simple majority of marked checkboxes in **Exceeds Expectations** category is required. Students having more than two marked checkboxes “**Does Not Meet Expectations**” will not have met the Student Outcome.

CRITERIA	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Graduated in 2022-23
<p>Language Function</p> <p>Refers here to the capacity to discuss topics extensively and narrate and elaborate orally in a sustained manner.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Student can speak accurately across major time frames on general topics and some special interests. <input type="checkbox"/> Can talk about abstract topics, especially those related to particular interests and expertise. <input type="checkbox"/> Can provide a structured argument to support opinions and may construct hypotheses.	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently narrates and describes across most major time frames. <input type="checkbox"/> Able to participate in diverse oral exchanges on familiar topics. <input type="checkbox"/> Errors generally do not interfere with communication or distract from the message.	<input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes a prepared topic, but with frequent errors. <input type="checkbox"/> Is constrained to producing a simple, uncomplicated presentation of basic information. <input type="checkbox"/> Is limited to oral expression on topics relating to personal interests and areas of competence.	
<p>Language / Text Type</p> <p>Refers here to different types of discourse including the use of formal language.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Student can use formal language in pertinent situations. Capable of extended discourse on prepared topics involving analysis or supporting an opinion or hypothesis.	<input type="checkbox"/> Capable of using formal language in connected sentences and developing critical arguments and hypotheses although limited in scope and accuracy.	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to use some formal language but may resort to memorized phrases or strings of words.	
<p>Comprehensibility</p> <p>Refers to the speaker’s audience. Can the oral expression be understood by a native speaker?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> The student’s use of language is readily understood by native audiences unaccustomed to interacting with non-natives.	<input type="checkbox"/> The student’s oral expression is understood by native audiences unaccustomed to interacting, although the choice of terms and wording may differ from native forms.	<input type="checkbox"/> The spoken language is generally understood by those unaccustomed to interacting with non-natives, although interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may occur.	
<p>Language Control</p> <p>Refers to grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, and the degree of fluency.</p>	<p>-The student demonstrates control of aspect in written narration on a prepared topic.</p> <p>-Uses precise, diverse vocabulary; writes with clarity.</p> <p>-Accuracy may break down when attempting to perform complex tasks over a variety of topics.</p>	<p>-Demonstrates some control of aspect in written narration on a prepared topic.</p> <p>-Vocabulary may lack specificity. Fluency decreases.</p> <p>-Fluency decreases in quality and quantity when attempting to perform advanced tasks.</p>	<p>-Significant breakdown in communication in one or more of the following areas: ability to narrate and describe, use of lengthy discourse, ease of speaking, breadth of vocabulary.</p>	