

# **Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report**

Program Name (no acronyms): FrenchDepartment: Languages, Literatures and CulturesDegree or Certificate Level: B.A in FrenchCollege/School:Arts and SciencesDate (Month/Year): September 1, 2021Assessment Contact: Pascale Perraudin, Ph.DIn what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2020-2021In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? In 2018

# 1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please list the full, complete learning outcome statements and not just numbers, e.g., Outcomes 1 and 2.)

We assessed the Written Summative Essay, which includes three sub-categories in the rubrics:

- Interpersonal communication
- Interpretive communication
- Intercultural competence

# 2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

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

We collected final essays for upper level courses (courses in literature/culture at the 4xxx level. All courses were taught on SLU campus during the pandemic, and offered hybrid modalities of instruction.

#### 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** (do not just refer to the assessment plan).

Final essays were collected by French program coordinator (Dr. Pascale Perraudin). Essays submitted were then distributed to members of the French program for evaluation. Essays received by evaluators were anonymous (names of students were removed as well as course number). Evaluators were assigned essays that were written in classes other than their own.

Each evaluator received the assessment criteria (a detailed list of items coming from the three sub-categories identified above).

#### 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)?

I have focused my interpretations of the data on a selection of criteria to be found in the sub-categories mentioned above.

The data tells us that most of our students met the expectations for the **criterion** "language function"; for "text type" (formal language and critical argument); for "language control"; for "cultural knowledge". Expectations were either met "strongly" or "minimally", with a majority of "strongly"

One student did not meet the expectations for all the items that were included within each item.

Language function: 9% exceeds expectations; 52% meets expectations strongly. 39% meets expectations minimally.

**Text type** (appropriate use of formal language in extended discourse and defense of critical argument): 46% meets expectations (strongly); 46% meets expectations (minimally); 8% does not meet expectations.

**Language control**: (full control of narration for complex tasks assigned): 63% meets expectations (strongly); 37% meets expectations minimally.

**Cultural knowledge** (sophisticated understanding of culture): 30% exceeds expectations; 28% meets expectations (strongly); 28% meets expectations (minimally); 14% responded: N/A.

# 5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

The French program meets its goals for a majority of students, although there is still room for improvement.

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

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

Essays were collected after the end of the Spring 2021 semester. We are in the preliminary stages of discussion and exchanges of comments.

The current findings will be discussed during our upcoming French program meetings (September 23, 2021 and October)

- **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

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Course content
- Teaching techniques
  - Improvements in technology
  - Prerequisites
  - Student learning outcomes
  - Artifacts of student learning
  - Evaluation process

- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings
- 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.

It is difficult to assess final essays using the criteria we had in place since we had too many general questions that were not necessarily designed to assess a final essay across all courses.

The assignment for each given class varied according to the context of the course and did not necessarily lend itself to assessment based on the criteria we had.

I am suggesting that we discuss specific requirements we would like to see in our students' final essays, and intentionally strengthen our teaching approach towards these learning outcomes in our courses.

I suggest that it will involve revising our evaluation tools (select in advance a limited number of rubrics rather than using a large number of all-encompassing rubrics).

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

#### 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 assessment data?
 In the past few years, we have introduced new textbooks for several courses, adding online, asynchronous components in several courses.

# B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed? N/A --(They have been assessed at the course level (rubrics)

C. What were the findings of the assessment? improvement was identified.

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

We will continue to observe and discuss student attainment of learning outcomes related to our choice of textbooks, and will replace textbooks that do not seem to help our students advance sufficiently toward the objectives in our courses.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a standalone document. AY 2021

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Essay # \_\_\_\_\_

Please assess the following on a scale of 1-4, <mark>where 4 is **Exceeds Expectations**, <mark>3 is **Meets Expectations. Strong**, 2 is</mark> <mark>Meets expectations. Minimal</mark>, and <mark>1 is Does not meet expectations.</mark></mark>

- First <u>check</u> (circle) the items under each heading that are applicable.
- Then *assign a number* to the right.
- Use space below questions for brief comments.
- If a paper Exceeds Expectations means that the level of proficiency is higher than Intermediate High
- When assigning numerical values, please refer to the general rubric for a description of the categories used in this form.

Since these assessments are of the Program, not of the individual students, they will not see your markings. To guarantee the anonymity of the process, student's names will be removed from the final essays before they are distributed for assessment to the Faculty. Each essay will be assigned an individual number

#### Language Function:

<ul> <li>Narrates and describes fully and accurately in all major time frames.</li> </ul>	
• Can discuss some topics abstractly, especially those related to particular interests and expertise.	
Provides a structured argument to support opinions and may construct hypotheses.	
Text Type:	
<ul> <li>Uses appropriately formal language in an extended discourse.</li> </ul>	
Is able to construct and defend a critical argument on the assigned topic.	
Comprehensibility:	
• Is readily understood by native audiences (writing) unaccustomed to interacting with non-natives.	
Language Control:	
<ul> <li>Demonstrates full control of aspect in narration on prepared topic.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Uses precise vocabulary and intonation, great fluency, and ease of speech.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Accuracy may break down when attempting to perform complex tasks over a variety of topics.</li> </ul>	
Cultural Self-awareness:	
• Articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases as compared to the target language culture(s).	
Cultural Knowledge:	
<ul> <li>Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of culture important to members of the target language culture(s).</li> </ul>	
Empathy:	
Interprets intercultural experience from the perspectives of own and more than one worldview.	
Communication Skills:	
<ul> <li>Articulates a complex understanding of cultural differences in verbal communication.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Is able to skillfully negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.</li> </ul>	

#### **Curiosity:**

- Asks complex questions about the target language culture(s).
- Seeks out and articulates answers to these questions that reflect multiple cultural perspectives.

\_\_\_\_\_

#### **Attitude of Openness:**

- Initiates and develops interactions with others from the target language culture(s).
- Suspends judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.

Comments: