

## Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): Russian Studies, BA

Department: Languages, Literatures, and Cultures

Degree or Certificate Level: BA

College/School: College of Arts and Sciences

Date (Month/Year): May 24-June 11, 2021

Assessment Contact: Elizabeth Blake

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? AY 2021

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? AY 2021

### 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.)

2. Graduating majors will be able to present personal information about themselves in Russian in connected sentences with a logical progression and with attention to temporal frameworks. They will also be able with a minimum Intermediate-Mid level of Russian to write for a page or more, present for at least fifteen minutes, and discuss a variety of prepared and/or researched topics. Such presentations and discussions would be understood by native speakers of Russian.

We assessed the presentational and interpersonal modes of discourse in Russian through presentation projects for the three graduating majors to assess the speaking and listening capabilities of the majors. They practiced three of the five Cs (communication, cultures, connections) in interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational discourse according to ACTFL standards.

### 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.

In the 4010 course, students presented on research topics of their own choosing for twenty minutes and a discussion of their presentations followed. The attached document was used to assess the students' preparedness and performance in both presentational and interactive modes. The courses were primarily in-person with some individual consultations completed over zoom.

### 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).

Students gathered materials for analysis and prepared for both presentation and discussion with the help of the two full-time instructors in Russian who evaluated their own students. The rubric is included.

### 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)?

There is no basis for comparison, since everything was mostly face-to-face. The results were that all of the students exceeded expectations for the presentation mode with an average scoring of 5/5, but the unprepared speech in the Q&A was a weaker component than the remainder of the project, so this will be the focus for assessment next year.

## 5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

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

We learned that when the students speak on prepared topics with notes they exceed expectations in their accuracy, but there is an unexpected gap between prepared and spontaneous speech, so opportunities for improvisational speech need to be introduced more frequently.

## 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?

The full-time faculty in Russian in LLC shared the current findings on May 21 at 9 AM over zoom and agreed that we need to make sure that the students have additional speaking practice, so we are working on ways in which we can provide this through the club or the honor society as well as in class. We also agreed to meet at the beginning of the year to identify a single area of language acquisition on which to work. Dr. Blake will look at working with heritage speakers.

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 are working on ways in which we can provide speaking opportunities in the classroom and in other settings. We also agreed to meet at the beginning of the year to identify a single area of language acquisition on which to work. Dr. Blake will look at working with heritage speakers.

In preparation to discuss student learning outcomes that include the areas of political science, history, and philosophy, currently outside the departmental assessment plan, the report and plan are being shared with colleagues for discussion, review, and editing for 2021-2022.

Dr. Blake started exit interviews with majors, a practice she observed worked for the Director of Russian and East European Area Studies, to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the program (see attached).

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?

We added 2020 to the sequence so that four courses are required before starting the major-level courses. Learning Outcomes have been articulated for 1010-2020, and assessment is completed for 1010-2010.

**B.** How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

Through changes with the registrar and the assessment modules collected from 1010-2010

**C.** What were the findings of the assessment?

Students in the program have been at or above level consistently after the 2020 addition, even though the study abroad programs were suspended last year. I would not have anticipated such a measure of success for those whose course of studies was disrupted last year because of the pandemic, so the students are to be commended for their focused attention on their language skills.

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

We discuss these plans every year to confirm that students are moving through the program with sufficient skills. We have adapted the major and plan to work on listening/speaking for AY 2022. Additional members are being consulted for review of the student outcomes and means of assessment.

**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 stand-alone document.**

- **RUSS 4010**

**Please complete this assessment project as a part of the course and complete this sheet for each major in the course.**

- **Final Project**

The comparative analysis of the three texts in an oral presentation in Russian for 20 minutes with information pertinent to the chosen theme/issue, including the background of the authors, the historical contexts of the texts chosen, and the way in which the texts contribute to a dialogue on the theme/issue. The recommendation is that the student use 8-10 slides with 1-2 for the introduction, 1-2 for the conclusion, and the remainder to make more fine points from the detail of the three paragraphs of the body. There will be a follow-up Q&A to check for comprehension (~~5%~~). **(This was included in error, EAB).**

**Rubric for Presentation**

Evidence of Research Excellence (20%)

Knowledge of the three articles

1. Article 1/6

2. Article 2 /6

3. Article 3 /8

Logical and structured argument (20%)

1. Are the points made central to the thesis? \_\_/5

2. Do these points originate in the articles? \_\_/5

3. Has the presentation found a good place where the articles overlap? \_\_/5

4. Does one sentence logically follow another? \_\_/5

Fluidity/Clarity of Expression (30%)

1. The presenter's articulation and phonetics is understandable to a native speaker \_\_/10.

2. The presenter uses Russian vocabulary and phrases in an accurate manner \_\_/10.

3. The presenter speaks in connected sentences that make sense together as far as tense, aspect, and transition are concerned \_\_\_/10.

Complexity/sophistication of expression (30%)

1. The presenter uses terminology learned during this semester's discussions and writings \_\_\_/10.

2. The presenter can express oneself in complex and compound sentences correctly \_\_\_/10.

3. The presenter can articulate and communicate to a native speaker that the presenter is discussing three different perspectives on a single issue \_\_\_/10.

**Q&A**

1. The presenter understands the questions (20%):

Clearly with no repetition A 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Needs repetition A/A- 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Needs rephrasing B/B+ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Needs modeling B-/C+ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

2. The presenter responds (50%):

accurately and clearly to the precise question. A 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

accurately but not clearly addressing the question. A-/B+ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

not accurately and not clearly addressing the question. B/B- 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

in an incomprehensible manner. C 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

not at all. F 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

3. The presenter's articulation and use of terminology is (20%):

primarily accurate with complex terms. A 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

primarily accurate with conversational language. A-/B+ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

mid-range accurate with complex terms. B 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

mid-range accurate with conversational language. B- 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

inaccurate with complex terms. C 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

inaccurate with conversational language. C- 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

has a complex breakdown in its communicative function. D 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

refusal to answer. F 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

## Exit Interview

1. How did the Russian Studies program help you achieve your academic and career goals at SLU?
2. What are your plans after graduation, and how does your degree fit into them?
3. Did you study in Russia? Was it on a SLU-sponsored program? Please comment on the experience.
4. Did you participate in other Russian-related activities at SLU? If so, what were they (club, tutoring, internship, REEAS, or International Studies) and in what capacity were you involved?
5. Are there additional opportunities from which future students can benefit that are not currently part of the program?
6. Did you want to maintain contact with the program and, if so, how would you like to do this? For example, did you want to join Dr. Blake's Linked-in page, do you prefer to receive a newsletter a few times a year, or will you just keep up with the Russian Club and the Alumni Office on your own?