

Course or Program Assessment Summary http://academic.cuesta.edu/slo/docs/Course_and_Program_Assessment_Summary_F_2011.docx

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: LANGUAGES AND COMMUNICATION Program: MODERN LANGUAGES

Date: August 15, 2013

Courses in program ASL 215A, 215 B, 215C - FR 201/110, 202/120, 203 - GER 201/110, GER 202,120, 203, 204 – SPAN 201, 202, 203, 204

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: Discipline Lead instructors (Clayton, Dunn, Lloyd, Rector-Cavagnaro) and all temporary part-time instructors

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes **X**

1	<p>Student Learning Outcome Statements</p> <p>X Program</p>	<p>Student will be able to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. demonstrate receptive and expressive proficiency when engaging in interpersonal communication using idiomatic language (Interpersonal Communication) 2. demonstrate receptive proficiency when interpreting recorded and live idiomatic language (Interpretive Listening). 3. demonstrate reading proficiency when interpreting texts written in idiomatic language (Interpretive Reading: Spanish, French, German) 4. demonstrate writing proficiency when composing and revising idiomatic language (Presentational Communication – Writing: Spanish, French, German). 5. describe and discuss the relationship of selected practices, values, and attitudes found in target culture and demonstrate awareness of the links between language and culture (Culture).
2	<p>Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)</p>	<p>NOTE:</p> <p>This CPAS primarily summarizes a follow-up <u>direct</u> assessment of PLO #1, which was performed in spring 2013. The first direct assessment for PLO #1 was done in Fall 2012 and has been documented in a CPAS which is part of the Modern Languages Program Review submitted in spring 2013. A comparison between fall 2012 and spring 2013 data follows in # 6 below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In spring 2013 all faculty in all four disciplines of the Modern Languages Program (29 sections) administered an oral interview/exit interview at <u>all</u> language levels (three levels per each of the four language resulting in 12 individual courses). • Faculty used a common rubric to rate student performance.
3	<p>Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In spring 2013 the sample size was a total of 547 students (364 at level 1, 168 at level 2 and 15 at level 3). • The sample size of 537 included 214 students in ASL, 58 students in French, 43 students in German, and 232 students in Spanish. • The student performance was reported using a rating of Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor.

4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	<p>In spring 2013 assessment results were reported for 100% of all students enrolled in Modern Languages. 29 sections reported their assessment results (100% participation rate) representing 16 instructors, 12 of whom are temporary part-time faculty.</p> <p>In spring 2013 overall 95% of all students who participated in the direct assessment of PLO #1 succeeded (i.e. were rated Excellent, Good, or Fair). The success rate was five percentage points higher at level 2 over level 1 (98% vs. 93%). At level 3 the success rate was 100%. At level 2 65% of the students earned “Excellent,” compared to 47% students at level 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall 7% of the 588 students who were registered did not participate in the assessment event. At level 1 the non-participant rate was 8%, at level 2 6 %, and at level 3 0%. Since no-shows did not earn a performance score, they were not included in the calculation of performance success/failure. The no-show rate varied between languages. (French and Spanish 6%, ASL 7%, German 10%) • The grade distribution for successful students varied by language with French and Spanish having the highest percentage of <i>Excellent</i> (60%), followed by ASL (45%) and German (40%). In the <i>Good</i> range ASL had the most (28%), followed by German (25%), Spanish (21%) and French (19%). The most <i>Fair</i> ratings were in German (30%), followed by ASL (19%), French (17%), and Spanish (15%). • Comparing degree of success by level showed a slightly higher percentage of <i>Excellent</i> at level 2 for ASL (74%) and Spanish (71%), but for French and German, the percentage of <i>Excellent</i> was slightly higher at level 1 (French 63%, German 42%). • The overall <i>Excellent</i> rate at level 3 was 47% , with level 3 Spanish being at 38%.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	<p>Throughout the spring 2013 semester faculty discussed the pros and cons of various assessment methodologies, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • type of interaction (instructor-to-student or student-to-student) • number of questions asked/answers given • type of address (formal and/or familiar) • type of verbal exchange (highly scripted, somewhat scripted or mostly extemporaneous) <p>Faculty also agreed on a common scoring rubric by which to define student performance for a rating of <i>Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor</i> (see attached).</p>
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	<p>At the end of spring 2013 when conducting the oral interview/exit interview some faculty reported having modified their methodology as compared to fall 2012. Although only 5 (21%) of the potential 24 sections reported changes, the modifications which took place were highly creative, expanding the initial methodology options. Particularly adding a <u>student-to-instructor</u> component broadens the spectrum of linguistic behavior, simulating “real world” situations. This mode will be added to the methodology options.</p>

COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT

FALL 2012 & SPRING 2013

In both semesters assessment results were reported for **100%** of all students enrolled in Modern Languages. All sections participated representing 15 to 16 instructors, the majority being temporary part-time faculty (10 to 12 faculty members).

The overall pool of students assessed was virtually the same in both semesters. In fall 2012 overall 93% of all students who participated in the direct assessment of PLO #1 succeeded (i.e. scored Excellent, Good, or Fair). In spring 2013 the success rate went up by two percentage points to 95%. The percentage of registered students who did not participate in the assessment event went down by 3 percentage points from 10% to 7%.

- The success rates for level 1 are within one percentage point of one another for the two semesters (94% for fall 2012 vs. 93% for spring 2013).
- For level 2 the success rates were 3 percentage points higher in spring 2013 (96%) than fall 2012 (93%).
- At level 3 students succeeded 100% in spring 2013 vs. 90% in fall 2012. The numbers of students assessed at level 3 has been halved in spring 2013 and will remain small: One section of Spanish 2013 and some “credit by exam”s in French and German. ASL course offerings were redesigned effective fall 2013: Course units increased from 3 to 5 units and level 3 was eliminated.

Although all four languages will continue to assess Interpersonal Communication (PLO #1) each semester, reporting and aggregating assessment results for PLO #1 will be suspended until results for the other four program learning outcomes have been collected, aggregated and studied.

However, ASL will continue to formally track assessment data for PLO #1 in an effort to align assessment methods among faculty teaching the courses, resulting in potential modifications and professional development.

What has not occurred (yet) is a systematic, external validation of our internal assessment results. Cuesta’s Modern Languages students have not participated in standardized testing, such as the CAPE test which was administered at Cal Poly in spring 2013. Cuesta students are not tracked at four-year institutions to ascertain their success in language courses upon transfer. The only “evidence” we have is anecdotal to find out how they fared after leaving Cuesta, either at other institutions or applying their Interpersonal Communication skills as they converse with native speakers stateside or abroad.

It should be noted that care was taken to afford each instructor the freedom to conduct the assessment as they saw fit. In tracking assessment results for the first of five program learning outcomes the Modern Languages Program is starting to develop a “culture of evidence.”

The summative assessments of PLO #1 in two successive semesters resulted in

- documentation of an existing high student success rate
- discussion and expansion of assessment tools
- establishment of program-wide assessment rubric

		It seems that current student performance is sufficiently high to assume that further improvement may not be possible. Therefore the data may redirect the focus on the distribution of ratings as there is a preponderance of “ <i>Excellent</i> ” in most languages. Are we setting the bar high enough? Looking beyond the scores the discussion revolved around various assessment (and teaching) methodologies to improve student learning. Adding a third assessment mode (student-to-instructor) expanded the options available for conducting the assessment. Regularly collecting data and discussing process and results not only enhances inter-collegial communication but is in full compliance with accreditation standards.
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	During spring 2013 Modern Languages faculty convened monthly from January through May to discuss the assessment results and enhancements of teaching and testing methods. Minutes of each meeting reflect participation by both tenured and temporary part-time instructors and the content of the discussions.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at <http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa>
pc08/15/2013

Note: **Why are there no Course CPASs in Modern Languages?**

Assessment data has been tracked and documented for each course in each of the disciplines. Aggregating the course data resulted in the program data which was interpreted in the program CPAS above. However, separate interpretive reports by language will not be routinely generated unless specifically requested. Writing separate course CPASs does not meet the needs of the faculty nor does the activity support the spirit of the ACCJC’s mandate of “Continuous Sustainable Quality Improvement,” particularly #2: “Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.”

It is important to note that the Modern Languages operates with a miniscule pool of four tenured faculty of whom three teach only 2/3 of a full-time load (ASL, French, German).

ASL and Spanish, the two languages with the most sections, rely predominantly on part-time faculty. ASL has only one tenured part-time instructor. Spanish has the only full-time tenured instructor, who also serves as division chair. French currently operates with one tenured part-time instructor and one temporary part-timer and German has one tenured part-time instructor.

Although all temporary part-time faculty participate in the student assessment and report assessment results, most of them do not regularly attend the meetings to discuss the “assessment results, recommended changes and planned implementation of improvements.” It is unrealistic to expect “pervasive and robust” dialog at the level of each discipline. However, it is doable and even imperative that the lead instructors of the four disciplines engage in pedagogical discussion and collaborate on one document rather than attempt to engage their part-time faculty in separate meetings and discussions and generate individual reports.

MODERN LANGUAGES
Program Learning Outcome
Interpersonal Communication Rubric

Comprehensibility/ Pronunciation	Fluency	Vocabulary	Grammar	Rating
Stays all in target language and comprehensibility is not affected by errors	Speech natural and continuous; no unnatural pauses	Demonstrates extensive vocabulary. No use of English. Almost always uses appropriate word. Rarely if ever searches for words.	Uses appropriate syntax and morphological form. Controls most structures used (consistently high performance.) Few error types	Excellent
Stays all target language but comprehensibility is sometimes affected	Speech generally natural and continuous; only slight stumbling or unnatural pauses	Demonstrates a large vocabulary. No use of English words. Almost always uses appropriate word. Seldom misses or searches for words.	Uses mostly appropriate syntax and morphological forms. Controls some structures used (some inconsistency in performance). Errors are infrequent.	Good
Sometimes uses English and / or comprehensibility is affected	Some definite stumbling, but manages to rephrase or continue	Demonstrates moderate size vocabulary. Sometimes uses English or invents words. Frequently misses or searches for words.	Uses inappropriate syntax and morphological forms Controls very few structures. Errors are frequent.	Fair
Overuse of English and / or comprehensibility is an issue	Speech frequently hesitant and jerky; sentences may be left uncompleted	Demonstrates small vocabulary. Overuses English or overuses invented words. Vocabulary limits interaction.	Uses inappropriate syntax and morphological forms control of structures is an issue. Errors dominate.	Poor