Annual Program Assessment Report

Academic Year Assessed: 2018-2019
College: Letters & Science
Department: MLL
Submitted by: Galen Brokaw

Program(s) Assessed:
Indicate all majors, minors, certificates and/or options that are included in this assessment:

Majors/Minors/Certificate	Options
Modern Languages & Literatures	**French & Francophone Studies** **Hispanic Studies** **German Studies** **Latin American & Latino Studies**

Annual Assessment Process (CHECK OFF LIST)

1. Data are collected as defined by Assessment Plan
   YES__X___   NO_____
2. Population or unbiased samples of collected assignments are scored by at least two faculty members using scoring rubrics to ensure inter-rater reliability.
   YES__X___   NO_____
3. Areas where the acceptable performance threshold has not been met are highlighted.
   YES_____   NO_____   NA__X___
4. Assessment scores were presented at a program/unit faculty meeting.
   YES__X___   NO_____
5. The faculty reviewed the assessment results, and responded accordingly (Check all appropriate lines)
   Gather additional data to verify or refute the result. _____
   Identify potential curriculum changes to try to address the problem _____
   Change the acceptable performance threshold, reassess _____
   Choose a different assignment to assess the outcome _____
   Faculty may reconsider thresholds_____
   Evaluate the rubric to assure outcomes meet student skill level _____
   Use Bloom's Taxonomy to consider stronger learning outcomes _____
   Choose a different assignment to assess the outcome_____
   OTHER:

6. Does your report demonstrate changes made because of previous assessment results (closing the loop)?   YES_____   NO__X___

1. Assessment Plan, Schedule and Data Source.
a. Please provide a multi-year assessment schedule that will show when all program learning outcomes will be assessed, and by what criteria (data). (You may use the table provided, or you may delete and use a different format).

ASSESSMENT PLANNING CHART					
PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOME	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	*Data Source**
1. Attain oral proficiency at ACTFL Intermediate High					Adv. Lang
2. Attain writing proficiency at ACTFL Intermediate High					Adv. Lang.
3. Attain reading proficiency at ACTFL Intermediate High	x				Adv. Lang.
4. Identify, describe, and analyze historical and cultural periods and trends.		x			Survey courses
5. Identify, analyze, and critique themes and rhetorical or cinematic techniques in different types and genres of media (e.g., novels, poetry, historical documents, film, painting, etc.)			x		Capstone seminar
6. Formulate a research question, locate and interpret relevant sources, and produce original research.			x		Capstone seminar

*Data sources can be items such as randomly selected student essays or projects, specifically designed exam questions, student presentations or performances, or a final paper. Do not use course evaluations or surveys as primary sources for data collection.

b. What are your threshold values for which you demonstrate student achievement? (Example provided in the table should be deleted before submission)

Threshold Values		
PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOME	Threshold Value	Data Source
1. Attain oral proficiency at ACTFL Intermediate High	Intermediate High	Advanced language class
2. Attain writing proficiency at ACTFL Intermediate High	Intermediate High	Advanced language class
3. Attain reading proficiency at ACTFL Intermediate High	Intermediate High	Advanced language class
4. Identify, describe, and analyze historical and cultural periods and trends.	80%	Survey course essays/exams
5. Identify, analyze, and critique themes and rhetorical or cinematic techniques in different types and genres of media (e.g., novels, poetry, historical documents, film, painting, etc.)	80%	Capstone paper
6. Formulate a research question, locate and interpret relevant sources, and produce original research.	80%	Capstone paper

2. What Was Done
a) Was the completed assessment consistent with the plan provided? YES__X___   NO_____
If no, please explain why the plan was altered.

b) Please provide a rubric that demonstrates how your data was evaluated.
Rubric for Learning outcomes 5 & 6. Score of 2 or above demonstrates proficiency.

3 Outstanding
 -Essay is on topic and contains a clearly articulated, critical thesis.
 -The supporting argument(s) are well-developed, relevant to the thesis, and explicitly tied to it.
 -The identification and use of themes and rhetorical or cinematic devices in support of the argument
   are clear and accurate.
 -There may be minor issues with the validity of the evidence, but they do not undermine the
   argument in any serious way.
 -Organization is clear and logical.

2 Acceptable
 -Essay is on topic and contains a clearly articulated, critical thesis.
 -The supporting arguments(s) are mostly well-developed and relevant to the thesis, but may not be
   explicitly tied to it.
 -The identification and use of themes and rhetorical or cinematic devices in support of the argument
   are generally clear and accurate.
 -There may be issues with the validity of some of the evidence/supporting discussion, but they do
   not completely undermine the larger argument.
 -Organization and clarity may be somewhat lacking, but the essay still holds together.
_____
1 Marginal
 -Essay is on topic but does not contain a clearly articulated or critical thesis. Thesis may be vague or
   primarily expository or descriptive.
 -Supporting argument(s) are poorly developed and/or do not relate directly to the thesis. Evidence
   may rely on opinion to a limited degree.
 -The identification and use of themes and rhetorical or cinematic devices in support of the argument
   may not be entirely clear or accurate.
 -Evidence may be related to the theme, but its relevance may be unclear. The implications of the
   evidence may be underdeveloped. Evidence may undermine the validity of a larger argument to
   some extent, but the basis for a critical argument may be present.
 -Organization and clarity may make it difficult to follow the argument or exposition.

0 Unacceptable
 -Essay treats topic in an overly simplistic or superficial way, or is off topic. If a thesis is present, it may
   be strictly expository or descriptive.
 -Supporting arguments may be entirely descriptive rather than analytical, undeveloped, and/or
   unrelated to thesis.
 -Essay may not identify themes or rhetorical techniques, or they maybe unclear and/or inaccurate.
 -Evidence may be absent or irrelevant to topic. Support may consist in merely the expression of
   opinion.
 -Organization and clarity may be lacking to the point that any argument is indiscernible.

3. How Data Were Collected
a) How were data collected? (Please include method of collection and sample size).

The assessment was based on the capstone research paper of all students in the capstone course of each program. French had 17 essays from 2016, 2018, and 2019. Spanish had 14 essays from the spring 2019 course. And German had 8 essays from spring 2019.

b) Explain the assessment process, and who participated in the analysis of the data.

All of the faculty members in each section read and evaluated each research paper using the rubric. The faculty then met to compare their scores. Any differences were discussed, and a consensus was reached regarding the score. Last year, the assessment committee pointed out that when doing an embedded assessment, faculty who teach the course that is used should not be involved in the assessment. Unfortunately, that is not possible in MLL where we often have only one TT faculty member in each program.

4. What Was Learned
Based on the analysis of the data, and compared to the threshold values provided, what was learned from the assessment?

French: 15 of 17 students demonstrated proficiency. 88.2%

German: 5 of 8 students demonstrated proficiency. 62.5%

Hispanic Studies & LALS: 10 of 14 students demonstrated proficiency. 71.4%

Last year, the committee suggested that our programs be reported together because they are part of a single major. I've incorporated all programs into a single report, but it does not make sense to aggregate the data except in the case of Hispanic Studies and LALS for this year's learning outcomes. The suggestion by the committee may be based on a misunderstanding of the nature of our programs. It is true that we have the same learning outcomes and that administratively they are options within a single major, but our programs really aren't options. The French, German, and Spanish programs have no courses in common. They are similar at a broad disciplinary level, but they are completely different content areas with no overlap. And each program has completely different faculty. So to aggregate the data would not be helpful.

a) Areas of strength

Strong performance was somewhat random. We didn't identify a general area of strength. The general structure of the curriculum is sound, we believe. And it has produced strong results in the past.

b) Areas that need improvement

The French program notes that students could do better at formulating their research questions and integrating secondary criticism into their analyses. They will work on that in the next cycle.

The essays in the German program were dominated by description rather than analysis. This is a common issue, but there are strategies that can address it.

The Spanish essays demonstrated that many students were not familiar with standard formatting for our discipline. Like the French program, they also had difficulty integrating secondary criticism into their arguments. But this really is an advanced skill. And this issue is not so much a problem with the curriculum or the learning outcome. In past years, we have had more successful outcomes, and we have identified differences in strategies employed that we believe account for this difference. So our efforts will focus on standardizing effective teaching practices in the capstone course.

5. How We Responded

a) Describe how "What Was Learned" was communicated to the department, or program faculty. Was there a forum for faculty to provide feedback and recommendations?

All faculty members of each section participated in the assessment. The assessment meeting itself was an opportunity to provide feedback.

b) Based on the faculty responses, will there be any curricular or assessment changes (such as plans for measurable improvements, or realignment of learning outcomes)?
YES_____   NO___X____

 If yes, when will these changes be implemented?

We are not going to change the curriculum structure, but we do plan to implement more standard practices in the capstone courses. The problems we see in the German and Hispanic Studies program are more due to execution of the capstone course than to the nature of the plan or the assessment process. We plan to develop more standardized best practices for these classes.

c) When will the changes be next assessed?

This year we plan to revise and reassess our plan. The changes in the execution of our capstone courses will happen this year. They will be assessed in the next cycle.

6. Closing the Loop

a) Based on assessment from previous years, can you demonstrate program level changes that have led to outcome improvements?

No. The lower outcomes this year are due to two factors. First, in such small sample sizes, there will always be random variations. Second, different faculty members have taught the capstone course differently. Of course, this will always be the case, but we would like to avoid differences in methodology that result in different outcomes. And we think that this has been a factor. That is what we plan to address with the standardization of best practices.

Submit report to programassessment@montana.edu