

## 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 2022

Assessment Contact: Lois Cassandra Hamrick

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2022

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? The plan is dated: 2016.

Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization? We follow the standards established by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. They do not "accredit"



programs.

### 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.)

Among the important student outcomes identified in the French M.A. program is the following: the "student will demonstrate a command of written and oral French."

In our current 2021 – 2022 assessment report, the focus is on the student's command of *written French* rather than on both oral and written communicative skills. This report follows up on the one done last academic year which for the first divided the two skills in order to be able to assess writing proficiency more effectively. This year, we have modified the rubric in an effort to study more closely the writing component in the program. *A copy of the 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 and identify the course(s) in which they were collected. 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 2021-2022, graduate course offerings included *French Cinema* in Fall 2021 and *The New Media* and *French for the Professional* in Spring 2022. All courses were given *in-person* on the home campus. Artifacts of student learning were collected in the *Cinema* course and in the *French for the Professional* class, where there was no overlap of enrollment. Short reflection papers were a part of the written components in both courses, but the subject matter necessarily differed in the two courses, which allowed for different *text types* and *comprehensibility* of different topics. Yet this divergence of topics did not appear to have any difference on the students' writing proficiency, as the percentage breakdown between "*Exceeds Expectations*" and "*Meets expectations*" in written French finished at 50% competency in each category and there were no "*does not meet expectations*" for either category. (Please see the chart at the end of this report.)

### 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).

Both the selection of the materials that would serve as artifacts and their evaluation were integral to the outcomes identified for both the *Cinéma* course and the *French for the Professional* course. In the *French for the Professional* course, writing assignments were linked with the targeted outcomes. Interaction with native French speakers broadened access to the ultimate outcomes of *Language control (accuracy)*, *Comprehensibility* and *Language Function*. The rubric basically served as the internal organizer for the course in each case, while providing at the same time 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 results of the assessment of the learning outcomes have been positive in the case of these two courses. The fact that no one in these classes failed to *meet expectations* is an important sign that learning outcomes were successfully met and that students profited from their own investment in these outcomes.

#### 5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

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

The data is providing a way to look more specifically at the meaning of “outcomes” and “assessment” and their rapport with student success.

#### 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?

Findings from this assessment have been shared in our language program meetings and planning for future courses. These will continue to be a part of on-going talks in this on-going period of transition.

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.

As a result of earlier and on-going assessment of our program and the resulting findings, we are looking into ways of helping students having recurring difficulties with accuracy in their writing by making use of the SLUPE placement test and the on-line technology that it offers to students.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

N/A

## 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?

Our program has been revamped and renewed as a result of assessment.

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

These changes are still in progress. They will start to be implemented next Fall (2023).

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

The findings are promising. It will be next Fall when we may start to see any potential findings.

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

We will be able to see how the information can be used in future months.

**IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., artifact prompts, 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.**

Please see copied attachments below:

### French M.A. Assessment 2021-2022

**SLO 1: The M.A. Graduate in French will be able to “demonstrate a command of written and oral French.”**

This assessment concerns specifically the written component of SLO 1. Although we examined the written component in last year’s assessment, we are using a new rubric (document attached) in this assessment. The direct assessment of the written component was measured in courses through short reflection papers, written responses to texts, and a final written paper.

To meet the written M.A. French outcome, students must at the very least “**Meet Expectations**” in all four Criteria categories (*Language Function, Text Type, Comprehensibility, Language Control*, according to the *American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)* scale). To be assessed as “**Exceeding Expectations**”, a simple majority of checkboxes in the “**Exceeds Expectations**” category is required. Students having more than two marked checkboxes under “**Does Not Meet Expectations**” will not have met the Student Outcome.

### Assessment Results, Spring 2022

Total number of grad students assessed	Outcome & skill assessed (see rubric)	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectations
6	Language Function	1 (16%)	5 (83.3 %)	0 (0%)
6	Text Type	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
6	Comprehensibility	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
6	Language Control	2 (33.3%)	4 (66.6%)	0 (0%)

**Rubic**

**French M.A. Assessment Tool: Written Proficiency (10/7/2022)**

**SLO 1: The M.A. Graduate in French will be able to “demonstrate a command of written and oral French.”**

This assessment concerns specifically the written component of the SLO 1. The Oral component will be measured in a future assessment. The direct assessment of the written component is measured here in courses through short reflection papers, written responses to texts, and a final written paper. Students graduating from the French M.A. program in the year the assessment was done are designated by the checked box on the far right. To meet the written French outcome, 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	Check box if graduated in 2021-2022
<p><b>Language Function</b></p> <p>Refers here to the capacity to narrate and describe in written form in a consistent and sustained way.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Student writes fully and accurately across all major time frames on a prepared topic.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Can write on some topics abstractly, especially those related to particular interests and expertise.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Can provide in writing a structured argument to support opinions and may construct hypotheses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Consistently narrates and describes in writing across most major time frames.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Able to participate in diverse written exchanges on familiar topics.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Can handle successfully in writing and with ease questions related to a presented topic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Narrates and describes in writing on a prepared topic, but with frequent errors.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Is constrained to producing a simple, uncomplicated presentation of basic information.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Is limited to written expression on topics relating to personal interests and areas of competence.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Text Type</b></p> <p>Refers here to different types of discourse including the use of formal language in paragraph form.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Student can use formal language in paragraph length. Capable of extended discourse on prepared topics involving textual analysis or supporting an opinion or hypotheses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Capable of using formal language in connected sentences and developing critical arguments and hypotheses although limited in scope and accuracy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Able to use formal language in mostly connected sentences but may resort to memorized phrases or strings of words.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Comprehensibility</b></p> <p>Refers to the writer’s audience. Can the written expression be understood by a native speaker and writer?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The student’s use of written language is readily understood by native audiences unaccustomed to interacting with non-natives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The student’s written expression is understood by native audiences unaccustomed to interacting, although the choice of terms and wording may differ from native forms.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Written 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.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Language Control</b></p> <p>Refers to grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary, and the degree of fluency.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The student demonstrates control of aspect in written narration on prepared topic.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Uses precise, diverse vocabulary, writes with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates some control of aspect in written narration on a prepared topic.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Vocabulary may lack specificity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Significant breakdown in communication in one or more of the following areas: the ability to narrate and describe, use of paragraph length discourse, ease of writing, breadth of vocabulary.</li> </ul>	

	<p>ease on familiar topics and able to handle lesser familiar topics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>❑ Accuracy may break down when attempting to perform complex tasks over a variety of topics.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>❑ Written fluency decreases in quality and quantity when attempting to perform advanced tasks.</li></ul>		
--	--	--	--	--