

## PROGRAM SUMMARY

Department: World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures	Report Type: Interim Year
Program Name and Level: BA and BSED in French, Italian, and Spanish.	Academic Year Data: 2019-20
Report Preparer: Rocío Fuentes	Date Completed: 11/9/2020

Program Assessment Question	Response
<p><b>1) URL:</b> Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.</p>	<p><a href="http://www.ccsu.edu/modlang/undergrad.html">http://www.ccsu.edu/modlang/undergrad.html</a></p> <p>Learning Outcomes for BA/BS/Graduate Certification:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Speak at an Advanced Low oral proficiency in the target language.</li> <li>2. Write at an Advanced Low written proficiency in the target language.</li> <li>3. Use the target language to discuss major topics related to the cultures of countries where the target language is spoken.</li> </ol> <p>Use the target language to discuss the works of major authors of countries where the target language is spoken.</p>
<p><b>2) LO Changes:</b> Identify any changes to the LO and briefly describe why they were changed (e.g., make LO more discrete, align LO with findings). If no changes were made, please report not applicable.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>3) Strengths:</b> What about your assessment process is working well?</p>	<p>Our assessment process is based on standardized instruments; the use of common rubrics across the languages, and a comprehensive assessment plan created by the department, based on national standards and ACTFL guidelines.</p>

<p><b>4) <u>Improvements:</u></b> List ways in which your assessment process needs to be improved based on student data. (A brief summary of changes to assessment plan can be reported here)</p>	<p>We definitely need to design a better system for keeping the data, as the data-base that we use is outdated and makes it difficult for our professors to make reports. We are looking into different options of databases to improve this situation.</p> <p>Under-enrolled classes do not provide relevant information and they skew the results. CCSU-SCSU Distance Learning courses also represent a challenge because of the different use of assessment instruments and data sharing. Unfortunately, we cannot do anything in the latter areas.</p>
---	--

**For Each Learning Outcome (LO) complete questions 1, 2 and 3:** Many programs have a large number of LOs, please limit the report to no more than five.

LO 1. ____ Speak at an Advanced Low oral proficiency in the target language	
<b>1.1) <u>Assessment Instruments:</u></b> What is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.)	Performance tests and scoring rubrics aligned to the Oral Proficiency Guidelines developed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL).
<b>1.2) <u>Interpretation:</u></b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.).	Assessment committee of the Department of Modern Languages
<b>1.3) <u>Results:</u></b> Using this year's Findings, list: <i>a.</i> The conclusion(s) drawn <i>b.</i> The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)	<p>Conclusion: The majority of students perform within the target/meets the standards levels in the assessment of speaking skills.</p> <p><b>For the percentage corresponding to each program, please consult the tables included in the second part of the report.</b></p>
	Changes: The department is considering implementing an official ACTFL OPI for the graduating majors in order to assess and certify their oral proficiency in the target language.

LO 2. Write at an Advanced Low written proficiency in the target language	
<b>2.1) <u>Assessment Instruments:</u></b> What is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone	Writing portfolios and scoring rubrics aligned with the Written Proficiency Guidelines developed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL).

course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.)	
<b>2.2) Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admin. assistant, etc.).	The Assessment Committee of our department.
<b>2.3) Results:</b> Using this year's Findings, list: a. The conclusion(s) drawn b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)	Conclusion: The majority of students perform at the meet the standards or target level in the assessment of writing. <b>For percentages per language, please consult the tables included in the second part of the report.</b>
	Changes:  The department is considering making the 336 level courses compulsory in all the programs to make sure that the students get more instruction in their writing skills.

<b>LO 3.</b> Use the target language to discuss major topics related to the Cultures of countries where the target language is spoken	
<b>3.1) Assessment Instruments:</b> What is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.)	Oral presentations and scoring rubrics aligned with the National Standards in the Teaching of Culture in World Languages.
<b>3.2) Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admin. assistant, etc.).	Department's Assessment Committee
<b>3.3) Results:</b> Using this year's Findings, list: a. The conclusion(s) drawn	Conclusion:  Conclusion: The majority of students perform at the acceptable or target level in the assessment of Cultures; however, offering culture courses in German presents a challenge, considering low enrollment and the absence of full-time faculty who can teach these courses.

<p>b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)</p>	<p>The small number of students enrolled in Italian also can skew the data, since no clear trends can be discerned.</p> <p>For specific percentages for each language, please consult the tables included in the second part of the report.</p>
	<p>Changes: It is very likely that German is going to become a minor.</p> <p>French and Francophone culture courses are now offered in collaboration with SCSU, but the assessment instruments are not the same and collecting data from them is a problem.</p>

<p><b>LO 4.</b> Use the target language to discuss the works of major authors of countries where the target language is spoken</p>	
<p><b>4.1) Assessment Instruments:</b> What is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.)</p>	<p>Essays and scoring rubrics keyed to National Standards in the teaching of Literature in world languages</p>
<p><b>4.2) Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admin. assistant, etc.).</p>	<p>Department's Assessment Committee</p>
<p><b>4.3) Results:</b> Using this year's Findings, list:</p> <p>a. The conclusion(s) drawn</p> <p>b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)</p>	<p>Conclusion:</p> <p>The majority of students perform at the acceptable or target levels in the assessment of Literature. Offering literature courses in German presents a challenge, considering low enrollment and no full-time faculty.</p> <p>For percentages per language, please consult the tables included in the second part of the report.</p>
	<p>Changes: No German literature courses were offered during the period reported here. There was no way to address this problem.</p>

**LO 5.** \_\_\_\_\_

**5.1) Assessment Instruments:** What is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.)

**5.2) Interpretation:** Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admin. assistant, etc.).

**5.3) Results:** Using this year's Findings, list:  
*a.* The conclusion(s) drawn  
*b.* The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)

Conclusion:

Changes:

## GENERAL EDUCATION SUMMARY

### **GENERAL EDUCATION SUMMARY:**

1. All departments contribute to the general education foundation of CCSU students (i.e., the CCSU General Education Learning Objectives/Outcomes) and must submit the General Education Summary below.
2. If your department participated in the General Education Assessment initiative (Multi-State model), complete Section 1 below.
3. If your department assesses GenEd Learning Objectives/Outcomes at the department-level, complete Section 2 below. Complete one Summary table for each LO assessed.
4. URL for the list of CCSU Learning Objectives/Outcomes, click [here](#).

Department: World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures	Report Type: GenEd Summary
Program Name and Level: BA in French, Italian, Spanish and German. BSED in French, Italian, and Spanish.  *We are presenting data for the languages that we teach for the 112 level (language requirement) and for the culture and literature courses for our BAs and BSEDs.	Academic Year Data: 2019-20
Report Preparer: Rocío Fuentes	Date Completed: 11/06/2020

Participation in General Education Assessment Initiative (Multi-State Collaborative model)	Section 1 Responses
<p><b>1)</b> Our departmental faculty participated in the assessment of the GenEd Learning Objectives/Outcomes by contributing to the GenEd Assessment Initiative (Multi-State Collaborative model).</p> <p><i>Please list the participating faculty and General Education Learning Objective/Outcome(s) for which faculty have provided student artifacts.</i></p>	<p>Faculty member(s):</p> <p>GenEd Learning Outcome(s)/Objective(s):</p> <p>Course(s):</p> <p>N/A</p>

Complete one Summary table below for each Learning Outcome assessed.

Participation through Department-level GenEd Assessment	Section 2 Responses
<p><b>1) Courses:</b> List course(s) and the CCSU General Education Learning Objective/Outcome with which the course is aligned. (These include courses across all schools and departments and are not limited only to designated GenEd Study and Skill Area courses.)</p>	<p>“To develop global awareness, historical perspective, and appreciation of social and cultural diversity in the world. Relevant outcomes include the ability to: analyze an issue from the perspective of another cultural tradition or historical period; understand and respect cultural differences; read, write, speak, and understand a foreign language at an enhanced level.”</p> <p>All 112 language courses (GENED)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speak and write at the Novice-High proficiency level in the target language.</li> <li>• Demonstrate knowledge of Products, Practices and Perspectives in the target culture, as defined by National Standards.</li> </ul> <p>Speaking, writing, literature, and culture courses:</p>
<p><b>2) Assessment Instruments:</b> What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used to assess the stated CCSU General Education Objective/Outcome? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)</p>	<p>For the 112 level: Final assessment testing all four linguistic skills (Speaking, reading, writing, listening). Instrument elaborated by certified ACTFL raters.</p> <p>For the 336 level: Oral interview, conducted by instructors as part of the course’s final assessment. This instrument measures student performance according to ACTFL speaking proficiency guidelines.</p> <p>For Literature courses (304, 375): Essay dealing with literary topics.</p> <p>For Culture courses (315, 316): Oral presentation dealing exploring, analyzing, comparing, and contrasting C2 (target culture) topics.</p>
<p><b>3) Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admin. assistant, etc.).</p>	<p>The Assessment committee of the WL department.</p>

<p><b>4) Results:</b> Since the most recent full report, list:</p> <p>a. The conclusion(s) drawn, noting strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s).</p>	<p>As in the last years, the majority of students either get “acceptable” or target ratings, with the exception of Spanish, which has 20% of students who do not pass the assessment. This is definitely an areas that needs to be looked into.</p> <p>Since the results involve last year, which was gravely affected by the pandemic, it is likely that the results are not reliable because of the extenuating circumstances that both students and professors went through. The results for 20-21 will be observed to see if there are any real trends.</p>
<p><b>5) Strengths in your Assessment Process:</b> List ways in which your assessment process is working well.</p>	<p>Despite the pandemic, the results obtained in the academic year 2019-2020 confirm a trend of positive learning outcomes in our courses. Assessment tasks and instruments as well as the rating procedures seem to be consistent and reliable.</p>
<p><b>6) Improvements:</b> List ways in which your GenEd assessment process needs to improve based on student data (A brief summary of changes to assessment plan can be reported here).</p>	<p>At this point, the major problem is the gathering of the data, since we lack of an effective system that can be used by our professors and that represent an extra expense for our students.</p>

APPENDIX

**General Education (LO # 1)**

Language	Do not meet	Acceptable	Target
ARABIC 112	0	2 (11%)	16 (89%)
ASL 112	3 (7%)	23 (52%)	18 (41%)
CHINESE 112	0	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
FRENCH 112	0	8 (28%)	21 (72%)
GERMAN 112	1 (8%)	5 (42%)	6 (50%)
ITALIAN 112	1 (7%)	8 (57%)	5 (36%)
JAPANESE 112	7 (41%)	3 (18%)	7 (41%)
LATIN 112	0	6 (60%)	4 (40%)
POLISH	0	4 (36%)	7 (64%)
SPANISH 112	20 (20%)	38 (37%)	44 (43%)

**BA/BS Programs**

**Language Written Assessment (LO# 2)**

Language	Do not meet	Acceptable	Target
FRENCH 336	0	0	3 (100%)
GERMAN 336	Not offered		
ITALIAN 336	0	0	3 (100%)
SPANISH 336	0	1 (17%)	5 (83%)

**Culture Assessment (LO# 3)**

Language	Do not meet	Acceptable	Target
FRENCH 315	0	1 (8%)	11 (92%)
GERMAN 316	Not offered		
ITALIAN 316	0	0	4 (100%)
SPANISH 316	1 (7%)	8 (53%)	6 (40%)

**Literature Assessment (LO# 4)**

<b>Language</b>	<b>Do not meet</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Target</b>
FRENCH 304	Not offered		
GERMAN 304	Not offered		
ITALIAN 304	Not offered		
SPANISH 304	1 (11%)	0	8 (89%)
SPANISH 375	3 (16%)	8 (42%)	8 (42%)