

#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Student Outcomes

To be completed by Departments and submitted by the Department Chair to the Assessment Blackboard Site.

Department: Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages **Date:** 5-12-2017

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: John Mehl, Vicki Anderson

See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: a) *Student Outcome*; b) *Background*; c) *Question(s)*; d) *Methodology*

Analysis of artifacts:

1). **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*** - *How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*

Members of the department scored papers from assignments related to cultural competence and fieldwork experience for EDUC 425B (ESL Methods, Curriculum, and Assessment, Part 2) and GMC 280 (Missional Leadership) using the Student Outcome #1 rubric that is attached here. This rubric scores students on whether or not they show evidence in their written reflections of cultural awareness, understanding, and appreciation. For EDUC 425B, all students' final papers that were submitted were included in the sample (N=1); for GMC 280, a course with much larger enrollment, a sample of 5 papers was chosen at random from those submitted for a single assignment that related to cultural competence.

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*

Are students demonstrating awareness, understanding, and appreciation of other cultures in the context of coursework that is part of the majors in the Department of ISML? (taken from Department of ISML Student Outcome #1)

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The goal of 95% of students scoring at the proficient level was not met however students are indeed showing some level of cultural awareness, understanding, and appreciation in their reflections, with a stronger result for cultural awareness than for cultural understanding or appreciation.

Our results show that, on average, students are scoring as somewhere between “appropriate” and “proficient” on the Student Outcome #1 rubric for cultural awareness, and between “developing” and “appropriate” for cultural understanding and cultural appreciation.

	Mean Score (N=6)	Rubric Score Designation (mean scores rounded up)
Cultural Awareness	3.7 (Range of Scores: 2-5)	“Proficient”
Cultural Understanding	2.7 (Range of Scores: 2-4)	“Appropriate”
Cultural Appreciation	2.8 (Range of Scores: 0-5)	“Appropriate”

Scoring Scale

0= Cultural Competence Component Not Evident

1= Deficient

2= Developing

3= Appropriate

4= Proficient

5= Excellent

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*

These results show that students are, on average, indeed evidencing cultural awareness, understanding, and appreciation in their responses in their assignments and fieldwork reflections (i.e,

the mean scores for students was not “0”). Last year we decided to modify our prompts for these assignments in order to encourage students to more clearly provide responses that focus on these components of cultural competence, and it would appear that we were successful: For both classes, students provided responses that made it possible to more clearly assess the levels of cultural awareness, understanding, and appreciation than students did last year.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* While we are now seeing evidence in the reflection papers of students’ awareness, understanding, and appreciation of other cultures, it is still “easier” to see these in papers coming from the Missional Leadership class (GMC 280) than from the ESL teacher preparation class (EDUC 425B).

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 5-15-2017

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) e-mail to department members

Who were results shared with? (List names): Vicki Anderson, Julie Johnston, John Mehl, Jerry Pfabe, Matt Myers, Margie Propp, Ben Sparks, Kim Davis, Peggy Williams

Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:

1. **ACTION***- *How will what the department learned from the assessment impact the teaching process/course/program etc. in your department starting the next academic year?*

As a department, we would like to see mean scores rank as “Proficient” in all three areas of cultural competence (cultural awareness, understanding, and appreciation). As a result, the Department of ISML has decided on three action areas for pursuit during the next year:

- 1) a review of all ISML courses (including language courses) for cultural competence components contained in each class connected to cultural awareness, understanding, and appreciation, alongside intentional exploration of current research on the teaching of cultural competence components in modern language and intercultural studies courses, and
- 2) from the exploration of current research, the development of a plan (which may involve curricular modifications) for raising the cultural competence scores for students in the courses which have been part of our evaluation for the past two years (EDUC 425B, EDUC 490, GMC 270, 280, 290, and 490), and
- 3) the development of a plan to extend the teaching of cultural competence through all of the department’s programs by inserting intentional teaching of cultural competence components into appropriate modern language classes.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*

We anticipate that students in EDUC 425B and 490, and GMC 270, 280, 290, and 490 will reflect more cultural awareness, understanding, and appreciation (higher scores) in response to prompts in the assignments that we continue to evaluate.

3. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the **ACTION*** (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).* none

If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.

What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future? After the insertion of intentional teaching about cultural competence components into some of the department's modern language classes, how will those students score against this same evaluative rubric in regards to cultural awareness, understanding, and appreciation?

**Submitted by: Vicki Anderson
5/17/17**

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 5/17/17