

## #1. Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

**Department:** Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages

**Date:** September 30, 2016

**General Education Committee has selected the following area for the 2016-2017 assessment cycle:**

**COMMUNICATION: to demonstrate effective communication skills for personal, academic and professional purposes.**

**General Education Committee: Background: What factors caused the committee to choose this particular assessment outcome? If this outcome was selected because of a perceived problem, please explain.**

The committee selected this outcome based upon two criteria: 1) effective communication skills in a broad range of forms (including but not limited to written, oral, visual and technological media) is a key goal of our general education curriculum; 2) Difficulties specifically with written communication has become a concern of faculty across disciplines.

**Department:** *What student outcome will the department assess that addresses: "The student will be able to demonstrate effective communication skills for personal, academic and professional purposes? The language programs that are part of the Department of ISML share the goal of raising the second language communication competence of all students in those programs. This communicative competence involves acquiring language-specific pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and pragmatics (understanding of culture-appropriate social behavior involving language). One desired outcome of the Department of ISML is that all General Education students will, after one year of language instruction in Spanish, ASL, or Mandarin, demonstrate language speaking and writing proficiency at the low intermediate ("Intermediate Low") level as determined by the benchmarks utilized in the ACTFL (American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages) proficiency rating.*

In response to addressing this outcome, the Department would like to take this year to continue last year's task of developing instruments to measure our students' language proficiency that assess both the mastery of target language features and notions of communicative competence. Eventually these measures would be administered at the end of the 102 level of the various language classes offered (ASL, Mandarin, and Spanish). For this year we will work on the development of a measure for Mandarin and ASL, in consultation with the instructors who are responsible for those courses. Sections of ASL 102 and CHNS 102 are running in the fall semester, so an initial (pilot) probe will be possible at the end of the fall semester. Dr. Pfabe will also continue to work on the development of an assessment for SPAN 102, and this assessment instrument will be ready to test at the end of the spring semester.

**Department:** *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.*

1. The goal of all of ISML's language classes is to increase the ability of the student to communicate effectively with speakers of the respective languages, both in terms of language proficiency (i.e., correct second language pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar) and in terms of sociopragmatic competence (i.e., correct use of language forms in the appropriate way, in the appropriate social contexts). We have asked ourselves the following question about our students' level of language proficiency: Do our assessment instruments for Spanish, Mandarin, and ASL classes clearly and accurately distinguish those students who have achieved an Intermediate Low Level in the ACTFL (American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages) benchmarking system from those who have not, at least in terms of writing? This is important to us because

we need this information about our instruments in order to know if we can use them to see if we are reaching our goal (stated above) of all ASL/CHNS/SPAN 102 students achieving Low Intermediate proficiency by the end of one year of language instruction.

[For more details about these benchmark indicators for language proficiency level, see the following source: n.a. (2012). ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Retrieved from [http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/ACTFLProficiencyGuidelines2012\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/ACTFLProficiencyGuidelines2012_FINAL.pdf).]

### **Methodology:**

1. *OBJECT\** - *What data (i.e. artifact, exam score, detailed description of assignment) will be collected?*  
Final exams from SPAN 102, CHNS 102, and ASL 102.
  - a. *How does this data address the assessment question?* We will know if the assessment instruments are an accurate measure of intermediate language proficiency if they are passed with scores of 90% or above by students previously determined (from interactions in class and other coursework assignments) who have achieved an Intermediate Low level as defined by the ACTFL benchmarks, and that students who did not receive a lesser score are indeed NOT at an intermediate Low level. These assessments of how well students meet the ACTFL benchmarks will be determined by Dr. Pfabe (Spanish), PeiLan Kao (Mandarin), and Margie Propp (ASL).
    - i. *Include/attach a description/example of assessment tool to be used.*
2. *How will data be collected?* Dr. Pfabe, PeiLan Kao, and Margie Propp will provide the department with two categories of data: A list of the names of students in SPAN 102/CHNS 102/ASL 102, grouped according to who are considered to be proficient at an Intermediate Low level (according to the ACTFL benchmark standards), plus the exam score for each SPAN/CHNS/ASL 102 student.

### **Analysis of Artifacts: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA\* -**

Discuss :

- 1) How the artifacts will be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used): A representative in the department will take the data provided for students in SPAN 102/CHNS 102/ASL 102 and make a determination if there is a correlation between those membership in the "Intermediate Low" or "not Intermediate Low" categories and the achievement of test scores of over 90% on the final exam.
- 2) How you will know if it is good (i.e. score required by % of students): We will know that are instruments are demonstrating validity (here, ability to measure proficiency level) if we find a positive correlation between students who have attained an Intermediate Low proficiency rating and those who have scored a 90% or higher on the final exams.

**Submitted by: Vicki Anderson, PhD**  
**Committee (Date): 10/17/16**

**Date: 9/30/2016**    **Reviewed by the Assessment**

**Department Chair notified approved or additional action needed: 10/17/16 - Revisions Made - Approved 10/18/17**

**Gen Ed: Plan**

**The assessment plan is good but it is not clear how it relates to the overall area of "Communication". Including a sentence or two in the section: "Department: What specific questions..... " are needed to clarify this.**