

#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

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

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Margie Propp, Peilan Kao, Jerry Pfabe

See Undergraduate Program Outcome Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes – Gen Eds for: a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology

Analysis of artifacts:

1). **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*** - *How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* Each student who received an "A" on the final exam for ASL 102, CHNS 102, or SPAN 102 in the spring semester was rated by the course instructor for language proficiency level according to the proficiency benchmark indicators indicated in guidelines for the ASL Private Interview (ASLPI) [for ASL] or the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) [for Mandarin and Spanish]. The proficiency benchmarks of the ASLPI and ACTFL that were used for this assessment can be found at these links:

ASPLI: <https://www.gallaudet.edu/asl-diagnostic-and-evaluation-services/aslpi/aslpi-proficiency-levels>

ACTFL: <https://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012/english/writing>

<https://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012/english/speaking>

<https://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012/english/listening>

Summary of RESULTS*:

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

Are our language course finals at the 102 level a good indicator of the language proficiency levels our students are achieving as a result of taking our language classes? Are the students exiting our 102 classes attaining a language proficiency level comparable to "low intermediate" (ASPLI 2+), ACTFL "Intermediate Low")?

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*

The best students in our language classes (those receiving an "A" on the final exam) are not consistently scoring at a proficiency level of "low intermediate" (ASPLI 2+; ACTFL "Intermediate Low") but rather are more often scoring as "high beginner" (ASLPI 2; ACTFL "Novice High"). In other words, an "A" on the language course final does not seem to ensure that students who receive it have achieved a "low intermediate" proficiency. See attached chart for more detailed information.

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

There are two possible interpretations of this assessment: Either the language classes are not sufficiently rigorous to allow students to consistently achieve the desired levels of proficiency, and/or our final exams for the language classes are not a reliable indicator that a student has reached a certain language proficiency level (not just demonstrated ability to achieve well on the final).

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* We are well aware that final exams (oral or written) are not specifically designed to act as general language proficiency indicators but as a means to see if students have mastered specific course material (which may be related to general language proficiency, but only indirectly) and that therefore they have limitations; however, this is the best instrument we currently have to serve as an indicator of language proficiency without incurring extra cost to the student or to the university (as would be the case for students taking official ASPLI or ACTFL exams). Also, none of the final exams here measured achievement in all four of the language skill areas (reading, writing, listening, speaking), but rather only a subset which differed depending on the language: "listening" and "speaking" for ASL, listening and speaking for Mandarin, and listening and writing for Spanish.

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 members of the department

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

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?*

The drive for language students to attain a "low intermediate" language proficiency rating by the time they have finished their first year of language studies is not based solely on our department members' professional opinion as language educators, but on state requirements as well: Education majors who are language teaching candidates planning to apply for a language teaching endorsement from the Nebraska Department of Education are required to have reached an ASLPI level of 4 for ASL, an ACTFL level of "Intermediate High" for Mandarin, and an ACTFL level of "Advanced Low" for Spanish. In order for students to be able to achieve these state-proscribed language proficiency benchmarks, it is imperative that they reach certain levels of proficiency by the end of each language course, else they will not be able to achieve the state's overall language proficiency goal by the time they graduate from Concordia and apply for their endorsements. We realize from this year's assessment results that many of our Education major language students are not "on track" to achieve these levels. As a result, we plan to start with ASL (for this year) to implement a cycle of curriculum review (paired with subsequent revamping of the final exam) in an effort to improve the rigor of the ASL course sequence.

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 who receive "A's" on the ASL 102 exam in spring 2018 will achieve an ASLPI level of 2+ or 3.

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).* We would like to request \$500 to hire a curricular consultant from the University of Virginia to help us work through a review and alteration of our current ASL program curriculum, materials, and assessment. This review would have the goal of developing a more rigorous scope and sequence across the ASL program that will support student learning to the level it needs to be in order for students who graduate from the program to achieve the level of ASL language proficiency they need to attain a teaching endorsement from the state.

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? Has our curricular review and modification efforts resulted in higher student language proficiency achievement at the end of ASL 102?

**Submitted by: Vicki Anderson
(date): 5/17/17**

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: yes - request was included in the 2017-18 budget

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