

#2. 2017 – 2018 Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

Department: Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages

Date: 6-12-18

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Margie Propp, Josephine Chiu, 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).*

For the last two academic years, the Department of Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages has worked at benchmarking the proficiency levels of the highest-achieving students at the end of their first year of language study. 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> By this means, we have found in the last two years that "A" students in these classes are NOT consistently achieving the "low intermediate" proficiency level that we would like (ASPLI 2+ for ASL; "Intermediate Low" on the ACTFL scale for Spanish and Mandarin). This year we set out to determine if this low performance is due to a problem with the final exams, the rigor of the language classes, or both.

Summary of RESULTS*:

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

Why are the students exiting our 102 classes attaining a language proficiency level BELOW "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"). Upon investigation and discussion (including the comparison of student performance in CUNE Dual Credit classes for ASL 102, CHNS 102, and SPAN 102, all of which meet for an entire year in the high school context), we have determined that the fault lies primarily in the sheer amount of language exposure and opportunities for student language output in our 101-102 classes. Students in our on-campus language classes complete 135-150 hours of classtime and outside-of-class work for each course (101 and 102), whereas students in the CUNE Dual Credit classes are completing about twice that, since their courses span an entire year (not only one semester).

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

On-campus language classes are not sufficiently long to allow students to consistently achieve the desired levels of proficiency, and/or our final grades 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)* While college students often possess greater higher-order thinking ability than high school students (and thus can progress more quickly than high school students through many courses), this does not seem to be the case with language (which is less about learning content than it is about learning language skill); in other words, the 135 hours a semester we have students working is

not even half of the 350-400 supervised learning hours recommended by the European Framework of Guided Learning Hours for reaching a B1 (or "low intermediate") level.

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 6-15-18

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

Who were results shared with? (List names): erry Pfabe, John Mehl, Julie Johnston, Josephine Chiu, 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:*

a. *Teaching:* Click or tap here to enter text.

b. *Assignment/course:* Our department has already made plans to increase the rigor (even if we cannot increase the length) of the ASL 101 and 102 course sequence next year so that students learn approximately 500 signs in each of ASL 101 and 102, for a total of 1000 signs by the end of ASL 102. We are also adding a Thursday night language lab hour to the Monday night ASL classes in order to increase the amount of language instruction and practice that students receive each week.

c. *Program:* Click or tap here to enter text.

d. *Assessment:* Click or tap here to enter text.

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 2019 will be closer in proficiency to achieving an ASLPI level of 2+.

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 for the fall--we have sacrificed our section of ASL 102 in the fall in order to be able to pay for a language lab instructor; for the spring we ask for the ability to continue to hire a language lab instructor at the normal adjunct rate (in addition to instructors for our normally scheduled sections of ASL 101, ASL 102, and ASL 202).

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 **Assessment Committee Reviewed:** 6/18/18

Department Chair notified/additional action needed:na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na**Approved & Posted to**

Assessment site: 7/1/18