

III. Program Outcomes Assessment and Improvements

A. Attach or insert the assessment cycle calendar for your program.

MODERN LANGUAGES Assessment Calendar by Academic Year

CYCLE STAGE	2012-13 PLO 1	2013-14 PLO 3	2014-15 PLO 2	2015-16 PLO 4	2016-17 PLO 5	2017-18 PLO 1
SLO Assessment	ASL 215A, ASL 215B, 215C; FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110 GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	ASL 201, 202 FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	ASL 201, 202 FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	ASL 201, 202 FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204
Analyze Results & Plan for Improvements	ASL 215A, ASL 215B, 215C; FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110 GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	ASL 201, 202 FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	ASL 201, 202 FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	ASL 201, 202 FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204
Plan Implementation	ASL 215A, ASL 215B, 215C; FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110 GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	ASL 201, 202 FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	ASL 201, 202 FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	ASL 201, 202 FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204
Post- Implementation SLO Assessment	ASL 215A, ASL 215B, 215C; FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110 GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	ASL 201, 202 FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	ASL 201, 202 FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204	ASL 201, 202 FR 201/110, FR 202/120; GER 201/110, GER 202/120 SPAN 201,202, SPAN 203, 204

B. Attach or insert the most recent program-level Course or Program Assessment Summary (CPAS) for each of the degrees/certificates in your program or the Student Services Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report (SSSLOAR).

Course or Program Assessment Summary

Division: LANGUAGES AND COMMUNICATION **Program:** MODERN LANGUAGES

Date: November 19, 2014

Courses in program: ASL 201, 202 - FR 201/110, 202/120, 203 - GER 201/110, GER 202/120, 203, 204 – SPAN 201, 202, 203, 204

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: Lead instructors: Clayton, Dunn, Lloyd, Rector-Cavagnaro and all temporary part-time instructors

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes X

1.	Student Learning Outcome Statements X Program	Student will be able to <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. demonstrate receptive and expressive proficiency when engaging in interpersonal communication using idiomatic language (Interpersonal Communication) 2. Demonstrate receptive proficiency when interpreting recorded and live idiomatic language (Interpretive Listening). 3. demonstrate reading proficiency when interpreting texts written in idiomatic language (Interpretive Reading: Spanish, French, German) 4. Demonstrate writing proficiency when composing and revising idiomatic language (Presentational Communication – Writing: Spanish, French, and German). 5. Describe and discuss the relationship of selected practices, values, and attitudes found in target culture and demonstrate awareness of the links between language and culture (Culture).
2.	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	NOTE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This CPAS primarily summarizes a follow-up direct assessment of PLO #3, which was performed in spring 2014. The first direct assessment for PLO #3 was done in fall 2013 and has been documented in a separate CPAS, as part of the Modern Languages APPW submitted in spring 2014. A comparison between fall 2013 and spring 2014 data follows in # 6 below. • PLO #3 was chosen for <u>direct</u> assessment for spring 2014. • PLO #3 only applies to French, German and Spanish. • ASL faculty continued assessment activities for PLO # 1. • All instructors in all 22 sections of French, German and Spanish administered a reading comprehension activity in the final exam at three language levels. • Spanish, French and German faculty used the same assessment instrument in all sections of the same level and applied identical scoring rubrics in determining the number of students who performed successfully.
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sample size was a total of 337 students (236 at level 1, 85 at level 2 and 16 at level 3). • The sample size of 337 included 55 students in French, 29 students in German, and 253 students in Spanish. • The student performance was reported using a rating of “Excellent,” “Good,” “Fair,” “Poor.” • The Spanish discipline, which accounted for 16 out of the 22 sections, standardized its assessment. All instructors used the same text as in fall 2013 with ten M/C comprehension checks in all sections of the same level.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoring rubric for Spanish at level 1 and 2: “Excellent” = 9 -10 correct “Good” = 8 correct “Fair” = 7 correct “Poor” = 6 or fewer correct German (1 section at level 1) used the same assessment tool as in fall 2013. Since level 2 of German was not offered in fall 2013, PLO #3 was assessed for the first time. At both levels reading texts were followed with a writing assignment as comprehension check. Spelling and grammar were not considered in the scoring, only content. French (3 sections at level 1) used the same text in the spring 2014 for all sections. Since level 2 of French was not offered in fall 2013, PLO#3 was assessed for the first time. At both levels a reading text was followed by an M/C comprehension check.
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	<p>Assessment results were reported for 100% of all students enrolled in French, German and Spanish in spring 2014. All 22 sections reported their assessment results (100% participation rate) representing 11 instructors, 6 of whom were temporary part-time faculty. Spanish was offered at levels 1, 2 and 3. French and German were offered at level 1 only.</p> <p>Overall 88% of all students who participated in the direct assessment of PLO #3 succeeded (i.e. scored “Excellent,” “Good,” or “Fair”).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall Success rate by language: French scored 93%, Spanish 88% and German 83%. Success rate by level: Success rate at level 2 (92%) was five percentage points higher than at level 1 (87%). Level 3 success rate was 100%. Disaggregating the success data by level: Level 1 students achieved a higher percentage of “Excellent” than level 2 students (36% vs. 34%). But level 2 students had a higher rate of “Good” than level 1 students (41 % vs. 30%). Disaggregating the success rate by language: French students had the highest percentage of “Excellent” (38%), followed by Spanish (37%), and German (21%). In the “Good” range French and German tied at 38% and Spanish had 32%. The most “Fair” were in German (24%), followed Spanish (19%), and French (17%) Disaggregating the success data by level <u>and</u> language: French level 2 students achieved the highest percentage (55%) of “Excellent”, followed by Spanish level 3 (50%), Spanish level 1 (38%). French level 1 and Spanish level 2 tied (29%). German level 2 (23%) and German level 1 (19%) Overall 12% of all students who were registered (385) did not participate in the assessment event. 13% were enrolled in a level 1 course, 11% in a level 2 course, 16% in a level 3 course. Since no-shows did not earn a performance score, they were not included in the calculation of performance success/failure. The no-show rate varied between languages (9% in French, 11% in Spanish, 29% in German).
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous	<p>Faculty discussed the pros and cons of various assessment methodologies, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> length of reading text authentic text vs. text written for language learners types of comprehension checks (M/C; T/F; short answers; longer responses) scoring rubric vocabulary aids (none vs. footnotes vs. glossary)

	Improvement Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> uniform assessment activity in all sections at the same level
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	<p>Faculty agreed that reading assignments with comprehension checks are valuable assessment tools and will be continued.</p> <p>Effective fall 2014, in an effort to assess all PLOs in the next five years, faculty will target PLO #2 (Interpretive “Listening”), which will include ASL. Results from direct assessment will be collected from all sections of all courses of all four languages and will be used for analysis and collegial discussions regarding teaching and testing methods and their effectiveness.</p>
		<p style="text-align: center;">COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT FALL 2013 & SPRING 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In both semesters assessment results were reported for 100% of all students enrolled in French, German and Spanish. All sections participated, representing 10 to 11 instructors, the majority being temporary part-time faculty (6 to 7 faculty members). The overall pool size of students assessed was virtually the same in both semesters (326 in fall 2013 / 337 in spring 2014). In fall 2013 overall 85% of all students who participated in the direct assessment of PLO #3 succeeded (i.e. scored Excellent, Good, or Fair). In spring 2014 the success rate went up by three percentage points to 88%. The percentage of registered students who did not participate in the assessment event did not change significantly: 11% in fall 2013, 12% in spring 2014. The success rates for level 1 are within two percentage point of one another for the two semesters (85% for fall 2013 vs. 87% for spring 2014). For level 2 the success rates were 4 percentage points higher in spring 2014 (92%) than fall 2013 (88%). At level 3, representing a small pool of Spanish students, the success rates were 100% in spring 2014 vs. 78% in fall 2013. (The numbers of students assessed at level 3 will remain small: One section of Spanish and some “credit by exams” in French and German. Level 4 will be added once a year for Spanish effective spring 2015). <p>ASL continued to formally track assessment data for PLO #1 in an effort to align assessment methods among faculty teaching the courses, resulting in potential modifications and professional development.</p> <p>Although French, German and Spanish will continue to assess Interpretive Reading (PLO #3) each semester, summative assessment (reporting and aggregating assessment results) for PLO #3 will be suspended until results for each of the other program learning outcomes have been collected, aggregated and studied.</p> <p>What has not occurred (yet) is a systematic, external validation of our internal assessment results. Cuesta’s Modern Languages students have not participated in standardized testing, such as the CAPE test which was administered at Cal Poly in spring 2013. Cuesta students are not tracked at four-year institutions to ascertain their success in language courses upon transfer. The only “evidence” we have is anecdotal to find out how they fared after leaving Cuesta, either at other institutions or applying their Interpersonal Communication skills as they converse with native speakers stateside or abroad.</p>

		<p>By tracking assessment results, so far for two of five program learning outcomes, the Modern Languages Program is developing a “culture of evidence.”</p> <p>The summative assessments of PLO #1 and PLO #3 in two successive semesters resulted in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • documentation of an existing high student success rate • uniform assessment tools in all sections at the same level of the same language • discussion and expansion of assessment tools • establishment of program-wide assessment rubric <p>It seems that current student performance is sufficiently high to assume that further improvement may not be possible. Therefore the data may redirect the focus on the distribution of ratings as there is a preponderance of “<i>Excellent</i>” in most languages. Are we setting the bar high enough? Looking beyond the scores the discussion revolved around various assessment (and teaching) methodologies to improve student learning. Regularly collecting data and discussing process and results not only enhances inter-collegial communication but is in full compliance with accreditation standards.</p>
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	<p>Modern Languages faculty convened on a monthly basis throughout the spring 2014 semester to discuss and plan the assessment procedures and tools. The minutes for each meeting reflect participation by both tenured and temporary part-time instructors and the content of the discussions.</p> <p>In spring 2014 ASL instructors continued their discussion of how to conduct and assess exit interviews (PLO #1). In fall 2014 they will join French, German and Spanish faculty in the dialog regarding PLO #2 (Interpretive Listening).</p>

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at <http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa>

C. Summarize in one to two paragraphs program improvements that have been implemented since the last APPW or CPPR.

Since the last APPW two assessments of reading comprehension have been performed with 100% participation of program faculty, full-time and part-time. Lead faculty continues to meet on a monthly basis to discuss pedagogy and share teaching and assessment methods in an effort to improve student performance and success. As a result, faculty communication has improved. It is, however, a challenge for PT faculty to attend the monthly gatherings.

The Modern Languages continues to operate with a small pool of five tenured faculty of whom three normally teach only 2/3 of a full-time load (ASL, French, and German). ASL and Spanish, the two languages with the most sections, rely predominantly on part-time faculty. In fall both tenured Spanish instructors taught an overload, thus tilting the tenured vs. temporary PT ratio to 54% to 46%. However, the total program’s ratio for fall 2014 was 46% tenured vs. 54% temporary PT.