**Student Learning Assurance Report Requirements**

**Word Template**

**AY** 2011-2012

**Report Date:** October 19, 2012

**School/College:** Arts and Sciences

**Department/Program:** Modern and Classical Languages

**Person completing the Report:** Karen Bouwer

**Overview Statement**: Briefly summarize the student learning assurance activities that were undertaken this academic year, indicating:

The Department of Modern and Classical Languages (MCL) houses three language majors: French, Japanese, and Spanish. (It also houses the Comparative Literature and Culture major that functions independently.) Although the majors developed individual assessment plans (Anne Mairesse for French, Noriko Nagata for Japanese, and Ana Urrutia for Spanish) and will assess individual outcomes for each of the programs, MCL has also been striving to work together more closely as a department. Since we also offer Minors in Chinese and German and students can choose from among ten other languages, we also focus on ensuring a quality education for all the students who enroll in our department to fulfill their language requirements.

Once the assessment plans were completed, MCL requested that the university acquire a testing program that would allow us to determine whether our students were indeed attaining the various levels on the ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) Proficiency guidelines. Since we were unable to obtain such a measuring device, one that would help us assess our first goal, this became a stumbling block to assessing the later goals. However, we have made some progress:

**Japanese Studies:**

Japanese Studies submitted annual reports for 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. The program has since embraced a more proficiency-oriented approach as suggested by our external reviewers (Spring 2011) and Professor Nagata has been OPI certified (she is officially certified to conduct the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview).

**Spanish:**

Both French and Spanish made changes to their Majors and Minors since the assessment plans were devised. Here is the statement of goals for the significantly revised Spanish Major and Minor:

**Statement of Goals/Philosophy**

Our goals in revising the Spanish major have been to:

• make more transparent the relationship between the Spanish major and the broader humanistic goal of discovering, engaging, and understanding the Spanish-speaking world;

• create a more obvious and direct relationship between the major and the unique, increasingly-important role of Spanish in the US, viewing Spanish speakers as representatives of numerous, complex cultures, as well as a socially, politically, and economically-significant sector;

• facilitate student development of deep cultural knowledge by adding (to ongoing classroom contact with Spanish speakers and the experience of study abroad) a service learning component that will structure student engagement with members of the local Spanish-speaking communities;

• ensure greater student involvement in learning by increasing students’ opportunities to shape and/or personalize a major to reflect more closely the individual’s interests and goals;

• provide additional support for developing and refining language skills.

In this revised major, literature will share upper-division space with a range of cross-disciplinary, linguistic, and service-learning courses. Further, the program will establish relationships with other departments whereby discipline-specific courses will be offered in Spanish, with support from Spanish faculty for discussion facilitation and the management/evaluation of written assignments, if needed.

The philosophy underlying this revision continues to value the literary text as cultural artifact, but it also recognizes the needs of our students (1) to engage in other modes of cultural analysis, (2) to hone higher-level language skills and to understand and talk about language, (3) to acknowledge Spanish and Spanish speakers as an emerging force in the US, no longer “foreign”, and (4) to encourage systematic contact with Spanish speakers in the US and abroad as preparation for a lifetime of applying the knowledge and skills of the major to intellectual and social interactions with Spanish speakers and their cultures.

**French Studies:**

**FRENCH STUDIES ASSESSMENT GOAL 1**

In our original document, we set the proficiency levels we would like our students to attain according to the ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) guidelines at Advanced Low for production and Advanced Mid for comprehension. Our external reviewers asserted that this was too ambitious and that students, even those who have had the opportunity to study abroad rarely reach those levels of proficiency. So we have adjusted the goals to reach to Intermediate High for production and Advanced Low for comprehension.

In May 2011, one of our two graduating majors took the CASLS (Center for Applied Second Language Studies) CAP (Computerized Assessment of Proficiency) test. The University of Oregon is still piloting this program and we were granted access. Here are her results:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Panel Name** | **Benchmark** | **Level** | **Teacher Rated** | **Test Time** | **Start Time** | **Writing/Speaking Detail** |
|    | French Reading   | Expanding (A)   | 797\*   |    | 41 min.   | Monday May, 16 2011 02:42 PM    | [Detailed View](http://cap.uoregon.edu/caslspilot/do/viewstudentreport?testtakerid=44398&viewStudentReportAction=viewStudentProductivePanel" \t "_blank)  |
|    | French Listening   | Expanding (B)   | 8   |    | 40 min.   | Monday May, 16 2011 02:01 PM    | [Detailed View](http://cap.uoregon.edu/caslspilot/do/viewstudentreport?testtakerid=44397&viewStudentReportAction=viewStudentProductivePanel" \t "_blank) |

Translated into the ACTFL proficiency guidelines, she was evaluated as having reached Advanced Mid in both comprehension skills. Since there tends to be a close correlation between the comprehension and production scores of students, we can see that this student has exceeded the goals as currently defined. It should be noted that this student did have the opportunity to spend a semester studying in a Francophone country. Based on my personal knowledge of the other graduating student’s skills, I would say the two students are comparable. The other student has also studied abroad.

\* This score only makes sense if read as 7.97, i.e. 8.

Based on the definition of the goals outlined below, the student has reached the more ambitious level of proficiency we set as our goal before taking into consideration the external reviewers’ recommendations.

**French Goal 1:**

1. **To communicate clearly and effectively in French, both in written and oral discourse**

**Defined: To achieve a common minimum of Intermediate High (for language production, i.e. speaking (a) and writing (b), as well as a minimum of Advanced Low (for language comprehension, i.e. listening (c) and reading (d) on the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines.**

**Measurable outcomes:**

1. Speaking: Graduates will express information and opinions in French in a consistent, effective, and clear French.
2. Writing: Graduates will write coherently in French using the disciplinary conventions and methodologies that constitute effective literary and cultural analysis.
3. Listening: Graduates will understand connected oral discourse on a variety of issues produced by native speakers from different places and times.
4. Reading: Graduates will demonstrate a critical competence to identify, interpret, and evaluate the main ideas and formal features of literary texts and formal artifacts from all periods and genres, showing some sensitivity to the plurality of meanings they offer.

**Performance Rubrics:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Inadequate Achievement of Outcome** | **Average Achievement of Outcome** | **Very Good Achievement of Outcome** |
| a.Speaking | Students can interact with native speakers but there is a strong interference from English, and misunderstandings are frequent. Students feel most comfortable talking about personal matters. | Students can initiate, sustain and conclude conversations on personal, cultural and academic matters with native speakers in their own communities (either abroad, through service learning, or in informal encounters on and off campus). Their speech may contain pauses, reformulations and self-corrections as they search for the adequate words | Students can explain complex ideas in detail using precise vocabulary and intonation patterns. There is little interference from English.  |
| b.Writing | Students’ writing often shows lack of fluency due to systematic grammatical errors, misuse of words, and spelling mistakes. Syntax is poor consisting of recombinations of learned vocabulary and structures into simple sentences. | Students can frame and sustain an argument that includes both the exposition and explanation of information, even when there is only partial control of complex structures. They are attentive to questions of structure and style in their written work, but transitions and cohesive devices may still be limited.  | Students’ writing incorporates a wide range of expressions and rhetorical forms with attention to register and finer shades of meaning. Some misuse of vocabulary may still be evident, but in general there is little interference from English. |
| c.Listening | Students’ understanding is uneven which causes them to often miss main ideas when interaction is not face-to-face and on familiar topics.  | Students can synthesize the main ideas of extended conversation, audiovisual materials, and academic lectures.  | Students can follow the general lines of more complex arguments, provided the topic is reasonably familiar. |
| d.Reading | Students need guidance to understand literary excerpts and longer texts from a variety of sources. | Students are able to read and understand texts from a variety of sources and understand literary texts representing different genres.  | Students begin to discern writers’ attitudes and viewpoints. They may understand texts in varying literary styles of greater length and complexity. |

In April 2012 Professor Pamela Park (Idaho State University), who is currently completing her training as an OPI evaluator, tested several of our students in an unofficial capacity. She will share the official results with us when she receives them. But her preliminary show that our students are indeed achieving the levels of proficiency we are striving for, and are at times surpassing them.

Katherine Francisco, French Major (S’12):  Intermediate High\*
Carl Jaquin, French Major (F’12): Advanced Mid\*\*
Ana Kitapini, Advanced Certificate (S’12): Intermediate High\*\*\*
Mary Frances Knapp, Advanced Certificate (S’13): Intermediate Mid
Meghan Briggs, Advanced Certificate (S’13): Advanced Low\*\*\*

\*This student, a strong and consistent student, shows what we can expect from graduating majors who do not have the opportunity of studying abroad. MaryFrances, who is working toward an Advanced Certificate, has also not studied abroad.

\*\*This student is exceptional and his performance exceeds what we can expect from most of our students

\*\*\*Both of these students spent a semester abroad with the BU internship program

**French Goal 2:**

**Evaluated by Ahmed Bangura**

**Course Title: FREN 332 Francophone Literature II**

**Name of Professor: Professor Karen Bouwer**

**Number of Students: 17**

**To demonstrate a concrete knowledge of major artistic works and figures of the French-speaking world**

**Defined: To demonstrate a basic critical ability to identify and evaluate the ideas and formal features of major artistic works and figures, the contexts in which they are produced, and the perspectives they represent.**

**Measurable Outcomes:**

1. Applyanalytical skills to the interpretation of a wide spectrum of cultural phenomena, including literature, art, music, film and popular media
2. Identify major artistic and cultural figures of the French-speaking world and their principal works
3. Situate the Arts in the context of their historical, cultural, and aesthetic traditions, while recognizing the limitations of such categorizations.

**Performance Rubrics:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Inadequate Achievement of Outcome** |  | **Average Achievement of Outcome** |  | **Very Good Achievement of Outcome** |  | **Students meeting outcome** |
| a. | Students still struggle when trying to analyze complex material; a dependence on summary or exposition versus argument and an inability to develop their own thesis when ask to write or discuss independent ideas. | 3 | Students can evaluate texts through a range of critical approaches and can apply analytical strategies (learned through literary analysis) to non-literary texts of the French -speaking world, including news media, film, advertisements, visual arts, performance, etc. Students can develop and carry out independent reading and research beyond the knowledge and understanding provided in the classroom.  | 9 | Students can evaluate the function of different stylistic devices within a text and can uncover nuanced and multilayered meanings and complexities of a text (or artistic work) through various modes of inquiry. They can begin to assess competing claims of interpretation of a text or other work of art independently and with confidence.  | 5 | 14/17 = 82% |
| b. | Students have only the most cursory understanding of essential works and figures within the French or Francophone world. Mistake in differentiating between Francophone cultures occur often.  | 2 | Students demonstrates an understanding of major artistic works and figures as well as the essential characteristics of the trends, periods, movements and names within the French and Francophone intellectual traditions that influence them.  | 9 | Students demonstrate a depth of knowledge and breadth of the major artistic works and figures from the French and/or Francophone world. | 6 | 15/17 = 88% |
| c. | Students blur essential distinctions between Francophone countries and cultures. A lack of sophisticated thought is often linked to sloppiness, disinterest and repetitive errors in argument.  | 1 | Students recognize key terms specific to the French-speaking world. They can compare and contrast artistic works from different eras, including those that represent important trends and movements from the same period, while also demonstrating knowledge of the significant events that have impacted French and Francophone cultures across the centuries. They are aware that conventions and canons may be questioned.. | 11 | Students regularly show a command of recognizing particularities of individual intellectual traditions within the French and/or Francophone world. | 5 | 16/17 = 94% |

The above results have been gleaned from two sets of final examinations (taken in Fall 2008 and Spring 2010) in FREN 332 Francophone Literature II (subsequently to be known as Rencontres II: Le monde francophone). The faculty member who evaluated the results did not teach the class.

The above results have been gleaned from two sets of final examinations (taken in Fall 2008 and Spring 2010) in FREN 332 Francophone Literature II (subsequently to be known as Rencontres II: Le monde francophone). The faculty member who evaluated the results did not teach the class.

**Overall MCL Progress:**

**Department of Modern and Classical Languages**

**Response to External Review: Action Items**

Japanese Studies submitted their response separately

**Department**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendation** | **Action** | **Proposed timeline** | **Progress report** | **Completed** |
| **Change the name of the department to the “Department of Modern Languages and Cultures”** | Discuss and reach consensus  | Fall 2011 | Discussed during F’10; no consensus reached. For now we’re trying to promote the moniker “MCL”; will revisit  |  |
| **Rotate chair position among various languages** | Establish rotation for the next five years | Fall 2011 | F’10-F’12; co-chairs from French and Spanish (after Japanese) |  |
| **Improve communication and collegiality, within department and with other parts of university** | 1. Hold regular meetings; circulate agenda in advance |  | Four 90-minute meetings in F’10 and S’11; different time slots on Thurs and Fri to try to accommodate as many people as possible | F’10 and ongoing |
|  | 2. Hold separate language program meetings at least once a month or three times a semester |  | Japanese (6), French (2 FT, ;7 PT), Spanish (5) | F’10 and ongoing |
|  | 3. Continue discussions initiated during self-study; consider retreats; implement changes |  | Regular discussions (chairs also held a meeting with adjunct faculty and 2 meetings with directors and coordinators) | S’11 and ongoing |
|  | 4. Chairs widely available for meetings and discussion |  | Chairs sent out invitations for individual or group meetings; numerous meetings with individuals and small groups during the year | F’10 and ongoing |
|  | 5. Introduction of formal feedback mechanisms (Feedback and Suggestion Forms to be completed with Surveymonkey at the end of each semester) |  | Developed in F’10. Faculty invited to complete feedback forms end of each semester. F’10 feedback forms regarding chairs shared with and discussed during department meeting. Feedback for directors to be shared with directors in a meeting with chairs. In F’10 insufficient responses for Noriko Nagata.  | F’10 and ongoing |
|  | 6. Social gatherings |  | Potluck after last department meetings in F’10 and S;11 (already part of department culture under Noriko); off-campus potluck at Karen’s house S’11. Well attended and successful. one planned at Ana’s house F’11. | F’10 and ongoing |
|  | 7. Video of interviews with students, staff and faculty who use more than one language | F’11 (had originally hoped S’11 but took longer than anticipated) | Ana identified student (Laura Waldron) who will make film and gathered names of potential interviewees, F’10. S’11, student recorded interviews; now faculty are identifying relevant portions to edit and will transcribe these; product will be completed F’11. |  |
|  | 8. Liaisons with International Studies |  | Pedro and Steve communicating with BAIS and MAIS; Karen and Ana met with Keally McBride, the new co-chair of BAIS and coordinator of European Studies area concentration S’11. | F’10 and ongoing |
| **Staying focused on and meeting the needs of all language students** | 1. Reaching advisers and students through Webtrack  |  | Anne liaised with Lois Lorentzen, Tonya Miller and Peter Novak to change language in orientation materials and to urge students to start fulfilling their language requirement during their first year | F’10 and ongoing |
|  | 2.Bridge divide between lower and upper division course by introducing 200 level courses | New courses will be introduced F’11 | Introduction of 200 level content courses into new curriculums in French and Spanish |  |
|  | 3. Activities to promote programs  |  | Department participation in Don’s Fest, Orientation to Major, and Major and Minor Fair. Plan to do Orientation to Major as Orientation to MCL. Plan to invite speakers of interest to MCL as a whole or more than one language program (e.g. French and Japanese: images of Japan in French literature). Also see individual programs. | F’10 and ongoing |
|  | 4. Offer 3-4 regular courses evenly distributed between 200, 300 and 400 levels (in the target language) | F’11 (based on changes to French Studies and Spanish Studies majors and minors, S’11) | Also see individual programs |  |
|  | 5. Work with other departments to develop courses on the model of “Languages across the Curriculum” |  | See individual programs |  |
|  | 6. Renumber course sequencing |  | See individual programs |  |
|  | 7. Re-structure French and Spanish majors by bringing resources back to programs |  | See individual programs |  |
|  | 8. Consider introducing Secondary Major |  | See individual programs |  |
|  | 9. Advertise course offerings in various outlets |  | Posted fliers for a variety of courses; listed Swahili on USFConnect , held an information session, and advertised to local community. S’11 prepared booklet with all course offerings; also to be shared with summer advisers | F’10 and ongoing |
|  | 10. Hold teaching workshops and sessions in which students can present work | F’11 for developing forums for students to present their work.  | Workshops offered on ongoing basis in LCC; Claire Kramsch talk about culture competency F’10; ACTFL Writing Proficiency workshop S’11; 3 hour workshop with faculty planned for August F’11. | F’10 and ongoing |
|  | 11. Language instructors should regularly visit each other’s classes | F’11 | There has been an expression of interest in doing this but it has not been formalized yet. |  |
|  | 12. Re-structure tutoring program |  | Karyn offered pedagogy course in F’10 and will again in F’11; Susanne Hoelscher experimented with alternatives; discussions continue | F’10 and ongoing |
| **As advocates for languages, take leadership in communicating with the faculty at large and first-year advisers in particular** | 1. All language program faculty at all ranks to teach language |  | See individual programs |  |
|  | 2. Each semester, offer content courses in the target language at the upper division |  | Always strive to do so; enrollments can pose problems; support of administration appreciated for necessary classes that have low enrollment |  |
|  | 3. All faculty at all ranks to offer content courses in the target language on interesting topics |  | See individual programs |  |
|  | 4. Encourage department faculty to ‘reinvest’ in language students |  | See individual programs |  |
|  | 5. Establish rotation of courses offered in other programs |  | See individual programs |  |
|  | 6. Require online posting of projected offerings at all levels of language and content courses for next 2-3 years | F’11 (after completion of revisions to majors and minors in S’11) | Work during the summer on website; will include online posting of offerings |  |
| **Student development and learning** | 1. Create more visibility |  | Video will be completed in F’11; working on new website; will participate in Welcome Week excursions (for French and Swahili); booklet with courses to be distributed among all summer advisers |  |
|  | 2. Language tables |  | Ana arranged for language tables to be held in lobby of cafeteria | S’11 |
|  | 3. Outreach | F’11 for discussion of options | One idea is to invite high school students to campus events; possibly to have students prepare a play for credit throughout the semester and then invite high school students to performance.  |  |
|  | 4. Language clubs |  | Currently clubs in French, Spanish and Japanese but sometimes difficult to sustain when active students graduate |  |
|  | 5. National honor society |  | See individual languages. |  |
|  | 6. Film festivals/showings | F’11 for discussion | Will most likely develop in conjunction with next point (residential options) |  |
|  | 7. Residential options | F’12; will prepare F’11 and S’12 | Invited Peter Novak to a S’11 meeting to talk about residential options. One suggestion to have a Polyglot floor where students interested in language learning sign up. MCL would develop cultural activities such as film screenings to engage the students on the floor. |  |

**French**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendation** | **Action** | **Proposed timeline** | **Progress report** | **Completed** |
| **Coordination, consultation and cooperation between different faculty members need to be improved** | * New coordinator appointed
* Regular meetings between coordinator and PT faculty
* Regular meetings of FT faculty
* Meetings of all French faculty
 |  | Matthew has held 7 meetings with the PT faculty this past year and has created a real esprit de corps. French FT faculty worked together to make revisions to the major and minor and introduce the secondary major and continue to work together developing syllabi and working on assessment. | Fall 2010 and ongoing |
| **The program should introduce a number of transitional courses taught in French** | * Changes to major to include 200 level CBI courses
* Development of new 200 level courses
 | FREN 255 to be offered for the first time in F’11Another 200 level course has been developed by Gaëlle Corvaisier and will be offered in S’12 | New Major, Secondary Major and Minor agreed upon during Fall 2010 and approved by the Curriculum Committee in S’11 | S’11 |
| **There needs to be better sequencing, balancing and renumbering of courses at the 200, 300 and 400 levels** | Changes to Major and Minor and introduction of Secondary Major |  |  | S’11 |
| **The program needs more regular offerings of interesting content courses taught in French that are based within the department** | Introduction of new content courses at 200 level (and potentially beyond) | F’11 | Two 200 courses approved in S’11 (FREN 255 Diplomatie sans frontières and FREN 265 Les Enfants terribles). Will consider teaching more French/English hybrid courses (extra discussion hour in French, for example) | S’11 and beyond |
| **The program should consider starting a capstone experience for senior French majors** |  | F’11 for discussion | Given the small number of students at this time, it is difficult to have a separate course fulfilling this requirement. But it may be feasible to have students add 2 units to their final 400 level seminar and expand their research paper |  |
| **Other, from general departmental recommendations (signaled as “See individual programs” in section on Department as a whole)** | 1. Offer 3-4 regular courses evenly distributed between 200, 300 and 400 levels (in the target language) | F’11 | 1. Will introduce 200 level courses in F’11. |  |
|  | 2. All faculty at all ranks to offer content courses in the target language on interesting topics |  | Invitation has gone out to PT faculty to develop content course syllabi for evaluation. One such syllabus has been received. A PT faculty member will also get to teach our new FREN 100 French and the City course.  |  |
|  | 3. Work with other departments to develop courses on the model of “Languages across the Curriculum” |  |  a) Two of the 200 level courses we are developing will appeal to BAIS students (Diplomatie sans frontières—discussed with Annick Wibben who said would be of interest and then also shared with Keally McBride who made some recommendations—and Réconciliation or some such course focused on conflict resolution, forgiveness and reconciliation). These courses will be of interest to students who have chosen both African and European regional emphases.  b) The new 2-unit grammar course that we intend to offer every semester (Finesses de la langue) can also serve as a reading course for MAIS students since it will include grammar and vocabulary logs based on readings done in the class but also in other classes or outside of class.  |  |
|  | 4. Re-structure French major by bringing resources back to programs |  | It is not only the structure of the majors/minor that has faculty invested in other interdisciplinary programs supported by the administration. Will continue to keep the primacy of French students in mind. |  |
|  | 5. Consider introducing Secondary Major | F’11 | Secondary major included during discussions in F’10; will be implemented in F’11 |  |
|  | 6. All language program faculty at all ranks to teach language |  | Matthew Motyka has taught lower division language courses but the division mostly remains in place. |  |
|  | 7. Each semester, offer content courses in the target language at the upper division |  | Already attempt to do; low enrollment and class cancellation makes is difficult; appreciate support from administration for keeping open some low enrollment classes |  |
|  | 8. Encourage department faculty to ‘reinvest’ in language students |  | Matthew teaching language courses; French Culture through Cuisine meant to recruit French majors and minors; Comp. Lit. requires investment in language |  |
|  | 9. Establish rotation of courses offered in other programs | F’11 | Initiated developing this rotation during revisions to French Studies; plan to post on website in the future |  |
| **Recommendation requiring extra resources** | 1. When courses taught in English, consider adding an extra 2-unit component that could be taught in the target language |  | This would actually also “eat up” faculty course time. Will consider but has not been instituted at this time. |  |
|  | 2. Develop higher level language courses | F’11 | New 2-unit grammar course offered every semester |  |
|  | 3. Set proficiency goals for each course, preceded by assessments to determine the current level of student proficiency |  | This taking place at the departmental level. A committee was created under Karyn Schell’s leadership that is currently developing online resources to share with department and we are moving to greater standardization and inclusion of proficiency guidelines in all syllabi.  | S’11 and ongoing |

**Please return to: Office of Student Learning Assurance by September 30.**

**Please send your replies as Word attachment (to:** **wmurry@usfca.edu****).**

**If you have any questions, please contact: William Murry, Director of Student Learning Assurance (****wmurry@usfca.edu** **or x5486)**