

## SPANISH STUDIES

### ASSESSMENT REPORT ACADEMIC YEAR 2017 – 2018 **REPORT DUE DATE: 10/26/2018**

**Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), graduate and non-degree granting certificate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences. Programs can combine assessment reports for a major and a minor program into one aggregate report as long as the mission statements, program learning outcome(s) evaluated, methodology applied to each, and the results are clearly delineated.**

**Note:** Dear Colleagues: In an effort to produce a more streamlined and less repetitive assessment report format, we are piloting this modified template for the present annual assessment cycle. We are requesting an assessment report that would not exceed eight pages of text. Supporting materials may be appended. We will be soliciting your feedback on the report as we attempt to make it more user-friendly.

**Some useful contacts:**

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts – [adamati@usfca.edu](mailto:adamati@usfca.edu)
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences – [lendvay@usfca.edu](mailto:lendvay@usfca.edu)
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities – [meritt@usfca.edu](mailto:meritt@usfca.edu)
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences – [mrjonas@usfca.edu](mailto:mrjonas@usfca.edu)
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – [schakraborty2@usfca.edu](mailto:schakraborty2@usfca.edu)
6. Ms. Corie Schwabenland, Academic Data & Assessment Specialist- [ceschwabenland@usfca.edu](mailto:ceschwabenland@usfca.edu)

**Academic Effectiveness Annual Assessment Resource Page:**

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-resources/academic-effectiveness/assessment>

**Email to submit the report: [assessment\\_cas@usfca.edu](mailto:assessment_cas@usfca.edu)**

**Important: Please write the name of your program or department in the subject line.**

**For example: FineArts\_Major (if you decide to submit a separate report for major and minor); FineArts\_Aggregate (when submitting an aggregate report)**

## I. LOGISTICS & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

2.

Ana Urrutia-Jordana ([urrutia@usfca.edu](mailto:urrutia@usfca.edu))

Director, Spanish Studies Program

Department of Modern and Classical Languages

3. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor program.

- No changes were made since the last assessment cycle.

• **Mission Statement:**

The Spanish Studies program inculcates both linguistic proficiency in Spanish and cultural literacy about the Spanish-speaking world that our students can deploy in their future academic and professional endeavors, and in their service to the greater good.

4. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.

Note: Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, [gamson@usfca.edu](mailto:gamson@usfca.edu)). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.

- No changes were made to our PLOs since the last assessment cycle.

• **PLOs for the Spanish Studies Major:**

1. Express information and opinions verbally in consistent, effective and clear Spanish.

2. Write in Spanish using the disciplinary conventions and methodologies of literary and cultural analysis.
3. Comprehend oral discourse produced by native speakers of Spanish
4. Analyze the main ideas of various cultural phenomena, such as literature, art, music, film and popular media.
5. Identify major artistic and cultural figures of the Spanish-speaking world in the context of their historical, cultural, and/or aesthetic traditions.
6. Appreciate the linguistic, ethnic, racial, religious, cultural and social diversity of Latin America, Spain and Latina/o and Hispanic communities within the US.

• **PLOs for the Spanish Studies Minor:**

Same as above, minus PLOs 4 & 5.

5. Which particular Program Learning Outcome(s) did you assess for the academic year 2017-2018?

**PLO 2:** Write in Spanish using the disciplinary conventions and methodologies of literary and cultural analysis.

## II. METHODOLOGY

6. Describe the methodology that you used to assess the PLO(s).

For example, “the department used questions that were inputted in the final examination pertaining directly to the <said PLO>. An independent group of faculty (not teaching the course) then evaluated the responses to the questions and gave the students a grade for responses to those questions.”

**Important Note** – WSCUC advises us to use “direct methods” which relate to a direct evaluation of a student work product. “Indirect methods” like exit interviews or student surveys can be used only as additional complements to a direct method.

For any program with fewer than 10 students: If you currently have fewer than 10 students in your program (rendering your statistical analysis biased due to too few data points), it is fine to describe a multi-year data collection strategy here. It would be important to remember that every 3 years, we would expect you to have enough data to conduct a meaningful analysis.

**Important:** *Please attach, at the end of this report, a copy of the rubric used for assessment.*

- We collected samples of the final research papers (25 in all\*) required in three of our courses: SPAN336 (S’18), SPAN 390 (F’17), SPAN 490 (S’19). Our majors and minors are asked to take two courses from the Literary and Cultural Studies category, and in the cases

of minors, this advanced level is the last elective they will take before graduation. SPAN 390 and SPAN 490 are Senior Seminars, and our majors are required to complete two such seminars.

- The 25 samples were written by **9 majors** and **6 minors\***. Some students were enrolled in two (or even all) of the above classes, which explains the discrepancy between the number of samples in relation to number of students evaluated. No faculty member evaluated more than one paper from the same student, and though the papers written by these students obtained similar assessments by our faculty readers.
- All full-time faculty revised several rubrics (some were obtained from colleagues at USF, some were used by individual Spanish Studies faculty) and agreed on the analytical rubric we used to evaluate this PLO. Please see attached.
- The Director distributed the samples among four full-time faculty members in the program, making sure they were not instructors of the course. Each person read 6 or 7 papers—the original, “ungraded” version sent to the professor by students in these courses.
- Faculty evaluated the samples according to the rubric and then submitted their assessment of student papers to the Program Director, who compiled and analyzed all of these results.

\* During the last academic year, 10 majors and 10 minors graduated from our Spanish Studies program.

### III. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

#### 7. What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

This section is for you to highlight the results of the exercise. Pertinent information here would include:

- a. how well students mastered the outcome at the level they were intended to,
- b. any trends noticed over the past few assessment cycles, and
- c. the levels at which students mastered the outcome based on the rubric used.

To address this, among many other options, one option is to use a table showing the distribution, for example:

- a. Overall, we are pleased with the results included here. The **majors** performed quite well as the majority (6 students) showed complete or near-complete mastery in all areas evaluated: introductory thesis, organizational structure, grammar, style and mechanics, conclusion, bibliography, as well as the use of citations.

Not surprisingly, the **minors** did not show the same level of mastery, as grammatical mistakes and other issues with writing mechanics inevitably pose a more complicated challenge for students who have not had the same exposure to the language as our majors have.

- b. This cycle was the first time we evaluated this PLO.
- c. Level at which **majors** mastered the outcome based on the rubric used:

Level	Percentage of Students
Complete Mastery of the outcome	22% (2 students)
Mastered the outcome in most parts	44 % (4 students)
Mastered some parts of the outcome	22% (2 students)
Did not master the outcome at the level intended	11% (1 student)

Level at which **minors** mastered the outcome based on the rubric used:

Level	Percentage of Students
Complete Mastery of the outcome	0% (0 students)
Mastered the outcome in most parts	66 % (4 students)
Mastered some parts of the outcome	33% (2 students)
Did not master the outcome at the level intended	0% (0 students)

#### IV. CLOSING THE LOOP

- 8. Based on your results, what changes/modifications are you planning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery in the assessed learning outcome? This section could also address more long-term planning that your department/program is considering and does not require that any changes need to be implemented in the next academic year itself.

Given the results, we plan to continue with the same emphasis on writing that we stress in all of our Spanish classes, even in our lower level language courses. Clearly, the Spanish Writing Center is an invaluable resource for our students, as these one-on-one sessions with adjunct faculty (a requirement in every intermediate-level language class) help to reinforce the importance of good writing in our program and also provide the assistance necessary that so

many of our majors and minors still need. In addition, the one-on-one interviews which our two coordinators carry out each semester to place “borderline” students (whose scores on the placement exam often raise difficult questions) have been key to our success; the writing samples they examine each term allow us to place students in the correct course with far more accuracy. However, this task is very cumbersome, time consuming, and we hope the implementation of a newer, more comprehensive placement exam—so long overdue now—will serve the same pedagogical purpose going forward.

9. **What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2016–2017, submitted in October 2017)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in this report?**

While complimentary, the assessment report feedback for the 2016-2017 cycle indicated that our student data was still somewhat insufficient and therefore any curricular evaluations and modifications could be difficult to make. For this reason, we gathered data on students at or near graduation, from three different courses, for this current report. While our sample size may not be as large as that of other programs, it is significantly larger than what was gathered during the last cycle. Also, the fact that several faculty members assessed papers written by the same student (though from different classes), and the results obtained each time were indeed similar, is quite reassuring.

## **ADDITIONAL MATERIALS**

(Any rubrics used for assessment, relevant tables, charts and figures should be included here)