Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2018-19   *Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.*

Unit/Program Name: Language Studies   **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)**   Brian José = brian.jose@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual data/results?	e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? *Can expand on this in Part 2.*
Outcome 1B: *Tools of Analysis: Literary. Identify genre, literary devices, movement and period.* This is a partial repetition of what we assessed last year (outcome #1 in its entirety), but through different means.	Faculty teaching literature courses or courses that focused in part on literature were asked to provide anonymous student essays (direct assessment) pertaining to this outcome. (Slight variations according to the course.) Essays for a sample of LS majors (32% of all LS majors) in FREN/GERM 215, SPAN 301, SPAN 312, and LLL 350 were assessed. 301 is Advanced Grammar, practiced in part with literary analysis; 215 is a literature course with a narrow focus on the genre of fairytales; 312 is a more general literature course; 350 is a UDIE with a focus on Latin texts.	A rubric was developed in spring 2019 for the assessment committee to use. Literary analysis is just one of three analytical tools in outcome #1, and the sub-area in which students receive the least direct instruction: they typically take only one dedicated literature course (e.g., 215 or 312), but literary analysis is also conducted in some other courses (e.g., 301, 350). Therefore, while we would like our students to achieve "proficient" skills, we don't realistically expect them to do so. Our more realistic expectation is for them to collectively acquire at least "developing" skills (avg rubric score ≥ 2.0) and for 80% of individual students to do so.	We omit the rubric category of "genre" from the analysis as it was not consistently relevant in the writing tasks across the 4 separate courses. In the other three rubric categories, the students collectively achieved an avg score halfway between "developing" and "proficient" skills (2.5), but only 64% of the individual students in the sample (9/14) earned an avg score of at least 2.0. Performance was similar across the 4 courses, but was discernably weaker in LLL350 than in the other 3 courses. As a group, the students scored highest in comprehension (avg 2.6, "developing"+), then in analysis (2.4, "developing"+), and lowest in cultural knowledge (1.9, just below the threshold of "developing" skills); this pattern obtained in the 4 individual courses as well as for the sample as a whole.	During our most recent dept meeting (Sept 2019), faculty expressed concerns about the sampling methods. Specifically, because the committee chose to collect data only for 2018-2019, several relevant courses could not be included in the assessment. Faculty suggest re-assessing outcome 1B in 2019-2020 in order to expand the data-collection window to a 2nd year. Including data from additional courses should give us more generalizable results. Literature faculty will also be invited to meet for the purpose of discussing and perhaps revising the rubric.

Note: *If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.*

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table

a. Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
b. Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program's outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.
c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of "3" to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities
Use Blue Reports to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you):
  1) Cohort Sizes   2) Year-to-Year Retention   3) 5-Year Graduation Rate

1. cohort sizes

	start F15	start F16	start F17	start F18	start F19
LS by original dept	5	5	4	8	8
LS by latest dept	11	10	8	11	8

2. year1-to-year2 retention

	return F16	return F17	return F18	return F19	return F20
LS by original dept	0/5 = 0%	4/5 = 80%	3/4 = 75%	8/8 = 100%	TBD
vs CAS	65%	68%	62%	67%	TBD
LS by latest dept	8/11 = 73%	7/10 = 70%	7/8 = 88%	9/11 = 82%	TBD
vs CAS	67%	69%	65%	69%	TBD

3. 5-year graduation rates

	- - - - - -	F10 + 5yrs	F11 + 5yrs	F12 + 5yrs	F13 + 5yrs	F14 + 5yrs
LS by original dept	- - - - - -	3/7 = 43%	3/6 = 50%	2/7 = 29%	7/13 = 54%	4/7 = 57%
vs CAS	- - - - - -	36%	39%	38%	37%	37%
LS by latest dept	- - - - - -	8/15 = 53%	3/5 = 60%	5/14 = 36%	10/20 = 50%	2/7 = 29%
vs CAS	- - - - - -	36%	40%	38%	38%	36%

4. 6-year graduation rates

	F09 + 6yrs	F10 + 6yrs	F11 + 6yrs	F12 + 6yrs	F13 + 6yrs	F14 + 6yrs
LS by original dept	3/5 = 60%	3/7 = 43%	3/6 = 50%	2/7 = 29%	7/13 = 54%	TBD
vs CAS	46%	48%	40%	43%	42%	TBD
LS by latest dept	7/10 = 70%	9/15 = 60%	3/5 = 60%	5/14 = 36%	10/20 = 50%	TBD
vs CAS	47%	49%	43%	43%	41%	TBD

Cohort sizes have been variable, but after a bump in 2013, we've welcomed a fairly stable 9-10 new students per fall (by latest dept).

1-year retention rates have improved. Making early contact with freshmen and transfers appears to be helpful.

Graduation rates are respectable. Our 5-year rate generally exceeds that for CAS: in recent years, only our 2012 cohort and our 2014 cohort (by latest dept) was slower than the CAS as a whole. The 6-yr rates (by latest dept) seem to be dropping, but it's difficult to know if this is a genuine decline or the result of individual students who are delayed, e.g., by study abroad. (Again, except for the 2012 cohort, LLL's rate by latest dept exceeds CAS' rate.) The number of students who must complete the study abroad requirement through alternate activities has remained steady, but continues to be a concern for the department. The recent announcement that CGE cannot continue to pay the consortium fee for ISEP, the most affordable study abroad program for students in FREN, GERM and JAPN, greatly concerns the faculty.

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

Fall welcome event for incoming freshman and transfer students allowed faculty to meet students who are being advised by University College. This allowed us to get to know better the individual needs and interests of students.

As of fall 2019, the department is supporting a new living-learning community, Lingua Franca House. (Until an actual house becomes available, the 'house' is in a dorm.) Residents are required to use their target language with their roommate and on the floor, to take at least one LLL course, and to develop and participate in extra-curricular activities. Faculty eat meals once per month with students and support their extra-curricular activities.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

Faculty will continue efforts to communicate with freshmen and transfer students early and to supportively welcome them to the dept.

The department will work more closely with the Study Abroad office to renew communication pathways and roles in student advising for their study abroad requirement.

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities
Please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. You can find the template here: https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components

1. see attachment *LLL assessment - career readiness rubric.xlsx*

2. During 2018-2019, faculty added to and revised assignments in LLL 400 (capstone course) to ensure that CR competencies are being met and assessed in this course. Included are:

writing and revising résumé (ongoing).

attending career fair (post-fair discussion in class)

writing a cover letter for a job or a personal statement for a grad school application

participating in mock job interviews (a pool of interview questions is under continuous development)

formally requesting a letter of reference (from e.g., professor, employer)

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:

1) **the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness** (ex: What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? What evidence can you provide that learning is improving? How might learning, success, and career readiness overlap? What questions do your findings raise?)
2) **findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)**
3) **what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year**
4) **how this information will be shared with other stakeholders**

1. The review of literary analysis this year was a focused attempt to examine this outcome, as past assessments have traditionally focused largely on aspects of the acquisition and development of foreign language skills. We found that, in one sense, this outcome is being met: our assessment sample was collectively rated at or above the "developing" level of literary analysis skills that we hope for (2.5 > 2.0). In another sense, however, the outcome is not being met: we expect 80% of our students to reach that 2.0 ("developing") threshold of literary analysis skills, but only 65% of our sample reached that mark. The encouraging news is that they (we) were not far off the mark: if just two more students had been assessed at the "developing" level of literary analysis skills, then we would have met our 80% target (79%).

The faculty discussed the assessment process and the outcomes in meetings. It was argued that the results may not be sufficiently valid because of a lack of data from some relevant courses, in particular FREN, GERM and LAT 312. A notable point in this discussion was the lack of consensus about certain aspects of the rubric, not all courses target *genre* as a subtopic. An ad-hoc committee will be invited to review the rubric for potential revision. Faculty are also hopeful that reviewing the rubric will open a discussion about how each language area is meeting outcome 1B. Another question is whether the assessment committee should have been the ones to assess the students' work or whether more appropriate faculty could and should have been involved in that activity. Also noted is that some students may take literature courses during study abroad. Faculty suggested discovering how many students take literature courses abroad versus in courses taught on campus.

The Second Language Research Group (SLRG) is focusing on assessment of cultural knowledge and competency this year. We expect that group to provide information about best practices in assessment that can be used for both outcome 1B (literary analysis) and 1C (cultural analysis).

2. Faculty will discuss and perhaps revise the assessment rubric. Faculty will discuss the kinds of assignments that are most likely to demonstrate students' knowledge and skills in this area. Collection of student writing samples for another year, targeting additional courses (e.g., GERM, FREN, LAT 312), to ensure sufficiently representative assessment points, is planned. Evaluation of the student essays will likely be farmed out to faculty more acquainted with the goals of the literature courses (vs members of the assessment committee).

3. Our original plan for this report was to assess program outcome #2 (*Demonstrate knowledge of how languages operate*). We made a late decision, though, to (re-)assess outcome #1B, rather than outcome #2, in order to align the assessment of both our LS degree and our LST degree on their similar literary analysis outcomes. In response to subsequent faculty concerns about a lack of data from other relevant courses (courses that, it could be noted, weren't offered during the assessment cycle), we have been urged to assess this same outcome yet again in 2019-2020, incorporating 2 years of data

into the analysis (2018-2019 and 2019-2020). However, in the hope of not focusing exclusively on outcome 1(B), to the detrimental exclusion of any others (keeping in mind that we assessed outcome #1 in the previous year, too), we hope to resume our previously-planned sequence by also assessing outcome #2 in 2019-2020 via one or more of its sub-components (*Identify and analyze differences between languages*; *Make generalizations about language based on recognition of its systematic nature*; *Recognize that languages vary over time, space, and social groups*).

4. Assessment results are shared among faculty through Blackboard web site and departmental meetings.

Please prepare this report as a Word document. Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials
(e.g., detailed—but not student-specific--assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college's assessment site in Blackboard.

Dear Brian,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2018-19 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: B.A. Language Studies	Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
- Learning outcome is clear, specific, and measureable. - Rationale for outcome assessment is clear, and information about the next cycle for assessment is given with thoughtful context. I think it's a great idea to reassess based on the suspected current limitation, as well as move forward with assessing your next outcome. - Clear information is provided about the courses, assignments, and sampling method used for assessment. - Rubric was developed by the assessment committee to be applied to the student artifacts for direct assessment. Expectations were clearly described, along with rationale for how they were set, and actual student performance was shared in relation to expectations. - LLL goes above and beyond in their involvement of the assessment committee and the department faculty in conversations about teaching, assessment, and use of findings. The openness to critique and questioning, the analysis of findings in context, and the evidence-based decision-making that occurs as a group process is exemplary. - Clear information provided about how findings are shared and how faculty are involved.	- I support the recommendation to reassess based on the limited sources of data compared to what's available throughout the curriculum, while moving forward with the assessment plan. - Great notes to discuss among faculty the rubric and who should be applying it and why.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
Student Learning Outcomes	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.) Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.	No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.
Performance Goals & Measures	Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).	Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).	Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome. Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures. Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.	No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.

Analysis & Results	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures). Results are shared in relation to performance goals. Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures). Results are shared in relation to performance goals.	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with little description of analysis.	No data is being collected. No results are provided.
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice. Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice. A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.	Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice. Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.	Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice. Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.	No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice. No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)
Overall Rating	□ **Exemplary**	□ **Mature**	□ **Developing**	□ **Undeveloped**