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Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

There are three SLOs that LCWA has been assessing for the past 5 years. They are: Speaking proficiency of the three modern language majors; LCWA majors and minors who study abroad, and the financial gifts of our LCWA Advisory Board. Of those three, only one is an academic learning outcome. All three modern language departments have made changes to their programs based on this data; in French, the program raised the performance target from intermediate-high to Advanced Low. This shows that the program is working to increase the proficiency level of their majors and using data to make the decision. In German, the program has made major changes to their assessment targets and measures to more fully understand the various skill levels and proficiency of their majors. The new assessment plan is being put into place starting in fall 2016. In Spanish, the program has added a new capstone course in order to more fully understand why their data has been so uneven over the past 5 years. Now that all Spanish majors will have one course in common, the program faculty will have a better idea of what areas of improvement are needed. This is a more helpful way of determining areas of weakness before students take the external proficiency exams. All graduating Spanish majors will have taken the capstone course by the end of AY 17. A new strategy is being put into place as of 2016, based on data from the three programs: 1). all three programs will assess the speaking level of their student in the 300-level classes that form the beginning of the major; these scores will be compared to the scores on the same students when they take the external proficiency exam in their final semester. 2). Students' study abroad experiences will be factored in to the results. These factors will be evaluated to determine each program's areas of strengths, weaknesses, and any gaps that there may be. This is a new strategy, based on the past five years of data.

The other areas of assessment that have been on-going are study abroad and Advisory Board involvement. The new Senior Development Officer is working with the board; since those data are also not steadily rising, he will use the information to direct him in his efforts to increase giving by individual board members. This is a new strategy, based on five years of data.

The Study Abroad information is the project for 2016-2017 that the Dean will be working on. In order to more fully fund LCWA majors and minors for study abroad, the Dean, the Senior Development Officer, and the faculty of LCWA will be working to raise funds for more scholarships, and to publicize the opportunities to students in a more assertive manner. These are new strategies, based on the past five years of data.

The new SLOs, 4, 5, and 6, are mostly set at the baseline for 2016; however, due to the difficulty in obtaining information and data for this year's report, the Associate Dean will contact faculty and
chairs each month to obtain information and data in order for the School to assess its progress in those areas.

This is a new strategy, based on this first year of attempting to collect this data at the end of the academic year.

Classics - BA/Minors

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

CLOSING THE LOOP

2011-2012: Based on the data and discussion of Classics faculty at end of the year departmental meetings, the faculty made the following curricular revisions: (1) 300 level students were introduced to strategies for and practice in oral presentations; (2) all 300 level courses in both language and civilization required a paper and writing projects, which together total 12-15 pages of formal graded writing; (3) CLAS 401, a major course for summative assessment and taken mostly by seniors, was offered in the fall semester only, and therefore students who did not meet standards had the opportunity to take another advanced course with assessment assignments. Remediation was therefore possible. The faculty could through advising direct underperforming students into appropriate courses.

2012-2013: Compared to 2011-2012, performance levels improved for the categories of Knowledge and Critical Thinking/Communication, but fell for the category of Writing. Based on the data and discussion of Classics faculty at end of the year departmental meetings, changes were made in the curriculum to introduce students to research resources and their analysis earlier in their studies, specifically at the beginning of the 300 level. Also at the beginning 300 level students were introduced to strategies for and practice in oral presentations.

2013-2014: For the past two years the assessments for Knowledge and Critical Thinking met or exceeded targets. The curricular revisions made (2011-2013) appeared to have a positive effect. Further, currently LATN 301 is required for all A.B. Classics majors as the first 300-level reading course. Based on the data and discussion of Classics faculty at end of the year departmental meetings, the faculty decided to eliminate this requirement in order to provide students more flexibility in their choice of a first 300 level course.

2014-2015: For the past three years the assessments for Knowledge and Critical Thinking met or exceeded targets. Scores for Writing also improved. Specifically, 300 level CLAS students were introduced to strategies for and practice in oral presentations, and all CLAS 300 level courses required a paper and writing projects. Based on the data and discussion of faculty at end of the year departmental meetings, faculty decided to apply the same revisions to LATN 300 courses. The department chair charged a faculty task force to undertake a revision of the Latin curriculum
designed to improve programming in the 100-200 level Latin language courses.

French, Francophone, and Italian Studies

Business Language in French - Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Program faculty examined the results and determined that no changes are necessary for this year. After one more application of these assessments, program faculty will examine the results and determine what changes need to be made.

French and Francophone - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Based on the speaking test results up to 2014, the program faculty decided to raise the target level from Intermediate High to Advanced Low. However, in 2014-2015, the results did not meet the new expectations. In order to more fully understand the uneven nature of the scores since 2011, the program decided to obtain the names of French majors who have studied abroad to see if study abroad in a French-speaking country is the major reason for the higher scores. Of the 9 French majors who have graduated in 2015-2016, 5 spent one semester studying in France. Of those 5, 4 (80%) were rated at or above expectations, and 1 (20%) was rated 2 levels below expectations. Of the 4 students who did not spend a semester studying in France, 3 (75%) were rated at or above expectations, and 1 (25%) was rated one level below expectations. Since this is just based on one year, the program will continue to track students who study abroad to see if there is a stronger correlation than there was this year.

Based on the results of the writing assessments, after the first year, the program faculty determined that the instruction in the FREN 320 and FREN 321 survey of literature courses should be improved such that students are taught how to write a thesis statement, develop it, and come to a logical conclusion. The results of the next two years were good, so it was assumed that the changes had worked. After the results this year, faculty will focus on the FREN 313 level to ensure writing is appropriately taught, practiced, and assessed.
Based on the results of the cultural analysis assessments in the first two years of assessment, program faculty determined that instructors in the FREN 326 and 327 classes needed to increase the amount of time spent teaching students how to write analytical papers. While this approach has helped with students’ writing skills, it did not focus enough on the cultural analysis that is required to meet expectations on the rubric. The assessment committee will work with faculty during the school year 2016-2017 to ensure that they understand the concept of analyzing cultural perspectives, and that they provide instruction and practice in cultural analysis before the signature assignment is given. In addition, faculty teaching the capstone course will be reminded of the cultural analysis component required in the capstone paper.

Italian Studies - Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

SLO I (Writing)

The committee has decided that our original expectations were set too low. 100% of students have met or exceeded expectations. In the 2017 year the committee will raise the standard. As opposed to expecting 100% of students to score at the ACTFL Intermediate-mid level, in the 2017 academic year we will expect 100% of our ITAL 313 students to write at the Intermediate-high level on the ACTFL scale.

SLO II (Cultural Comprehension)

With the addition of a second, different measure (2.2), a comparison of 2015 and 2016 presents too many variables. A comparison of such data may result in false conclusions. The committee has decided to gather another cycle of data and compare 2016 with 2017 in the spring of 2017.

SLO III (Speaking)

88% of students met or exceeded expectations during a structured, prepared presentation (2.1). Only 50% of students met or exceeded expectations when they were in a conversational setting during the exit interview (2.2). Although this is the first data cycle, the assessment committee has decided to add additional student-student conversation activities in the ITAL 313 and ITAL 314 courses. Specifically, these activities will be employed at the beginning of each unit when new vocabulary is introduced. The committee believes that these activities will increase conversational Italian, while also increasing proficiency during formal class presentations.
German - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

The evidence from our last assessment cycle (2012-15), which focused writing at the beginning, middle and end of the major, was as follows:

For the beginning of the major, data from 2013 and 2014 prompted the German faculty to change the take-home assignment (2013 and 2014) to an in-class assignment (2015). The result was a remarkable 100%, or 31.04% increase from 2014, of students meeting or surpassing the target writing goal.

For the SLOs related to the mid-point of the major, an initial adjustment to the assessment tool was made in 2014 based on results in 2013, and a noticeable improvement was reflected in the results with 80% of students meeting or surpassing the target goal. However, with a similar assessment instrument integrated in 2015, results were disappointing with only 50% of students meeting or surpassing the target goal.

Finally, for the SLOs for the end of the major, there was mixed data: in 2013, %100 percent of graduating majors passed the B1 exams; in 2014, 77.5% passed; and in 2015, 85.8% of graduating seniors passed the B1 exams. These numbers reflected an improvement on 2014, but were still lower than 2013.

Based on the above evidence, we made several changes for AY 2016. First, we revamped our German 202 course (the entry occurs into 313 and 314) with plans to subsequently revamp, in AY 17, German 313 and 314 to provide a stronger preparation for the Goethe Institute’s B1 exams. Secondly, we decided to aim for %100 our majors to exceed expectations in writing on the B1 exams. Thirdly, our 3-year assessment cycle on writing also convinced us to add speaking and literary/cultural analysis as two further Student Learning Objectives. Because the Goethe Institute’s B1 exams do not include Literary/Cultural Analysis as a category, we have elected to use a rubric for literary/cultural analysis provided by ACTFL for our third SLO and assess it in 314 and our 400 level courses. Roster faculty voted unanimously to incorporate these two SLOs in the curricular revisions mentioned above.

As a reaction to our first round of data from the SLOs for AY 16, we have elected to revise, completely, our German 313 and 314 sequence for AY 2017 in order to streamline our assignments and teaching methods towards better preparation towards the B1 writing exams, spoken exams, and towards cultural analysis. We chose to revise the 313 and 314 courses so that they no longer use a textbook, but rather are structured around original materials to emphasize content-oriented learning and task-based lesson planning that guides students more clearly towards the writing and spoken skills required by the B1 exam as well as the analytical writing skills necessary for our upper level German courses.
German Studies - Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

In 2014-15, we assessed two SLOs:

1. German Studies Minors identify key themes and topics in a variety of media (such as German Literature or Film) that German culture deems important in understanding the traditions of the culture.

4 out of 6, and thus 67% of the class participants, scored at the target level, but two (33%) did not (Population size: n: 6; N: 7)

2. German Studies Minors interpret, situate and contextualize key themes and topics in a variety of media (such as German Literature or Film) that German culture deems important in understanding the traditions of the culture in their historical, intellectual, aesthetic or ethical dimension.

4 out of 6, and thus 67% of the class participants, scored at the target level, but two (33%) did not (Population size: n: 6; N: 7)

As a result of the data from AY 2015, we decided to add a third SLO for AY 2016, as well as two assessment measures for each SLO.

3. Graduating minors in German Studies are able to identify links between multiple courses they have completed in the minor and demonstrate how their coursework was interconnected.

The assessment data from AY 2016 and the resulting evidence-based changes to our assessment for AY 2017 are as follows:

Measure 1.1

The data met the target goal of 90%, and improved by the previous year's data by 23%. The assignment, however, was a recorded presentation and thus different than last year's in-class writing assessment.

Measure 1.2. The data was 15% lower than the target goal of 90% meeting expectations, but it improved on last year's comparable assessment by 8%.

Based on the evidence from Measure 1.1 and 1.2 AY 2016, we elected to make the following changes in AY 2017:

The program committee decided to implement a class-long training on the metacognitive and writing skills necessary for in-class essay writing, which is the measure in which we have improved but are not yet reaching the target goal of %90. We elected to include such a class-long training in all future LTGR 250 and LTGR 270 syllabi, probably at an early date in the
semester before the midterm, so that all students are more strategically prepared to succeed at in-class writing assignments.

While the data from measure 1.1 showed successful identification of themes, the data from measure 1.2 was 15% below target; the committee speculated that this has to do with the rigors of an in-class exam (measure 1.2) vs. the time students had to prepare their presentation. We therefore elected to add a specific training day for in-class essay writing in future courses in order to see if that helps our students meet the target goal.

Measure 2.1

The data for measure 2.1 was 19% short of our target of 90% meeting expectations, but improved on last year's data by 4%.

Measure 2.2

The data for measure 2.2 was only 8.75% short of the target goal of 90% meeting expectations, but it did improve considerably upon last year's data, by 14.25%.

Based on the evidence from Measure 1.1 and 1.2 AY 2016, we elected to make the following changes in AY 2017:

The program committee chose to include a workshop class session in which students are required to bring a draft of their analytical paper and provide other students feedback in a group. The committee deemed this change to our syllabi in LTGR 250 and 270 courses necessary in order to demonstrate the necessity of writing revisions and also provide students more time to understand that analytical writing is a process.

The use of assessment results here is thus primarily aimed at measure 2.1 (the analytical out-of-class paper), because we will be able to address better preparation in measure 2.2 in the additional class workshop on in-class exam writing, which will address both identification and analysis of themes (see the response to the evidence form measure 1 above).

The data for both measure 3.1 and measure 3.2 both fell 15% short of the target goal of 90% meeting the standard. This is the first year that we have had this SLO so it is impossible to compare with the previous year's data.

Due to the small sample size, the program committee elected to wait at least another year, and probably two, before making changes based on the results.

However, we have decided to implement one change: the committee has now demanded that the program director of the German Studies minor write all German Studies minors once per semester to remind them to save their papers for a final assessment. The committee agreed that this reminder every semester will help ensure that we gather data from all of our graduating GS minors every year (this year, only 4 of 5 completed the assessment).
Russian Studies - Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

The Russian Studies faculty met in the Fall semester to discuss assessment plans and program offerings. As a result of the review of previous 2 years of assessment data, the Russian Studies Minor was significantly revised to eliminate required courses from outside the Russian Studies Program and to create a new "Core Courses" requirement consisting of either LTRS 210: 19th Century Russian Lit or LTRS 220: 20th Century Russian Lit. These changes were made to ensure that Russian Minors would take at least one historical survey course before graduation. These courses will specifically focus on the Russian Studies SLOs 1, 2 and 3. This decision was made on the basis of previous assessment data, and further affected by the Program Director's review of the assessment data collection process, which revealed that in the past Russian Minors were more likely to take one common class in the History Department than in the Russian Studies Program. This explains the creation of the Russian Studies "Core Courses" requirement, which is designed to provide a common introduction to the Russian Minor SLO's for all Russian Studies Minors and thus to standardize future program assessment.

The 2015-2016 assessment results were collected by the Program Director and disseminated to the Program faculty at the end-of-the-year meeting. After a discussion by the Program faculty, it was determined that the results support the switch made this year from assessing all LTRS papers to only assessing Russian Minor Senior Portfolios composed of LTRS papers and Exit Interviews, as they give a more accurate picture of Russian Minor SLO attainment.

The new Russian Studies Minor requirements will take effect in 2016-17. Thus, the Russian Studies faculty need to collect results for at least one more year to observe how the program changes impact the assessment results. Next year's results will provide data that can lead to further program improvements, such as curriculum changes and core requirements.

Hispanic Studies

Business Language in Spanish - Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Students were evaluated on three learning outcomes in two of the three business-specific courses in the minor. The target performance was met in five of the six measures. The
assessment identified a weakness in measure 3.1, evaluated in SPAN 317 on the mid-term examination. Poor terminology retention by some students resulted in incomplete answers to an essay prompt. To address this weakness, additional in-class practice on terminology will be provided, with activities designed to force students to produce those business terms. The program faculty will continue to assess and make changes as needed.

Spanish - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Spanish Program
4 Years Data Improvement Summary
May 4, 2016

In spring 2013, 2014, 2015, and fall 2015, the Department of Hispanic Studies assessed four student learning outcomes for its major program:

1. Oral proficiency in Spanish
2. Knowledge of main periods, movements, authors and genres of Hispanic Literature, and literary interpretation skills
3. Writing proficiency in Spanish
4. Knowledge of linguistic characteristics of Spanish and concepts related to phonology, morphology, semantics and syntax

In spring 2016, two assessment instruments were implemented for each of the aforementioned student learning outcomes.

For oral proficiency, results for the first two assessment years (2012-13 and 2013-14) reflected a recurring problem: a consistent 22% of graduating majors NOT taking the OPI test. In response, the department worked with the LCWA dean’s office to improve communication with graduating majors via the Registrar’s Office, website and other venues, and as a result, the percentage of test-taking graduates was improved by over 20% with 97% of graduating seniors (up from 77%) taking the OPI test. However, 24% of students who took the OPI test did NOT meet or exceed the target level of 90%. However, after 3 years we succeeded in increasing the percentage of graduating majors to take the OPI, and in AY 2015-16 we began exploring possible adjustments to our programmatic approaches with regard to oral proficiency. One step, which would not have shown results for another 3-4 years if implemented, was the consideration in AY 2015-16 of a study abroad requirement for all majors, which could indeed improve the percentage of students who meet our goal of 90% of graduating Spanish majors to speak at the intermediate-high level. The department chair formed an ad hoc committee that researched this possibility extensively, and after extensive considerations and deliberations, the department concluded that implementing a study abroad requirement in the midst of serious institutional financial hurdles would be an irresponsible decision both for the health of our academic program and the fiscal resources of our
students. We therefore concluded that we would revisit the question of the study abroad requirement in another 3-5 years and when the fiscal challenges at the College subsided. However, effective fall 2015, we began offering a new conversation supplement to our curriculum at the Spanish 275-level, which is our gateway course for all Spanish majors and minors. The new one-credit hour, 275-C class, which is not required of majors and minors, is a step toward improving the oral proficiency of our minors and majors—they are strongly encouraged to take this class—but the results of this curricular adjustment will likely not be measurable until at least the fall of 2017 when those students work their way to SPAN 381. In addition, the department chair formed another ad hoc committee to examine the overall structure of the Spanish 275 course to determine if adjustments should be made not only to better prepare our students for the subsequent 300-level coursework, but also to improve their skills in all four skill areas: reading, writing, listening and speaking. The committee completed its work in early spring 2015, and the department approved its “guidelines” on March 15, 2016. The official document is found here: http://spanish.cofc.edu/faculty-resources/CourseObjectivesSPAN275and344March2016.pdf. Since these changes will not go into effect until fall 2016, measurable results might not be available until at least the fall 2017 semester. Once that data is gathered, we would want to assess the results collected for an entire academic year (2017-18) to determine how effective the implemented curricular changes will have impacted students oral proficiency in SPAN 381 and upon graduation.

For the SLO “recognize main periods, movements, authors and genres of Hispanic Literature, and literary interpretation skills,” we gathered data from 3 different 400-level literature classes. After closely examining the assessment results for AY 2012-13, it was determined that both academic years reflected a deficient articulation of the instructions for student completion of the signature assignment was responsible for those who did not meet the expected standard. From these results, in spring 2015 we made numerous adjustments in preparing students to engage the assessment instrument more accurately. This included more explicit guidance with preparatory exercises throughout the semester, and improved wording on the final exam question. As a result, 100% of students met the standard in spring 2015. In fall 2015 and spring 2016, we made a concerted effort in four different 400-level classes to ensure that signature assignments were composed clearly and explicitly so that student outcomes were aligned with the target information desired. Results were positive with 41/46 or 89% of all students assessed meeting or exceeding expectations. The recurring issue that seemed to hamper a 100% success rate was identifying effective approaches in all 400-level classes to ensure students complete the critically important homework assignments that are geared toward building the skills and knowledge necessary for fulfilling the stated learning objective. Beginning in fall 2016, faculty of 400-level literature courses will explore additional ways to accomplish this goal, as well as work with those colleagues who have enjoyed 100% success rate in their respective 400-level classes.

For the SLO “Written Proficiency in Spanish,” the 2013 and 2014 years of assessment in Spanish 400-level literature classes signaled some inconsistencies with the Spanish writing skills of students. In response, two curricular adjustments were made: 1) in the 400-level class itself (spring 2015), writing assignments were further emphasized throughout the semester via short-essay pop quizzes, critical essays, short-essay group assignments, and short essay homework assignments. All writing assignments were graded with substantial feedback to help bolster writing skills; 2) increase of writing assignments at the basic language level (101-201) were approved in spring 2015 to be put into effect fall 2015. Although the results of these foundational adjustments will not be seen for a few years in assessment results, it is important to recognize that we believe partial targeting at the basic language level might help with expediting advanced writing skills at the 300-400 levels. During the fall 2015 and spring 2016 semesters, 44/46 or 96% of students assessed either met or exceeded expectations, which was an impressive result and due to curricular adjustment #1
noted above. But with an eye toward a 100% result, in AY 2016-17 the department will further reinforce the administration and prioritization of multiple writing assignments, such as short-essay group assignments, while also providing thorough feedback to students.

For the SLO “Knowledge of linguistic characteristics of Spanish and concepts related to phonology, morphology, semantics and syntax,” initial assessment results in spring 2012 with Spanish 381 were disappointing with only 59% of students meeting target expectations. In response, the signature assignment was adjusted to elicit more accurately student knowledge, which as noted above was a similar issue back in 2013 for the 400-level Spanish literature course. As a result of the adjusted signature assignment in Spanish 381, at least 90% of students have met or exceeded the standard in all four subsequent years: 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016. In fact, the results in spring 2016 for the semester-long-project even surpassed the results of the previous 3 years, which demonstrates that adjustments to the signature assignment beginning in 2013, and tweaking thereafter, have been effective with measuring more accurately learning outcomes. However, the SLOs measured for the 2 midterm questions presented some important data that have prompted planned changes for AY 2016-17 that will include improved teaching methodology that will target more effectively structural comprehension. Such an adjustment will not require changes to the assessment instrument.

Interdisciplinary Programs and Minors

African American Studies - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

This is a new major so program faculty are still feeling their way in relation to how best to assess what we do. Evidence from the limited data that we have acquired so far suggests that we are headed in the right direction, and has so far identified one particular area for potential improvement, namely the citation and analysis of sources.

African Studies - Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).
Data from our assessments of historical and geographical knowledge and awareness have suggested that we need to recalibrate those assessments to test improvement in any given class rather than to continue to attempt assessments based on potentially more arbitrary comparisons of scores achieved by different classes. Assessment of the Model AU course is leading us to consider a change to the requirements in the minor.

Archaeology - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

This is the third year of the archaeology major. Additional assessment measures were added in FY 2016, effectively doubling the number of assessment measures for the program. While providing additional points of data, their addition complicates the ability to provide a succinct evaluation of broad changes/improvements. As of FY2016, measures 1.2, 2.1, and 3.1 were added to preexisting measures 1.1, 2.2, and 3.2.

Closing the Loop.

Given that SLO 1.1, .2.2, and 3.2 have been in effect for several years, data in these areas have been used to evaluate the program, discussing results among faculty, and making changes in targeted areas of the curriculum, to follow forward with review of those changes.

SLO 1

In year 1 (AY2014), SLO 1 was met by a high percentage. The steering committee approved a strengthening of the assessment assignment for 2015 which moved the students to become more explicit and evaluative in their responses. The assessment assignment for SLO 1 (Measure 1 in 2015, Measure 1.1 in 2016) was strengthened in 2015 to identify and discuss a sample of archaeological writing within the context of archaeological intellectual history. Following the initial assessment in 2015, classroom activities were modified further modified within CLAS 104 in 2016 to bolster review and study of this learning outcome, yielding increases in the number of students meeting or exceeding this measure (62% in AY2015, 78% in AY2016).

Measure 1.2 was added in AY2016, with 50% of the students meeting or exceeding the expectations. This measure will continue in subsequent cycles with the goal of improving student outcomes. Instructors involved with teaching this measure will be adding additional focus within the class upon the assignment’s expectations and employing additional supporting materials.

SLO 2

Students have consistently met or approached the target for SLO 2 (measure 2.2 in AY2016). Faculty discussions have led the program to maintain this measure as is a matter of maintaining programmatic standards.

Assessment measure 2.1 was added in AY2016. This measure will continue in subsequent
cycles with the goal of maintaining current targets.

SLO 3
Students have consistently met or approached the target for SLO 3 (measure 3.2 in AY2016). Faculty discussions have determined to maintain this measure as a matter of maintaining programmatic standards.

Assessment measure 3.1 was added in AY2016. This measure will continue in subsequent cycles with the goal of maintaining current targets.

Overall review of student learning outcomes, assessment measures, and student performance over the last 3 cycles presents a process by which the beginning part of the program's curriculum has been strengthened.

The capstone experience for the major, assessed via measurements 2.2 and 3.2 shows consistency in terms of students meeting their target. Its use as an assessment measure has assisted in creating a system of standardization across the panoply of courses which can be applied for this requirement, and has assisted in developing a standard useful for evaluating work that transfers in from outside institutions. While no changes have been recommended, this recommendation comes after review and discussions among the faculty. Rather than evidence for 'closing the loop' being recognized changes, the reflection and review of these measures has strengthened the consistency and clarity of expectations for this component of the program.

Asian Studies - Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

The data available until now does not warrant conducting major changes (if needed). Asian Studies will continue collecting data in the next year(s). It is important that most if not all students complete the exit survey (used to measure outcomes 3 and 4) because the questions therein are designed to assess the program as a whole. Therefore, the program is thinking of possible ways to make the exit survey mandatory. As for the Outcome 1 and 2 (Describing aspects of the diversity and complexity of the Asian experience and identifying, describing and analyzing at least one contemporary or historical political or cultural issue they regard as defining the region), it is important that the syllabi for this course be unified to obtain reliable results. Meanwhile, to improve the success rate of these results, the program will request continue giving students assignments of this nature throughout this course so that students improve their analytical and descriptive skills.
British Studies - Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

This is the third year the program has been assessed, and there have been only 4 students assessed. Based on that small amount of data, the program has determined to wait until they have more sufficient data and more students before using this data to make any changes.

Comparative Literature - Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Based on a reviews of comparative topics proposed, there has been a revision of course content to broaden the scope of analytical tools for students. Modern Algerian writers were added to the course curriculum for post-modernist approaches to identity, self-determination and various socio-political issues. For students of Spanish Literature with a minor in CPLT, LTSP 250 (survey of Iberian Literature) was added to the second tier of the minor, and two Russian theme-based courses were added to the electives of the minor. Also, considering that CPLT 200 was only offered in spring until 2014, one of the instructors in the program underwent training to teach online and CPLT 200 is now offered online to attract more students. This change will also allow the program to assess better the direction of the program as well as get more data than the ones obtained once a year. The Program Director underwent the same training to teach LTFR 250 (survey of Colonial French Lit) to increase the frequency of this course offering. It will be taught 3 times a year instead of once every other year.

European Studies - Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

The EUST minor had very good results with the previous assessment cycles. New measures are in place to assess the program in a different way. As can be seen in annual assessment reports in 2014 and 2015, EUST minors did very well in meeting standard in previous assessment measures, typically exceeding 90% in meeting standard. Additional, new, and
different measures appeared in spring 2016. Not surprisingly, results compiled were mixed. Data collected in spring 2016 showed that 33% of minors met or exceeded standard for outcome 1.1. and 1.2. Data showed that 67% of minors met or exceeded standard in outcome 2.1. and 100% met or exceeded standard in 2.2. Data showed that 100% of minors met or exceeded standard in outcome 3.1 and 0% met or exceeded standard in 3.2. As explained above, in the academic year 2016-2017, prior to written assignments on outcomes 1, 2, and 3, the questions will be more fully explained to minors before they submit their answers. With sufficient prior explanation, it is likely that the percentage of minors who meet or exceed standard will rise.

Foreign Language Education Cognate - BS

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Data is consistently good for all student learning outcomes, since students are not recommended for licensure if they do not meet the standards. They are allowed to re-write lesson plans and assignments until they meet ACTFL standards. At the end of the 2015 Academic year, the program decided to keep track of how many students do not meet the expectations on their first attempt, beginning in fall 2015. Students were able to meet expectations on their first attempt in fall 2015. This baseline has been established and will continue to be monitored for the next two years to determine if any changes are needed to the program.

In addition, in order to more accurately pinpoint where there may be weaknesses, the performance target for SLO 2, Implementing State and National Standards, and SLO 3, Performance Based Assessments, have been changed. Beginning in fall 2016, specific lesson plans will be evaluated for how well the students matched the state standard to specific activities in the lesson plans, for both the methods course and the internship. And, for SLO 3, the sublevel scores on the rubric will be tabulated rather than just whether or not students meet expectations. This will allow the program to more accurately pin-point areas in which students need to improve.

Japanese Studies - Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

The data suggests that the students minoring in Japanese Studies are meeting or exceeding
our expectations and that the program is working well. Due to the implementation of the new measures, the sample sizes for Outcomes 1 and 2 were small this year even though the enrollment in JPNS 314 was healthy. In order to make the sample sizes bigger so our data become more reliable, we have decided to store the results of the students enrolled in JPNS 314 who are not immediately graduating for future use.

Linguistics - Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

During the 2013-2015 assessment cycle, the Linguistics Studies program developed assessment measures and continues to adjust these measures for the interdisciplinary minor. In spring 2013, Introduction to Linguistics (LING 125) the Linguistics Steering Committee worked on adjusting the student learning outcomes and assessment measures to include this course as part of the General Education Assessment endeavor (Social Science component). To measure the SLOs, an essay question was added to the final exam. Students applied a social science concept, model or theory to explain human behavior, social interactions or social institutions. In their essay they provided the following: a synopsis of the theory, model or concept, and then explained how it described, provided an interpretation of, or predicted human behavior, social interactions or social institutions. This assessment was initially implemented in the Fall 2013 and continues each semester as part of general Education assessment.

In addition, the College of Charleston instituted the assessment of interdisciplinary (or “stand-alone”) minors during the 2013-2014 academic year. As part of this activity, a “Curriculum Map” was developed and an Exit Interview was constructed to be administered to graduating seniors. The creation of a test item bank of content questions was initiated for all courses in the minor curriculum. Since this is an interdisciplinary program, tests reflecting each graduating senior’s unique course selections were then compiled and administered during their exit interviews. The student learning outcomes addressed were: 1.) Understand and Remember Major Concepts in Structured Linguistics, 2) Understand and Remember Major Concepts in Historical Linguistics, 3) Understand and Remember Major Concepts in Language and Society, and 4) Enhanced Awareness of Cultural Diversity. In 2014-2015, the same process of assessment of the minor continued.

Based on the results of past assessment, the following steps were taken to close the loop.

Since LING 125: Introduction to Linguistics became a part of the General Education sequence, the artifacts requested from the Committee have been submitted each semester (starting in fall 2013-present).

Based on the 2013-2014 assessment of this General Education course (LING 125: Introduction to
Linguistics), which is mostly structural linguistics, the Linguistics Steering Committee created a new course (LING 101: Introduction to Language), to address the faculty’s perceived struggle of audio processing and comprehension of abstract concepts that some students had. This new course is available to all students who find structural linguistics (or who have never had a language course), as an initial course, too challenging.

In assessing the minor, the results for the exit interviews and mastery test for the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 Linguistics Studies Interdisciplinary Minor Program were reported in the Linguistic Minor Assessment Report to Academic Affairs. These results indicated the following: 1) too few graduating students participated (in 2013-2014, 2 out of 4 graduating students, or 50%, participated and in 2014-2015, only 2 out of 9 participated, or 22%), 2) more test items for each of the learning outcomes were needed to collect sufficient data for assessment, and 3) more opportunities for students to enhance cultural diversity were needed.

To address these results, the following steps were taken in 2014-2015. One, all eight of the graduating linguistics minors were sent the interview portion of the exit exam, however no results were received from this survey. Two, attempts to accumulate more test items from each of the individual courses continued; and due to student feedback and faculty assessment for the learning outcome for historical linguistics, the Linguistics Steering Committee eliminated it as a learning outcome. The requirement for Historical Linguistics is no longer required as part of the minor. The rationale for this decision was due to changes in the many different disciplines that participate in this minor program, where several historical linguistics courses had been eliminated making it difficult for students to fulfill this learning outcome. This was not meant to diminish the importance of historical linguistics to the curriculum; the content of several existing courses (i.e., English 309, Spanish 447 and 446, and others), which continue to be a part of the minor. Three, the Linguistics Club and the Linguistics Steering Committee explored ways to enhance cultural diversity by creating activities, such as bringing one speaker (Dr. John Lipski) to campus (2015) and a visit to the Penn Center (2014) to learn about the Gullah community. Approximately 80 people attended the speaker’s lecture and 14 students and 5 faculty visited the Penn Center.

Based on the results for 2014-2015, in 2015-2016, the following steps were taken. One, all faculty teaching courses for the Interdisciplinary Linguistics Minor were contacted and asked to submit 10-15 multiple-choice test items for a test bank and in addition, to comply with the new measure for assessment, faculty were asked to provide 2 essay questions for the courses each taught (one essay question included a component on cultural diversity to assess the third learning outcome), to create a test bank for the essay question measurement. Two, all graduating Linguistics minors were asked to provide dates of availability at the end of spring 2016 to take the exit exam. By accommodating their schedules, all 8 graduating seniors in the Linguistics minor are scheduled to take the Exit Exam on April 12 and 13, 2016. Three, in February 2016, Dr. Walt Wolfrom was invited to campus and spoke on the “Sociolinguistic Significance of Martin Luther King, Jr.” In addition, a regional Linguistics Conference (SLINKI: Spanish Linguistics in North Carolina) was held on campus on February 6, 2016 and the Linguistics Minor Program started a series of “Linguistics Talks” where two faculty members presented their research in February and March 2016. In April 2016, the Linguistics Minor Program agreed to host next year’s SECOL Conference (Southeastern Conference on Linguistics) at the College of Charleston.

Middle East and the Islamic World - Minor

Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies
7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

This is the first year students have been able to declare a minor in Middle Eastern studies. Only two measures that have to do with the introduction course were assessed. The results were below the expected acceptance rate. To improve this rate, the program will be working on modifying the syllabus in terms of the required and recommended readings. Course instructor will also be working on in-class and outside class assignments so that students improve the skills required for the final assessment.

International Studies - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Jewish Studies - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

The Jewish Studies major is extremely small, and so the data that have been generated thus far are not clearly meaningful. Before 2015-16, the program had assessed only nine majors; with two more this year, it has assessed only eleven in five years. In the earlier assessments, there was only one measure for each outcome, and those measures were often grade-based, with expectations set at B or better. Until 2014-15, every major met all of the expectations. The one major who failed to meet them in 2014-15 was judged by the program faculty to be a particular weak student overall. It was difficult to make improvements on the basis of these assessment data, and it almost certainly would have been imprudent to do so.

Most of the program's efforts at improvement, therefore, has been devoted to improving the assessment process itself. There are now have two measures for each program learning outcome, and the outcomes are assessed in different courses. Each outcome is assessed with a detailed rubric (the last of these will come into use only in 2016-17), and expectations for all measures have been raised to 100%. The 2015-16 majors did fail to meet certain of these more nuanced and demanding expectations in particular ways, which means that there now many finally be some evidence that could be used for program improvements. Program faculty do expect that the rubrics they developed over the past two will eventually allow them, over time, to draw meaningful conclusions. Still, two students do not yet provide anything like robust data.
Faculty have followed through on the recommendations from previous assessment reports to improve the capstone experience. The capstone seminar, which could never enroll robustly, has been replaced for 2016-17 and after with a requirement that majors complete an independent study or bachelor's essay. Proposals for these must be submitted to and then reviewed by all program faculty, which means that there is a front-end check on the quality of the capstone experience. The shared rubric for assessment of capstone papers, which program faculty designed collectively, should then provide a similar check on the back end.

The program has done less well on the other recommendation of the earlier reports, which was aimed at the recruiting of more majors. Better recruiting is an important goal of the program and is already on the faculty's agenda for the fall. However, it should be noted that the Jewish Studies major was never expected to be anything but small. To a significant extent, the major exists as a tool for recruiting Jewish students to the College; this population is important to the institution's efforts to attract out-of-state students. That the College offers a major in Jewish Studies is important to these students and their parents, even if the students do not choose the major.

Latin American and Caribbean Studies - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).
During the 2012-2015 assessment period, the LACS Program was able to assess SLO1 in LACS 101 – Introduction to Latin American and Caribbean Studies. For SLO1, graduating majors in LACS demonstrate an understanding of the diversity and complexity of the Latin American and/or Caribbean experience. Its assessment method consisted in having students write four short analytic essays as part of their Midterm and Final examinations addressing four major contemporary and historical issues pertinent to the Latin American and Caribbean experience. 90% of students were expected to achieve a rating of “meets standard” or beyond. The data collected in the Fall of 2013 as well as in the Spring of 2014, showed a rating of 97% of students met or exceeded standard [58 out of 60(n) samples achieved this rating]. Between the Fall of 2014 and the Spring of 2015, 91% of students met or exceeded standard [167 out of 183(n) samples achieved this rating]. Between the Fall of 2015 and the Spring of 2016, 90.38% of students met or exceeded standard [230 out of 254(n) samples achieved this rating].

SLO2 and SLO3 are assessed in LACS 495, the capstone, but no data was collected since there were not enough graduating majors to offer the course in those years.

The LACS Major is currently under review in order to make it more effective in terms of meeting departmental Student Learning Outcomes. Starting in the academic year of 2015-2016, and in order to better assess how LACS majors demonstrate an understanding of the diversity and complexity of the Latin American and/or Caribbean experience, it was decided that assessment was to be carried out every semester of every academic year instead of every even year (as was done in the past); and two artifacts, (a take-home essay and an analytic essay from the final exam) were to be collected from all students in all sections of LACS 101, instead of the one artifact and the random sample that was collected in the past. In these essays (both, in the take home essay and in the final exam), students are expected to analyze and describe issues clearly and indicate a thorough reading and understanding of the cultural text. Students must also demonstrate in-depth knowledge of political context and address major contemporary and historical issues pertinent to the Latin American and/or Caribbean experience. With regard to SLO2 and SLO3, and due to an exponential decrease in the number of majors between 2011 and 2015, LACS 495 could not be offered and, therefore, could not be assessed. The LACS program has decided to assess SLO2 at the newly added 300-level LACS courses starting in the Fall of 2016.