School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs

LCWA

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):

LCWA has been attempting to find an assessment plan that is useful, accurate, and reflects our strengths. The plan intended to do that in AY 18 was not what it was intended to be, so the Dean’s office worked on a new strategy during the year 17-18, to begin in Fall 2018. That plan is now in place, and is detailed in the AY19 Plan.

African American Studies - BA/Minor

African American Studies BA

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):

Failure to comply with assessment plan will be reported in annual evaluations.

Explicit memos to remind faculty of assessment responsibilities will be sent every semester at the beginning and end of the term.

Faculty will attend Assessment Workshops hosted by the Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning.

Faculty will have a working meeting to

- revise assessment rubrics
- Discuss better mapping the curriculum to SLOs.

Archaeology - BA/Minor

Archaeology BA

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 SLO data from 2015 to current are presented below from the summaries presented in previous reporting cycles. There are several fluctuations from year to year, with some solid high scores. Each of these will be discussed during this academic year and any assessment changes that are needed will be made to better understand the fluctuations and directions of the student learning results as compared to the objectives currently outlined. The results of that Steering Committee Meeting will be placed in this section next year, and those recommendations put forward. It will also be helpful to have a first week meeting next year to evaluate the overall assessment numbers prior to the evaluation. This need was just recently recognized at the end of the first year of a new directorship of the Archaeology Program.

Summary Through Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not/appr</td>
<td>m/exceed</td>
<td>not/appr</td>
<td>m/exceed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS104</td>
<td>SLO 1.1</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS104</td>
<td>SLO 1.2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH202</td>
<td>SLO 2.1</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone</td>
<td>SLO 2.2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classics - BA/Minors

Classics

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 then 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 assessment for Knowledge and Critical Thinking met or exceeded targets. The curricular revisions made (2011-2013) appeared to have a positive effect. Further, currently LATIN 301 is required for all AB. 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 LATIN 300 courses. The department chair charged a faculty task force to undertake a revision of the Latin curriculum designed to improve programming in the Latin 100-200 level Latin language courses.

2015-2016: Based on the data and discussion of Classics faculty at end of the year departmental meetings, the faculty determined three actions: (1) to compress language acquisition in the Latin 100-200 sequence, so that students have direct access to primary sources more quickly. To aid in this compression a new Latin textbook was adopted, beginning this fall. The Latin task force in place starting last year will continue to work on developing supporting materials for this text; (2) extend the work of the BA task force, especially with the target of developing internships to give students a better command of the core study necessary for particular career applications; (3) coordinate writing expectations with required writing courses in general education to ensure a continued improvement in writing beyond the basic level in mechanics.

2016-2017: Based on the data and discussion of Classics faculty at end of the year departmental meetings, the faculty determined three actions: (1) to continue implementation of the new Latin textbook, monitoring the language Gedlil assessments to understand the effects of compressing the language acquisition in the Latin 100-200 sequence see 2015-16 "Use of Assessment Results"; (2) implement the BA task force with the Senate in the next academic year; (3) implement new student learning outcomes for the BA in Classics, consistent with the new structure and learning objectives.

2017-2018:

AB: In general, performance on student outcomes has been rather consistent over time. On average, 85% to 97% of students score ‘adequate’ or above on the measurements selected. The greatest deviation is in measure 2.2 (writing), where the standard deviation is 14% across the 7 years. The greatest variation in scores comes from measures 1.2, 2.2, and 3.2, which may be a product of small sample size. In its meeting prior to the beginning of the fall semester, the Department chose to maintain with the current sets of SLOs and assessment methods, given that in particular cases the low number of students per year provided wide variances in data.

BA: 2017-18 was the first year in which the BA Classics major was assessed separately from the AB in Classics. One of the courses, CLAS 200 is not scheduled to be taught until 2018, at which point outcome measurements 1.1 and 2.1 will be recorded.

In terms of the measurements which are more summative (Measures 1.2, 2.2), performance on student outcomes are generally good, but need improvement. Departmental goals are to have 90% of students score ‘adequate’ or above; students currently do not meet these thresholds. In outcome 3 (Communication/Critical Thinking), students meet the threshold for 3.1, but did not meet measurement 3.2 (verbal/visual communication, particularly in the mechanics of presentation). It is possible that the small sample size plays a part. The performance on outcome 3 suggests that earlier exposure to this learning outcome may be appropriate, such as in CLAS 200, which is now required of all BA CLAS majors.

In its meeting prior to the beginning of the fall semester, the Department chose to adjust the point at which SLO 2 and 3 were measured, bringing them into parallel with SLO 1. Students will be now measured at points earlier in their coursework (CLAS 200, required of all BA Classics majors and at the 300-level).
Foreign Language Education Cognate - BS

Foreign Languages Education Cognate BS

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 an attempt to pinpoint specific weaknesses, the program decided to begin to track how students scored on their first drafts of the lesson plans. This change was implemented in 16-17 and it shows that not all students are demonstrating understanding the first time. The program will continue to collect data on the first drafts of the first complete lesson plan in the methods course (EDFS 456) and on the first draft of the unit plan during clinical practice (Candidate Work Sample). This was the second year of assessing the first drafts of those artifacts; we will continue for another two years to see if improvements are made.

Based on the data from the 17-18 assessment of first drafts of the lesson plans, a new classroom activity will be implemented to help with SLO 2. Students will fill out a new worksheet in which they check that the standards indicated on the lesson plan are, indeed, being implemented. They will fill out that worksheet for each other's lesson plans and return the results to each person. It is hoped that this will help them see their own mistakes as well as point out the mistakes of others.

French and Francophone - BA/Minor

French and Francophone BA

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 results from 16-17 and 17-18, we have made the following changes to our teaching:

1. Add in a module in which critical thinking/analysis of perspectives is taught specifically in the 330 courses and in which it is reviewed in 400-level courses.
2. Put the SLO that is assessed in each course as appropriate in all 330 courses and all 400-level syllabi.
3. All 330 and 400 courses will do an in-class writing activity in which students analyze a primary source for its perspectives, etc. The question/primary source can be prepared outside class before the assessment is given, but the writing will be in class. The instructor determines the question and source, based on the content of the course. To enable sufficient time for assessment, faculty are encouraged to schedule the in-class assessment to take place around midterm or shortly thereafter.
4. Faculty who teach the 400-level courses are encouraged to include a class activity in which students read a critical secondary source and discuss it as part of the module on how to write critical analyses of cultural perspectives.

German - BA/Minor

German BA

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 midpoint 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. Second, we decided to aim for 100% of our majors to exceed expectations in writing on the B1 exams. Third, 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 revised, completely, our German 313 and 314 sequence for AY 2016-17 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.

AY 2017-18 represents our second year of data since the revamp of German 313 and German 314. The data reveals that the changes in German 314 in the 2016-17 year in order to improve the scores on measure 1.1 have yielded success. Regarding measure 2.2, the one student who failed the B1 writing claims that they did so because they misunderstood the writing prompt. In order to avoid similar problems in the future, the elected to make the following improvement for the following year: every graduating senior signing up to take the B1 exams will meet with their advisor in German to discuss the exam.

The assessment committee discussed the findings and concluded that the changes made to German 313 in the 2016-17 year in order to improve the scores on measure 2.1 are continuing to yield success. However, the committee did discuss at length the 15.4% drop in performance in German 313 from 2016-2017. The German 313 instructor indicated that 2016-17 was a particularly strong group of students. At the end of the discussion, the committee voted to collect another year of data before making changes based on the scores for measure 2.1. Regarding measure 2.2, the committee discussed the positive results but two members tempered those results by noting that we will be graduating 13 majors in the coming academic year and that it will be critical to wait before that data before concluding that our efforts have been successful. The committee voted to continue the assessment for at least another year.

In Regards to the third SLO of literary and cultural analysis, the 2017-18 results measure 3.1 appear to show a lack of improvement despite the additional focus on practicing literary and cultural analysis. In response to the data, the committee agreed to continue to employ the additional focus on practicing literary and cultural analysis in German 314 in 2017-18 and to gather more data before making any further changes to German 314. Regarding measure 3.2, the committee agreed that the issue with the lower scores has largely to do with the higher level of German needed to interpret and analyze. The committee concluded that it would be important to emphasize and expand on the vocabulary and linguistic structures necessary for interpretation throughout the 300-level curriculum, do that students receive repeated, streamlined practice with the structures necessary for arguing and interpreting as they progress towards the 400 level. The committee agreed to meet in the fall of 2018 to decide on specific vocabulary and argumentative language to include and practice all 300 level courses in order to streamline the linguistic skills.

**International Studies - BA/Minor**

**International Studies BA**

### 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 International Studies program revised its assessment plan significantly in 2016-17. We now have two years worth of data to analyze during the 2018-19 academic year in our review cycle, which is the first year following the retirement of the previous program director. The data so far are as follows:

Shares of students who “met” or “exceeded” expectations on SLOs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Measure</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO1 Measure 1 (target: 50%)</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO1 Measure 2 (target: 70%)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO2 Measure 1 (target: 70%)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO2 Measure 2 (target: 70%)</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO3 Measure 1 (target: 70%)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO3 Measure 2 (target: 70%)</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is encouraging despite the mixed results so far, is that the shares of students meeting or exceeding expectations consistently higher for the measures no. 2 across all three SLOs. The measures under nos. 2 are all assessed in courses which students take later in the major compared to the forms of assessment under nos. 1 for each SLO. Hence, we can infer with some confidence that students are likely making progress on the outcomes as they progress in the major.
In 2016-17, we introduced the SLO "Theories of International Studies" (SLO 2 in 2017-18) for the first time. Based on the newly stated learning outcome at the time, the faculty, in Fall 2016, developed a key set of topics, terms and theoretical approaches and concepts relevant to International Studies as an interdisciplinary field which were to be introduced as a matter of content in all sections of the Introductory course (INTL 100). This was aimed at ensuring a cohesive teaching program which exposes students to theoretical views on global issues early in the major. We have re-emphasized the importance of incorporating this set of content items into INTL 100 courses to faculty in 2018-19, based on a review of the assessment results of 2017-18.

Based on the 2016-17 results, we changed our assessment plan for 2017-18 and set a baseline goal of 50% of students meeting SLO1 (Global Awareness) as measured by the IDI survey instrument on intercultural competency. While the share of students meeting this outcome hovered around 46% for the second year in a row, we have begun conceptualizing curricular or co-curricular elements to complement study abroad as an academic experience which increases students' global awareness (voluntary or mandatory workshops, a zero-credit course etc.). Since these measures have potential resource implications, we are aiming to have some measures in place by 2019-20 at the earliest. We are aiming to implement some of these changes as part of the LCWA Global Fluency initiative, if possible.

In response to results from two years of assessment of the same SLOs, we will be discussing and implementing changes outlined for SLO3 (Synthesis) as well. One idea is to collect exemplary materials submitted by students, as well as resources available to students through the program and/or the library in an online repository, which students and INTL instructors can utilize for their courses to highlight best practices and accomplished student work that can serve to help students model their own work on them. The goal is to have this resource up and running by Spring 2019.

### Jewish Studies - BA/Minor

**Jewish Studies BA**

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 assessment results from 17-18, the Associate Director of Jewish Studies will be making the following changes:

1. The Jewish Studies Faculty will meet at the beginning of each semester, beginning in Fall 2018, to discuss the assessment process, measures, and rubrics.
2. During the 2018-2019 school year, the Jewish Studies faculty will revise the rubrics and assessments to better work with the courses, assignments, and student learning outcomes.
3. The Associate Director will create and distribute a chart on which each SLO, each measure, and each assessment is listed; the Jewish Studies Majors will be identified, and each faculty member teaching the courses in which the program is assessed will write each student’s score for each measure on the chart and turn that chart in to the Associate Director for data collection.
4. At the end of the spring semester, the JSTF faculty will meet to discuss the results and any changes they feel are necessary to improve the program.

### Latin American and Caribbean Studies - BA/Minor

**LACS BA**

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”: The LACS program made significant changes to its assessment in AY 2017-2018: it started assessing SLO1 at two different levels (in LACS 101 and in LACS 3xx classes) as well as SLO2 in LACS 3xx courses, and SLO3 in LACS 495 or a 400-level equivalent, in the Fall of 2017.

Assessment results for A1, SLO1 (students in Latin American and Caribbean Studies will demonstrate an understanding of the diversity and complexity of the Latin American and/or Caribbean experience) in AY 2017-18, where 88.6% of students achieved a rating of meets or exceeds standard, were a little lower than those from the previous year (in AY 2016-17, 93% achieved a rating of meets or exceeds standard) and suggested that continuous assessment of Measure 1 for SLO1 ensures students learn the critical tools and content necessary to succeed in demonstrating an understanding of the diversity and complexity of the Latin American and/or Caribbean experience; Assessment results for A2, SLO1, in AY 2017-18, where 77.7% of students achieved a rating of meets or exceeds standard and performance target was not met, followed the trend of the previous year (in AY 2016-2017, 82.5% achieved a rating of meets or exceeds standard) and suggest that a review of this particular learning outcome, measure, and course content is in order.

The Assessment Committee has identified a trend that occurs towards the end of the semester and that seems to be related to an increase of expectations on the instructors’ part and it may be skewing the assessment. The Committee has noticed a decrease in the dedication or time invested preparing for the final exam on the students’ part. This trend was also noted by several faculty at the Fall 2017 assessment workshop for LACS 101. Therefore, the Committee recommends that 1.2 be assigned toward the end of the semester but not as part of the final exam. The Committee recommends that SLO1 A2 be assessed in an end-of-the-semester research assignment. The Committee will also put greater emphasis on the need on the instructors’ part to use the rubric for that particular SLO as objectively and independently from other rubrics/expectations as possible.
Following recommendations from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, LACS started assessing SLO1 at the 300 level in Fall of 2017. Two measures were assessed:

1.3: Take home writing assignment, 1.4: End-of-the-semester test. In both assignments, students analyze and describe issues clearly and indicate a thorough reading and understanding of cultural text. Students demonstrate in-depth knowledge of political/cultural context. Students address major contemporary and historical issues pertinent to the Latin American and/or Caribbean experience. Performance target: 90% of students should achieve a rating of "meets standard" as measured by a rubric.

The very high results of 1.3 and 1.4 in AY 2017-2018, where 100% of students achieved a rating of meets or exceeds standard, and for A.4, SLO1, where 94.1% of students achieved a rating of meets or exceeds standard, and performance targets were met in both measures, indicate that assessing SLO1 at the 300 level may not be as effective since students seem to have already acquired a cultural and political foundation by that time. The Assessment Committee recommends that SLO1 be measured at the 200 level, in LACS 2xx classes, instead of at the 300 level, in LACS 3xx courses.

Assessment results for A1, SLO2 (Students in Latin American and Caribbean Studies apply an integrative multidisciplinary approach to an analysis of current issues in Latin American and/or the Caribbean) in AY 2017-2018, where 94.4% of students achieved a rating of meets or exceeds standard and where performance target was met, showed that students are building up their analytical skills at the 300 level; results for A2, SLO2, however, where 72.2% of students achieved a rating of meets or exceeds standard, was significantly lower and did not meet performance target. Because this is the first year that LACS is assessing SLO2, the Assessment Committee decided to wait one more year to compare results with AY 2018-2019 before making any adjustments to assessment methods.

Following recommendations from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning in May 2017, LACS started assessing SLO3 (Students in Latin American and Caribbean Studies will demonstrate an appreciation for and understanding of the value of Latin American and Caribbean Studies and its interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary, and comparative approaches) in LACS 495 or LACS 400 equivalent, in Fall 2017. Two measures were assessed:

Measure 3.1: During the final semester of their undergraduate career students write a 1500-2000 word ungraded "Reflective Essay" which assesses their academic development from the beginning to the end of their major as well as their assessment of the program. Students turn in completed student portfolio in hard copy to the LACS Office in order to graduate. The "Reflective Essay" is submitted in hard copy to the instructor of record in their LACS 495 or course equivalent, LACS 400. Members of the LACS Assessment Committee read the Reflective Essays annually. Assessment of required reflective essays starts in Spring 2018. Performance target: 100% of students should achieve a rating of "meets standard" as measured by a rubric.

Measure 3.2: Exit interview: All LACS 495 or course equivalent, LACS 400, students will take an exit interview where they will describe the impact of courses and of the LACS program by answering the following questions:

1. How has your course work helped you value Latin American and Caribbean studies and its interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary, and comparative approaches?

2. Considering the courses you have completed for this program, what shared issues and themes were introduced in those classes and how did they help you understand the cultures and regions of Latin America?

3. Taking as a whole your coursework in LACS, what contemporary or historical, political, or cultural issues best define the region for you and why?

4. Based on what you have learned here, how do you envision yourself contributing to this region? How do you feel you could impact the LAC region?

Assessment of exit interview started in Fall 2017. Performance target: 100% of students should achieve a rating of "meets standard" as measured by a rubric.

Assessment results for both A1 and A2, SLO3 in AY 2017-2018, where 100% of students achieved a rating of meets or exceeds expectations and where performance targets were met, indicate that students are able to demonstrate an appreciation for and understanding of the value of Latin American and Caribbean Studies and its interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary, and comparative approaches, by the time they take the capstone or 4xx equivalent in their senior year. These high ratings, however, may also be due to the fact that the Assessment Committee noticed some degree of redundancy between 3.1, the Reflective Essay, and 3.2, the Exit Interview.

Due to this degree of redundancy in 3.1 and 3.2 and now that there has been time for majors to collect graded assignments, the Assessment Committee recommends that the academic student portfolio be reinstated as measure 1 for SLO3.

Implemented Changes Based on AY 2017-2018 Results:

- Assign 1.2 toward the end of the semester but not as part of the final exam. The Committee recommends that SLO1 A2 be assessed in an end-of-the-semester research assignment. The Committee will also put greater emphasis on the need on the instructors' part to use the rubric for that particular SLO as objectively and independently from other rubrics/expectations as possible.
- Assess SLO1 in LACS 200-level courses instead of LACS 300-level courses, starting in Fall 2018;
- Change Measure 3.1 from Reflective essay to Academic Portfolio.

**Spanish - BA/Minor**

**Spanish BA**

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 Fall 2017, the Department of Hispanic Studies passed its program assessment efforts in order to assess its own assessment approach. As a result, changes were made to the formative assessment in SPAN 381, and a new formative assessment in SPAN 314 was adopted to better assess oral proficiency. The department will review the results of its Spring 2018 program assessment and determine if any changes are advisable for implementation in Spring 2019.

**African Studies - Minor**

**New Assessment Report Summary Item**

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):

Over the last few cycles we have amended our assessment instruments on basic geographical and historical knowledge so as to produce assessment results with enhanced validity. Our current practice now involves testing students early in the semester to see what level of knowledge they enter the course with, and to then test them later in the term in the expectation that they will have gained the basic geographical and historical knowledge fundamental to African Studies.

Our assessment of the Model AU course confirms the value of that course. We will continue this method of assessment for at least another three years, before looking at the data to see whether it would be feasible to make the course a requirement for the African Studies minor.

**Asian Studies - Minor**

**Asian 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):

Due to administrative changes, no assessment was done in 2016-2017. Based on the assessment that was done in 2017-2018 which only concerns SLO 1, the results meet the expectations and therefore no changes will be made.

The director of the program discussed the difficulty of having students complete the Exit Survey with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning and LCWA Dean's office on the ineffectiveness of portfolios as a method of assessment. Possible resolutions will be to replace the portfolios with focus groups (if numbers of graduates allow for such groups). Also, non-credit course was created for the minors in ASST to facilitate following up with the minors and communicating with them more frequently.

Additionally, once a student is approved to take the minor, the director will write in his approval letter that the student is expected to complete the Exit Survey once he/she is done with the minor requirement in an attempt to better the quality of programming and curriculum.

**British Studies - Minor**

**British 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):

In the last three assessment cycles, 100% of the students have either met or exceeded expectations for all three SLO. However, there have only been three students that have been assessed. Given the small number of students assessed, it would be difficult to argue on the basis of results that any change is warranted.

At the beginning of the 2018 fall semester, several additional history courses will be added to the curriculum. Additional courses will provide students with a broader range of opportunities to spark their interest in British culture, which in turn will hopefully lead to increased academic engagement and achievement.

**Business Language in French - Minor**

**Business Language in French**

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 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 data, the program made changes. The changes made in 2017-2018 need some arrangements or need to be supported with more emphasis.

For a better balance in the assessment process, the outcomes were more equally spread between the 2 mandatory Business classes 380 and 381.

Fren 380: SLO 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1
Fren 381: SLO 1.2, 2.2, 3.1 and 3.2.
The SLOs are now organized around 3 major sections.
SLO1 Theory and Simulation
SLO2 Application of Models
SLO3 Professional Development

The SLO 1.2 Delf Exam was prepared and taken in both 380 and 381 (same format but a different set of documents to analyze). Students who were taking the exam for the second time did better.

The exam for SLO 1.2 is modeled on the official Delf Pro (Diplôme en langue française à but Professionnel) Exam designed by the French government for candidates seeking a job/internship in France. Following the course, some students took the real Delf Pro with the French Government (at level B2 or C1) and succeeded 100%.

However, it seems that the results were not as good as one could expect. It seems that our students are used to American testing and need more preparation to be more comfortable with the French testing style. Therefore an emphasis will be given to the familiarization of the format.

The program also re-balanced the activities assessed to cover a larger spectrum of competencies that better reflects students’ preparedness for the French working environment. Both classes emphasize oral proficiency, practical knowledge, and critical thinking.

SLO 1.1 Marketing project simulation and defense,
SLO 1.2 Exam Delf simulation,
SLO 2.1 Paper on Social analysis case study and critical thinking on cultural differences in the professional environment, and defense
SLO 2.2 Application/candidature letters and defense
SLO 3.1 Portfolio and defense,
SLO 3.2 Interview skills.

SLO 2.1 was changed to integrate an essay on social analysis based on a case study from authentic documents, reports, or events happening in the French professional environment. In 2018-2019, this SLO will be improved to integrate new departmental rules regarding “critical thinking module” in 3xx and 4xx levels courses.

SLO 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, students have to explain, justify and defend their work orally. that part will be emphasized in 2018-2019.

The program has proved that this realignment effectively assesses student learning through the Business Language Minor in French Program.

In 2018-2019, in order to facilitate students' improvement, the SLO 2.1 will be partly done as an in-class writing activity. The documents will be prepared outside class before the assessment will be given, but the first draft will be produced in class. Then after first correction, students will improve their essay at home. Finally, they will orally defend the strategy of their essay in class.

Until now, students were not told that the exercise counted for the assessment of the program.

Stating Fall 2018, students will be informed about the SLOs and before assessment, students will be informed that the exercise is part of the program assessment.

Business Language in Spanish - Minor

Business Language in Spanish - Minor
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 six of the six measures. The assessment identified a weakness in measure 2.1, evaluated in SPAN 317 on a project focusing on the analysis of a business website. To address this weakness, the assignment will be scaffolded to ensure students are on target. The program faculty will continue to assess and make changes as needed.

**Comparative Literature - Minor**

**Comparative Literature**

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 new assessment implemented for the academic year 2017-18 needs another cycle to test its efficiency and improve the participation rate of students.

**European Studies - Minor**

**European 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):

The EUST minor has now gone through several years of assessment. The 2017-18 cycle is the second year of the current measures which began in 2016-17. The 2017-18 cycle was very unusual in that there was one graduating minor who met all learning outcomes. It is expected that the 2018-19 cycle will have a larger population and sample size because more of the minors will be graduating in the spring semester of academic year 2018-19.

It is clear that graduating minors, using the current three outcomes and current six measures, have a grasp of Europe that is mixed. They have so far done best on meeting standard on “Understanding Europe as a Region” and in “Analysis of Issues.” They seem to have a harder time in “Linking Themes.”

In order to improve the learning of European Studies minors, the director will make a conscious advising effort in 2018-19 (this will occur in writing to all minors) to inform all minors of the three major learning outcomes. Newly declared minors in 2018-19 should be especially informed about using their cluster courses to think of Europe as a region of the world with diverse countries and cultures. Minors who are sophomores and juniors should also be informed of the three learning outcomes.

By putting these three outcomes in writing and distributing each outcome to each minor in 2018-19, students will be more informed about what is expected of a graduating minor. As every student becomes better informed about the learning outcomes, s/he will be more focused to meet standard by the time they take EUST 400 in spring semester (One section of EUST 400 is intentionally offered in the spring semester - not in the fall semester- so as to coincide with the fact that students are seniors graduating in spring semester). The three clearly identified learning outcomes are 1) Europe as a Region of the World; 2) Analysis of issues; 3) Linking Themes. The students who arrive in the required EUST 400 capstone course will be better able to demonstrate having met the standards because they will have already been alerted about the expected learning outcomes.

**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):

The most prominent evidence-made changes to our German Studies Minor assessment occurred after the 2015-16 academic year, when the committee decided to implement two changes to our LTGR 250 and LTGR 270 courses (the core courses of our German Studies Minor).

Evidence-based Change number 1:

The first change was made in regards to Measure 1.2, which was significantly below the target goal (by 15% in the 2015-16) year. As a result, 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.

The committee has tracked effects of this change over the past two years. In 2016-17, 100% of the students met or exceeded expectation on measure 1.2. IN 2017-18, 88.2% met or exceeded expectations. These data seem to indicate an improvement resulting from the in-class training, but the committee requested another year or two’s worth of data before making any conclusions, especially
since only 7 students took LTGR 250 in the 2016-17 academic year.

Evidence-based change number 2:

In 2015-16, the data for Measure 2.1, the data fell 19% short of the target goal of 90% meeting expectations. As a result, the 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.

Over the past two years, the committee has tracked the results of this evidence-based change. In 2016-17, 100% of students met expectations on measure 2.1. In 2017-18, 88.2% met or exceeded expectations on measure 2.1. These data seem to indicate an improvement resulting from the in-class training, but the committee requested another year or two’s worth of data before making any conclusions, especially since only 7 students took LTGR 250 in the 2016-17 academic year.

Change number 3:

Regarding the new 3rd SLO, which was launched beginning in the 2015-16 year, the committee is currently continuing to gather data because of the small number of German Studies minors that the program graduates every year (since 2015-16, the program has graduated 9 German Studies minors). The main changes that have been made regarding the 3rd SLO on interdisciplinary linkages have involved methods of gathering the data from the German Studies minors, which has been particularly difficult. Since 2015, only 6 of the 9 graduating minors have completed the assessment, and the committee has discussed and implemented different methods to ensure that they complete the major. After only 2/3 completed the assessment in 2017-18, however, the committee requested to put a graduation hold on any student who is a German Studies minor and has not completed the assessment for measures 3.1 and 3.2.

**Italian Studies - Minor**

**Assessment Report Summary ITST AY18**

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 just recently decided to raise expectations of the students for AY 2017. As opposed to expecting 100% of students to score at the ACTFL Intermediate-Mid level, in AY 2017 academic year 100% of ITAL 313 students were expected to write at the Intermediate-high level on the ACTFL scale. In AY 2018, 90% of students met or exceeded expectations on measure 1.1 and 90% met or exceeded expectations on measure 1.2. The committee is encouraged by these results and has decided to wait on discussing curriculum changes until after collecting data for AY 2019. This will provide a larger sample to justify any curriculum changes.

**Measure 1.1**

10% does not meet standard (N=10, n=1)
60% meets standard (N=10, n=6)
30% exceeds standard (N=10, n=3)

**Measure 1.2**

11% does not meet standard (N=9, n=4)
44.5% meets standard (N=9, n=4)
44.5% exceeds standard (N=9, n=1)

**SLO II (Cultural Analysis)**

A comparison between AY 2016 and AY 2017 demonstrated some discrepancies. In AY 2016 87% of students met or exceeded expectations in measure 2.1; in measure 2.2 94%. In AY 2017 100% of students met or exceeded expectations in measure 2.1; in measure 2.2 94%. The committee decided to gather another cycle of data in AY 2018 and decide then if expectations should be elevated. In AY 2018 measure 2.2 saw 89% of students meet or exceed expectations. AY 2018 proved to be an aberration with the course typically used to conduct measure 2.1 not being offered. For this reason, the committee has decided to wait until the end of AY 2019 to discuss changes with regard to SLO II.

**Measure 2.1**

% does not meet standard (N=0, n=0)
% meets standard (N=0, n=0)
% exceeds standard (N=0, n=0)
Measure 2.2
11% do not meet standard (N=27, n=3)
67% meets standard (N=27, n=18)
22% exceeds standard (N=27, n=6)

SLO III (Speaking)
In AY 2018 100% of students met or exceeded expectations when they were in a conversational setting during the exit interview (3.2) and the in-class presentation (3.1). Although targets were met, after the next data cycle (AY 2019), the committee will discuss raising targeted expectations. Additionally, more presentations have been added to the ITAL 201 curriculum: three throughout the course of the semester with a final presentation as opposed to just the final presentation. It will be interesting to see if the increase in presentations results in a higher percentage of students meeting and exceeding expectations in SLO III, especially with regard to measure 3.1.

Measure 3.1
0% does not meet standard (N=11, n=0)
64% meets standard (N=11, n=7)
36% exceeds standard (N=11, n=4)

Measure 3.2
0% does not meet standard (N=5, n=0)
60% meets standard (N=5, n=3)
40% exceeds standard (N=5, n=2)

Japanese Studies - Minor

Japanese 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):

The data suggests that the students minoring in Japanese Studies continue to meet or exceed our expectations and that the program is working well. The exit interviews have revealed that more minors are taking advantage of the affiliate study abroad programs during the summer, as well as the bilateral exchange program with Kansai Gaidai during the academic year, and that such experience has contributed to gaining a better understanding of Japanese culture and language.

Linguistics - Minor

Linguistics Minor
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 2017-2018 academic year, the assessment process from 2016-2017 continued. This was the third year applying the same Assessment tools to graduating seniors: an Exit Exam with two measures (a 24 item multiple-choice section and two essays) addressing the three SLOs (Structural Linguistics, Language and Society and Cultural Diversity Awareness). This year there were only three graduating seniors. All three (100%) participated by taking the Exit Exam in April 2018. The dates were set to accommodate the students and Faculty proctors. Additional test items and essay questions were collected for new courses or courses for which students were being tested and no items or essays existed in the test bank that the program accumulated over the last three years.

The Exit Exam had a performance target of 75% for each measure of each SLO. These were the final results for the Exit Exam. One, Mastery of SLO 1: Structural Linguistics, 33% (1/3) of the students met or surpassed the target performance for Measure One and 0% (0/3) of the students met the target performance for Measure Two. Two, Mastery of SLO 2: Language & Society, 66% (2/3) of the students met or surpassed the performance target for Measure One and Measure Two. Three, SLO 3: Awareness of Cultural Diversity, 66% (2/3) of the students met or surpassed the target performance for Measure One and 100% (3/3) of the students met or surpassed the target performance for Measure Two.

The overall average (n=3 students) of the students, which more accurately represents the program (and not the individual students) met the performance target in only three of the six measures: SLO 2.1 (79%), SLO 3.1 (75%) and 3.2 (83%). SLO 1.1 (67%), SLO 1.2 (36%) and SLO 2.2 (67%) did not meet the performance target. There are two possible explanations for this: 1) there were only three students, which does not allow for statistically significant information; and 2) one of the students did not answer SLO 1.2 indicating that they had taken the course early on and could not remember details. Another student also mentioned having taken one of the courses earlier on and not being able to remember enough to answer accurately.

Comparing 2016-2017 overall average to 2016-2017, in 2016-2017, students performed slightly better in SLO 1.1 (69 vs 67%) and much higher in SLO 1.2 (77.25% vs 36%). In SLO2, 2016-2017 performed almost the same as 2017-2018 in SLO 2.1 (78.5% vs 79%). However, in SLO 2.2, 2016-2017 performed much higher than 2017-2018 (84.5% vs 67%), and in SLO 3, 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 scores were about the same for both measures: SLO 3.1 (75.5% vs 75%) and SLO 3.2 (83% vs 83%).
The results of the 2017-2018 Exit Exams were reported in the Linguistics Studies Minor Annual Report and in Compliance Assist for the College's Assessment records. The Annual Report is released to Academic Affairs, the Dean of the School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs and the Linguistics Studies Steering Committee.

The results from the last year's essay questions in the last exam suggested that we review the essay questions. Two of the three students were unable to respond accurately or at all to one of their essay questions because it had been a while since they had had the course and the questions were too specific. As a result, to address this issue and to close the loop, the Linguistics Steering Committee reviewed Measure two: The Essay Questions for each of the SLOs and consider revising the questions to allow for more global knowledge of the linguistics areas and learning outcomes.

Other improvements to the program included adding more courses offerings from different departments. The Linguistics Steering Committee researched all courses in all departments at the College to determine whether there were additional courses that could be added to the minor. Two new Spanish courses and two new Education courses were added to the minor. In addition, we have added more offerings of LING 101: Introduction to Language. It was offered only during fall semesters and now it is being offered fall and spring semester as a face-to-face course, and during the summer as a distant education course.

The Linguistics Studies Minor added more opportunities for cultural awareness. One major event in spring 2018 was The Linguistics Studies Lecture Series. Dr. Salikoko Mufwene from the University of Chicago presented some of his newest research on “The Meaning of Evolutionary Linguistics”. The lecture drew many faculty and students of different departments and there have been many requests for copies of his lecture to present in classes. The Linguistics Club organized two Game Nights and a table for Linguistics at the World Cultures Fair promoting Cultural Diversity (March 2018).

**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):.

Based on the assessment that was done in 2017-2018 which only concerns SLO 1, the ARST 100 syllabus will be modified in a way where the instructor ascertains that students understand the sources. In terms of writing, special attention will be paid to writing thesis statement in the final papers that students will be required to submit.

The director of the program discussed the difficulty of having students complete the Exit Survey with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning and the LCWA Dean’s office. He also discussed the ineffectiveness of portfolios as a method of assessment. Possible resolutions will be to replace the portfolios with focus groups (if numbers of graduates allow for such groups). Also, a non-credit course was created for the minors in MEW to facilitate following up with them and communicating with them more frequently. Additionally, once a student is approved to take the minor, the director will write in his approval letter that the student is expected to complete the Exit Survey once he/she is done with the minor requirement in an attempt to better the quality of programming and curriculum.

**Russian Studies - Minor**

**Russian 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):.

As a result of the review of previous assessment data, the Russian Studies Minor was significantly revised in 2016 to eliminate required courses from outside the Russian Studies Program and to create a new “Core Courses” requirement consisting of either LTR 210: 19th Century Russian Lit or LTR 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 new Russian Studies Minor requirements took effect in 2016-17. Thus, the Russian Studies faculty are still observing how the program changes are impacting assessment results and what further curricular improvements are needed in the Russian Studies Minor.

We have, however, discussed improvements in the survey methods in order to ensure that we are getting an accurate picture of Russian Minor SLO attainment. We will be implementing an additional Measure 1.3 and 2.3 during the 2018-19 assessment period. All students enrolled in LTR 210 or LTR 220 (one of which is offered every spring semester) will be tested on SLO 1 and 2 at the beginning and at the end of the class. This will help us get a baseline for students at the beginning or middle of their career in the Minor.