

2014/15 Instructional Program Review

Course-Level SLO Assessment

▼ Text and Image Section

The Department of Languages has been successful in assessing all student learning outcomes for nearly each course that we offer. Courses lacking assessment of all outcomes were primarily the smaller programs taught only by adjunct where assessment coordination was difficult (German, Italian, Russian, Vietnamese), course offerings were sporadic due to low enrollment/cancellation (210/211 levels, 201, and 202), and/or where upper level course offerings fell outside of the assessment cycle, again at 201, 202 levels. To address those courses lacking assessment in courses taught exclusively by adjunct instructors, we are looking to contract instructors outside of those disciplines to assist in coordinating the assessment in those courses. Additional contract personnel will accelerate this process and lead to a more consistent and balanced assessment results across all disciplines and levels.

As mentioned under student learning outcomes at the program level, program and course level assessment almost function as one with few exceptions. The most recent assessment was a student self assessment survey administered to all students in all languages and at all levels. The comprehensive nature of the survey allowed us to assess three course level outcomes at once: language comparison, cultural knowledge and diversity, and global awareness. Numerical scores all fell above 3.0 on a 4.0 scale; however, the lowest on the spectrum referenced students' perceived inability to connect with the living language outside of the classroom. To address this issue, departmental discussions have focused on the need to provide students with opportunities for meaningful interaction in the target language on campus (Language Exchange during International Education Week), in the community through service learning (we partner with the Everyone a Reader Program and Coaching Corps), and globally through study abroad (offering Spanish 102 and 201 for the second time in Spain, Summer 2015, and French 201 in France in collaboration with Fashion, Spain 2105).

Last Modified: 12/08/2014 01:36:29 PM PDT

2014/15 Instructional Program Review

Program-Level SLO Assessment

▼ Text and Image Section

All languages in our department, with the exception of Latin, have in common the goals of making that human connection, meaningful communication, celebrating the cultures and diversity of the countries that speak those languages, and connecting to the global community. Successful language instruction requires routine evaluation of classroom practices and assessment instruments. As a result, SLO assessment is on-going in our department and inspires group reflection and purposeful departmental discussions of our strengths and what we can do better to promote student success in achieving our learning outcomes.

Program level student learning outcomes are tied directly to the National Standards for Foreign Languages and therefore mirror those at the course level by virtue of their shared commonality as do their assessment instruments, so progress made at the program level naturally applies to the course level and vice versa. We are able to assess a multitude of outcomes in various languages because our existing national standards and assessments provide a strong foundation from which to customize outcome measurement. Since 2005-2006 (before Task Stream), we have been identifying and assessing student learning outcomes (See SLO Summary Report 2005-2012).

The assessment findings gathered below (from 2005 to the present) have led to the following actions:

- Marked disparity in grading standards in early writing assessment analysis - Establishment of standardized rubrics, universal to all languages, for oral and written assessment.
- Disparities in the levels of preparation of our 101 students - adoption of departmental standards for chapter test assessment that reflect a balance of comprehension and communication in meaningful context, culture, global awareness, and critical thinking.
- High affective filter of one-on-one oral assessment - research implementation of on line oral assessment (on hold until we have Language/Lab Director in place)
- Low scores in students' self perceived connection to the living language (most recent survey) - reinforced our commitment to maintain and establish study abroad program in Languages, and develop interactive on-line platforms for virtual and real- time communication.

▼ Attachment Section

Files:

 SLO Summary Report 2001-2012

Last Modified: 12/16/2014 10:21:13 AM PDT

Department of Languages: San Diego Mesa College

SLO Summary

<u>SLO: Program Level</u>	<u>SLO: Course Level</u>	<u>Assessment</u>
- Communicate effectively in a meaningful context.	-Communicate effectively in meaningful context writing in the target language*.	-Response to prompt.*

*Each course level SLO specific to that level. Each writing prompt created to match appropriate level and outcome being assessed.

Timeline: (Note: Department work on SLO's commenced well before Task Stream came on board)

2005-2006: -Course level SLO established for Spanish 101 and initial assessment conducted

2006-2007: Assessments gathered for Spanish 101 and original instructor's scores recorded

Group grading session held

- Random writing samples graded with multiple instructors grading same sample
- Scores tabulated –to be discussed at next department meeting

2007-2008: Scores discussed with following results/recommendations based on findings:

Strengths:

- High level of participation among Spanish 101 instructors in conducting assessment
- More than 70% of students in each class met or exceeded proficiency benchmark of C or above
- Assessment reflected what most instructors due already as part of the final exam

Weaknesses:

- Wide variation in scores awarded to same writing sample
- Range in scores reflected inconsistency in grading practice and procedure
- Range in scores reflected inconsistency in applying program/course level standards

Recommendations/Response:

- Establish grading rubric to improve consistency in grading (done)
- Discuss program and course level standards with instructors (done)
- Conduct best practice workshop for instructors to share what has been successful (done)

2008-2009: -Program SLO's established for all languages and those with the AA degree

-Course level SLO (assessed in Spanish 101) expanded for use in French

-Course level SLO established for Spanish and French at the 102 levels

-Assessments scheduled for Spanish 101, 102 and French 101, 102

-Input begun in Task Stream

2009-2010: -Course level SLO's (used and assessed in Span and French) expanded to all languages

-Assessments scheduled at the 101 and 102 levels – all languages

-Dept rubric established for use in grading of assessments from last year and this year

-Assessment samples gathered and original scores tabulated

-Group grading session held

2010-2011: -Established course SLO for 201 level, all languages

-Assessment scores from prior semester discussed with following results/recommendations based on findings:

Strengths:

- More than 70% of students in each class met or exceeded proficiency benchmark of C or above
- Increased consistency in scoring (less variation among instructors grading same sample)

Weaknesses:

- Low level of participation among instructors in assessment and grading phases – especially in those languages taught only by adjunct or those smaller programs
- Lack of time to gather and analyze assessment scores
- Lack of contract instructors to assist in coordination of process
- Lack of release time to input data in Task Stream, meet with instructors, coordinate efforts, and act as liaison between adjuncts, other departments, and administration
- Faculty expressed dissatisfaction with rubric – too general and inapplicable to Asian languages
- Lack of participation in some languages proved obstacle to group grading (e.g. only one instructor present to grade writing sample and sometimes it was his/her own)

Recommendations/Response:

- Japanese and Chinese programs establish own grading rubric better suited to their courses (done)
- Establish more detailed grading rubric for all other languages to improve ease in scoring (done)
- Increase participation among all languages through increased communication at department meetings and via email (in progress)
- Elicit assistance from dept chair and dean to encourage instructor participation (done)
- Continue to hold best practice workshops for instructors to share what has been successful (ongoing)

2011-2012:

- Established course level SLO's for other levels: 202, 210, 211, 215/216 in all languages to which those levels apply (most completed May 2011 so most assessments could be conducted Fall semester 2011)
- Conduct assessments for above levels/languages - Fall 2011
- Conduct assessments for any levels/languages missing from previous semesters
- Conduct any missing assessments –Spr 2012
- Begin assessment of additional course level SLO's to focus on culture and oral proficiency