Annual/Biennial Program Assessment Report

Academic Year Assessed: 2023-2024

College: Letters & Science

Department: Modern Languages & Literatures

Submitted by: Galen Brokaw

Program(s) Assessed

List all majors (including each option), minors, and certificates that are included in this assessment:

Majors

> Modern Languages & Literatures: French & Francophone Studies, German Studies, Hispanic Studies, Latin American & Latino Studies
>
> Asian Studies

Minors: Asian Studies, Japan Studies, China Studies, French & Francophone Studies, German Studies, Hispanic Studies, Latin American & Latino Studies

****

� **Have you reviewed the most recent Annual Program Assessment Report submitted and Assessment and Outcomes Committee feedback? (*please contact Assistant Provost Deborah Blanchard if you need a copy of either one).*

****

The Assessment Report should contain the following elements, which are outlined in this template and includes additional instructions and information. Additional instructions and information should be deleted from final reports.

1. Past Assessment Summary.
2. Action Research Question.
3. Assessment Plan, Schedule, and Data Source(s).
4. What Was Done.
5. What Was Learned.
6. How We Responded.
7. Closing the Loop.

Sample reports and guidance can be found at:
https://www.montana.edu/provost/assessment/program_assessment.html

1. **Past Assessment Summary.** Briefly summarize the findings from the last assessment report conducted related to the PLOs being assessed this year. Include any findings that influenced this cycle's assessment approach. Alternatively, reflect on the program assessment conducted last year, and explain how that impacted or informed any changes made to this cycle's assessment plan.

   This is a new program outcome. The previous cycle did not include this outcome.

2. **Action Research Question.** What question are you seeking to answer in this cycle's assessment?

   Can students identify and explain literary/critical terms and concepts*?*

3. **Assessment Plan, Schedule, and Data Source(s).**
   a) Please provide a multi-year assessment schedule that will show when all program learning outcomes will be assessed, and by what criteria (data).

Assessment Planning Schedule Chart					
Program Learning Outcome	**Courses Mapped to PLOs**	**21-22**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**
1. Linguistic Proficiency	See assessment plan	X			
2. Describe major periods of hist./cul. production	See assessment plan		X		
3. Identify and explain critical terms and concepts	See assessment plan			X	
4. Produce original research	See assessment plan				X

   b) What are the threshold values for which your program demonstrates student achievement?

Threshold Values		
Program Learning Outcome	**Threshold Value**	**Data Source(s)***
1. Linguistic Proficiency	75% of students score at least 3 on 1-5 rubric.	Oral Proficiency Interviews of Students
2. Describe major periods of hist./cul. production	75% of students score at least 3 on 1-5 rubric.	Exams in literature and culture/civ. courses
3. Identify and explain critical terms and concepts	75% of students score at least 3 on 1-5 rubric.	Exams in literature courses
4. Produce original research	75% of students score at least 3 on 1-5 rubric.	Research papers from capstone class

4. **What Was Done.**
   a) Was the completed assessment consistent with the program's assessment plan? If not, please explain the adjustments that were made.

   ☒ Yes   ☐ No

b) How were data collected and analyzed and by whom? Please include method of collection and sample size.

For this outcome, we used exams from appropriate courses in each major or option: CHIN 320IH (9), FRCH 401 (14), GRMN 450R (334), and SPNS 342 (14). The numbers in parentheses indicate the sample size from each class. The exams asked students to identify and analyze literary techniques in works covered in the course. The instructor of the course anonymized the exams and submitted them to the Section Coordinator. Each of the other members of the section evaluated the exams and assigned a score based on the rubric. We then met to go over the scores. Major discrepancies were discussed in an attempt to come to a consensus. Minor and/or unresolved discrepancies were averaged.

c) Please provide a rubric that demonstrates how your data were evaluated.

5	Demonstrates superior understanding of terms and concepts.	
4	Demonstrates good understanding of terms and concepts.	
3	Demonstrates adequate understanding of terms and concepts.	Passing
2	Demonstrates poor understanding of terms and concepts.	Failing
1	Demonstrates misunderstanding of terms and concepts.	
0	No response, or off topic, or unintelligible.	

Scores of 3 or above indicate responses that meet the expectations of the learning outcome.

5. What Was Learned.

a) Based on the analysis of the data, and compared to the threshold values established, what was learned from the assessment?

I don't see anywhere in this template where it actually asks for the data itself. So I will include it here. The results of the assessment were as follows:

	Passing/Fail	% Passing
Asian Studies	8/9	89%
Modern Languages & Literatures		
French & Francophone Studies	14/14	100%
German Studies	27/33	82%
Hispanic Studies and LALS	12/14	85.7%

We learned that the majority of our students are meeting our expectations with regard to this learning outcome.

b) What areas of strength in the program were identified from this assessment process?

We identified this learning outcome as an area of strength.

c) What areas were identified that either need improvement or could be improved in a different way from this assessment process?

While we met the standard, we did identify ways in which the assignments themselves could be improved.

6. **How We Responded.**
   a) Describe how "What Was Learned" was communicated to the department, or program faculty. How did faculty discussions re-imagine new ways program assessment might contribute to program growth/improvement/innovation beyond the bare minimum of achieving program learning objectives through assessment activities conducted at the course level?

      The department faculty are the ones who determined what was learned. So there was no need to communicate that to them. We met as a department and went over the results of all the programs. We discussed the exams and how to improve them.

   b) How are the results of this assessment informing changes to enhance student learning in the program?

      The results themselves aren't informing changes. But the process has given us the opportunity to compare and contrast different ways that we formulate exams to assess learning. And we are making improvements as a result.

   c) If information outside of this assessment is informing programmatic change, please describe that.

      n/a

   d) What support and resources (e.g. workshops, training, etc.) might you need to make these adjustments?

      n/a

7. **Closing the Loop(s).** Reflect on the program learning outcomes, how they were assessed in the previous cycle (refer to #1 of the report), and what was learned in this cycle. What action will be taken to improve student learning objectives going forward?

   a) In reviewing the last report that assessed the PLO(s) in this assessment cycle, what changes proposed were implemented and will be measured in future assessment reports?

      This is a new learning outcome. It was not a PLO in the last cycle.

   b) Have you seen a change in student learning based on other program adjustments made in the past? Please describe the adjustments made and subsequent changes in student learning.

      n/a