

Seaver College General Education (GE) Assessment – Foreign Language Academic Year 2011-2012

I. Program Learning Outcome

Students listen, speak, read, and write within the appropriate cultural context of Spanish.

II. Institutional Educational Outcomes (IEOs)

The GE Program Learning Outcome aligns with the following IEOs.

Knowledge & Scholarship

Service

Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.

Leadership

Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly and act with integrity.

Community & Global Understanding

Purpose

Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity.

III. Student Learning Outcome(s)

Indicate the student learning outcome (SLO) or outcomes for this component of the General Education program. See the OIE [website](#) for instructions on how to develop quality SLOs.

SLO #1	Orally narrate events using different time frames and express opinions and emotions.
SLO #2	In writing, narrate events using different time frames, and express opinions and emotions.
SLO #3	Explain cultural aspects of Spanish-speaking countries including traditions, important figures, art, and religious beliefs.

IV. Curriculum Map

For each **SLO**, indicate the course(s) where the outcome is **I**ntrouduced (I), where students will **D**evelop their skills, knowledge, abilities, etc. related to the SLO (D), and where students will demonstrate **M**astery of the SLO (M) by entering I, D or M in the appropriate cell(s) of the following table.

	SLO #1	SLO #2	SLO #3
SPAN 151	I	I	I
SPAN 152	I/D	I/D	I/D
SPAN 251	D/M	D/M	D/M

V. Assessment Plan

Complete the following table to indicate how you will gather both direct and indirect evidence to assess student achievement for each SLO. For each assessment, be certain to fully detail the methodology that will be used to conduct the assessment.

	Direct Evidence	Indirect Evidence
SLO #1	Oral interview	Graduating Senior Survey
SLO #2	Composition on final exam	Graduating Senior Survey
SLO #3	Final group presentation	Graduating Senior Survey

Please see Appendix A for a copy of each assessment tool and explanation.

VI. Rubrics

For the assessments identified in Section V., rubrics are provided in Appendix B. There is a separate rubric for each assessment tool.

VII. Criteria/Benchmarks for Student Achievement / Success

For each assessment SLO, list the criteria or benchmarks established as an acceptable standard of student achievement.

	Criterion (Criteria)
SLO #1	Intermediate Low Sublevel of ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012 - Speaking
SLO #2	Intermediate Low Sublevel of ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012 - Writing
SLO #3	Communicate and comment/reflect on cultural content at the Intermediate Low Sublevel of ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines - Speaking

For a copy of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) *Proficiency Guidelines* please see the “Publications” tab at: <http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=1>

VIII. Evidence / Data

For each SLO, present in summary form the evidence/data gathered to assess the SLO. If necessary, use Appendix C to report raw or original data necessary to support your findings.

In Spring 2012 there were 5 sections of SPAN 251 offered. Four were taught on the Malibu campus and one was taught in the Buenos Aires International Program. There was a total enrollment of 97 students, 81 students in the Malibu sections and 16 in Buenos Aires. The direct evidence here was collected across the various sections during the Spring 2012 semester.

SLO #1

Oral interviews between the instructor and students take place during the 251 course. The actual interview experiences are not currently recorded or preserved in any way. Therefore, the data for this SLO consists of the rubrics prepared by the instructors from notes shortly after the interviews. 50 rubrics were selected at random from the four sections of 251 taught in Malibu by Professors Roggero and Stewart. A chart with the scores (out of a possible 100 points) appears in Appendix C.

The data shows that all 50 students could communicate effectively in Spanish during their interviews with the average score being 89.28 points out of 100. The students were evaluated on their ability to comprehend the conversation in which they participated with their instructor, fluency in responding, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary usage and pronunciation. These skills correspond directly to SLO #1 for the course and more generally to the Foreign Language GE PLO components of speaking and listening.

SLO #2

All SPAN 251 sections in Malibu and Buenos Aires utilize a common final exam. There is a composition exercise on the final. 50 of these compositions from across all sections of the 251 course were randomly selected and scored by Professors Lila Carlsen, George Carlsen and April D. Marshall after student names were removed and inter-rater reliability was established. A chart with the scores from those compositions (out of a possible 30 points) appears in Appendix C. Copies of the compositions are on file in the ISL Division.

The evidence reveals that only two students demonstrated a lack of competence in written expression in Spanish. The average rating for the 50 compositions was 24.5 out of 30 points, which signifies a

demonstration of basic to good competence in written expression, according to the rubric. This assessment tool reflects SLO #2 for the course and relates to the writing component of the Foreign Language GE PLO.

SLO #3

Group oral presentations are also used in the SPAN 251 course. One of these group presentations focuses on a cultural topic. The actual presentations are not currently recorded or preserved in any way. Therefore, the data for this SLO consists of the rubrics prepared by the instructor during or from notes shortly after the presentations, which are made in class. 50 of these rubrics from the final group presentations in the three sections of Professor Roggero's SPAN 251 classes in Malibu were randomly selected as data for this SLO.

In particular the last two sections of the rubric were considered relevant as evidence for this SLO, "Content, Participation, and Group work" and "Supportive Material". The first section was worth 30 points and the second 10. The evidence illustrates that all students are good to excellent in explaining cultural aspects of Spanish-speaking countries with no combined score in the last two rubric categories below 32 points and an average score of 38.94. A chart with all scores (out of a possible 40) appears in Appendix C. This SLO can be applied to the speaking and reading components of the Foreign Language GE PLO.

Indirect evidence for this assessment was collected in Spring 2012 as well using a survey of graduating seniors at Pepperdine conducted by our Office of Institutional Effectiveness. 315 students responded to the survey and 272 to a question directly related to the GE Program and outcomes. This represents a 42% response rate on the survey overall and a 35% response rate to the question about the GE.

The question about the GE had several parts, two of which provide data for the Foreign Language GE requirement. "How has the General Education curriculum contributed to your knowledge, skills and personal development in the following areas?" The areas listed that followed this question and convey evidence for this report include "Intercultural knowledge and competence" and "Foreign Language".

Regarding "Intercultural knowledge and competence," 40.6% of students responded that the GE Education curriculum sufficiently contributed to their knowledge, skills and personal development while 17.7% of students answered that the curriculum contributed considerably to this area. In relation to "Foreign Language," 38.1% of respondents reported that the GE Education curriculum sufficiently added to their "ability to read, speak, listen and write in a non-English language". 28.1% of students believe the curriculum considerably contributed to those abilities.

IX. Summary

Based on the evidence reported in the previous section, summarize the findings in narrative form. In the summary, be certain to address the following questions. Also, be certain to reference the appropriate evidence/data supporting each finding/conclusion.

1. Are the SLOs being met at the appropriate level of achievement based upon the criteria/benchmarks defined? Stated differently, are students learning at an appropriate level for this component of the GE Program?
2. Is the GE requirement as described in the catalog appropriate or does it need to be revised?

The *ACTFL 2012 Proficiency Guidelines* generally define the Intermediate level for Speaking as: "Speakers at the Intermediate level are distinguished primarily by their ability to create with the language when talking about familiar topics related to their daily life. They are able to recombine learned material in order to express personal meaning. Intermediate level speakers can ask simple questions and can handle a straightforward survival situation. They produce sentence-level language, ranging from discrete sentences to strings of sentences, typically in present time. Intermediate-level speakers are understood by interlocutors who are accustomed to dealing with non-native learners of the language" (7). Our committee determined that a reasonable expectation for the SPAN 251 course and GE Foreign Language sequence would correspond to achievement at the Intermediate Low sublevel for SLO #1. For further detail about this sublevel please see page 8 of the *ACTFL 2012 Proficiency Guidelines*. Additionally, the committee determined that 65% of the students in SPAN 251 scoring at least 75 points on the rubric used for evaluation of their oral interviews represented attainment of that ACTFL Intermediate Low sublevel given

that the score of 75 would describe a speaker who was “mostly” able to understand, “mostly” fluent, “generally” grammatical accurate, exhibited “occasional” misuse of vocabulary and “minor” pronunciation errors.

The evidence from this assessment indicates that only one of the 50 students scored below the 75-point threshold with a score of 73. Therefore the 65% benchmark for SLO #1 was achieved. In fact, 98% of the students in this assessment performed at least at the Intermediate Low sublevel with regards to SLO #1.

The *ACTFL 2012 Proficiency Guidelines* generally define the Intermediate level of Writing as: “Writers at the Intermediate level are characterized by the ability to meet practical writing needs, such as simple messages and letters, requests for information, and notes. In addition, they can ask and respond to simple questions in writing. These writers can create with the language and communicate simple facts and ideas in a series of loosely connected sentences on topics of personal interest and social needs. They write primarily in present time. At this level, writers use basic vocabulary and structures to express meaning that is comprehensible to those accustomed to the writing of non-natives” (13). The committee agreed that students completing the 251 course should produce written work at the Intermediate Low sublevel for SLO #2. For further detail about this sublevel please see page 13 of the *ACTFL 2012 Proficiency Guidelines*. Moreover, the committee resolved that 65% of the students in SPAN 251 achieving the “Demonstrates basic to good competence in written expression” evaluation on the rubric for writing indicated accomplishment at the ACTFL Intermediate Low sublevel.

The data collected this spring shows that 70% of the compositions on the final exams received a rating in the category of the rubric that correlates to the ACTFL criterion selected by the committee. Thus, we are reaching the benchmark set for SLO #2.

Concerning SLO #3, the same ACTFL Intermediate Low sublevel for Speaking mentioned above was considered appropriate when applied to specific communication of cultural content. The committee decided that only two sections of the assignment rubric truly offered evidence of this SLO. The benchmark selected was achieving a rating of good or higher in the categories of “Content, Participation and Group Work” and “Supportive Material”.

According to the data collected, 100% of the final group presentations attained the benchmark established by the committee. No student received a rating less than “good” on the sections of the rubric connected to SLO #3 which represents achievement of the ACTFL Intermediate Low sublevel.

Meeting the benchmarks for the three SLOs for the SPAN 251 course indicates that students are indeed learning at a suitable level for this module of the GE Program since they are asked to listen, speak, read and write within the appropriate cultural context in the foreign language. That suitable level is described on page 81 of the 2012-2013 Seaver College catalog as “intermediate” and as previously mentioned, the criteria used in this assessment align with the ACTFL Intermediate Level, specifically Intermediate Low sublevel.

The indirect evidence gathered in the survey of graduating seniors supports these findings as well. 66.2% of the graduating students who responded to the question about the GE curriculum judge that those courses contributed either sufficiently or considerably to their “ability to read, speak, listen and write in a non-English language”. 58.3% of students further acknowledge that the GE curriculum sufficiently or considerably enhanced their “information, skills, and commitments that support effective and appropriate interactions in a variety of cultural contexts”.

Upon discussion of the GE PLO and SLO #3 for SPAN 251 the committee realized that there is no ACTFL guideline related specifically to assessing cultural knowledge and that the various committee members’ expectations for explaining cultural knowledge differed. The committee would like to further develop a common definition of culture in relation to the SPAN 251 course in particular and the Foreign Language GE more generally and to also explore how to accurately assess an outcome that focuses on culture. Related to this, the committee proposed a revision to the GE PLO listed at the start of this document so that

the PLO would read “Students listen, speak, read, and write within the appropriate SITUATIONAL context in Spanish,” thus eliminating the unclear term “cultural”.

The data for SLOs #1 and #3 came from only certain sections of SPAN 251. It was discovered during this assessment that not all instructors use exactly the same scenarios for the oral assessment tools or identical rubrics. Though the materials are all similar they do contain slight variations on themes and rubric categories/scoring. Samples were drawn across only the sections using identical materials.

Furthermore in conducting this assessment, the committee realized that there is no SLO for the 251 course that focuses solely on the reading component of the Foreign Language GE PLO. Reading is implicit to the other three SLOs for the SPAN 251 course, but is not explicitly addressed. The committee would like to discuss this issue further to determine whether or not another SLO might be needed.

With reference to the description of this GE requirement in the 2012-2013 Seaver College catalog, the committee noted that the list of courses that fulfill the Foreign Language GE requirement should be amended to include Arabic 251 (ARBC), offered for the first time in Fall 2011.

X. Recommendations (Closing the Loop)

What recommendations are necessary to correct weaknesses or improve this area of the General Education program? For each recommendation, reference the supporting evidence and briefly describe the expected outcome. All recommendations should be resource neutral.

Additionally, if you propose revision of the catalog content on pages 77-87 of the 2012-2013 Seaver College catalog (<http://seaver.pepperdine.edu/academics/content/2012seavercatalog.pdf>) indicate the proposed revised content as an action item.

You may propose as few as one or as many as four (or more) action items. However, acting on fewer changes is likely more realistic than acting on numerous changes at one time. For this reason, prioritize all action items in order of importance and limit action items to those supported by compelling evidence.

1. Revise page 81 of Seaver College catalog. The list of courses that fulfill the Foreign Language GE requirement should now include Arabic (ARBC) 251. This change will modify catalog content to reflect all current courses that fulfill this GE requirement.
2. In light of the confusion that resulted when trying to discuss “culture” as related to the Foreign Language GE for this assessment, modify the GE PLO listed at the start of this document to read, “Students listen, speak, read, and write within the appropriate SITUATIONAL context in Spanish,” thus eliminating the ambiguous term “cultural”.
3. Continue discussions in the International Studies and Languages Division among all language faculty about how we want to define and assess culture in relation to this GE in order to decide if another SLO is necessary for the 251 courses. Along the same lines, consider adding a specific SLO related to reading to directly address that component of the Foreign Language GE PLO.
4. As explained above there is not uniformity across all of the SPAN 251 sections with regards to the oral assessment tools and rubrics utilized. To better guarantee achievement of the GE Foreign Language PLO organization and coordination of these materials across all sections of the class needs to occur. In the past, the Spanish Program had a Lower Division Coordinator in charge of SPAN 151,152, 251 (the GE sequence). That position has been vacant for a few years now. Lack of agreeable compensation is one reason and the nature of managing fulltime non-tenure track and tenure track colleagues who are not graduate assistants is another. Approaches to effectively managing the harmonization of the 251 courses across the various sections and instructors should be discussed among the Hispanic Studies faculty and not simply designated as a duty of the division Chairperson who must also deal with the other languages in the GE. Perhaps the Coordinator position should be revived or a Course Head role could be created for just this final class in the GE sequence.

5. Work with IT's Technology and Learning Group to consider efficient ways to record/preserve and archive the oral activities described in this assessment. The data collected here came from rubrics resulting from the assessment tools used for the SLOs related to oral production (speaking and listening). We do not actually archive the oral interviews and group presentations. Doing so could help with training for faculty, classroom instruction to help students note and correct errors, and future assessments.

XI. Contributors

Assessment of this area of the General Education program was performed by the following individual(s).

Committee Chairperson	Position Title	Academic Division
April D. Marshall	Associate Professor of Hispanic Studies and Chair	International Studies and Languages

Committee Members	Position Title	Academic Division
George Carlsen	Assistant Professor of Hispanic Studies	International Studies and Languages
Lila Carlsen	Assistant Professor of Hispanic Studies and Seaver Assessment and Learning Team Representative	International Studies and Languages
Cristina Roggero	Visiting Instructor of Hispanic Studies	International Studies and Languages
Alison Stewart	Adjunct Lecturer of Hispanic Studies	International Studies and Languages
Laura Moldes	Professor of Spanish	Buenos Aires International Program

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Assessment Details

The following assessment was used to assess Student Learning Outcome # 1.

The oral interview is between the instructor and the student. It consists of questions posed by the instructor about the students' life experiences (present, past and future). The students are able to discuss those topics as well as to express emotion, concerns, opinion, etc. about contemporary social/political events discussed in class (immigration, environment, etc.). The interview is individual (exceptionally could be with a partner). The duration is 10 to 15 minutes and it is performed out of class time.

The following tool was used to assess Student Learning Outcome #2.

COMPOSICIÓN: “*MI ÍDOLO*” (30 puntos)

Escribe una composición sobre una persona conocida a quien admiras.

Incluye el siguiente contenido:

- 1) Explica de manera general por qué admiras a esta persona.
- 2) ¿Qué hizo esta persona en el pasado? (Describe ejemplos específicos.)
- 3) Termina la composición con una reflexión; particularmente expresa tu opinión sobre la influencia de esta persona en el mundo de hoy o en tu vida.

Extensión: 200 palabras aproximadamente

This is the composition from the final exam for the SPAN 251 course. The prompt asks students to write a composition of approximately 200 words about a person they admire, asking them: 1) to explain in a general way why they admire the person, 2) in particular, what did this person do in the past? (Describe specific examples.) and 3) to end the composition with a reflection; express their opinion about the influence this person has on the world today or in their own life.

The final exam is 15% of the grade in the course and this composition section is 30% of the total final exam grade.

The following assessment was used to assess Student Learning Outcome #3.

SPAN 251 – PRESENTACIONES ORALES - PROYECTO FINAL 16 y 17 de abril

En grupos de 4 estudiantes o más, cada grupo representa un país dentro de los siguientes grupos regionales:

- 1) *Caribe*
- 2) *Centroamérica*
- 3) *Países Andinos*
- 4) *Cono Sur*

Cada grupo debe:

- compartir con la clase una canción representativa. La letra de la canción debe ser culturalmente apropiada. Deben traer copias para que todos los estudiantes puedan comprender la letra y acompañar el canto. Deben explicar de qué se trata, por qué la eligieron y hacer una reflexión y comentario.

- compartir imágenes representativas de la cultura de su país o región (puede ser arte, deportes, cine, etc.....) Breve descripción, comentario y opinión/reflexión.
- seleccionar una persona conocida nativa del país elegido: puede ser un actor, deportista, escritor, presidente etc. Expliquen porqué eligieron a esa persona como representante de su región. Síntesis sobre la vida y obra de la persona. Expresen su opinión y comentarios.
- **Algo más:** tienen que traer algo de comida y bebida –en lo posible representativo de su región! para compartir con la clase (no necesita ser ni mucha cantidad, ni caro... algo simple, y simbólico, simplemente para compartir).
- bienvenidas guitarras, flautas, acordeones o sus instrumentos favoritos!! Sí: queremos escuchar nuevamente sus talentos (eso sí! Tienen que interpretar algo hispánico!)...
- ...y alguna indumentaria... algo representativo o simbólico... usen la imaginación!!!

Duración:

- Cada estudiante debe hablar alrededor de 2 minutos. **NO pueden leer.**
Deben MEMORIZAR su parte.
- Cada grupo tendrá 10 minutos más para compartir material extra (por ejemplo las canciones), responder preguntas o comentarios de los compañeros.

La nota es individual e incluye: (vean la rúbrica para más detalles)

- Gramática y vocabulario: 30%
- Fluidez, pronunciación y expresión: 30%
- Contenido, participación y trabajo con el grupo: 30%

- **Material de apoyo cultural: 10%**

This is a group oral presentation that takes place in front of the class. The instructions explain that students will work in groups of four or more to represent a Spanish-speaking country. Each group will share a representative song, some representative images and a famous person from the country they select. The groups should explain why they selected the examples they share and reflect/comment on the song, images and person. Furthermore, the groups should bring a simple and symbolic food or drink from the country to share with the class and try to incorporate a characteristic article of clothing into the presentation as well. Each student in the group should plan to speak for two minutes. Students cannot read their presentation, but are encouraged to memorize their part. The groups will have about 10 additional minutes to share extra material and respond to questions and comments from the class. They are encouraged to use their imagination

The three assessment tools selected here represent cumulative activities for the final course in the GE Foreign Language sequence for Spanish.

Rubrics were utilized to analyze the data collected. The data and results will be archived in the ISL Division.

Appendix B - Rubrics

The following rubric was used to analyze the evidence gathered for Student Learning Outcome # 1.

Span 251 – Oral Interview Rubric

Oral performance is assessed with the following rubric.

1. Comprehension skills:

___ (20) Able to understand questions and follow the conversation at a natural pace. Does not require adjustments.

___ (15) Able to understand most questions and can comment without difficulty. Occasional need for clarification.

___ (10) Able to understand very simple questions only. Frequent need for clarification and explanation.

___ (5) Frequently misunderstands and needs repetition, or slowed down and rephrased speech. May answer the wrong question.

2. Fluency:

___ (20) Able to sustain the conversation. Exclusive use of Spanish language.

Responses are always appropriate. Conversation flows smoothly and naturally; it sounds natural, spontaneous, unbroken.

____ (15) Responses are mostly appropriate. Conversation generally flows smoothly. Communication is continuous with slight pauses.

____ (10) Responses are at times inappropriate. Conversation does not flow well. Slow and hesitant communication.

____ (5) Responses are inappropriate. Conversation does not flow. Long pauses. Halting and broken communication.

3. Grammar Accuracy:

____ (20) Expression is as grammatically correct as can be expected for the level. Uses variety of time frames (present, past, future), pronouns, and word connectors to formulate relative complex sentence structures.

____ (15) Grammatical errors are more numerous but do not substantially impair communication. Generally good control of all grammatical constructions Uses variety of time frames (present, past, future), pronouns, and word connectors to formulate relative complex sentence structures.

____ (10) Grammatical errors are numerous and serious enough to noticeably impair communication. May not use a variety of time frames. Complex structures are avoided or inaccurate but meaning accurately expressed in simple structures.

____ (5) Grammar seriously impedes comprehensibility; basic errors are excessive for this level.

4. Vocabulary:

____ (20) Knows and uses precise words for the situation and/or is able to paraphrase.

____ (15) Misuses words occasionally; has difficulty paraphrasing when "stuck";

____ (10) Very limited vocabulary for this level; uses English. Unable to paraphrase when necessary.

____ (5) Vocabulary is clearly inadequate for this level.

5. Pronunciation:

___ (20) Pronunciation is very good for the level; does not impair communication. Rhythm and intonation are good for this level.

___ (15) Pronunciation errors tend to be minor and interfere only minimally with comprehensibility.

___ (10) Pronunciation is fairly weak and impedes comprehensibility.

___ (5) Major errors (e.g., poor vowel/consonant production) are excessive for this level.

The following rubric was used to analyze the evidence gathered for Student Learning Outcome #2.

Span 251 - Rubric for the Composition (Final Exam)

30 points (A): Demonstrates excellence in written expression (appropriate to this level: “narrate events using different time frame and express opinions and emotions”)

- Relevant, thorough, and very well-developed treatment of the topic
- Very well organized.
- Control of a variety of structures and idioms
- Comfortably varies sentence style
- Few to no errors in the usage of verbs (tense, conjugation, & subject-verb agreement)
- Few to no errors in the usage of pronouns
- Few to no errors in agreements of nouns, articles, adjectives, and pronouns
- Vocabulary is very varied and accurate in choice and word form
- Few to no errors in spelling

27-29 points (A/A-): Demonstrates very good command in written expression

- Relevant and well-developed treatment of the topic
- Well organized
- Control of a variety of structures and idioms, although a few grammatical errors may occur;
- Often varies sentence style

- Occasional errors in the usage of verbs do not affect comprehensibility (tense, conjugation, & subject-verb agreement)
- Occasional errors in the usage of pronouns
- Occasional errors in agreement of nouns, articles, adjectives and pronouns, do not affect comprehensibility
- Vocabulary is appropriately varied. Occasional errors in word choice or form do not affect comprehensibility
- Occasional errors in spelling do not affect comprehensibility

26-24 (B/B-) points: Demonstrates basic to good competence in written expression

- Relevant treatment of topic
- Adequate organization
- Errors may occur in a variety of structures
- Sometimes varies sentence style
- Errors in the usage of verbs (including tense, conjugation, & subject-verb agreement) do not affect comprehensibility
- Errors in the usage of pronouns
- Errors in agreement of nouns, pronouns, and adjectives do not affect comprehensibility
- Appropriate vocabulary; occasional second language interference may occur
- Occasional errors in word choice or form do not affect comprehensibility
- Occasional errors in spelling do not affect comprehensibility

21-23 points (C/C-): Demonstrates minimum competence in written expression

- Poor comprehensible expression. Partial response to the topic
- Some attempts at organization, but with confused sequencing
- Limited variety of sentences structures. Many word-order errors
- Frequent grammatical errors may occur even in elementary structures; there may be some redeeming features, such as some correct advanced structures
- Errors in verbs affect comprehensibility
- Errors in agreement of nouns, pronouns and adjectives affect comprehensibility
- Lack/wrong use of pronouns do affect comprehensibility

- Vocabulary is limited. Errors in word choice or form affect comprehensibility
- Frequent second language interference may occur

20-18 points (D+/D-): Demonstrates lack of competence in written expression

- Minimal relevance to the topic
- Disorganized
- Little to no structure present
- Struggles to or does not vary sentence style
- Verbs are almost always used improperly
- Wrong or lack use of pronouns
- There is little to no agreement in nouns, articles, adjectives and pronouns
- Insufficient vocabulary; constant second language interference
- Errors in word choice or form greatly affect comprehensibility

The following rubric was used to analyze the evidence gathered for Student Learning Outcome #3.

SPAN 251 - RUBRIC FOR FINAL GROUP PRESENTATION

<i>Grammar and Vocabulary</i> -----	Excellent 30-27 points	Good 26-24 points	Fair 21-23 points	Poor 20-18 points
	Appropriate usage of vocabulary and very few grammatical mistakes were made. Easily comprehensible.	Appropriate usage of vocabulary and grammar most of the time. There are mistakes made, but comprehension is not affected.	Grammatical mistakes are regularly made. Vocabulary is lacking. Comprehension negatively affected.	Vocabulary and Grammar are lacking. Many mistakes are made. Comprehension is negatively affected and presentation is almost incomprehensible.
<i>Pronunciation,</i>	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor

<i>Fluidity, and Expression</i>	30-27 points	26-24 points	21-23 points	20-18 points
-----	Pronunciation and Fluidity in Speech are excellent with close to no mistakes made. Comprehension is easy.	Pronounces most of the words correctly and speaks clearly but with a few mistakes. Comprehension is not affected by performance.	Mistakes are made regularly in pronunciation and there is little fluidity in the speech. Comprehension is possible, but negatively affected.	Pronunciation and lack of fluidity cause the presentation to be almost, if not completely incomprehensible.

<i>Content, Participation, and Group work</i> -----	Excellent 30-27 points	Good 26-24 points	Fair 21-23 points	Poor 20-18 points
	Completely covers topic, and gives details and information that allow the class to easily understand. Group members function as a successful whole.	Mostly covers all the details and information, leaving out only a few pieces of info. Topic is understood. Group members evidence good cooperation.	Covers about half of the info available. Gives only enough detail that negatively affects understanding but can still be understood somewhat. Members evidence little group work and cooperation.	Does not provide enough information and details to allow the class to understand the topic of the presentation. Fails to cover almost all important information. Lack of group work and cooperation.
<i>Supportive Material</i> -----	Excellent 10-9 points Cultural experience exceeded	Good 9-8 points Speaker mostly provided something cultural	Fair 7-6 points Speaker somewhat provided something cultural	Poor 6-5 points Speaker did not provide something cultural

Appendix C - Evidence /Data

The following direct evidence was gathered in assessment of Student Learning Outcome #1.

Rubric Scores for Oral Interviews (SLO #1)

100 points possible

Student	Score	Student	Score
1	96	26	90
2	86	27	84
3	87	28	91
4	95	29	95
5	77	30	94
6	85	31	95
7	92	32	96
8	91	33	90
9	85	34	93
10	88	35	84
11	85	36	98
12	75	37	95
13	97	38	92
14	94	39	92
15	80	40	95
16	86	41	79
17	80	42	83
18	73	43	84
19	95	44	87
20	95	45	99
21	89	46	96
22	87	47	96
23	95	48	85
24	94	49	88
25	85	50	91

The following direct evidence was gathered in assessment of Student Learning Outcome #2.

Rubric Scores for Compositions on Final Exam (SLO #2)

30 points possible

Student	Score	Student	Score
1	25	26	22
2	22	27	22
3	26	28	27
4	23	29	24
5	29	30	28
6	23	31	28
7	28	32	26
8	25	33	24
9	25	34	25
10	22	35	28
11	24	36	28
12	21	37	28
13	25	38	24
14	24	39	20
15	25	40	25
16	24	41	22
17	24	42	24
18	26	43	22
19	28	44	23
20	22	45	28
21	28	46	21
22	25	47	24
23	24	48	22
24	27	49	21
25	25	50	19

The following evidence was gathered in assessment of Student Learning Outcome #3.

Rubric Scores for Final Group Presentations (SLO #3)

Last two categories of rubric only, 40 points possible

Student	Score	Student	Score
1	39	26	40

2	32		27	40
3	39		28	40
4	39		29	36
5	39		30	39
6	40		31	39
7	40		32	39
8	38		33	39
9	39		34	39
10	37		35	39
11	40		36	39
12	40		37	32
13	40		38	39
14	39		39	40
15	39		40	39
16	39		41	40
17	40		42	38
18	40		43	39
19	39		44	40
20	39		45	40
21	40		46	40
22	39		47	39
23	40		48	37
24	40		49	40
25	40		50	39

Appendix D - Chronology

The committee met and performed activities in support of this assessment as indicated below.

Date	Members Participating (Initials)	Action
9/13/2011	ADM	GE Assessment Meeting with other Committee Chairpersons and Associate Dean Michael Feltner
10/6/2011	ADM	Email to all Language faculty about GE Learning Outcome for Foreign Language requesting their feedback
10/6/2011	ADM, GC	Email discussing SPAN 251 and GE Assessment for Foreign Language
10/6/2011	ADM, LC	Email sharing progress on this document, copy also to Associate Dean Feltner
10/10/2011	ADM	Meeting with Associate Dean Feltner to discuss progress on this document
11/14/2011	ADM	Meeting with Associate Dean Feltner to discuss ongoing development of GE assessment for Foreign Language, including courses taught in International Programs and this document
11/18/2011	ADM, GC, CR	Meeting to discuss SPAN 251 SLOs and direct evidence

1/5/2012	ADM, CR	Meeting to review assessment plan and tools for SPAN 251
2/16/2012	ADM, CR, AS, LM	Emails discussing and sharing information and rubric ideas for oral interviews and group presentations
2/21/2012	ADM, LC	Meeting to discuss GE assessment for Foreign Language progress
4/4/2012	ADM, CR, AS, LM	Email discussing collection of direct evidence and assessment
4/9/2012	ADM, CR	Meeting to review and finalize rubrics
4/25/2012	ADM, GC, LC	Meeting to assure inter-rater reliability of writing rubric
5/8/2012	ADM, GC, LC	Meeting to discuss benchmarks and analyze direct evidence