

## **Assessment Report 2013 - 2014**

### **Department of Foreign Languages**

**May 30th, 2014**

The Department Assessment Committee is formed by Professors Kevin Elstob, Barbara Carle, Kazue Masuyama, María Mayberry and Beatrice Russell. *(The report for FORL IB has been compiled by Professor Beatrice Russell).*

#### **Templates:**

Two professors (Dr. B Carle – Italian, page 24; and Dr. B. Russell – French, page 2) have used the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Templates.

Dr. M. Wade used the narrative option report (page 42).

## 2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

### Part 1: Background Information

**B1. Program name:** [\_\_\_\_BA in French \_\_\_\_]

**B2. Report author(s):** [\_\_Beatrice Russell\_\_]

**B3. Fall 2013 enrollment:** [\_\_14\_\_]

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment:  
(<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

**B4. Program type:** [SELECT ONLY ONE]

X	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

## Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

### Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed **in 2013-2014**.

**Q1.1.** Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess **in 2013-2014**? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). **[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

x	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1)*
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were <b>assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above</b> : a. b. c.

\* One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance **at graduation** in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy**.

#### **Q1.1.1.** Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

French BA program has developed 5 program learning outcomes (See Appendix 1 for more details). This year, we have assessed program learning outcome 4 (**PLO 4**): critical thinking skill. French BA students will define and articulate social or political issues and movements in the Francophone world in order to explore and evaluate them from their own and different perspectives and formulate an opinion and a conclusion: they will (PLO 4: Critical thinking adopted from the VALUE rubric in Appendix II):

4.1: Thesis. Although not original, thesis is fairly clear and matches the writing task, although evidence supports all statements. Details are present but not developed.

4.2: Content and Ideas/Reflection on context and assumptions (Critical Thinking)

Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented with

recognition of contextual sources of bias, assumptions and possible implications of bias.

#### 4.3: Conclusions, implications and consequences

Identifies conclusions / implications as having connections to some relevant contexts. Formulate conclusions and evidence are relatively obvious, with synthesis drawn from selected (cherry picked) evidence.

**Q1.2.** Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q1.3.** Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
x	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q1.4</b> )
	3. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q1.4</b> )

**Q1.3.1.** If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q1.4.** Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)*\* to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
x	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

\* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:

[http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The\\_Degree\\_Qualifications\\_Profile.pdf](http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf) and  
<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html>.

## Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

**Q2.1.** Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

x	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>ALL</b> PLOs <b>assessed in 2013-14.</b>
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>SOME</b> PLOs <b>assessed in 2013-14.</b>
	3. No ( <b>If no, go to Q2.2</b> )
	4. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q2.2</b> )
	5. Not Applicable ( <b>Go to Q2.2</b> )

**Q2.1.1.** If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

**Standards of performance and expectations:** Students in the French BA program are expected to demonstrate critical thinking skills (PLO 4) at the level between Good to Competent, with a score range (3-4) (see Appendix II).

Students in the French BA program are expected to demonstrate writing skills (PLO -1 ) at the level between Good to Competent, with a score range (3-4) (see Appendix II).

**Q2.2.** Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s)** you assessed in **2013-2014**?

x	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q3.1</b> )

**Q2.2.1.** If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

x	1. In <b>SOME</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In <b>ALL</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
X	10. In other places, specify: SacCT (Blackboard)

### Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

**Q3.1.** Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014?

x	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

**Q3.2.** If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014?

x	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

**Q3.3.** If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s)** for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

**Essay 1. Explication de texte (Close reading).** Leon. G. Damas. Poem « Hoquet » (Hiccup). Data for the critical thinking ability of our French BA students are presented in Table 1.

**Table I: The Results for Critical Thinking Skill**

Different Levels Three Criteria (Areas)	Beginning (1)	Developing (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (3.5)	Competent (4)	Accomplished (5)	Total (N=17)
<b>4.1:</b> Thesis (Introduction)		6 %		22%	72%		(100%, N=17)
<b>4.2:</b> Critical thinking (Content and Ideas/Reflection on context and assumptions)		6%	22%	17%	56%		(100%, N=17)
<b>4.3:</b> Conclusion, implications & consequences	6%		6%	33%	56 %		(100%, N=17)

## Essay 2. Analysis and interpreting Feminism in three (3) selected movies.

Data for the critical thinking ability of our French BA students are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: The Results for Critical Thinking Skill**

Different Levels Three Criteria (Areas)	Beginning (1)	Developing (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (3.5)	Competent (4)	Accomplished (5)	Total (N=17)
<b>4.1:</b> Thesis (Introduction)					100%		(100%, N=17)
<b>4.2:</b> Critical thinking (Content and Ideas/Reflection on context and assumptions)			6%	18%	76%		(100%, N=17)
<b>4.3:</b> Conclusion, implications & consequences				6%	94 %		(100%, N=17)

Based on the standards and criteria from 4.1 to 4.3 in Tables 1 and 2 (see also in the critical thinking rubric in Appendix II), all the students (except 1) were thinking critically. A total of 17 students were enrolled in FREN 111: 10 of the 17 students were seniors, one student was a post-baccalaureate and 6 students were juniors.

For criteria 4.1 in essay 1, 72% of our student performed at the Competent level (4), 22 % performed very good (3.5) between Competent and Good. In other words, 94 % of our student received scores between 3 and 4 which is our goal and only 1 student (6%) performed at developing level (2), which is below our goal. The one student who failed in this area is a senior. A closer look at the students works and class participation revealed that factors such as personal motivation to complete course work and class attendance negatively affected the student's performance. In essay 2, students performed better: 100% of student performed at the Competent level (4) which is our goal and the highest score at the BA level. Students clearly stated the thesis and matched the writing task, provided evidence to supports all statements and gave detailed examples.

For criteria 4.2 in essay 1, 56 % of our student performed at the Competent level (4), 17 % performed very good (3.5), 22% performed Good (3). A total of 94% of student received scores between 3 and 4 which is our goal. Only 1 student (6%) performed at developing level (2), which is below our goal.

In Essay 2, students performed better: 76 % of our student performed at the Competent level (4), 18 % performed at the Very Good (3.5) level , and 6 % performed Good (3). All our students 100 %. Almost all our students clearly identify and analyzed content and ideas were

clearly stated, reflection on context and assumptions were considered and described critically. Our BA students have met the standards of performance in this area of critical thinking.

For criteria 4.3 in essay 1 (table 1), 56 % of our student performed at the Competent level (4), 33 % performed “very good” (3.5), 6 % performed Good (3). A total of 94% of student received scores between 3 and 4 which is our BA goal. Only 1 student (6%) performed at developing level (2), which is below our goal. In essay 2 (Table 2), 94 % of student performed at the Competent level (4) and 6% performed very good (3.5). All our students 100% met the standards of performance in this area of critical thinking at the BA level. Almost all students summarized the issues, students’ conclusions were logically tied to a diverse range of information, including opposing viewpoints, and all the related outcomes (consequences and implications) were identified clearly and they included their opinions of items.

Students performed better in essay 2 compared to essay1, this difference in performance (scores) is to be interpreted in the context of individual assignment (essay1) versus Group Assignment/ Group Discussion assignment (essay 2; table 2). Essay 2 assignment was given as an online group assignment. Students worked in groups online in the Discussion Board. Discussion groups were composed of a mix of senior and junior students. Students were able to post questions and/or obtain answers, ask for clarification, share ideas and resources (adding articles and /or links) and provide evidence that support their critical thinking. With SacCT 9.1Communication Tools, students were able to work collectively, define and describe the scope of the topic/issue. Discussion at a critical level included establishing connection between film contents with course lecture content, research and personal experiences. All Students groups in essay 2 successfully addressed all three criteria (4.1, 4.2 and 4.3).

**Q3.4.** Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

**Q3.4.1.** First PLO: [\_\_\_\_\_Critical Thinking\_\_\_\_\_]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don’t know

**[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]**

**Q3.4.2.** Second PLO: [\_\_\_\_\_]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard



	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

**Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.**

**Q4.1.** How many PLOs in total did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year?  
[ 1 ]

**Q4.2.** Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

x	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) <sup>1</sup>
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

**Direct Measures**

**Q4.3.** Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

**Q4.3.1.** Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? [Check all that apply]

	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
	2. Key assignments from other <b>CORE</b> classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
x	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios

	8. Other measure. Specify:
--	----------------------------

**Q4.3.2.** Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

**Essay 1. French Explication de texte (Close reading).** Leon. G. Damas. Poem « Hoguet » (Hiccup).

Explication de texte (close reading in English) is a method of analyzing both the grammar (form) and the meaning (content) of a work of art (poems, songs, excerpts). The method required a detailed examinations of grammatical structures, vocabulary and rhetoric devices, esthetics such as metaphors, comparisons, metonymies, euphemisms, ironies, etc. Students are asked to explain "how" the form (text) mirrors the message (content) and they establish connections between the form and the content of a literary text.

Students were ask to follow the following format in their writing:

**Introduction/Thesis:** students formulate an original title of their essay that support their assertion and give the reasons they support their assertion. They provide a brief summary of content, how many parts or ideas are expressed and indicate in what order they will present them.

**Development:** Explain all the themes/ideas/ claims in the text and show what evidence did the author mention to support his/her ideas. Evaluate the author's evidence. Are they convincing? Why? How? What is the student point of view? Why?

**Conclusion:** Students summarize the author's themes/ ideas/issues/ claims, present their opinions of items. Students may make connections with other writers' perspective or make references to social, culture, political events from their own country.

**Essay 2.** Question about Francophone women in films:

Review the definition of "feminism" in your notes. Princess Dior, Rama and ZOUINA, Are these women "feminists" or not?

The Princess Dior (film: "Ceddo"), Rama ( film: "Xala") and ZOUINA ( film: "Inch Allah Dimanche" ). How are they symbols of resistance? Explain their "resistance" by answering the questions: When? Where? What (what are they against)? How (acts of resistance)? Why? (Students give concrete examples from films to support their ideas/opinions)

**Q4.3.2.1.** Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.3.** Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.4.** How was the evidence scored/evaluated? **[Select one only]**

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
x	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

**Q4.3.5.** What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? **[Select one only]**

x	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

**Q4.3.6.** Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.7.** Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.8.** Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

	1. Yes
x	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.9.** Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.10.** How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)?  
Please briefly specify here:

We selected all student papers. We had 17 students in FREN 111. 10 papers belonging to seniors, 6 belonging to a juniors and 1 to a post-baccalaureate student

### **Indirect Measures**

**Q4.4.** Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
x	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

**Q4.4.1.** Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

**Q4.4.2.** If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.4.3.** If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

### **Other Measures**

**Q4.5.** Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
x	2. No (If no, go to Q4.6)

**Q4.5.1.** Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS)

	PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

**Q4.6.** Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
x	2. No ( <b>Go to Q4.7</b> )
	3. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q4.7</b> )

**Q4.6.1.** If yes, please specify: [\_\_\_\_\_]

### **Alignment and Quality**

**Q4.7.** Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The VALUE critical thinking rubric has been used to collect data in order to directly assess 17 student papers from one required core courses offered in spring 2014. Since there are no other sections of FREN 111, I was the only faculty who assessed the 2 papers.

This is the first time that our BA program has used the present rubric (The VALUE rubric) to EXPLICITLY AND DIRECTLY assess our students' critical thinking skills. We have discovered excellent insight into students' critical thinking skill even though our sample size is small and students in this class were a mix of seniors and juniors.

**Q4.8.** How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [\_\_1\_\_]

**NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.**

**Q4.8.1.** Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.8.2.** Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

### Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

**Q5.1.** To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses	x				
2. Modifying curriculum		x			
3. Improving advising and mentoring	x				
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals		x			
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	x				
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	x				
7. Annual assessment reports	x				
8. Program review					x
9. Prospective student and family information			x		
10. Alumni communication				x	
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)		x			
12. Program accreditation					x
13. External accountability reporting requirement					x
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					x
15. Strategic planning				x	
16. Institutional benchmarking				x	
17. Academic policy development or modification				x	
18. Institutional Improvement				x	
19. Resource allocation and budgeting			x		
20. New faculty hiring			x		
21. Professional development for faculty and staff			x		
22. Other Specify:					

**Q5.1.1.** Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

- 1) Professional development for faculty and staff: I have participated in Spring 2014 the Faculty Learning community (FLC) at Center for Teaching & Learning (CTL): “Critical Thinking and Student Discussion” to learn and improve how to “facilitate effective face to face and online Discussions” and students in FREN 111 have successfully performed at the competent levels which was our ( French BA) goal.
- 2) Revising learning outcomes/goals to match the 1B rubrics

**Q5.2.** As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

	1. Yes
x	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q5.3</b> )
	3. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q5.3</b> )

**Q5.2.1.** What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

This is the first time that our graduate program has used the VALUE rubric to EXPLICITLY AND DIRECTLY assess our student critical thinking skill. We have gained excellent insight into student learning.

Like many other graduate students, our students have been struggling with their thesis. If we want our students to meet the critical thinking standards soon and to write theses or similar research papers (with 5 chapters) without too much struggles, we need to design MORE lectures and exercises (in and outside our graduate classes) to teach our students EXPLICITLY how to think critically. We can start with EACH of the 5 areas (6.1 to 6.2) and EACH of the five chapters of a thesis or a research paper. We need to give students many more opportunities (assignments or excises) in our graduate program to practice thinking critically. For example, students need to be clear on the major purposes of each of the 5 chapters or the whole research paper. Moreover, all the research questions in chapters 1, 2, and 3 should be the same as those in chapters 4 and 5: they should all fit logically together. Students need to clearly understand the complexities of many social issues and consider all perspectives, including the opposing points of view, their own assumptions, others' assumptions, and the limitations of their studies and others' studies and the limits of their positions.

To improve students' critical thinking, this summer before the August 2014 retreat, the graduate director will ask faculty members who will teach graduate classes in fall 2014 and spring 2015 for possible changes they plan to make. The assessment committee will suggest the following changes. All these suggestions will be discussed at the department retreat in August 2014 or the department meetings next fall.

- Describe at least 2 ways to show how students in their class can demonstrate each of the 5 areas of the critical thinking skills. This would include clearly defining purposes, clarifying issues/problems, selecting types of evidence (texts, issues, literature, or numerical data) and using the evidence to investigate different points of view and assumptions in EACH of the 5 chapters.
- Design or modify at least two lectures to EXPLICITLY discuss what is critical thinking and describe two ways students and faculty can introduce and develop the critical thinking skills before we ask our students to write a research paper or thesis to EXPLICITLY DEMONSTRATE students can think critically (short term and long-term).



- Design or modify at least two assignments to give students opportunities to EXPLICITLY demonstrate the critical thinking skills before we ask our students to write the thesis or the research paper to EXPLICITLY DEMONSTRATE students can think critically (short term and long-term).
- Modify the critical thinking rubric.
- Reassess critical thinking based on different classes.

**Q5.2.2.** Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q5.3.** Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

**Question 6 (Q6).** Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) <sup>1</sup>
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
x	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above: a. b. c.

### Part 3: Additional Information

**A1.** In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
x	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet <b>developed</b> a formal assessment plan

**A2.** In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
x	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet <b>updated</b> the assessment plan

**A3.** Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A4.** Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A5.** Does the program have any capstone class?

	1. Yes
x	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A5.1.** If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [\_\_\_\_\_]

**A6.** Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

	1. Yes
x	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A7.** Name of the academic unit: [\_\_\_\_French Area \_\_\_\_]

**A8.** Department in which the academic unit is located: [\_\_\_\_Foreign Languages \_\_\_\_]

**A9.** Department Chair's Name: [\_\_\_\_Bernice Bass de Martinez\_\_\_\_]

**A10.** Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [\_\_6\_\_]

**A11.** College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
x	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

***Undergraduate Degree Program(s):***

**A12.** Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_1 \_\_]

**A12.1.** List all the name(s): [\_\_\_\_BA in French\_\_\_\_]

**A12.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [\_\_0 \_\_]

***Master Degree Program(s):***

**A13.** Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_1 \_\_]

**A13.1.** List all the name(s): [\_\_\_\_]

**A13.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [\_\_0 \_\_]

***Credential Program(s):***

**A14.** Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_0\_\_]

**A14.1.** List all the names: [\_\_\_\_]

***Doctorate Program(s)***

**A15.** Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_\_\_0\_\_\_\_]

**A15.1.** List the name(s): [\_\_\_\_]

## **Appendix I:**

### **PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOS) FOR FRENCH LANGUAGE LEARNING**

French B.A. Program Learning Outcomes (PLO's) is aligned to our Campus Baccalaureate Learning Goals . We have identified the University's Baccalaureate Learning Goals by a number and have put the number in parentheses after each of our Student Learning Outcomes to show with which Baccalaureate Learning Goal our Student Learning Outcomes align: 1. Competence in the Disciplines; 2. Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World; 3. Intellectual and Practical Skills; 4. Personal and Social Responsibility; 5. Integrative Learning.

#### **PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOS) FOR FRENCH LANGUAGE LEARNING:**

##### **1. COMMUNICATION**

Students engage in conversations, provide and obtain information, express feelings and emotions, and exchange opinions (2, 3)

Students understand and interpret written and spoken language on a variety of topics (2, 3)

Students present information, concepts, and ideas to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics. (2, 3)

##### **2. CULTURES**

Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the practices and perspectives of the culture studied (1, 2, 3, 4)

Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the products and perspectives of the culture studied (1, 2, 3, 4)

##### **3. CONNECTIONS**

Students reinforce and further their knowledge of other disciplines through the foreign language (3, 5)

Students acquire information and recognize the distinctive viewpoints that are only available through the foreign language and its cultures (3, 5)

##### **4. COMPARISONS**

Students demonstrate understanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the language studied and their own (2, 3, 5)

Students demonstrate understanding of the concept of culture through comparisons of the cultures studied and their own. (2, 3, 5)

##### **5. COMMUNITIES**

Participate in Multilingual Communities at Home & Around the World

Students use the language both within and beyond the school setting (4, 5)

Students show evidence of becoming life-long learners by using the language for personal enjoyment and enrichment. (4, 5)

(Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century )

## Appendix II: Critical Thinking Value Rubric for PLO 4: Critical Thinking Skill

Rubric for Essays – Writing, Critical Thinking, Culture/Literature			Student:		
	Beginning	Developing	Good	Competent	Accomplished
<b>LO-1.3 - Writing</b>					
<b>1.3.1 Thesis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is missing and/or absence of relevant evidence and details. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is ambiguous or very vague or ignores the purpose of the assignment; evidence loosely related to the writing task.</li> <li>Details are not clear. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is somewhat clear but evidence sometimes is inadequate to support all statements.</li> <li>Details are general and not specific. Topic may be too big. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although not original, thesis is fairly clear and matches the writing task, although evidence supports all statements.</li> <li>Details are present but not developed. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is original, clear and closely matches the writing assignment; relevant evidence supports thesis.</li> <li>Writing is full of details; supports what is important about the topic. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>1.3.2 Knowledge of Conventions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows no mastery of conventions; poor grammar; no mastery of sentence construction rules; does not communicate.</li> <li>Dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, accent marks; <i>meaning is lost</i>. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major weaknesses in grammar that cause significant distraction; frequent errors in word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions; reads like a translation from English.</li> <li>Frequent errors of spelling, accent marks, punctuation; <i>meaning is confused or obscured</i>. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More frequent errors in word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions.</li> <li>More errors of spelling, punctuation, accent marks; <i>meaning is obscured in some areas</i>. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few grammatical errors that cause the reader some distraction; effective but simple constructions; several errors in word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions.</li> <li>Occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, accent marks; <i>meaning seldom obscured</i>. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows mastery of conventions of construction of sentences (word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions).</li> <li>Mastery of conventions of spelling, punctuation, and accent marks. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>1.3.3 Organization and Coherence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No organization to the paper.</li> <li>No explicit relationships among ideas. Many one-sentence paragraphs.</li> <li>Lack of transition words/phrases. There is no beginning or end to the paper; ideas seem disconnected and do not fit with the main idea or story. Paper is confusing. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is little organization to the paper.</li> <li>Frequent digressions; loose connection of ideas; serious omissions or underdevelopment.</li> <li>Little attempt to use transition words and phrases; writing does not connect to the main idea or story.</li> <li>Ending is missing or does not connect to the story or main idea. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A title is present. The paper is somewhat organized, but seems unfinished.</li> <li>Many irrelevant ideas/paragraphs included; many ideas omitted or not fully developed.</li> <li>Inconsistent use of basic transition words or phrases; It is not clear how some details are connected to the main idea or story.</li> <li>Some details are not in the right spot. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An appropriate title is present. Ideas/details are mostly presented in logical order.</li> <li>Some irrelevant ideas/paragraphs included; some ideas are omitted/not fully developed.</li> <li>Attempt to use some transitions words and phrases to show the relationships among ideas. Transitions are somewhat fluid.</li> <li>Paper seems complete. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Original title. The paper has a clear beginning, middle &amp; ending.</li> <li>Ideas &amp; details are presented in logical order.</li> <li>Skillful use of transition words and phrases to show the relationships among ideas. Transitions are internally coherent.</li> <li>Paper is complete. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>1.3.4 Sentence/fluency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simple sentence patterns.</li> <li>Paper is difficult to read. Difficult time identifying where one idea ends and the next begins. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attempt to include different sentence patterns but with uneven success.</li> <li>Paper does not flow smoothly. Choppy or awkward sentences and many parts are difficult to read (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes a range of varied sentence patterns.</li> <li>Some parts of the paper are difficult to read. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectively incorporates a range of varied sentence patterns to reveal syntactic fluency.</li> <li>Paper flows smoothly, but has some rough spots. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistently and effectively incorporates a range of varied sentence patterns to reveal syntactic fluency.</li> <li>The writing is natural and flows smoothly. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>1.3.5 Vocabulary</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vocabulary is essentially translation; invented words; clear projection from English.</li> <li>Confusing word choices.</li> <li><i>Meaning is unclear</i>. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vocabulary is not all translation.</li> <li>Word choices make the writing unclear to the reader.</li> <li><i>Word choices confuse the meaning</i>. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate range of vocabulary.</li> <li>Word choices get the message across but frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, and usage.</li> <li><i>Meaning is not obscured</i>. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate range of vocabulary.</li> <li>Occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, and usage, <i>but meaning is not obscured</i>. Some interesting words and phrases that are clear. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extensive and sophisticated range of vocabulary.</li> <li>Precise word choices; effective use of idioms, appropriate register. <i>Clear meaning. Interesting to read</i>. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>Totals</b>	5	10	15	20	25
<b>LO-4.2 - Critical Thinking</b>					
<b>4.2.1 = 1.3.1 Thesis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is missing and/or absence of relevant evidence and details. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is ambiguous or very vague or ignores the purpose of the assignment; evidence loosely related to the writing task.</li> <li>Details are not clear. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is somewhat clear but evidence sometimes is inadequate to support all statements.</li> <li>Details are general and not specific. Topic may be too big. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although not original, thesis is fairly clear and matches the writing task, although evidence supports all statements.</li> <li>Details are present but not developed. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is original, clear and closely matches the writing assignment; relevant evidence supports thesis.</li> <li>Writing is full of details; supports what is important about the topic. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>4.2.2 Content and Ideas/Reflection on context and assumptions (Critical Thinking)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented in absolutes. No recognition of own personal and cultural bias.</li> <li>No recognition of ethical, political, historical considerations. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented with little recognition of own personal and cultural bias.</li> <li>Little recognition of ethical, political, historical considerations. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented tentatively.</li> <li>Emerging awareness of own and others' biases, ethical and political, historical sources and implications of bias. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented with recognition of contextual sources of bias, assumptions and possible implications of bias. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture qualified by considerations of experiences, circumstances, conditions and environment that influence perspectives and the implications of those perspectives. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>4.2.3 Conclusions, implications and consequences</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences of the issue or the key relationships between the other elements of the problem, such as context, assumptions, data and evidence.</li> <li>Tendency to confuse correlation and cause.</li> <li>Considerations of consequences are absent. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies conclusions / implications, but within a single context.</li> <li>Conclusions are not supported by evidence or repeat the evidence with emerging synthesis and elaboration.</li> <li>Assertions of cause are doubtful, without support of evidence</li> <li>Considerations of consequences are sketchy, and drawn in absolutes. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies conclusions / implications as having connections to other contexts, but in a limited fashion.</li> <li>Conclusions are somewhat supported by evidence, with only emerging synthesis.</li> <li>Assertions of cause are vague supported mostly by opinion</li> <li>Considerations of consequences are narrow, exaggerated, dichotomous. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies conclusions / implications as having connections to some relevant contexts.</li> <li>Conclusions and evidence are relatively obvious, with synthesis drawn from selected (cherry picked) evidence.</li> <li>Assertions of cause are also selective.</li> <li>Considerations of consequences are timid or obvious and easy (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies conclusions / implications relative to the contexts important to the issue / topic at hand.</li> <li>Conclusions are based on a synthesis of evidence from various sources.</li> <li>Evidence that has been evaluated from disparate viewpoints.</li> <li>Analysis of implications indicates awareness of ambiguity. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>Totals</b>	3	6	9	12	15

**Standards and Achievement Targets:** BA students should score between **3 (Good)** to **4 (Competent)**.

## 2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

**B1. Program name:** [Italian Minor]

**B2. Report author(s):** [Barbara Carle]

**B3. Fall 2013 enrollment:** [49]

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2013 enrollment:  
(<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

**B4. Program type:** [SELECT ONLY ONE]

	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
X	5. Other, specify: Italian Minor

## Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

### Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed **in 2013-2014**.

**Q1.1.** Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess **in 2013-2014**? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). **[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1)*
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were <b>assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above</b> : a. b. c.

\* One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance **at graduation** in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy**.

#### **Q1.1.1.** Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

The Italian Minor consists of courses in **contemporary** and **modern** Italian **Cinema**, Italian **Civilization**, and **Literature**. The sweep is vast and covers the Middle Ages (Dante) to the modern and contemporary period. The Italian curriculum assumes as its premise the five C's,

1. Communication in Italian
  2. Cultures, gain knowledge and understanding of Italian culture
  3. Connections, Connect with other disciplines critically, such as art, cinema, music and literature acquire information, and expand knowledge
  4. Comparisons, develop critical insight into the nature of language and culture
  5. Communities, participate in communities at home and around the world
- (*Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, p. 332)

Specifically its five main ITALIAN MINOR PLO are

1. Communication and proficiency in Italian
2. Acquisition of significant cultural knowledge involving Italy

3. Connecting, recognizing, and interpreting common themes in Italian Cinema, Literature, Culture, and Language
4. Achieving critical thinking by practicing Italian through translation, **literary analysis**, and identification of various literary forms and genres in Italian

This year we have assessed learning outcome

**PLO 4** Achieving critical thinking by practicing Italian through translation, **literary analysis**, and identification of various literary forms and genres **in Italian** and we have assessed specifically, **ITALIAN 111, Fall, 2013**

Video (Cross Disciplinary Migrations Poetry in Italian and in Translation) of application of PLO 4 (Carle and Students) is available at:

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCM0DQ3OrTZvaMSKwG2OQQ2w>

**Q1.2.** Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q1.3.** Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q1.4</b> )
X	3. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q1.4</b> )

**Q1.3.1.** If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q1.4.** Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)* \* to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
X	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

\* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:

[http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The\\_Degree\\_Qualifications\\_Profile.pdf](http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf) and

<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html>.

## **Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.**

**Q2.1.** Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed **in 2013-2014 Academic Year**? We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 to 9 on the Written Communication & Critical Thinking in Italian VALUE rubric.

	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>ALL</b> PLOs <b>assessed in 2013-14.</b>
X	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>SOME</b> PLOs <b>assessed in 2013-14.</b>
	3. No ( <b>If no, go to Q2.2</b> )



	4. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q2.2</b> )
	5. Not Applicable ( <b>Go to Q2.2</b> )

**Q2.1.1.** If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Students in the Minor program are expected to demonstrate writing knowledge at the developed level (D), with a score of 3-9 in the writing rubric and 9-12 for summative students, graduating Italian minors.

**Q2.2.** Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s)** you assessed in 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q3.1</b> )

**Q2.2.1.** If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	1. In <b>SOME</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
X	2. In <b>ALL</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
X	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

### Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

**Q3.1.** Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information</b> )

	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

**Q3.2.** If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

**Q3.3.** If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s)** for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

We used data collected from the following sources: 1. Explanations of Poetry in Italian-- Assessment of the PLO 4 was carried out at the end of the Fall 13 semester for ITAL 111 by evaluating two sets of student papers consisting of explanations and analysis of poems in Italian. These papers were written in Italian. Assessment of their critical thinking was carried out by evaluating these papers and the student practice of the Italian language through their ability to translate, carry out effective literary analysis, and identify specific poems and their lexicon, grammatical structure, cultural context, artistic value and critical meaning. Using the Rubric for Critical Thinking, see table below, each paper was evaluated specifically for

### **3.2.1 Literary Analysis and writing IN ITALIAN**

However, there was only one graduating Senior enrolled in ITAL 111, and 5 other non graduating seniors. We have assessed all performances. Samples of all student work have been kept and are available upon request.

1. Thesis evaluated for writing in ITALIAN developed level (D), through good (G) with a score of 3-9
2. Literary Analysis and Comprehension of texts in Italian with scores between (G) (C) 9-12 Good to competent

Data Analysis of the papers yielded the following results

Paper 1

Average score (Total 100 points) 91%

Students scoring 80-89 (good) 56%

Students scoring 90-100 (excellent) 43%

Paper 2

Average score (Total 100 points) 95%

Students scoring 80-89 (good) 43%

Students scoring 90-100 (excellent) 56%

Literary Analysis and Writing in Italian (Out of 12 points)

Average Score Paper 1 8

Average Score Paper 2 9

**Rubric for Essays – Writing, Critical Thinking, Culture/Literature**

**Student:**

	Beginning	Developing	Good	Competent	Accomplished
<b>LO-1.3 - Writing</b>					
<b>1.3.1 Thesis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is missing and/or absence of relevant evidence and details. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is ambiguous or very vague or ignores the purpose of the assignment; evidence loosely related to the writing task.</li> <li>Details are not clear. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is somewhat clear but evidence sometimes is inadequate to support all statements.</li> <li>Details are general and not specific. Topic may be too big. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although not original, thesis is fairly clear and matches the writing task, although evidence supports all statements.</li> <li>Details are present but not developed. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is original, clear and closely matches the writing assignment; relevant evidence supports thesis.</li> <li>Writing is full of details; supports what is important about the topic. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>1.3.2 Knowledge of Conventions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows no mastery of conventions; poor grammar; no mastery of sentence construction rules; does not communicate.</li> <li>Dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, accent marks; <i>meaning is lost</i>. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major weaknesses in grammar that cause significant distraction; frequent errors in word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions; reads like a translation from English.</li> <li>Frequent errors of spelling, accent marks, punctuation; <i>meaning is confused or obscured</i>. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More frequent errors in word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions.</li> <li>More errors of spelling, punctuation, accent marks; <i>meaning is obscured in some areas</i>. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few grammatical errors that cause the reader some distraction; effective but simple constructions; several errors in word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions.</li> <li>Occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, accent marks; <i>meaning seldom obscured</i>. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows mastery of conventions of construction of sentences (word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions).</li> <li>Mastery of conventions of spelling, punctuation, and accent marks. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>1.3.3 Organization and Coherence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No organization to the paper.</li> <li>No explicit relationships among ideas. Many one-sentence paragraphs.</li> <li>Lack of transition words/phrases. There is no beginning or end to the paper; ideas seem disconnected and do not fit with the main idea or story. Paper is confusing. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is little organization to the paper.</li> <li>Frequent digressions; loose connection of ideas; serious omissions or underdevelopment.</li> <li>Little attempt to use transition words and phrases; writing does not connect to the main idea or story.</li> <li>Ending is missing or does not connect to the story or main idea. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A title is present. The paper is somewhat organized, but seems unfinished.</li> <li>Many irrelevant ideas/paragraphs included; many ideas omitted or not fully developed.</li> <li>Inconsistent use of basic transition words or phrases; It is not clear how some details are connected to the main idea or story.</li> <li>Some details are not in the right spot. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An appropriate title is present. Ideas/details are mostly presented in logical order.</li> <li>Some irrelevant ideas/paragraphs included; some ideas are omitted/not fully developed.</li> <li>Attempt to use some transitions words and phrases to show the relationships among ideas. Transitions are somewhat fluid.</li> <li>Paper seems complete. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Original title. The paper has a clear beginning, middle &amp; ending.</li> <li>Ideas &amp; details are presented in logical order.</li> <li>Skillful use of transition words and phrases to show the relationships among ideas. Transitions are internally coherent.</li> <li>Paper is complete. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>1.3.4 Sentence/fluency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simple sentence patterns.</li> <li>Paper is difficult to read. Difficult time identifying where one idea ends and the next begins. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attempt to include different sentence patterns but with uneven success.</li> <li>Paper does not flow smoothly. Choppy or awkward sentences and many parts are difficult to read. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes a range of varied sentence patterns.</li> <li>Some parts of the paper are difficult to read. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectively incorporates a range of varied sentence patterns to reveal syntactic fluency.</li> <li>Paper flows smoothly, but has some rough spots. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistently and effectively incorporates a range of varied sentence patterns to reveal syntactic fluency.</li> <li>The writing is natural and flows smoothly. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>1.3.5 Vocabulary</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vocabulary is essentially translation; invented words; clear projection from English.</li> <li>Confusing word choices.</li> <li><i>Meaning is unclear</i>. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vocabulary is not all translation.</li> <li>Word choices make the writing unclear to the reader.</li> <li><i>Word choices confuse the meaning</i>. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate range of vocabulary.</li> <li>Word choices get the message across but frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, and usage.</li> <li><i>Meaning is not obscured</i>. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate range of vocabulary.</li> <li>Occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, and usage, <i>but meaning is not obscured</i>. Some interesting words and phrases that are clear. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extensive and sophisticated range of vocabulary.</li> <li>Precise word choices; effective use of idioms, appropriate register.</li> <li><i>Clear meaning. Interesting to read</i>. (5)</li> </ul>
Totals	5	10	15	20	25
<b>LO-4.2 - Critical Thinking</b>					
<b>4.2.1 = 1.3.1 Thesis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is missing and/or absence of relevant evidence and details. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is ambiguous or very vague or ignores the purpose of the assignment; evidence loosely related to the writing task.</li> <li>Details are not clear. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is somewhat clear but evidence sometimes is inadequate to support all statements.</li> <li>Details are general and not specific. Topic may be too big. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although not original, thesis is fairly clear and matches the writing task, although evidence supports all statements.</li> <li>Details are present but not developed. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is original, clear and closely matches the writing assignment; relevant evidence supports thesis.</li> <li>Writing is full of details; supports what is important about the topic. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>4.2.2 Content and Ideas/Reflection on context and assumptions (Critical Thinking)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented in absolutes. No recognition of own personal and cultural bias.</li> <li>No recognition of ethical, political, historical considerations. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented with little recognition of own personal and cultural bias.</li> <li>Little recognition of ethical, political, historical considerations. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented tentatively.</li> <li>Emerging awareness of own and others' biases, ethical and political, historical sources and implications of bias. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented with recognition of contextual sources of bias, assumptions and possible implications of bias. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture qualified by considerations of experiences, circumstances, conditions and environment that influence perspectives and the implications of those perspectives. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>4.2.3 Conclusions, implications and consequences</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences of the issue or the key relationships between the other elements of the problem, such as context, assumptions, data and evidence.</li> <li>Tendency to confuse correlation and cause.</li> <li>Considerations of consequences are absent. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies conclusions / implications, but within a single context.</li> <li>Conclusions are not supported by evidence or repeat the evidence with emerging synthesis and elaboration.</li> <li>Assertions of cause are doubtful, without support of evidence</li> <li>Considerations of consequences are sketchy, and drawn in absolutes. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies conclusions / implications as having connections to other contexts, but in a limited fashion.</li> <li>Conclusions are somewhat supported by evidence, with only emerging synthesis.</li> <li>Assertions of cause are vague supported mostly by opinion</li> <li>Considerations of consequences are narrow, exaggerated, dichotomous. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies conclusions / implications as having connections to some relevant contexts.</li> <li>Conclusions and evidence are relatively obvious, with synthesis drawn from selected (cherry picked) evidence.</li> <li>Assertions of cause are also selective.</li> <li>Considerations of consequences are timid or obvious and easy (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies conclusions / implications relative to the contexts important to the issue / topic at hand.</li> <li>Conclusions are based on a synthesis of evidence from various sources.</li> <li>Evidence that has been evaluated from disparate viewpoints.</li> <li>Analysis of implications indicates awareness of ambiguity. (5)</li> </ul>
Totals	3	6	9	12	15

LO-3.2 - Literary and Intellectual development in target culture					
3.2.1 Literary Analysis and Comprehension of Text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not include literary analysis or criticism. Does not analyze literary theme(s) or techniques.</li> <li>Contains several factual errors (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inconsistent literary analysis or criticism. Includes inconsistent analysis of literary theme(s) or techniques.</li> <li>Contains occasional errors (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simple literary analysis or criticism. Basic level of analysis of literary theme(s) or techniques.</li> <li>Basic understanding of literary text; uses examples to support thesis (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides probing literary analysis or criticism. Includes inconsistent analysis of literary theme(s) or techniques.</li> <li>Understanding of literary text; uses appropriate examples to support thesis (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thought-provoking and complex literary analysis or criticism. Sophisticated and original analysis of literary theme(s) or techniques.</li> <li>Outstanding comprehension of plot, character's structure (5)</li> </ul>
3.2.2 ~ 4.2.2 Content and Ideas/Reflection on context and assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented in absolutes. No recognition of own personal and cultural bias.</li> <li>No recognition of ethical, political, historical considerations. (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented with little recognition of own personal and cultural bias.</li> <li>Little recognition of ethical, political, historical considerations. (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented tentatively.</li> <li>Emerging awareness of own and others' biases, ethical and political, historical sources and implications of bias. (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented with recognition of contextual sources of bias, assumptions and possible implications of bias. (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture qualified by considerations of experiences, circumstances, conditions and environment that influence perspectives and the implications of those perspectives. (5)</li> </ul>
Totals	2	4	6	8	10

**Q3.4.** Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

**Q3.4.1.** First PLO: [Literary analysis and Critical thinking]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]

**Q3.4.2.** Second PLO: [\_\_ Writing in ITALIAN]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

**Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.**

**Q4.1.** How many PLOs in total did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year?  
[ 2 ]

**Q4.2.** Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO** BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) <sup>1</sup>
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving

	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

### **Direct Measures**

**Q4.3.** Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

**Q4.3.1.** Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? [Check all that apply]

	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
	2. Key assignments from other <b>CORE</b> classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
X	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

**Q4.3.2.** Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Papers and compositions consisting of literary analysis through grammar and lexical analysis of poems in Italian

**Q4.3.2.1.** Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.3.** Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No



	3. Don't know
--	---------------

**Q4.3.4.** How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [**Select one only**]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
X	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

**Q4.3.5.** What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [**Select one only**]

X	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

**Q4.3.6.** Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.7.** Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.8.** Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.9.** Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.10.** How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)?  
Please briefly specify here:

We selected 6 student papers belonging to seniors including one graduating senior

### **Indirect Measures**

**Q4.4.** Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

**Q4.4.1.** Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)

	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

**Q4.4.2.** If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.4.3.** If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?



### **Other Measures**

**Q4.5.** Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q4.6</b> )

**Q4.5.1.** Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

**Q4.6.** Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No ( <b>Go to Q4.7</b> )
	3. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q4.7</b> )

**Q4.6.1.** If yes, please specify: [\_\_\_\_\_]

### **Alignment and Quality**

**Q4.7.** Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Six sets of student papers were assessed in ITALIAN 111, an advanced course taught in ITALIAN  
for ITALIAN MINORS ONLY. ALL work is done on ITALIAN texts.

**Q4.8.** How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [\_\_2\_\_]

**NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.**

**Q4.8.1.** Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.8.2.** Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

### Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

**Q5.1.** To what extent have the assessment results **from 2013-2014** been used for? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses			X		
2. Modifying curriculum				X	
3. Improving advising and mentoring		X			
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals			X		
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations			X		
6. Developing/updating assessment plan			X		
7. Annual assessment reports			X		
8. Program review					X
9. Prospective student and family information					X
10. Alumni communication					X
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					X
12. Program accreditation					X
13. External accountability reporting requirement					X
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X
15. Strategic planning					X
16. Institutional benchmarking					X
17. Academic policy development or modification			X		
18. Institutional Improvement					X
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					X
20. New faculty hiring					X
21. Professional development for faculty and staff			X		
22. Other Specify:					

**Q5.1.1.** Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

Student paper PLO were aligned with CSUS Mission LO and Department of FL PLO

**Q5.2.** As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q5.3)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

**Q5.2.1.** What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

**Q5.2.2.** Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q5.3.** Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

**Question 6 (Q6).** Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) <sup>1</sup>
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above: a. b. c.

### Part 3: Additional Information

**A1.** In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
X	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet <b>developed</b> a formal assessment plan

**A2.** In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
X	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet <b>updated</b> the assessment plan

**A3.** Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A4.** Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A5.** Does the program have any capstone class?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A5.1.** If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [ITAL 111]

**A6.** Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A7.** Name of the academic unit: Italian Minor

**A8.** Department in which the academic unit is located: [Foreign Languages]

**A9.** Department Chair's Name: [Professor Bernice Bass de Martinez]

**A10.** Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [2]

**A11.** College in which the academic unit is located:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Arts and Letters
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Business Administration
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Education
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Engineering and Computer Science
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Health and Human Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
<input type="checkbox"/>	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9. Other, specify:

***Undergraduate Degree Program(s):***

**A12.** Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: ITALIAN MINOR ONLY

**A12.1.** List all the name(s): [\_\_\_\_\_]

**A12.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [\_\_ \_\_]

***Master Degree Program(s):***

**A13.** Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_ \_\_]

**A13.1.** List all the name(s): [\_\_\_\_\_]

**A13.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [\_\_\_\_\_]

***Credential Program(s):***

**A14.** Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_\_\_\_]

**A14.1.** List all the names: [\_\_\_\_\_]

***Doctorate Program(s)***

**A15.** Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_\_\_\_]

**A15.1.** List the name(s): [\_\_\_\_\_]

**A16.** Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit\*?

<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. No

\*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program:

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration:

**Narrative option:**

**What follows is the report for the German minor:**

German Minor Assessment Report 2014

May 29, 2014

***Option 1: Narrative Submission: please address the following questions.***

This is the first time that assessment data for the Minor in German is included in the report.

This report uses the following legend to describe the levels of proficiency of the appropriate assessed skills depending on the program:

I= Introduced:

beginning = 1

D= Developed & Practiced with Feedback:

developing = 2 or

good = 3

M= Demonstrated at the Mastery Level Appropriate for Graduation:

competent = 4 or

accomplished = 5

- a. Students in the Minor program are expected to demonstrate knowledge at the Developed level (D), with a score of 2 or 3 in the writing rubric.

**2. How did you assess these learning outcomes?**

**a. Describe the measures you used and the information gathered? (Description, date administered, results)**

The learning outcome was assessed through the evaluation of compositions (direct measure) collected during the Spring 2014. Using the "Rubric for Writing" (see Appendix A), each composition was evaluated for general proficiency and language competence—broken down into the following five components:

- i. clarity of thesis
- ii. knowledge of writing conventions (grammar; spelling, accent marks, etc.)
- iii. organization and coherence
- iv. sentence fluency
- v. vocabulary

## ASSESSMENT OF German Minor

- 1. Compositions.** Assessment included evaluation of one short composition assigned in German 142. Although this is not a writing or grammar course, German 142 was chosen to gather data for direct assessment to serve as a baseline of students' writing skills. German 142 is not a requirement for the German minor. The Assessment Report for the minor includes compositions of four students (two in their junior year and two seniors).

Data analysis of the **compositions** yielded the following results:

### **Minor in German (achievement expected levels: 2, 3)**

- Average score (Total: 25 points) 23.5
  - Students scoring 32-40 (competent-4) 100% (4 students)
- A. (Thesis out of 5 points)
- Average score – Minor students 5 points (accomplished 5)
- B. (Conventions out of 5 points)
- Average score--Minor students 4 points (competent 4 )
- C. (Organization out of 5 points)
- Average score--Minor students 5 points (accomplished 5 )
- D. (Sentence Fluency out of 5 points)
- Average score--Minor students 4.5 points (competent 4 )
- E. (Vocabulary out of 5 points)
- Average score – Minor students 4.7 (between competent and accomplished 4-5)

### **b. As a result of these assessments what did you learn about the program's success in helping its students achieve these learning outcomes?**

**German Minor:** Currently, four upper-division courses are required for German minor program. Most of our students are juniors and seniors and the assessment data suggests that our students have achieved the learning objective of communicating effectively in written language.

### **c. In what areas are students doing well and achieving expectations?**

Overall, analysis of the compositions indicates that most students in the different programs can express themselves correctly in writing under testing conditions and are achieving expectations in Written Communication.

### **d. What areas are seen as needing improvement within your program?**

**German Minor.** The main difficulty faced by students is with the formal conventions of the language (spelling, and grammar, and word order) as well as with the development of



a clear and original thesis that matches the writing assignment. In the composition used for this assessment, the students were given clear perimeters for their writing. A different assignment might have resulted in a less controlled composition and might have wanted for a clear introduction or a conclusion.

**3. As a result of faculty reflection on these results, are there any program changes anticipated?**

**a. If so, what are those changes?**

**German Minor.** The data indicates that although the majority of learners are achieving expectations in the writing learning objective, many still need to improve their knowledge of grammar and their writing skills. With our limited resources, there are no changes anticipated at this time.

**4. Did your department engage in any other assessment activities such as the development of rubrics, course alignment?**

Yes. The "Rubric for Writing" (see Appendix A) has been updated with new 'labels' that reflect the developmental nature of the writing proficiency (beginning, developed, good, competent and accomplished). For the upcoming academic year, we propose to revise the "Rubric for Writing" in order to incorporate criteria for the assessment of critical thinking skills and subject matter.

**Rubric for Essays (Appendix A)**  
**California State University, Sacramento**

STUDENT \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

TOPIC \_\_\_\_\_

	1 Beginning	2 Developing	3 Good	4 Competent
<b>Thesis:</b> the extent to which the writing establishes a clear thesis to the reader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is missing and/or absence of relevant evidence and details. (12.5 or below)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is ambiguous or very vague or ignores the purpose of the assignment; evidence loosely related to the writing task.</li> <li>Details are not clear. (13-14.5)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is somewhat clear but evidence sometimes is inadequate to support all statements.</li> <li>Details are general and not specific. Topic may be too big (15-16.5)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although not original, thesis is fairly clear and matches the writing task. , although evidence supports all statements.</li> <li>Details are present but not developed (17-18.5)</li> </ul>
<b>Knowledge of Conventions:</b> the extent to which the writing exhibits conventional spelling, accent marks; punctuation, and grammar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows no mastery of conventions; poor grammar; virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules; does not communicate.</li> <li>Dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, and accent marks; <i>meaning is lost</i>. (12.5 or below)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major weaknesses in grammar that cause significant distraction; frequent errors in word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions; reads like a translation from English..</li> <li>Frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, and accent marks; <i>meaning is confused or obscured</i>. (13-14.5)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More frequent errors in word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions.</li> <li>More errors of spelling, punctuation, and accent marks; <i>meaning is obscured in some areas</i>. (15-16.5)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few grammatical errors that cause the reader some distraction; effective but simple constructions; several errors in word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions.</li> <li>Occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, and accent marks; <i>meaning seldom obscured</i>. (17-18.5)</li> </ul>
<b>Organization and Coherence:</b> the extent to which the writing maintains direction, focus, and coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is little no organization to the paper.</li> <li>No explicit relationships among ideas in the paper. Many one-sentence paragraphs.</li> <li>Writer makes no attempt to use transition words and phrases. There is no beginning or end to the paper.</li> <li>Ideas seem scrambled, jumbled, disconnected.</li> <li>Paper is confusing. The details do not fit with the main idea or story. Many unnecessary ideas are included. (12.5 or below)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is little organization to the paper.</li> <li>Frequent digressions; loose connection of ideas.</li> <li>Serious omissions or underdevelopment.</li> <li>Writer makes littler attempt to use transition words and phrases.</li> <li>A lot of the writing does not connect to the main idea or story.</li> <li>Ending is missing or does not connect to the story or main idea. A lot of unnecessary ideas are included. (13-14.5)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A title is present. The paper is somewhat organized, but seems unfinished.</li> <li>Many irrelevant ideas/paragraphs included; many ideas omitted or not fully developed.</li> <li>Writer makes an inconsistent attempt to use some basic transition words or phrases.</li> <li>It is not clear how some details are connected to the main idea or story.</li> <li>Some of the details are not in the right spot or are unnecessary. (15-16.5)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An appropriate title is present. The ideas and details are mostly presented in logical order.</li> <li>Some irrelevant ideas/paragraphs included; some ideas are omitted or not fully developed.</li> <li>Writer makes a consistent attempt to use some transitions words and phrases to show the relationships among ideas</li> <li>Transition from one idea to next somewhat fluid.</li> <li>Paper seems complete. Few ideas are unnecessary. (17-18.5)</li> </ul>
<b>Sentence/fluency:</b> the extent to which the writing incorporates a variety of sentence patterns and flows smoothly from one idea to the next	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Writer uses simple sentences. Most of the sentences are unclear.</li> <li>Paper is difficult to read. Difficult time identifying where one idea ends and the next begins. (12.5 or below)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The writer makes some attempt to include different sentence patterns but with awkward or uneven success.</li> <li>Paper does not flow smoothly. Sentences are choppy or awkward and many parts are difficult to read (13-14.5)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The writer makes some attempt to include a range of varied sentence patterns.</li> <li>Some parts of the paper are difficult to read. (15-16.5)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The writer effectively incorporates a range of varied sentence patterns to reveal syntactic fluency.</li> <li>Paper flows smoothly, but has some rough spots. (17-18.5)</li> </ul>
<b>Vocabulary:</b> the extent to which the writing incorporates precise and extensive range of words and idioms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vocabulary is essentially translation; invented words; clear projection from English.</li> <li>Word choices are confusing, unclear, or inappropriate.</li> <li><i>Meaning is unclear</i>. (12.5 or below)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although vocabulary is not all translation,</li> <li>Word choices make the writing unclear to the reader.</li> <li><i>Word choices confuse the meaning</i> (13-14.5)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate range of vocabulary.</li> <li>Word choices get the message across but frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, and usage.</li> <li><i>Meaning is not obscured</i>. (15-16.5)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate range of vocabulary.</li> <li>Occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, and usage, <i>but meaning is not obscured</i>.</li> <li>The writer uses some interesting words and phrases that are clear. (17-18.5)</li> </ul>

> 64

65-74

75-84

85-94

95-100

TOT: \_\_\_\_\_

### Assessment Scores and average – German Minor (Appendix B)

	total grade	thesis	conventions	organization	fluency	vocabulary
student 1	22	5	4	5	4	4
student 2	23	5	4	5	4	5
student 3	24	5	4	5	5	5
student 4	25	5	5	5	5	5

