Template
Academic Program
Assessment of Student Learning Plan
University of New Mexico

Instructions:

This template is a suggested guideline for creating three-year plans to assess academic program-level student learning outcomes. The order and format of the information does *not* need to follow the template exactly. Alternative formats (e.g., those used by specialized accreditors) may be acceptable; please check first with the Office of the Provost.* Regardless of whether you complete the template or use an approved alternate format, the six key sets of questions (D1-D2 and E1-E4) do need to be addressed in the three-year assessment plan.

Please transmit Degree Program Assessment Plans electronically when possible.

*If you have any questions, please contact the Assessment Office at assess@unm.edu or 277-4130.

B.A. in French
Plan for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes
The University of New Mexico

A. College, Department and Date

1. College: *Arts and Sciences*
2. Department: *Foreign Languages and Literatures*
3. Date: *January 12, 2009*

B. Academic Program of Study*
B.A. French

C. Contact Person(s) for the Assessment Plan
Walter Putnam, Professor of French, zarafanm@gmail.com
Stephen Bishop, Associate Professor of French, sbishop@unm.edu
Pamela Cheek, Associate Professor of French, pcheek@unm.edu
Rajeshwari Vallury, Assistant Professor of French, rvallury@unm.edu

D. Broad Program Goals & Measurable Student Learning Outcomes

1. Broad Program Learning Goals for this Degree/Certificate Program

A. Students will be able to read and write non-specialist texts with clear identification and expression of key ideas.
B. Students will be able to communicate effectively (orally and aurally) in common situations in French.
C. Students will be able to distinguish the salient features of the cultures associated with French in historical and contemporary contexts.
D. Students will be able to identify the role played by several significant forms of representation in the cultures associated with French.

2. List of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for this Degree/Certificate Program

A.1. Students can use and comprehend common word patterns in French, including tense, and syntax.
A.2. Students can communicate and comprehend narratives and descriptions of a factual nature in French.
B.1. Students can recognize and use common word patterns and idiomatic expressions in an accent comprehensible to native speakers.
B.2. Students can participate in conversations by initiating, sustaining, and bringing to a close a range of daily communicative tasks.

---

* Academic Program of Study is defined as an approved course of study leading to a certificate or degree reflected on a UNM transcript. A graduate-level program of study typically includes a capstone experience (e.g. thesis, dissertation, professional paper or project, comprehensive exam, etc.).

C.1. Students can identify the parts of the world in which the language has played a significant role.
C.2. Students can identify ways that the achievements, people and values of the cultures associated with French have been represented internally and externally.
D.1. Students can describe and contextualize several significant forms of representation used by the cultures associated with French.
D.2. Students can describe the distinctive qualities and legacy of several cultural works produced in French.

E. Assessment of Student Learning Three-Year Plan

All programs are expected to measure some outcomes annually and to measure all priority program outcomes at least once over two consecutive three-year review cycles. Describe below the plan for the next three years of assessment of program-level student learning outcomes.

1. Student Learning Outcomes

[Insert at least 2-5 priority learning outcomes that will be assessed by the unit over the next three years. Each unit will select which of its learning outcomes to assess.]

Relationship to UNM Student Learning Goals (insert the program SLOs and check all that apply):

University of New Mexico Student Learning Goals				
Program SLOs	Knowledge	Skills	Responsibility	Program SLO is conceptually different from university goals.
A.1. Students can use and comprehend common word patterns in French, including tense, and syntax.		xx		
A.2. Students can communicate and comprehend narratives and descriptions of a factual nature in French.	xx	xx		
B.1. Students can recognize and use common word patterns and idiomatic expressions in an accent comprehensible to native speakers.	xx	xx		
C.1. Students can identify the parts of the world in which the language has played a significant role.	xx			
C.2. Students can identify ways that the achievements, people and values of the cultures associated with French have been represented internally and externally.	xx		xx	
D.1. Students can describe and contextualize several significant forms of representation used by the cultures associated with French.	xx			
D.2. Students can describe the distinctive qualities and legacy of several cultural works. produced in French.	xx			

2. How will learning outcomes be assessed?

A. <u>What</u>:

    i. *For each SLO, briefly describe the means of assessment, i.e., what samples of evidence of learning will be gathered or measures used to assess students' accomplishment of the learning outcomes in the three- year plan?*

A.1, A.2, B.1 and C.1 or C.2: performance on a 10-minute oral presentation delivered by majors in two Spring semester French courses (French 351 or French 352, and French 345 or French 346) will be assessed for these skills.

A.1, B.1, and D.1 or D.2: performance on an essay of 5-6 pages submitted by majors in two Spring semester French courses (French 351 or French 352, and French 345 or French 346) will be assessed for these skills.

    ii. *Indicate whether each measure is **direct** or **indirect**. If you are unsure, then write "Unsure of measurement type." There is an expectation that at least **half of the assessment methods/measures will be direct** measures of student learning. [See attached examples of direct and indirect measures.]*

All of these measures (for A.1, A.2, B.1 and a choice of C.1, C.2, D.1 and D.2) are direct.

    iii. *Briefly describe the **criteria for success** related to each direct or indirect means of assessment. What is the program's performance target (e.g., is an "acceptable or better" performance by 60% of students on a given measure acceptable to the program faculty)? If scoring rubrics are used to define qualitative criteria and measure performance, attach them to the plan as they are available.*

For measures of A.1, A.2 and B.1, as they are assessed in oral performance, assessment will be correlated with the ACTFL (American Council of Teachers of Languages) "Oral Proficiency Guidelines: Speaking". For each of these, the ACTFL description of "intermediate-high" corresponds to an acceptable performance. We expect 80% of students to meet the "intermediate-high" criteria and 20% to meet the "advanced low" or above standard.

ACTFL guidelines: Speaking at the "Intermediate-high" level:
"Able to handle successfully most uncomplicated tasks and social situations. Can initiate, sustain and close a general conversation with a number of strategies appropriate to a range of circumstances and topics, but error are evident. Limited vocabulary still necessitates hesitation and may bring about slightly unexpected circumlocution. There is emerging evidence of connected discourse, particularly for simple narration and/or description. The intermediate-high speaker can generally be understood even by interlocutors not accustomed to dealing with speakers at this level, but repetition may be required."

ACTFL guidelines: Speaking at the "Advanced" level:
"The advanced level is characterized by the speaker's ability to: converse in a clearly participatory fashion; initiate, sustain, and bring to closure a wide variety of communicative tasks, including those that require an increased ability to convey meaning with diverse language strategies due to a complication or an unforeseen turn of events; satisfy the requirements of school and work situations, and; narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse."

For measures of A.1, A.2 and B.1, as they are assessed in written performance, assessment will be correlated with the ACTFL (American Council of Teachers of Languages "Writing Proficiency Guidelines". For each of these, the ACTFL description of "intermediate-high" corresponds to an adequate performance. We expect 80% of students to meet the "intermediate-high" criteria and 20% to achieve at the "advanced-low" level or above.

ACTFL guidelines: Writing at the "Intermediate-high" level:
"Writers at the Intermediate-high level are able to meet all practical writing needs such as taking notes on familiar topics, writing uncomplicated letters, simple summaries, and compositions related to work, school experiences, and topics of current and general interest. Intermediate-high writers connect sentences into paragraphs using a limited number of cohesive devices that tend to be repeated, and with some breakdown in one or more features of the Advanced level. They can write simple descriptions and narrations of paragraph length on everyday events and situations in different time frames, although with some inaccuracies and inconsistencies. For example, they may be unsuccessful in their use of paraphrase and elaboration and/or inconsistent in the use of appropriate major time markers, resulting in a loss in clarity. In those languages that use verbal markers to indicate tense and aspect, forms are not consistently accurate. The vocabulary, grammar, and style of Intermediate-high writers essentially correspond to those of the spoken language. The writing of an Intermediate-high writer, even with numerous and perhaps significant errors, is generally comprehensible to natives not used to the writing of non-natives, but gaps in comprehension may occur."

ACTFL guidelines: Writing at the "Advanced-low" level:
"Writers at the Advanced-low level are able to meet basic work and/or academic writing needs, produce routine social correspondence, write about familiar topics by means of narratives and descriptions of a factual nature, and write simple summaries. Advanced-low writers demonstrate the ability to narrate and describe in major time frames with some control of aspect. Advanced-low writers are able to combine and link sentences into texts of paragraph length and structure. Their writings, while adequate to satisfy the criteria of the Advanced level, may not be substantive. Writers at the Advanced-low level demonstrate an ability to incorporate a limited number of cohesive devices but may resort to much redundancy, and awkward repetition. Subordination in the expression of ideas is present and structurally coherent, but generally relies on native patterns of oral discourse or the writing style of the writer's first language. Advanced-low writers demonstrate sustained control of simple target-language sentence structures and partial control of more complex structures. When attempting to perform functions at the Superior level, their writing will deteriorate significantly. Writing at the Advanced-low level is understood by natives not used to the writing of non-natives although some additional effort may be required in the reading of the text."

For measures of C.1 or C.2, students will be assessed on their correct identification and their capacity to provide appropriate cultural and historical context. 80% of students are expected to perform adequately on C.1 and C.2.

For measures of D.1 and D.2, students will be assessed on their capacity to describe, contextualize and analyze the distinctive qualities of either significant forms of representation or several specific cultural works. 80% of students are expected to perform adequately on D.1 and D.2.

B. <u>Who</u>: State explicitly whether the program's assessment will include evidence from all students in the program or a sample. Address the validity of any proposed sample of students.

All graduating majors enrolled in advanced undergraduate classes during the Spring semester, at the time of assessments. Normally, this will correspond to 8-10 students and to at least 90% of program majors.

3. **When will learning outcomes be assessed? When and in what forum will the results of the assessment be discussed?**
[Briefly describe the timeframe over which your unit will conduct the assessment of learning outcomes selected for the three-year plan. For example, provide a layout of the semesters or years (e.g., 2008-2009, 2009-20010, and 2010-2011), list which outcomes will be assessed, and which semester/year the results will be discussed and used to improve student learning (e.g., discussed with program faculty, interdepartmental faculty, advisory boards, students, etc.)]

Students will be assessed in two French courses (French 351 or French 352 and French 345 or French 346) through an oral presentation of 10 minutes and a written essay of 5-6 pages every Spring semester. A.1, A.2 and B.1 will always be assessed. Either C.1 or C.2 and either D.1 or D.2 will be assessed on alternate Spring semesters. Results will be discussed by the French program faculty in the first Fall meeting of every academic year and reported to the departmental undergraduate committee. Improvements to the French program, corresponding to assessment outcome findings, will be proposed and implemented by the French faculty. Any necessary broad curricular changes will be subject to review by the Foreign Languages and Literatures faculty and will be presented by the end of the appropriate Fall semester.

4. **What is the unit's process to analyze/interpret assessment data and use results to improve student learning?**
Briefly describe:
   1. who will participate in the assessment process (the gathering of evidence, the analysis/interpretation, recommendations).
   2. the process for consideration of the implications of assessment for change:
   a. to assessment mechanisms themselves,
   b. to curriculum design,
   c. to pedagogy
   …in the interest of improving student learning.
3. How, when, and to whom will recommendations be communicated?
Gathering of evidence will be performed by the faculty of record for French 351 or French 352 and French 345 or French 346 (these courses rotate among the faculty in the program; thus all faculty will have the opportunity, over time, to gather evidence). Both faculty members involved in teaching these courses in the Spring semester will participate in analysis/interpretation of evidence from both courses. Each faculty member will attend the relevant oral presentations in the other course and assess the relevant written essays. Results will be presented in a meeting of all French faculty and of the Lower Division Language Program Coordinator. This group will generate recommendations focused on the assessment process, curricular redesign or update, and strengthening of skill development in individual courses as well as in the program as a whole. Results, recommendations and implementation plans will be communicated in

writing to the FLL Committee of Undergraduate Studies, to be considered at a regular CUS meeting. The proposed changes will be discussed and the results will be conveyed to the faculty of the entire department for comment and approval. New policy will be kept on file, published on the departmental website, and included in the syllabi or program faculty. The projected time frame for these recommendations is early Fall semester, after all assessment data has been gathered and analyzed.

Source: Kansas State University Office of Assessment