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Part I – Program SLO Assessment Report for 2012-13

Part I – for the 2012-13 academic year: Except for the formatting, this section nearly identical to previous years’ templates for the Program SLO Assessment reports. Because we have begun asking Deans to create College-Level Summary Reports annually, the template has been slightly modified for a) clarity for Chairs and Directors, and b) a closer fit with what the Deans and Associate Deans are being asked to report.

1. **Student Learning Outcome:** The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.

Demonstrate knowledge of major themes, genres, movements in the history of the literature of the language culture under study

2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** Indicate whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.

   _____ SLO is met after changes resulting from ongoing assessments, referencing assessment results from the previous year to highlight revisions;

   _____ x SLO is met, but with changes forthcoming;

   _____ SLO met without change required

3. **Strategies and methods:** Description of assessment method and choices, why they were used and how they were implemented.

Test took the form of notions to identify such as trends (classicism, romanticism, surrealism) and other literary terms (laï, novel, essay). It covered the whole span of French lit, from the middle ages to the contemporary period. It targeted the overall effectiveness of several classes: French 203 Grammar and Comp., FREN 330 Intro to French Lit, FREN 430 17th century French Lit, FREN 431 18th century French Lit, FREN 433 19th century French Lit, FREN 498 Francophone Lit.
4. **Observations gathered from data**: Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.

   a. **Findings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>out of 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. **Analysis of findings:**

   The test was made of 20 questions. It was not curved: 50% means that the student has answered correctly half of the questions.

   One of the students is a French national raised in France through high school. Her score, 85, shows that this test was fairly difficult. The two students who scored 75 can be considered well equipped in the area of general knowledge in French lit. Students who scored in the 60s demonstrate a decent general knowledge of French literary trends and concepts.

   Only one student scored below 50. This student is a third year student who has not taken the Intro to Literature or any lit class so far, therefore her performance should probably not be taken into consideration.

   An important caveat to consider is that typically students don’t take all the classes listed under #3. Therefore every student has a different and partial knowledge of this immense field.

   Another element that needs to be taken into account is the fact that the French program’s student population includes a large majority of people starting the program with 2, 1 or 0 years of French in their background. Our teaching, up to the 300 level, and to some degree in the 400 level, focuses on language acquisition. Most French graduates aim at becoming high school teachers, or do something that includes French only secondarily: the Peace Corps, Teaching English as a second language, English Lit, etc. Even for students going to Public Education the endorsement requirements rely heavily on language proficiency (ACTFL) and only marginally on competency in literature.

5. **What program changes will be made based on the assessment results?**

   a) Describe plans to improve student learning based on assessment findings (e.g., course content, course sequencing, curriculum revision, learning environment or student advising).

   Less than a year ago we added a credit to our Intro to literature class (Fren 330). Next year we should be able to find out whether these 10 extra hours of instruction make a difference.

   Generally speaking, we should improve communication between instructors, so that what we do in one class is reinforced in another. We could also develop assignments that aim at reinforcing students’
general knowledge in French lit. Research projects leading to class presentations could be particularly effective.

b) Provide a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year.
Changes have already been implemented or will be implemented right away.

6. Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed and an evaluation of the assessment plan/process itself.

This particular test could be made more reliable through a collaboration between instructors. Identifying more specifically what students should definitely know as opposed to what they have been briefly exposed to would help.
NEW: PART II – CLOSING THE LOOP
FOLLOW-UP FROM THE 2011-12 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

In response to the university's accrediting body, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, this section has been added. This should be viewed as a follow up to the previous year's findings. In other words, begin with findings from 2011-12, and then describe actions taken during 2012-13 to improve student learning along, provide a brief summary of findings, and describe possible next steps.

**Working definition for closing the loop:** Using assessment results to improve student learning as well as pedagogical practices. This is an essential step in the continuous cycle of assessing student learning. It is the collaborative process through which programs use evidence of student learning to gauge the efficacy of collective educational practices, and to identify and implement strategies for improving student learning.” Adapted 8.21.13 from [http://www.hamline.edu/learning-outcomes/closing-loop.html](http://www.hamline.edu/learning-outcomes/closing-loop.html).

1. **Student Learning Outcome(s) assessed for 2011-12**

Demonstrate knowledge of the customs and idioms of the language culture under study in order to be able to respond to everyday situations in appropriate ways.

2. **Strategies implemented** during 2012-13 to improve student learning, based on findings of the 2011-12 assessment activities.

The 320-321 sequence (French culture and civilization) was modified to include more in depth understanding of contemporary French and Francophone culture. Less time is spent on pre-revolutionary France, more on cultural topics such as visual arts, regional identities, current socio-political issues, etc.

3. **Summary of results** (may include comparative data or narrative; description of changes made to curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery, etc.): Describe the effect of the changes towards improving student learning and/or the learning environment.

Students have responded well to these changes. They have more interest for current issues. Discussing current issues, as well as arts, regional identities, etc., allows students to connect what we do in the French class with other classes they take at EWU: arts, sociology, international relations, etc.

4. **What further changes to curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery, etc.** are projected based on closing-the-loop data, findings and analysis?

I still don’t do a very good job including the idiomatic dimension of language, esp. the knowledge of idiomatic expressions, in the curriculum. However, students’ awareness of the idiomatic nature of language seems to have increased in my classes.