Part I – Program SLO Assessment Report for 2012-13

Part I – for the 2012-13 academic year: Except for the formatting, this section is 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;

   ___ SLO is met, but with changes forthcoming;

   _x_ SLO met without change required

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

   Self-reflection.

4. **Observations gathered from data:** Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.

   a. **Findings:**
   
   The French component of this degree includes classes taken at the University of Nice in the summer. Some of these classes are seminars organized around a theme such as French poetry, current events, cinema, Provençal culture, etc. The offer changes from year to year, and on a given summer students have several classes to choose from. The French component of this M Ed degree also includes two research papers. These research papers often focus on a cultural, historical or literary subject of the student’s choosing; yet some students prefer writing papers on pedagogy.

   b. **Analysis of findings:**
Culture and literature are not addressed in a systematic way in this program. For most students this program provides an opportunity to take a class on literature, spend some time in a French bookstore or library, discover new authors or trends, write on a literary or cultural topic. Yet, there is no standard content that they are supposed to assimilate. The program is student based. Its goal is in part for students to increase their knowledge of French culture and literature, but for the most part it is for students to improve on their analytical and writing skills in French – and brush up on their knowledge of pedagogical trends, techniques, etc., via the classes taken in the education program in Cheney.

90% of the candidates to this degree are high school teachers of French looking for professional development. This program is tailored for them: they improve their competencies in the area of education, and improve their speaking and writing skills in French. Additionally, they acquire some knowledge in culture and literature. However the literature component doesn’t need to be systematic, given the fact that these high school teachers typically don’t teach literature. With regards to culture, we believe that the two summer stays in Nice included in the program are the most effective way for them to stay in touch with socio-cultural trends happening in the Francophone world.

For all of these reasons we believe that this SLO is met. However, we should probably change the wording of this SLO in the next revision cycle of the catalog to reflect the student-centered, therefore unsystematic, aspect of this component.

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).
      No change needed
   b) Provide a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year.
      No change needed

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

   Last year we redefined the goal of the research paper to underline the analytical aspect of it. In the past we struggled with students writing papers that were just a rehashing of secondary sources, done with little reflection. The new directions require that students pick an object of research, typically a text or a movie, and apply their analytical skills to it. With this new approach, the secondary sources are meant to help students understand their object of study as well as give them something to confront their ideas with. A paper that is just a compilation of sources will be refused.

   In connection with this new approach, we discussed with Dr. Aleccia from the Education program, and reorganized the structure of the program so that students take the research methods class (EDUC 520) earlier in the program, so that they can apply the techniques acquired in his class to their French papers.

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.

   Due to the nature of the program, it is too early to measure the effectiveness of these revisions.

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

   None at this point.