

## **2015-2016 Annual Program Assessment Report**

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College and the assessment office by Monday, September 30, 2016. You may submit a separate report for each program which conducted assessment activities.

**College:** HUMANITIES

**Department:** MODERN AND CLASSICAL LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

**Program:** Major in Languages and Cultures

**Assessment liaison:** ADRIÁN PÉREZ-BOLUDA

### **1. Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).**

The Languages and Cultures major program SLO#5 “Apply cultural theory to effectively analyze multiple forms of cultural expression and creativity” was assessed on the basis of coursework in two courses required of all majors, *FLIT 391: Cultural Theories and Methods* and *FLIT 491: Capstone Seminar*.

FLIT 391. Assessment is based on seven seminar papers presented and submitted December 2016 by L&C majors (five in Japanese, one in Italian, and one in French)

FLIT 491. Assessment is based on nine capstone papers presented and submitted May 2016 by L&C majors (four in Japanese, three in Italian, and two in French).

### **2. Assessment Buy-In.**

Assessment liaison requested that the Languages and Cultures (L&C) section head, Drake Langford, assess L&C majors’ FLIT 391 seminar and FLIT 491 capstone papers for SLO #5, “Apply cultural theory to effectively analyze multiple forms of cultural expression and creativity.”

### **3. Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project.**

**3a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?**

SLO #5: “Apply cultural theory to effectively analyze multiple forms of cultural expression and creativity.”

**3b. Does this learning outcome align with one or more of the university’s Big 5 Competencies? (Delete any which do not apply)**

Yes, it aligns with the following Big 5 Competencies:

- 1) Critical Thinking,
- 2) Oral Communication,
- 3) Written Communication,
- 4) ~~Quantitative Literacy,~~ and
- 5) Information Literacy.

FLIT 391. Students think critically about the relationship between various kinds of texts and their contexts, and to present their work in both oral and written formats.

FLIT 491. Students write and present a substantive research paper on a topic of their own design using diverse media in their area of concentration (e.g. Japan for Japanese majors, France for French majors, etc.).

**3c. Does this learning outcome align with University’s commitment to supporting diversity through the cultivation and exchange of a wide variety of ideas and points of view? In what ways did the assessed SLO incorporate diverse perspectives related to race, ethnic/cultural identity/cultural orientations, religion, sexual orientation, gender/gender identity, disability, socio-economic status, veteran status, national origin, age, language, and employment rank?**

FLIT 391. Yes. Through their study of literary adaptation, students see how stories change as a result of differences in economic, political, and cultural conditions.

FLIT 491. Yes. Through group discussion, peer review, and project presentations, students exposed each other to the wide range of topics they were individually researching.

**3d. What direct and/or indirect instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?**

FLIT 391. Formative assessments included classroom discussion, periodic exams, written précis and peer review assignments designed to introduce, practice and reflect on skills needed to complete their seminar papers. Project presentation and paper provided a summative assessment. See Appendix A for descriptions of select assignments.

FLIT 491. Formative assessments included before and in-class outlining, note-taking, drafting, citing, commenting (including formal peer review assignments) and other activities designed to introduce, practice and reflect on skills needed to complete their capstone projects. They also included “en route” assignments (project milestones) such as a written proposal, working outline, working bibliography, working abstract, and rough draft. Project presentation and paper provided a summative assessment. See Appendix A for descriptions of select assignments.

**3e. Describe the assessment design methodology:** For example, was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (Comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.

The SLO was assessed longitudinally over the course of the semester in each course through both formative and summative activities, as described under “direct and/or indirect instrument(s)” above. See Appendix B for the rubric used to assess final papers for this report.

**3f. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO:** Provide a summary of how the results were analyzed and highlight findings from the collected evidence.

All students met or exceeded acceptable performance criteria.

FLIT 391. Performance on quizzes was acceptable; as a formative activity they helped students prepare for the research paper and final exam, on which students demonstrated generally higher levels of competency.

FLIT 491. Students demonstrated varying degrees of competence in producing their précis but most improved over time as they became more familiar with assignment expectations and academic writing. Peer review assignments demonstrated varying degrees of effort and ability that corresponded generally to performance on the final paper.

**3g. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO:** Describe how assessment results were used to improve student learning. Were assessment results from previous years or from this year used to make program changes in this reporting year? (Possible changes include: changes to course content/topics covered, changes to course sequence, additions/deletions of courses in program, changes in

pedagogy, changes to student advisement, changes to student support services, revisions to program SLOs, new or revised assessment instruments, other academic programmatic changes, and changes to the assessment plan.)

Formative assessments during the semester were used by the instructor to provide targeted, individual assistance to underperforming students, and to give supplemental advice and guidance to at or above-level students to further strengthen their performance. Summative assessment of the semester papers is used to redesign course lessons to improve student performance in future years.

4. **Assessment of Previous Changes:** Present documentation that demonstrates how the previous changes in the program resulted in improved student learning.

Not applicable.

5. **Changes to SLOs?** Please attach an updated course alignment matrix if any changes were made. (Refer to the Curriculum Alignment Matrix Template, [http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms\\_guides.html](http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms_guides.html).)

Not applicable.

6. **Assessment Plan:** Evaluate the effectiveness of your 5 year assessment plan. How well did it inform and guide your assessment work this academic year? What process is used to develop/update the 5 year assessment plan? Please attach an updated 5 year assessment plan for 2013-2018. (Refer to Five Year Planning Template, plan B or C, [http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms\\_guides.html](http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms_guides.html).)

The L&C SLO assessed here, “Apply cultural theory to effectively analyze multiple forms of cultural expression and creativity” (SLO 5), articulates explicitly with multiple MCLL undergraduate program SLOs, including demonstrating ability to reason and present sound arguments in both oral and written discourse (SLO 2), demonstrating critical thinking in the analysis of traditions, cultures and civilizations (SLO 3) and analyzing and clearly articulating interpretations of literary texts (SLO 5).

7. **Has someone in your program completed, submitted or published a manuscript which uses or describes assessment activities in your program?** Please provide citation or discuss.

No.

**8. Other information, assessment or reflective activities or processes not captured above.**

None.