

**Course Assessment Report**  
**Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Spanish	202	SPN 202 06/26/2017- Second Year Spanish II
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Foreign Language	Michelle Garey
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

**I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome**

Outcome 1: Comprehend and communicate in oral Spanish at the intermediate level.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Oral report given by individual students during the semester.
  - Assessment Date: Winter 2013
  - Course section(s)/other population: All sections
  - Number students to be assessed: All students
  - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score at the intermediate level or higher.
  - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2015, 2014	2015, 2016	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
68	58

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

All students enrolled during the time of assessment were included with the exception of one student, in Fall 2015, who completed the course but did not complete the final project.

**Fall 2014:** 10 of 11 students assessed. (1 had withdrawn)

**Winter 2015:** 20 of 22 students assessed. (2 had withdrawn)

**Fall 2015:** 13 of 15 students assessed. (1 had withdrawn and 1 did not complete the assessment)

**Winter 2016:** 15 of 20 students assessed. (5 had withdrawn)

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

This course is offered in face-to-face format only. All students enrolled at the time of assessment were included. This assessment tool was part of students' final project and as such, was administered during the last week of the semester. Data from 4 consecutive semesters is included in this assessment report: Fall 2014, Winter 2015, Fall 2015, and Winter 2016.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

**Assessment Tool:** Oral Presentation

**Scoring:** Rubric

**Requirements:** As a final project, students were required to choose two Spanish short stories (or a story and a movie) and compare and contrast the two pieces. Requirements included plot summaries and the interpretation and analysis of the stories' themes and symbolism. In addition to a written essay, students were required to give an **oral presentation** to the class outlining their insights and analyses. They were also required to respond to follow-up questions immediately following their oral presentations. Oral presentations were evaluated according to following criteria:

-Command of Grammatical Structures

-Accurate & Varied Vocabulary

-Fluency & Pronunciation

-Appropriate Content & Effective Communication of Ideas

**Standard of Success:** The SOS listed on the master syllabus is that **70% of students** will score at the ***intermediate level or higher***. A score of **75%** or higher on the oral presentation is indicative of *intermediate-level* communicative competence in the field of foreign language study.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

The standard of success was met.

**81%** (47 of 58 students) scored 75% or higher on the assessment tool and thus met the standard of success.

**19%** (11 of 58 students) scored below 75% and did not meet the SOS.

Of the 47 students that met the standard of success, 34% (16 of 47) demonstrated true mastery of outcome 1 by scoring between 90-100%. This outcome focuses on speaking proficiency and listening comprehension, whereas outcome 2 focuses on written communication and reading comprehension. Here's the breakdown:

27.5% (16 of 58) scored between 90-100%

39.6% (23 of 58) scored between 80-89%

13.7% (8 of 58) scored between 75%-79%

18.9% (11 of 58) scored below 75% and did not meet the SOS.

Also note that 10 students originally enrolled in the course had withdrawn prior to the administration of this assessment and 1 student, who was still enrolled, did not complete it.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Based on their oral presentations, it was obvious that students had a strong understanding (comprehension) of their chosen stories. Overall they were able to

effectively communicate their ideas despite structural errors. I was often struck by the unique perspectives and interpretations that students included in their final literary analysis of the semester. It was remarkable to witness their linguistic growth, as well as their ability to move beyond the literal decoding of a piece of writing to actually evaluating and interpreting it. The progress they made in just 15 weeks is impressive. It's also worth noting that students with the most effective oral presentations also incorporated a strong visual piece, such as a PowerPoint presentation or a creative visual piece (i.e.: painting, paper mache, etc.) that supported and enhanced their oral presentation.

Other areas of strength, noted for several students, was oral fluidity - speaking in fluid sentences with clear transitions, as opposed to short and choppy utterances. Many students also demonstrated the ability to speak spontaneously (rather than memorized) during the presentation. Finally, many students had remarkably authentic Spanish pronunciation.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Some students struggled to speak extemporaneously and clung to their note cards for dear life. This same cohort of students often found it difficult to respond to the follow-up questions with fluidity and their responses were often marked with lots of stops and starts. I plan to incorporate more opportunities throughout the semester for students to practice oral presentations and will also create a detailed rubric that clearly outlines expectations.

While students overwhelmingly understood their respective literary pieces and knew what they wanted to say, at times they lacked the linguistic skills to communicate their ideas effectively. Finally, while some students were able to self-correct when making a grammatical error during their presentation, some were not. Unlike written evaluations, which allow the students to edit their work, oral presentations are faster paced and errors often go unchecked.

## Outcome 2: Comprehend and communicate in written Spanish at the intermediate level

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Common questions on a written examination which will be shortessay style (based on cultural products studied in the course) and to which the student will respond in written Spanish.
  - Assessment Date: Winter 2013
  - Course section(s)/other population: All sections

- Number students to be assessed: All students
- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of the students will score at the intermediate level or higher.
- Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2015, 2014	2016, 2015	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
68	60

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

All students that were enrolled during the time of assessment were included with the exception of 1 student who failed to complete the essay exam. (The essay exam was used as the assessment tool.)

60 students were assessed.

7 students had withdrawn from the course prior to the assessment.

1 student, who was enrolled during the time of assessment, never completed the essay exam.

**Fall 2014:** 10 of 11 students were assessed. (1 had withdrawn)

**Winter 2015:** 19 of 22 students assessed. (2 had withdrawn & 1 did not complete the assessment)

**Fall 2015:** 15 of 15 students assessed.

**Winter 2016:** 16 of 20 students assessed. (4 had withdrawn)

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

This course is offered in face-to-face format only. All students enrolled at the time of assessment were included with the exception of 1 student who did not complete the exam. Data collected from 4 consecutive semesters was included: Fall 2014, Winter 2015, Fall 2015, and Winter 2016. Generally only one section of Spanish 202 is offered per semester with winter enrollment numbers more robust and fall enrollment numbers lighter.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

SPN 202 is the final course in our 4 semester Spanish language sequence. It is an intermediate-level language course with an emphasis on interpreting and analyzing Spanish short stories.

**Tool:** Essay Exam

**Scoring:** Rubric (attached)

**Requirements:** For question one, students were required to interpret and analyze the themes and symbolism of the Spanish short story *De dentro hacia afuera*, written by Francisco Jiménez. For question two, they were required to compare and contrast this story with *La casa en Mango Street*, written by Sandra Cisneros. Students had to read and interpret the two short stories, written in Spanish, and communicate their ideas and literary analyses in the target language. They were also required to explore and analyze the themes and symbolism of both works, as well as include a plot summary of each story.

Each essay was evaluated according to following criteria:

Grammatical Accuracy & Use of Complex Sentence Structures

Accurate Application & Variation of Vocabulary, including Transitions

Complete & Appropriate Content and Effective Communication of Ideas

Proper Mechanics, Punctuation & Spelling

**Standard of Success:** The SOS listed on the master syllabus is that **70% of students** will score at the *intermediate level or higher*. A score of **75%** or higher on the essay exam is indicative of *intermediate level* communicative competence in the field of language study.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this

learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: <u>Yes</u>
<p>The standard of success was met.</p> <p><b>86.6%</b> (52 of 60 students assessed) scored 75% or higher on the assessment tool.</p> <p><b>13.3%</b> (8 of 60 students assessed) scored below 75% and did not meet the SOS.</p> <p>Of the 52 students that met the standard of success, 34.6% (18 of 52) demonstrated true mastery of outcome 2 by scoring between 90-100% on this outcome, which focuses on writing proficiency and reading comprehension. Here's the breakdown:</p> <p>30% (18 of 60) scored between 90-100%</p> <p>40% (24 of 60) scored between 80-89%</p> <p>16.6% (10 of 60) scored between 75%-79%</p> <p>13.3% (8 of 60) scored below 75% and thus did <u>not meet</u> the SOS.</p> <p>Also note that 7 students originally enrolled in the course had withdrawn prior to the administration of this assessment tool and 1 student who was enrolled did not complete it.</p>

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

<p>Based on their responses to the essay questions, students demonstrated a strong understanding (comprehension) of the stories and were able to summarize the general plotlines and interpret major themes. Overall they were able to effectively communicate their ideas despite structural errors.</p> <p>The assessment consisted of two essay questions and students demonstrated a higher level of success on the first essay, which required them to interpret and analyze a single short story.</p> <p>Other areas of strength included mastery of basic sentence structure and proper application of Spanish punctuation, including accent marks, as well as accurate spelling.</p>
--

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Students were able to comprehend, analyze and interpret an individual story quite well but some struggled when they were required to compare and contrast two stories. Also, while overall students did a good job interpreting themes, they were not always able to interpret authors' symbolism.

At times students did not demonstrate the linguistic skills required to communicate their ideas effectively and as a consequence, English interference and/or literal translations were apparent.

Also, while students were able to communicate their thoughts fairly well using basic sentence structure, a much smaller number of students were able to accurately use complex structures, including effective transitions.

## II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results

1. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

Whereas our first-year Spanish courses focus almost exclusively on grammar and vocabulary, this course contextualizes the language by using literature as a vehicle for language study and development. This assessment clearly shows that students develop intermediate-level language skills while simultaneously building a framework to interpret and analyze a literary work. In addition, mini cultural and history lessons are covered to provide context for the stories. This class is academically rigorous and often pushes students outside their comfort zone; however, students' growth is evident by the end of the semester, as demonstrated in this assessment report.

I was not surprised by the assessment results but did notice that a smaller percentage of students truly mastered the SLOs (earned between 90-100% on the learning outcomes) than generally do in our first-year courses. This is likely due to the challenging nature of this course.

On a purely pragmatic level, this course meets the needs of our students since it transfers on a one-to-one basis to The University of Michigan. Students that successfully complete our 4th semester course, automatically fulfill the language requirement of U of M's College of Literature, Science and Arts. Anecdotally, students that wish to go on in Spanish at 4-year schools generally place very well at the transfer institution after completion of this course.

2. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.



The results of this assessment will be shared at our departmental meeting during in-service this fall.

3.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	Outcomes will be modified to capture the interpretation and analysis of Spanish short stories.	In addition to the intermediate-level linguistic elements, students are required to interpret and discuss Spanish short stories throughout the semester. This is a major element of the course that is currently not captured in the outcome language.	2017
Assessment Tool	Assessment tools will be reviewed and modified, as needed, to assess the revised learning outcomes.	It's necessary to modify the learning outcomes in order to capture this essential element of the course.	2017
Objectives	Add learning objectives that flesh out the content of the course and also capture the interpretation and analysis of Spanish short stories.	The current learning objectives do not reflect several essential core requirements of the course.	2017
Other: Speaking Opportunities	Incorporate more opportunities for students to practice giving oral presentations in front of the class.	All students would benefit from additional speaking practice and some students struggled with their final oral presentations.	2017

4. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

For many courses at WCC, instructors need only to reflect on the single course they are assessing in order to target areas for improved student success. In contrast, courses such as SPN 202, which is the final course in a four semester language sequence, follow a different paradigm. Since the skills taught in the previous semesters scaffold up to the skills required for successful completion of this course, any weaknesses or gaps in a prereq course have profound impacts on student success in this capstone course. As a result, it is also necessary to evaluate the four semester language sequence as a whole.

This is an academically rigorous and challenging course. Students move beyond studying discrete grammar rules and vocab items to synthesizing their amassed linguistic arsenal in order to achieve intermediate-level communicative competence. All four language skills are practiced and honed throughout the semester - speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Students often confirm that this course is exponentially more difficult than the previous 3 semesters, which generally evaluate individual language elements in a more isolated fashion. As such, I recommend the incorporation of more assignments that require students to synthesize multiple language elements, beginning in SPN 111, our first semester course, and continued throughout the entire language sequence.

Furthermore, based on my observations from teaching this course for numerous years, as well as a thorough analysis of various student evaluation tools, coupled with course assessment results, it strikes me that the groundwork laid in the prerequisite courses is absolutely essential to student success in this capstone course. I've noted that students that were either unable to successfully complete this course, as well as those that may have technically met the SOS but never ultimately achieved true mastery of intermediate-level language skills, were bound by a common thread - failure to master core, foundational structural elements, particularly those covered in the first two semesters of language study. As such, I will stress the necessity of academic rigor and consistency in all sections of our first-year sequence during our departmental meeting this fall.

### III. Attached Files

[Spanish Writing Proficiency Rubric](#)

[Spanish Oral Proficiency Rubric](#)

[Assessment Results Spreadsheet](#)

**Faculty/Preparer:** Michelle Garey **Date:** 06/26/2017

**Department Chair:** Juan Redondo **Date:** 06/27/2017

**Dean:** Kristin Good **Date:** 07/05/2017

**Assessment Committee Chair:** Michelle Garey **Date:** 09/19/2017