



## Annual Assessment Report 2020-2021

### BA Spanish

### English & Modern Languages

### College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences

#### CONTACT

**Name of Program Assessment Lead** Amalia Llombart

**Name of Person Completing Report** Amalia Llombart

#### DISCIPLINARY ACCREDITATION No

#### DEVELOPMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

**How were the program's SLOs developed? (select all that apply)**

- Our disciplinary accrediting agency has recommended learning outcomes, so we used and/or modified them.

**Other than the CPP Catalog and the Office of Assessment and Program Review website, where else are your SLOs published? Select all that apply.**

- Department Website - provide URL: <https://www.cpp.edu/class/english-modernlanguages/about/thespanish-ba.shtml>

#### ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES IN 2020-2021

This section provides the opportunity for programs to share and discuss assessment activities conducted in **AY 2020-2021**. This includes data collection, rubric development, data analysis, discussion of findings, development or implementation of closing the loop improvement strategies, update of your assessment plan and/or curriculum matrix, etc.

**How many total SLOs does your program assess according to your assessment plan?**

- 5

**How many SLOs did your program assess this past year in 2020-2021?**

- My program assessed SLOs in AY 2020-2021

**Please list the SLOs examined**

- SLO #1: SLO 3: Critical reading of literary and cultural texts: Students will contextualize a variety of literary and cultural texts produced in Spanish within their time periods and countries and critique literary and cultural texts using current critical language.

**Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 3: Critical reading of literary and cultural texts: Students will contextualize a variety of literary and cultural texts produced in Spanish within their time periods and countries and critique literary and cultural texts using current critical language.**

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.)</li> <li>Scored direct evidence of student learning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Portfolio/E portfolio of student work</li> <li>Other: The portfolio is prepared during the Capstone course</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used rubric or scoring guide</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.)</li> <li>Scored and/or analyzed indirect evidence of student learning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student survey/interview/focus group with self-reports of SLO achievement</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussed assessment results to make program decisions to improve SLO achievement (e.g., design new course, modify assignments, etc.)</li> </ul>		

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
6	This year we decided to implement a qualitative approach to assessment. The faculty member teaching the Capstone course in spring 2021 selected two artifacts in the top level, two in a medium range, and two at the bottom level. Our goal was not to see how many students achieve a certain benchmark, but rather to make a qualitative assessment of the strengths and weaknesses in the students' critical reading of literary and cultural texts. Some of the questions we wanted find a response to were: What is it that they do well? What is it that students who do well still lack? What is it that students who do poorly still do well? This is what will allow us to see what is working as well as to devise new strategies to implement. In addition, we wanted to test our new SLO 3 rubric.	Since the goal was qualitative, we had not set a goal in terms of achieving a benchmark. So, it's difficult to respond to this question.	1) When we met to share our individual findings, we were positively surprised to see that we had assigned the same scores in most cases, with 1 point diversion in a few questions. Our qualitative comments were very similar too. 2) We realized that some performance criteria of the rubric did not apply to some of the artifacts. After discussing this, concluded the reason was that students did not always have papers that allowed us to see these elements. This is because the 3000-level literature courses have widened the range of written assignments and some do not fit all the criteria of the rubric. And some students do their advanced literature courses in the same semester as the Capstone. 3) In addition, we realized that students do not truly revise their old papers during the Capstone course, at least not beyond some mechanical aspects of writing. We considered modifying the rubric, but we decided against this idea, since we all thought the rubric includes the criteria that represents SLO #3. We finally decided to change the Capstone, which is something that had been in our minds for a while. Instead of requiring students to prepare a portfolio and a new research paper (which is now in groups, because we have more students than when the Capstone was designed), we decided to focus on producing a research paper, to which the rubric should be applicable without much problem.

## IMPROVING THROUGH ASSESSMENT

**Overall, what best describes how the program used the results in 2020-2021? Select all that apply.**

- Assessment procedure changes (SLOs, curriculum matrix, rubrics, evidence collected, sampling, communications with faculty, etc.)
- Course-level changes (e.g., syllabus, content, pedagogy)

**Ideas to improve student learning can come from different constituents. With whom did the program discuss assessment planning and/or share results during AY 2020-2021? Select all that apply.**

- Program/department faculty as whole

**The past academic year posed both challenges and opportunities. Please share any assessment discoveries (e.g., insights about assessment procedures, great achievements, etc.) regarding program assessment in 2020-2021 so that others may learn from your experiences.**

The main challenge we have observed is that students have had a hard time during the pandemic. Many have been ill, have had ill family members, and/or lost family members to COVID. Other students had their children at home. While being at home themselves was a good thing for them, oftentimes they were distracted in class, or had to have their camera off. This has forced us to find ways to become flexible and supportive while still being rigorous. We have extended deadlines and offered incompletes. We have also had to devise ways to avoid cheating in the exams. For that, we modified our prompts so that students had to apply their learned knowledge to real situations. Those types of activities are impossible to find online. On the other hand, in many cases, we realized that those new graded activities were more powerful to assess students' knowledge, because of the application component. In some cases, we still regret not being able to assess memorization of basic elements that need to be memorized. Zoom, a dreadful as it is for teaching, has proved very helpful for meetings, because it has allowed us to find more opportunities to meet and discuss curriculum redesign and assessment.

**CPP's GI2025 goals focus on eliminating equity gaps. What plans do you already implement, or would implement to support the campus' diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) efforts? (e.g., planned or current disaggregation of assessment data by race/ethnicity, etc.)**

The Spanish program is at the forefront of eliminating equity gaps. Based on the CSU's dashboard, 85% of the students in the Spanish program are URM (compare to 67% in CLASS). Likewise, 84% of our students are Latino/Hispanic, while 15% are "Other". (Compare to 67% URM, and 64% Latino, 4% Black; 12% White; 11% Asian in CLASS). All our pedagogical, curricular, and assessment strategies are geared specifically to our student make-up-- bilingual students who have been raised in a Spanish-speaking home either in the US or in a Spanish-speaking country. We do not use the "Spanish as a foreign language" approach that is used in many other universities. In fact, the research some of us conduct is related to the language development of Spanish Heritage Language Learners (Spanish-English bilinguals). We have just created a First Year Experience course to improve student's success in the program and offer career advice. Some of us create extra-curricular experiences (such as going to a Spanish film festival or the theater) to enrich students experiences in a way we know they would not do on their own. In addition, we are very aware of the personal situation of our students (work, family obligations, and we create an academic environment that is flexible to allow students to succeed despite their time constraints, while maintaining a rigorous program. Finally, the five tenure-line Spanish faculty members are advisors and meet regularly with our students to ensure they are strategic in their course enrollment and to give them post-graduation advice.

The most current assessment plan and curriculum matrix we have on file for your program may be found [here](#). To ensure we have the most updated assessment plan and curriculum matrix for your program, and for posting on our website, please upload the following documents:

**Assessment Plan** Yes

**Curriculum Matrix** Yes