



Annual Assessment Report 2022-2023

BA Spanish

English & Modern Languages

College of Letters, Arts, & Social Sciences

CONTACT

Name of Program Assessment Lead Amàlia Llombart

Name of Person Completing Report Amàlia Llombart

DISCIPLINARY ACCREDITATION No

DEVELOPMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

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

- We do not have disciplinary accreditation but drew from our disciplinary/professional organizations, and developed our SLOs as a program/department.
- We developed them as a program/department using our own knowledge and expertise of the field.

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 2022-2023

This section provides the opportunity for programs to share and discuss assessment activities conducted in **AY 2022-2023**. 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?

- 1

How many SLOs did your program assess this past year in 2022-2023?

- My program assessed SLOs in AY 2022-2023 (e.g., artifact collection, scoring, closing the loop, etc.). May also have engaged in assessment planning activities unrelated to specific SLOs (e.g., modified curriculum matrix, assessment plan, etc.).

Please list the SLOs examined

- SLO #1: Students will communicate orally in Spanish at a high level of proficiency about a variety of general and discipline-related topics.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): Students will communicate orally in Spanish at a high level of proficiency about a variety of general and discipline-related topics.

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) Scored direct evidence of student learning Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework Capstone product (e.g., project, senior thesis, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Used rubric or scoring guide
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.) Scored indirect evidence of student learning Interpreted and made meaning of findings for indirect evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student survey/interview/focus group with self-reports of SLO achievement 	

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
<p>We did two scoring rounds. In the first one, we scored a total of 30 artifacts—six artifacts from five different courses. Of these six, two were taken from the top, two from the middle, and two from the bottom, according as they had been graded and assessed in the course. The courses were: SPN 4610 (Capstone project), SPN 2130 (an argumentative essay), SPN 4420 (an infographic), SPN 3310 (a PowerPoint), SPN 3160 (Podcast script). Because we have recently made changes in our curriculum (through a Teagle curricular development grant) aiming at expanding the types and genres of writing our students produce, we wanted to examine how students performed in a variety of genres. We used this first scoring to do a more qualitative examination of our students' strengths at different levels, in different genres, and in the different subskills identified in the rubric. In the second round, we scored 12 artifacts: 4 (the two best and the two worse) from three courses: SPN 4610 (Capstone project), SPN 2130 (an argumentative essay), SPN 4420 (an infographic).</p>	<p>This was the first time we used this rubric. Therefore, we didn't have a definite criterion for success. During the year 2023-24, we will discuss what we consider success and what our expectations will be for the next time we assess the written communication SLO.</p>	<p>The only goal we had, which we had identified during the curricular redesign process (Teagle Grant) was for our students to be able to write in a variety of genres and types, going beyond the traditional "academic paper". That goal has been achieved, as we have seen that students have been writing in different genres—based on their response in the exit survey and the artifacts we scored.</p>	<p>These are the most eye-opening take aways we had after we scored the artifacts and we discussed them: 1. We find it very difficult to assess writing in isolation without considering content knowledge. 2. Many of the difficulties students have in writing originate at their difficulty in analytical thinking and abstract thinking. 3. Students write better when they have a clear and real audience/readership for their writing, and when they see their written text has a real application. 4. Despite the ubiquitous presence of infographics (in the media, around campus, etc.) students had real difficulties in that medium. 5. Peer review was an important tool for students' writing.</p>

IMPROVING THROUGH ASSESSMENT

Overall, what best describes how the program used the results in 2022-2023? Select all that apply.

- Use is pending (typical reasons: insufficient number of students in population, evidence not evaluated or interpreted yet, faculty discussions are ongoing, etc.)

Ideas to improve student learning can come from different constituents. With whom did the program discuss assessment planning and/or share results during AY 2021-2022? 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 2022-2023 so that others may learn from your experiences.

This past year we concluded a curricular redesign process we had been conducting with a Teagle grant. This was an opportunity to reflect in depth about some of our writing communication SLO. The challenge is to be sure we are assessing written proficiency in the best way. This particular SLO is entangled with other SLOs and sometimes is difficult to tease them apart. Quantitative assessment of this particular SLO is definitely a challenge, but we also realize that while we were trying to tell the story through numbers, we were getting qualitative insights.

Please share how the program triangulates various data sources to determine student success. Consider assessment findings, [CPP's GI2025 markers](#), [CSU Dashboard](#), [CPP's Student Success Dashboard on Tableau](#), course evaluations, etc.

Each of us takes our students evaluations and comments seriously and try to get as many insights on how to improve our efforts on student success as possible. We also get insights from our graduating seniors' comments on their exist surveys. And this year we are trying to make sense of the data we are receiving form the CSU Dashboard and Tableau, for our Program Review.

Does the program offer a certificate or credential (e.g., teaching credential)?

- No

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