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**H. ROMS Assessment Cycle 2019-2022**

**A. Learning Outcomes**

In the undergraduate programs offered by the Department of Romance Studies (ROMS), students will acquire competence in the practice and analysis of Romance languages together with a critical knowledge of the written, oral, and visual traditions of their origin and diaspora. Our faculty promotes interdisciplinary connections and incorporates the study of literature, culture, theory, and history across the curriculum. Through coursework that emphasizes language acquisition, rhetoric, composition, and written and oral expression, our majors receive sustained personalized training in critical thinking and close reading.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Upon completion of the BA program in Romance Languages, students should be able to:

• Participate in conversations on concrete, social, academic, and professional topics.

• Speak in detail about experiences and events in a variety of time frames and moods.

• Represent points of view in discussions, both oral and written.

• Deliver well-organized presentations on concrete, academic and professional topics.

• Write on a wide variety of general interest, professional, and academic topics.

• Follow narrative, informational, and descriptive speech on concrete, academic and professional topics.

• Understand and discuss texts representing a variety of topics and genres.

These competencies correspond to the Performance Indicators for Language Learners developed by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages.[[2]](#footnote-2)

**B. Description and Rationale of ROMS Assessment Cycle 2015-2018**

**B1. Description**

The Department of Romance Studies has been undertaking regular outcomes assessment of its BA in Romance Languages since 2011. The Department has cycled completely through its original plan and is now employing a revised one. The assessment cycle currently being used measures the progress of student learning from the second-year (intermediate) level through the upper-level undergraduate majors. The cycle began in Fall 2015, evaluated progress in Fall 2016 and Spring 2017, and ended with the Outgoing Major Assessment & Survey at graduation Spring 2018 and Spring 2019.

To this purpose, the Programs Assessment Committee established a **cohort** of majors and potential majors in each of the four languages taught in ROMS: French, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish. The Spanish cohort consists of a group of declared majors from 9 of the 18 sections of SPAN 204 offered in Fall 2015. The French cohort consists of all students in all the FREN 203 sections (9) taught in Fall 2015, the Italian cohort consists of all students in all ITAL 203 sections taught in Fall 2015 (6), and the Portuguese cohort consists of all students in all the PORT 203 sections taught in Fall 2015 (5).

In Fall 2015, the **instrument** to measure performance was an oral interview or presentation carried out in the intermediate language classes listed above. In FREN, ITAL, and PORT 203, the instrument was an oral interview; in SPAN 204, the instrument consisted of two oral presentations. All instructors passed on their results to the assessment coordinator for each language who then wrote a short report. In addition, course coordinators and assessment coordinators across the languages were invited to share the assessment results with instructors.

The guidelines and **rubrics** used for the evaluations of the oral interview/ presentations are similar across languages (see competencies below), although they do, of course, emerge from the course material and curriculum.

The main **competency** measured was the students’ comprehensibility, according to the World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages: at the Intermediate-Low Level, the students are expected to express their own thoughts using sentences and strings of sentences when interacting on familiar topics in present time; make themselves understood by those accustomed to interacting with language learners; use pronunciation and intonation patterns which can be understood by a native speaker accustomed to interacting with language learners; occasionally make false starts and pause to search for words when interacting with others.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The **cohort**, **instrument**, **rubrics**, and **competencies** used in the **follow-up assessment** of FREN, ITAL, SPAN 300, and PORT 310[[4]](#footnote-4) for Fall 2016 are described below. The **cohort** emerged from the initial cohort established at the intermediate level in Fall 2015. In Fall 2016 and Spring 2017, only those students who moved from FREN, ITAL, PORT 203, and SPAN 204 into the 300-level courses were assessed.[[5]](#footnote-5) The **instrument** was a writing assignment or an equivalent exercise, and the **rubrics** were those regularly used by all instructors of these classes. The **competencies** are as follows: Comprehensibility, Comprehension, Language Control, Vocabulary Use, Communication Strategies, and Cultural Awareness.

Once the assessment of the 200- and 300-levels was completed, each Assessment Coordinator wrote a short report that was then passed on to the Director of Assessment. When the cohort goes through graduation, all students belonging to that cohort will be asked to take the Undergraduate Major Assessment & Survey. The Director of Assessment, with the help from the Programs Assessment committee, will then finalize the Outcomes Assessment Report for upper-level undergraduate majors in Romance Languages.

**Rubrics** for all assessments are available upon request from the Director of Programs Assessment.

The **competencies** assessed in the FREN/ ITAL/ PORT/ SPAN 300-level courses correspond to the Advanced-Low Learner Range, according to the World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages developed by ACTFL.[[6]](#footnote-6)

These competencies tie in with the **mission** developed by the Department of Romance Studies, “a diverse, multicultural, and plurilingual academic unit that engages in research and instruction in French, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, and the historical minority languages of Europe and the Americas. The principal aims of the department are to preserve, increase, and transmit knowledge and understanding of the Romance languages, literatures, and cultures within the global and regional contexts in which they have developed. Our course offerings present diverse approaches to the study, production, and appreciation of literary and nonliterary texts. The program offers a wide historical, literary, linguistic, social, and cultural emphasis that considers, among other topics, East-West, trans-Atlantic, and transcontinental discourses that have taken place among Europe, the Americas, Africa, and Asia; as well as North-South literary and cultural dialogues between Europe and Africa, and within the Americas.”[[7]](#footnote-7)

These pieces are the second and third year assessment in a cyclical approach to performance assessment (i.e. **Integrated Performance Assessment**, **IPA**) during which an interpretive communication phase (1st year)[[8]](#footnote-8) is followed by an interpersonal communication phase (2nd year) which is then followed by a presentational communication phase (3d year).[[9]](#footnote-9) (Note: Assessment in this context means the assessment of what students do in our program, not of what they should or could be doing under the best of circumstances or how well we should perform as instructors[[10]](#footnote-10)).

**B2. Rationale–Integrated Performance Assessment (IPA)**

**Cohort:** In FREN, ITAL, and PORT the beginning intermediate level is the one where many students decide whether they will continue to pursue language study before they take at least one more preparatory course (204) prior to being permitted to enroll in 300 Grammar Review and Composition, the foundational course for all majors. Many students declare their majors in these languages as they rise throughout the sequence. FREN, ITAL, and PORT 203 is also the last course of the sequence of three courses fulfilling the foreign language requirement for most majors at UNC.

Though students can study abroad at many stages of their program, and though SPAN 204 is the prerequisite for most of the study abroad programs in Spain and Latin America, FREN and SPAN 300 are the courses required for “direct enroll” study abroad programs, where students take the same university classes as the regular undergraduates in the country.

In Spanish, we have assessed the progression from 204 to 300, rather than from 203 as in the other languages, because of the slightly different nature of the program: students completing SPAN 203 who are considering a major in Hispanic Linguistics or Hispanic Literatures and Cultures, or a minor in Hispanic Studies, must complete 204 and then a fifth-semester course: 255, 260 or 266 (Conversation for Heritage Speakers). Spanish 260 is the required course for the majors. After completing the appropriate fifth-semester course, the student then takes 300 Spanish Composition and Grammar Review (gateway for both majors).[[11]](#footnote-11)

In addition, the majority of SPAN majors initially place into 204 or 255/260 via AP Language, SATII, IB or our UNC online placement exam. Students who score 4 or 5 on the AP Lit exam also receive credit for 260, thus placing them into 300—but this is a much smaller group.

**Instrument:** Throughout the languages in the Department of Romance Studies, the second- and third-year courses are four skills courses developing both the students’ more receptive abilities (listening, reading) and their productive skills (speaking, writing). The reason we began the outcomes assessment by testing speaking (and listening to some extent) in 203/204 is that all intermediate language classes in ROMS promote language proficiency through a communicative approach. Oral performance is therefore central to our BA program in Romance Languages and corresponds to the students’ desire for increased emphasis on oral proficiency. We then proceed to evaluate productive skills in writing on the 300-level which corresponds to the Advanced-Low Level according to ACTFL standards.

**Generic Peer-editing Rubric** for Advanced-Low Level (FREN/ ITAL/ PORT/ SPN 300-level):

*Comprehensibility*: Control of tenses, detailed / depth of expressions.

*Comprehension*: Details with inferences, cultural nuances, can clarify and transfer to another context.

*Language Control*: Capable of complexity, still present-tense bound, more idiomatic usage.

*Vocabulary*: Culturally authentic expressions, variety and use of idioms, use target language to define target language.

*Cultural Awareness*: analyze perspectives, use idioms.

*Communication Strategies*: sustain use of target language, degree of analysis, refining and detailed.[[12]](#footnote-12)

**C. IPA for the BA in Romance Languages – Phase 1**

**C1. Cohort Building and Assessment for French 203 Fall 2015**

In Fall 2015, the French section, in compliance with the revised Outcomes Assessment Plan for the BA in Romance Languages, began the first phase of its assessment cycle. This consisted in establishing a cohort of (potential) majors that will enable the department to measure the progress of student learning from the second-year (intermediate) level through the upper-level undergraduate majors. The current French cohort consists of all students in all the FREN 203 sections (9) taught in Fall, that is a total of 165 students.

In Fall 2015, the **instrument** to measure performance was an oral interview. This 10-15 min. pair interview was carried out according to current practice in all FREN 203 sections, that is, students received a prompt in preparation, instructors received guidelines for listening and grading, and students brought the required rubrics to their appointments. All instructors then passed on their results to the Assessment Coordinator for French (individual rubrics/grade sheets, copy and electronic copy of a list of all students’ grades for each section).

The main **competency** measured was the students’ comprehensibility, according to the World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages: the students were expected to express their own thoughts using sentences and strings of sentences when interacting on familiar topics in present time; make themselves understood by those accustomed to interacting with language learners; use pronunciation and intonation patterns which can be understood by a native speaker accustomed to interacting with language learners; occasionally make false starts and pause to search for words when interacting with others.[[13]](#footnote-13)

The results of the 9 sections of FREN 203 were the following:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sec.** | **Name** | **Class** |  **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **F** | **High** | **Low** | **Average** |
| 1 | Caitlin LeClair | 16 | 2 | 10 | 4 | - | - | 95 | 70 | 82.7 |
| 2 | Valérie Pruvost | 20 | 7 | 11 | 2 | - | - | 93 | 78 | 86 |
| 3 | Caitlin LeClair | 21 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 3 | - | 95 | 60 | 80.3 |
| 4 | Monica Scovell | 17 | 6 | 6 | 5 | - | - | 95 | 74.5 | 85.2 |
| 5 | Maury Bruhn | 19 | 3 | 12 | 4 | - | - | 91 | 76 | 84.5 |
| 6 | Monica Scovell | 15 | 5 | 8 | 2 | - | - | 95 | 70 | 85.8 |
| 7 | Dorothea Heitsch | 20 | 9 | 11 | - | - | - | 95 | 80 | 87.5 |
| 8 | Maury Bruhn | 17 | 6 | 7 | 4 | - | - | 95 | 70.5 | 84.8 |
| 9 | Adrianna Beaman | 20 | 4 | 10 | 6 | - | - | 93.5 | 75 | 82.9 |
| Total |  | 165 | 47 | 81 | 34 | 3 | - | 94.2 | 72.6 | 84.4 |

**C2. Cohort Building and Assessment for Italian 203 Fall 2015**

In Fall 2015, the Italian section, in compliance with the revised Outcomes Assessment Plan for the BA in Romance Languages, began the first phase of its assessment cycle. In this phase our goal was to establish a cohort of (potential) majors and minors that would allow us to measure the progress of student learning from the second-year (intermediate) language courses through the upper-level undergraduate courses typically populated by language majors (or minors). The Italian cohort documented in this report consists of all students enrolled in ITAL 203 in Fall 2015. This includes 6 separate sections for a total of 97 students.

The **instrument** we used in Fall 2015 to measure performance was an oral interview. This 10-minute interview between instructor and student was carried out uniformly across all ITAL 203 sections. In accordance with the thematic, lexical, and grammatical content of the current curriculum, the context used was a job interview. Prior to the interview, students wrote a resume and a cover letter identifying their professional interests and their experience. These prompts allowed them to prepare vocabulary relevant for the ensuing conversation. On the day of the interview, all instructors assessed and graded their students’ performance, using a standard rubric developed by the Department for this purpose. All instructors then passed on their results to the Assessment Coordinator for Italian (individual rubrics/grade sheets, copy and electronic copy of a list of all students’ grades for each section).

For the main **competency** measured, see note 13, above.

The results of the 6 sections of ITAL 203 were the following:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sec.** | **Name** | **Class** |  **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **F** | **High** | **Low** | **Average** |
| 1 | April Weintritt | 14 | 8 | 5 | 1 | - | - | 97 | 77 | 89.6 |
| 2 | Alessia Martini | 17 | 14 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 100 | 75 | 92.8 |
| 3 | Alessia Martini | 19 | 15 | 4 | - | - | - | 100 | 80 | 93.7 |
| 4 | Martino Rabaioli | 18 | 15 | 3 | - | - | - | 100 | 85 | 94.4 |
| 5 | Martino Rabaioli | 15 | 14 | 1 | - | - | - | 100 | 85 | 97.4 |
| 6 | Giovanni Del Giudice | 14 | 11 | 3 | - | - | - | 95 | 80 | 90.6 |
| Total |  | 97 | 77 | 18 | 2 | - | - | 98.6 | 80.3 | 93.1 |

**C3. Cohort Building and Assessment for Portuguese 203 Fall 2015**

In Fall 2015, the Portuguese section, in compliance with the revised Outcomes Assessment Plan for the BA in Romance Languages, began the first phase of its assessment cycle. In this phase our goal was to establish a cohort of (potential) majors and minors that would allow us to measure the progress of student learning from the second-year (intermediate) language courses through the upper-level undergraduate courses typically populated by language majors (or minors). The Portuguese cohort documented in this report consists of all students enrolled in PORT 203 in Fall 2015. This includes 4 separate sections for a total of 81 students. However, one of the instructors failed to comply with instructions and for that single section of approximately 20 students, we have no data.

The **instrument** we used in Fall 2015 to measure performance was an oral interview. This 5-7-minute presentation in front of the class and was carried out uniformly across all PORT203 sections. There was no common theme for the interview across PORT 203 sections. However, regardless of theme, each instructor provided students with a prompt and preparatory material.

These prompts allowed them to prepare vocabulary relevant for the ensuing conversation. On the day of the presentation, all instructors assessed and graded their students’ performance, using a standard rubric developed by the Portuguese section for this purpose. All instructors then passed on their results to the Assessment Coordinator for Portuguese (individual rubrics/grade sheets, copy and electronic copy of a list of all students’ grades for each section).

For the main **competency** measured, see note 13, above.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sec.** | **Name** | **Class** |  **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **F** | **High** | **Low** | **Average** |
| 1 | Kristine Taylor | 21 | 15 | 6 | - | - | - | 96 | 84 | 90 |
| 2 | Frederico Castellões | no data | no data | no data | no data | no data | no data | no data | no data | no data |
| 3 | Kristine Taylor | 19 | 18 | 1 | - | - | - | 96 | 85 | 90.5 |
| 4 | Richard Vernon | 21 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 1 | - | 100 | 65 | 82.5 |
| Total |  | 61 | 37 | 14 | 9 | 1 | - | 97.3 | 78 | 88 |

**C4. Cohort Building and Assessment for Spanish 204 Fall 2015**

In Fall 2015, the Spanish section, in compliance with the revised Outcomes Assessment Plan for the BA in Romance Languages, began the first phase of its assessment cycle. This consisted in establishing a cohort of (potential) majors that will enable the department to measure the progress of student learning from the fourth semester (intermediate) level through the upper-level undergraduate majors. The current Spanish cohort consists of all students from 9 selected sections of SPAN 204, Intermediate Spanish II.18 There were 161 students total.

In Fall 2015, the **instruments** to measure performance were two oral presentations that students gave during class. These two presentations were carried out according to current practice in all SPAN 204 sections, that is, students received instructions in preparation, instructors received guidelines for grading, and students were all evaluated using the same rubric. All instructors then passed on their results to the Assessment Coordinator for Spanish (individual rubrics/grade sheets, and a hard copy of of all students’ grades for each section).

For the main **competency** measured, see note 13, above.

The results of the 9 sections of SPAN 204 were the following (the number noted parenthetically is the actual section number):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sec.** | **Name** | **Class** |  **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **F** | **High** | **Low** | **Average** |
| 1 (6) | de Fays | 19 | 8 | 11 | - | - | - | 95 | 82.5 | 88.8 |
| 2 (12) | de Fays | 17 | 3 | 14 | - | - | - | 94 | 80 | 86.1 |
| 3 (13) | Kim | 19 | 13 | 6 | - | - | - | 95.5 | 84.5 | 90.6 |
| 4 (2) | Kim | 16 | 8 | 8 | - | - | - | 94.5 | 82 | 89.9 |
| 5 (15) | Munñoz-Hermoso | 15 | 5 | 10 | - | - | - | 97.5 | 81.5 | 87.4 |
| 6 (16) | Noffsinger | 18 | 10 | 7 | 1 | - | - | 97 | 75 | 90.6 |
| 7 (4) | Costa | 16 | 13 | 1 | - | - | 2 | 98.5 | 46.5 | 88.8 |
| 8 (17) | Huesa | 22 | 13 | 7 | - | - | 2 | 98 | 40 | 87.3 |
| 9 (18) | Huesa | 19 | 11 | 8 | - | - | - | 99 | 83.5 | 90.8 |
| Total |  | 161 | 84 | 72 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 96.5 | 72.8 | 88.9 |

**D. IPA for the BA in Romance Languages – Phase 2**

**D1. 300-level Assessment in French**

The assessment **instrument** was the second version of an end-of semester personal critique of a movie that the students had watched before. This assessment was prepared by the instructor through a unit on movies, then a written justification by each student for his/ her choice of movie, a draft of the critique that was peer edited in class, and a final version of the critique.

This is part of the academic writing goal for this course, guiding students in analyzing a film, one of the many analytic tasks they would be expected to do in literature, culture, and conversation classes, applying their critical skills to a visual genre and also building on what they usually know about film analysis from other courses and their personal experience in reading film critiques. Of course this also builds vocabulary skills and narrative as well as critical skills.

For the 300-level assessment, the assessment coordinator (*who was not the instructor*) had at her disposal the composition **prompts**, copies of each graded **composition**, and grading **rubrics**. She was able to compare the assessment results of the two sections FREN 300 for consistency. She then had a brief follow-up meeting with the instructors of the two sections.

For the competency measured, see **Generic Peer-editing Rubric** for Advanced-Low Level, above.

The assessment coordinator determined a cohort of six students who moved from FREN 203 Intermediate I in the fall 2015 to FREN 300 Advanced Grammar and Composition in the fall 2016.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | FREN 203 – Fall 2015 | FREN 300 – Fall 2016/ Spring 2017 |
|  | Interview / Speaking | Composition / Writing  |
| Adington, Kevin | 203.00395 | 300.00292 |
| Bowman, Grace | 203.00687 | 300.00271 |
| Gracieux, Marcy | 203.00994 | 300.00296 |
| Harkins, Lexi | 203.00192 | 300.001 (sp 17)94 |
| Heath, George | 203.00495 | 300.001 (sp 17)96 |
| Johnson, Imani | 203.00379 | 300.00194 |
| Moore, Nicole | 203.00495 | 300.00175 |
| Proctor, Annie | 203.00195 | 300.00275 |

**D2. 300-level Assessment in Italian**

The assessment **instrument** was an interview about art conducted by pairs of students. Playing the roles of art critics, they articulated a series of questions and responses in reference to works of art at the university art museum. In preparation for this activity, students had to speak informally about the art work on their first visit to the museum, noting associations they had with each work of art under study, whether they liked it or not, and which they felt most like analyzing and discussing during the assessment. During the assessment itself, students had to ask and answer questions regarding the technical elements of the art, the history of the artist, his or her influences and/or the artistic movements behind the works of art under discussion. Some research outside of class was necessary in order to become sufficiently knowledge about the artists and works of art to conduct a substantive interview.

Each student was assessed on the basis of the content of their observations (precise and well-chosen lexicon; analysis, logic, complexity of argument); as well as on their oral production of that content (pronunciation, fluency, dynamism, etc.)

For the 300-level assessment, the assessment coordinator (*who was not the instructor)* had at her disposal the interview **prompts** and copies of the grading **rubrics**. She also met with the instructor of the course (Ital 310–Italian Conversation) to get a fuller understanding of the rationale behind the assessment and the point at the semester in which it was conducted (toward the end).

For the competency measured, see **Generic Peer-editing Rubric** for Advanced-Low Level, above.

The assessment coordinator determined a cohort of four students who moved from ITAL 203 Intermediate I in the fall 2015 to ITAL 310 Italian Conversation in the fall 2016. In addition, the assessment coordinator determined a cohort of three students who had moved from ITAL 203 Intermediate Italian I in Fall 2015 to ITAL 300 Communicating in Italian: Media, Culture, and Society in Spring 2017. This was done in order to have a more robust cohort.[[14]](#footnote-14)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | ITAL 203 | ITAL 310 |
|  | Interview / Speaking | Interview / Speaking |
| Drake, Jordan | 203.002100 | 310.00193 |
| Mathews, Austin | 203.00497 | 310.00195 |
| Parker, Josey | 203.00496 | 300.00191 |
| Utter, Maggie | 203.004100 | 300.00192 |
|  |  | ITAL 300 sp 2017 |
|  |  | Writing |
| Edgerton Emily | 203.00598 | 300.00192 |
| Navarro, Karina | 203.003100 | 300.00182 |
| Sefler, Megan | 203.00195 | 300.00198 |

**D3. 300-level Assessment in Portuguese**

The assessment **instrument** was the students’ final exam essay dealing with films the students had seen throughout the semester. Students were given the choice between three different essay questions or topics based on material studied through the semester. In the first, students were asked to compare two films that deal with the same themes of social division and revenge but that treat them differently; the second question asked students to analyze the narrative device of “a story within a story” present in three films; and the third asked students to compare two films, one of which was produced mid-20th century and the other in 2015. Both films deal with the exploitation of one social class by another. Students were to discuss to what extent the more recent film evinces social progress from the period in which the first film was produced.

The assignment was an extension of an earlier oral assignment that included students leading discussions on the same films. The written assignment is an analysis of the films.

For the 300-level assessment, the assessment coordinator (*who was not the instructor)* had at his disposal the essay **questions**, the essays themselves, and copies of the grading **rubrics**. He met with the course instructor (PORT 323 – Cultures of Brazil, Portugal, and Lusophone Africa) to impart a deeper understanding of the rationale behind the assessment and the point at the semester in which it was to be conducted (toward the end).

For the competency measured, see **Generic Peer-editing Rubric** for Advanced-Low Level, above.

In Portuguese, because our 310 course was cancelled in Fall of 2016, we did not have an established cohort that began in 200-level courses. In fact, no student in our Spring 2017 300-level course had taken 203 in Fall 2015. For this reason, we are starting a cohort beginning with students from Spring 2017 PORT 323 that will be re-assessed in Fall 2017 PORT 310.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   | PORT 323 |
|  | Composition / Writing |
| Cassidy, Amber | 88 |
| Grand, Shannon | 88 |
| Jiminez, Carmerci | 100 |
| Kisiluk, Natasha | 88 |
| Sever, Veronica | 87 |

**Change in Portuguese Assessment due to course cancellation**

One student only, Shannon Leigh Grand, was assessed through PORT 323 and PORT 310 (Spring 2017, Fall 2017). The student is able to sustain communication in connected discourse of paragraph length with suitable accuracy and confidence.

**D4. 300-level Assessment in Spanish**

The assessment instrument was an end-of semester paper/peer-editing rubric for a research paper. Students in both tracks of SPAN 300 were given a list of topics from which to choose. They were required to write 2-3 pages typed and cite a least three sources. Students submitted the first draft of their paper, and then peer-edited the work of a partner using a detailed peer-editing rubric. The critera and responses on the rubric were all given in the target language. Students made revisions based on the peer feedback their received before submitting the final paper. Some variations in how the assignment was handled were left up to the discretion of the individual instructor.

For the 300-level assessment, the assessment coordinator (*who was not the instructor*) had at her disposal the peer editing rubrics used in the assignment, and the final grades for the research paper.

For the competency measured, see **Generic Peer-editing Rubric** for Advanced-Low Level, above.

The assessment coordinator determined a cohort of fourteen students who moved from SPAN 204 Intermediate II in the Fall of 2015 to SPAN 300 Advanced Grammar and Composition in the Fall 2016.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | SPAN 204Fall 2015Section | SPAN 204 Oral Presentation Grade | SPAN 300Fall 2016 Section | SPAN 300 Final Writing Project Grade |
| Thomas Andrews | 04 | 93.5 | 03 | 85 |
| William Bradshaw | 16 | 95 | 03 | 90 |
| Morgan Bizzell | 12 | 91 | 04  | 78 |
| Chelsea Cronin | 17 | 92.5 | 01 | 89 |
| Hannah Factor | 18 | 94.5 | 05 | 90 |
| Kinsey Fisher | 17 | 98 | 02 | 82 |
| Megan Fleming | 18 | 88.5 | 04 | 85 |
| Tiffany Gibbs | 16 | 75 | 05 | 75 |
| Mariah Harrelson | 13 | 94 | 04 | 92 |
| Brooke Hess | 18 | 86.5 | 03 | 90 |
| Carly Michelakis | 12 | 87 | 01 | 92  |
| Hannah Nunn | 15 | 86.5 | 03 | 88 |
| Nonso Obi-Guachai | 16 | 88 | 04 | 83 |
| Rachel Pomeroy | 04 | 97 | 05 | 84 |

**E. IPA for the BA in Romance Languages – Phase 3**

The Programs Assessment Committee followed the cohort started in 2015 through graduation with the Outgoing Major Assessment & Survey. This survey is taken once a year in the spring by all outgoing ROMS majors. The results for our cohort came in at the end of Spring 2018 and Spring 2019. The committee has thus completed its report for this assessment cycle, checked it against the World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages developed by ACTFL,[[15]](#footnote-15) and will share it with the department, both at a department meeting to be determined and on faculty space. Suggestions for adjustment will then be incorporated before the start of a new assessment cycle.

**E1. ROMS Outcomes and Outcomes Assessment of the Undergraduate Program**

Mission:

The mission of the BA in Romance Languages is to provide opportunities for studying the languages, literatures, and cultures of France, Italy, Portugal, Brazil, Spain, Spanish America and other countries and regions where Romance languages are spoken. Students acquire competence in language together with a knowledge and appreciation of the civilization, culture, and literature of peoples who speak that language. Such knowledge and skills have become increasingly important because of the economic and political significance of these languages abroad and in our multicultural society in the United States.

Responsibility for Assessing Outcomes and Reviewing Results:

The departmental Programs Asessment Committee (5 members from across the languages in consultation with DUS) is charged with program assessment. The committee meets regularly to review student performance and curriculum issues and to make recommendations about program improvements.

The department’s Outcomes Assessment Plan & Report 2019 summarizes the Undergraduate Outcomes Assessment as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expected Student Learning Outcomes: At the end of the program, students will be able to: | Assessment Methods To Be Used | Performance Targets | Implementation Schedule  |
| 1. Follow narrative, informational, and descriptive speech on concrete, academic and professional topics. | Oral interview or presentation evaluated through a rubric, using sample of students in intermediate (200-level) language classes in each of four languages taught in ROMS (FREN, ITAL, PORT, SPAN). | Average performance meets Intermediate-Low Level criteria according to the World Readiness Standards for Learning Language developed by ACTFL. | First year of three-year cycle (Fall 2015) |
| 2. Participate in conversations on concrete, social, academic, and professional topics. | Oral interview or presentation evaluated through a rubric, using sample of students in intermediate (200-level) language classes in each of four languages taught in ROMS (FREN, ITAL, PORT, SPAN). | Average performance meets Intermediate-Low Level criteria according to the World Readiness Standards for Learning Language developed by ACTFL. | First year of three-year cycle (Fall 2015) |
| 3. Speak in detail about experiences and events in a variety of time frames and moods. | Oral interview or presentation evaluated through a rubric, using sample of students in intermediate (200-level) language classes in each of four languages taught in ROMS (FREN, ITAL, PORT, SPAN). | Average performance meets Intermediate-Low Level criteria according to the World Readiness Standards for Learning Language developed by ACTFL. | First year of three-year cycle (Fall 2015) |
| 4. Deliver well-organized presentations on concrete, academic and professional topics. | Oral interview or presentation evaluated through a rubric, using sample of students in intermediate (200-level) language classes in each of four languages taught in ROMS (FREN, ITAL, PORT, SPAN). | Average performance meets Intermediate-Low Level criteria according to the World Readiness Standards for Learning Language developed by ACTFL. | First year of three-year cycle (Fall 2015) |
| 5. Represent points of view in discussions, both oral and written. | Writing projects and final exam essays from 300-level courses were evaluated with a rubric by instructors and peers, as well as an assessment coordinator who was not the instructor. | Average performance is in the Advanced-Low Learner Range, according to the World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages. | Second year of three-year cycle (Fall 2016/Spring 2017) |
| 6. Understand and discuss texts representing a variety of topics and genres.  | Final exam essays from 300-level courses were evaluated with a rubric by instructors and peers, as well as an assessment coordinator who was not the instructor. | Average performance is in the Advanced-Low Learner Range, according to the World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages. | Second year of three-year cycle (Fall 2016/Spring 2017) |
| 7. Write on a wide variety of general interest, professional, and academic topics. | Review of Honors Theses and Outgoing Major Assessment & Survey. | Holistic comparison to World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages developed by ACTFL. | Third year of three-year cycle (Spring 2018/Spring 2019) |

Other Program Goals and Metrics Tracked, Results, and Improvements: Metrics the program tracks on a regular basis to measure other aspects of academic program quality besides student learning, such as completion rates, time-to-degree, diversity, etc.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Goals | Assessment Methods To Be Used | Performance Targets | Implementation Schedule  |
| 1. Align Honors Thesis requirements across languages in ROMS | Assessment Committee meeting | Integrate Honors Thesis in all four languages | 2019-2020 |
| 2. Alignment with changing curricular needs | Committee work | Workshops | Every three to four years, according to assessment cycle |
| 3. Alignment with changing student demographics | Assessment SurveyUndergraduate Advising AppointmentsDepartmental Committee meetings | Maintain and increase the number of ROML majorsProgram renewal | Annually |

**E2. 2019 BA ROML Major Satisfaction Survey: 26 out of 110 graduating majors took the survey.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What is your Major? | FREN 1/26 | ITAL0/26 | PORT0/26 | HL11/26 | HLC14/26 |  | In Spring 2019, ROMS graduated |
| Is this your primary major or a second major? | Primary 7/26 | Second19/26 |  |  |  |  | 110 majors, 29 first and 81 second |
| 2. How would you rate the diversity of course offerings in the FREN/ITAL/SPAN major on a scale of 1-5 ? | Excellent 7  | Good12 | Fair6 | Poor | Very Poor | n/a | No answer1 |
| 3. How would you rate the quality of instruction in the FREN/ITAL/ SPAN major on a scale of 1-5 ? | Excellent 14 | Good7 | Fair4 | Poor | Very Poor | n/a | No answer1 |
| 4. How would you rate the quality of departmental advising in the FREN/ITAL/SPAN major on a scale 1-5 ? | Excellent 9 | Good 7 | Fair2 | Poor 1 | Very Poor1 | n/a5 | No answer1 |
| 5. What is your overall assessment of the FREN/ITAL/SPAN majoron a scale 1-5 ? | Excellent 11 | Good12 | Fair 2 | Poor  | Very Poor | n/a | No answer1 |
| 6. How would you rate your progress in overall proficiency in speaking, writing, listening, and reading gained through coursework on a scale 1-5? | Excellent 11 | Good13 | Fair1 | Poor | Very Poor | n/a | No answer1 |
| 7. Did you study abroad? | Yes16 |  |  | No9 |  |  | 1 |
| If yes, please indicate the length of your program: | 1 sem.6 | summer9 | Year1 |  |  |  |  |
| 8. How would you rate your progress toward developing proficiency in speaking, writing, listening and reading through your Study Abroad experience? | Excellent12 | Good3 | Fair | Poor | Very Poor | n/a1 | No answer |
| 9. Are you completing an Honors Thesis? | Yes2 |  |  | No23 |  |  | Why not?time constraints,lack of info |
| 10. Have you participated in any Extracurricular Activities or Initiatives related to your FREN/ITAL/SPAN studies? | Yes14 |  |  | No11 |  |  | No answer1 |
| How would you rate your progress toward developing proficiency in speaking, writing, listening and reading through Extracurricular Initiatives? | Excellent7 | Good4 | Fair1 | Poor1 | Very Poor | n/a1 | No answer |
| What was the best part of your experience in the major? | caringprofessors | interesting classes | studyabroad |  |  |  |  |
| What would improve your experience in the major? | connectionsacross ROMS | connectionsacross levels | onversation events |  |  |  |  |

**BA Honors Theses 2018-2019**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Students Name* | *Thesis Title* |
| Larson, Jacob(French) | The Representation of Franco-American Identity in Folk Tales |
| Quigley, Kaitlyn(Spanish) | La Identidad Española: Desarrollo, evolución y predicciones para el futuro |
| Stogner, Tess(French) | Traditionalism and the Tour de France |
| Trumpower, Dana(French) | Fin du Monde, Fin du Mois, Même Combat: A Spatio-Temporal Analysis of Social and Environmental Inequalities in France |

**F. Romance Studies Graduate Outcomes Assessment Report 2019**

1. What outcomes were you scheduled to assess during this annual reporting period? What outcomes did you assess?

The Graduate Program is regularly being monitored through surveys conducted by the Director of Graduate Studies in consultation with the Graduate Advisory Committee. The results are then shared with the Programs Assessment Committee as well as with other sections of the Department of ROMS.

2. What evidence did you collect? Summarize your findings.

Six students completed their Thesis Substitute Research paper during the reporting period. Writing the Thesis Substitute includes regular meetings with the graduate faculty member overseeing the paper which goes through multiple drafts until the faculty member deems it worthy of publication in a top journal in the field. The paper represents original research and a significant contribution to the respective field. It must also be polished in terms of adherence to style and research methodology. All six students were deemed to have completed the paper satisfactorily.

3. What did you and your faculty learn about your program and/or your students from the evaluation of the evidence? What strengths and areas of concern have emerged?

The thesis substitute has been very successful as a signpost for graduate students.

4. As a result of your assessment, what changes, if any, have you and your faculty implemented or plan to implement to address areas of concern?

No changes.

5. What outcomes are you planning to assess for the next annual reporting period?

We have assessed the success rate of the Qualifying Exams and have improved it from 43% in 2017 to 90% in 2018 and 2019. This is due to a reduced and restructured reading list in Spanish.

The department’s Outcomes Assessment Plan & Report 2019 summarizes the Graduate Outcomes Assessment as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expected Student Learning Outcomes  | Assessment Methods To Be Used | Performance Targets | Implementation Schedule  |
| 1. PhD students will demonstrate oral and written proficiency, and knowledge of the language, literature(s), and critical issues pertaining to their major field of study. | Analysis of a sample of 2nd-year research paper/thesis substitute or PhD thesis. a) Qualifying Exam b) Research Paperc) Doctoral Written Exam | Successful completion of paper / thesis. a) 90% pass on first attempt (up from 43% in 2017)\*b) 100% pass on first attemptc) 100% pass on first attempt | Annually  |
| 2. PhD students will demonstrate competence in teaching the target language. | Analysis of student evaluations and of evaluations of language coordinators. | An overall level of student evaluations equal to the departmental mean. | Annually  |
| 3. PhD students will demonstrate their ability to conduct an independent research project on a topic in their major field of study. | Pass rates on the Dissertation Prospectus Defense and the Dissertation Defense. | A “Pass” rating on 2nd-year research paper/thesis substitute or PhD thesis. 100% pass on first attempt100% pass on first attempt | Annually   |

Other Program Goals and Metrics Tracked, Results, and Improvements: Metrics the program tracks on a regular basis to measure other aspects of academic program quality besides student learning, such as completion rates, time-to-degree, diversity, etc.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Goals | Assessment Methods To Be Used | Performance Targets | Implementation Schedule  |
| 1. First-year PhD students report a level of satisfaction with their program | One-to-one interviews with the director of graduate studies. | Ensure every student’s progress | Annually  |
| 2. PhD students report an overall satisfaction with their program | Results of Graduate Student Survey (numerical and comments). | Measure and improve graduate student satisfaction. | Annually |
| 3. PhD students report on satisfaction with the department’s ability to prepare them professionally | Results of Graduate Student Survey (numerical and comments). | Measure and improve graduate student satisfaction. | TBD |

\*The Spanish faculty have made headway on shortening the reading list for the MA written exam. There remain some minor issues that will be resolved after the January 2020 deadlines for graduate admissions.

**MA Students 2018-2019**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Student’s Name*  | *Thesis/Thesis Substitute Title* |
|  Jossette Bailey | Bodies Consuming and Consumed in Germinal and Mont-Oriol |
|  Yanexy Cardona | From Guatemala City to Los Angeles: Central American Trauma and Cross Cultural Alliances in Hector Tobar’s The Tattooed Soldier. |
|  Brooke Farmer | The Limits of Subjugation in Sor Juana’s Love Poetry |
|  Kirsten Kane | A Poetics of Classical Song in Quebec: A 27-page paper analyzing musical adaptations of works by 4 Quebecois poets |
|  Elena Pena Argueso | Catarismo, redenciones y milagros en La vida de San Pedro Nolasco |
| Madeleine Riley |  The Suffering Self and the Common Path: Romantic Salvation in the Age of the Anthropocene |

**PhD Students 2018-2019**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Student’s Name* | *Dissertation Title* |
| Etna Veronica Avalos Molina  | Literary Representations of Disability in the Latin American Context of the 21st Century |
| Elena Nicole Casey  |  The Fracturing of Melancholy: Mental Health, Social Marginality, and National Crisis in the Theater of Pedro Calderón de la Barca |
| Massimiliano Cirulli | Pier Paolo Pasolini and the Space of the “Rivoluzione Antropologica” |
| Adrienne Erazo  | Identity in Transit: Central American Migration in Contemporary Latin American and Latinx Literature |
| Anne-Shirley Harford | Fabricating Religion: The Theological Significance of Sartorial Imagery in Juana de la Cruz's (1481-1534) El Conhorte |
| Giuliano Migliori  | Writing of the Body in Postwar Italy |
| Holly Elise Sims  | Writing a Past to Remember: Texts as Monuments in Medieval Castile |
| Carlos Vázquez Cruz  | Evolución tecno-digital en novelas gays hispánicas: El diario de J. L. de Rei, Ondergraund.com de Rodríguez Pagán y Sudor de Fuguet |
| April Danielle Weintritt  | Culinary Professions in Early Modern Italian Comedy |

**G. Pilot Assessment Project – General Education FREN/SPAN 203**

In the spring 2017, and prompted by Dean A. Panter, the Department of Romance Studies carried out a pilot assessment in French and Spanish that aims at evaluating whether students who have gone through the General Education sequence of three semesters have reached a level of Intermediate-Low, according to ACTFL standards.

**G1. FREN 203.** To this purpose, the French-203 coordinator developed an online diagnostic test that all FREN 203 students must take at the beginning of the semester. The test is composed of a grammar, listening comprehension, and reading comprehension; it is ungraded. The same test is taken again at the end of the semester when it counts for a homework. In addition, the usual mid-semester pair interview was not only graded by each instructor, but a group of 40 students across all sections of FREN 203 from spring 2017 were randomly determined whose recorded interviews were then evaluated by a second instructor in order to ensure consistency in the assessment of oral proficiency.

**FREN 203 Written Assessment.** The Excel spreadsheets with results from both diagnostic tests are posted on the FREN 203 Instructor Site. Student names can be pulled randomly to verify the results at the beginning and end of the semester. The following table shows the results of a group of 40 students randomly selected across all FREN 203 sections. However, two basic selection criteria were observed: the selected students had taken both tests and each student’s second score was an improvement over the first. *The numbers in the two results columns correspond to the percentage of correct answers, not to a grade*.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| FREN 203  | Spring 2017Beginning-of- semester diagnostic test | Spring 2017End-of-semester diagnostic test |
| 1. Alessandro, Caroline | 42 | 71 |
| 2. Allen, Elijah | 37.5 | 61 |
| 3. Anderson, Emili | 43.5 | 46.5 |
| 4. Barry, Kieran | 43.5 | 52 |
| 5. Becker, Liam | 39 | 76 |
| 6. Begg, Tj  | 33 | 43 |
| 7. Bobo, Jordan  | 40.5 | 45.5 |
| 8. Bottomley, J | 72 | 80 |
| 9. Brake, Bethany | 42 | 57 |
| 10. Bynum, Caroline | 19.5 | 57 |
| 11. Caraballo, Kirby | 42 | 58 |
| 12. Cervi, Nicole | 60 | 93 |
| 13. Clarke, Caleb | 51 | 63 |
| 14. Collett, Toddy  | 37.5 | 42 |
| 15. De Grasse, Justine | 34.5 | 48 |
| 16. Dinicola, Julia | 72 | 69 |
| 17. Dorrel, Hannah | 13.5 | 30 |
| 18. Dudash, Michael | 51 | 63 |
| 19. Ellington, Kenneth | 10.5 | 19.5 |
| 20. Farrell, Jane | 30 | 60 |
| 21. Ferguson, Hattie | 42 | 69 |
| 22. Gowland, Charley | 52.5 | 57 |
| 23. Hall, Alexis | 9 | 46.5 |
| 24. Hazerjian, Zoe | 60 | 66 |
| 25. Hemmer, Chris | 57 | 69 |
| 26. Hendrix, Jody | 27 | 36 |
| 27. Heynen, Sarah | 39 | 54 |
| 28. Ho, Henry | 12 | 36 |
| 29. James, Bruce | 48 | 79.5 |
| 30. Jenks, Hannah  | 18 | 60 |
| 31. Kindler, Emily | 37.5 | 51 |
| 32. Lillich, Madeline | 51 | 57 |
| 33. Mackay, Kalina | 36 | 60 |
| 34. Malanda, Joyce | 57 | 76.5 |
| 35. Martin, Davis | 43.5 | 69 |
| 36. Matthews, Ungaroo | 37.5 | 60 |
| 37.Mcconnell, Brighton | 27 | 51 |
| 38. Moore, Kathleen | 60 | 75 |
| 39. Norman, Elliott | 30 | 54 |
| 40. Olson, Becca | 43.5 | 76.5 |
|  |  |  |

Beginning-of-semester diagnostic

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A | B | C | D | F  | High | Low | Average |
| - | - | 2 | 3 | 35 | 72 | 9 | 40.05 |

End-of-semester diagnostic

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A | B | C | D | F  | High | Low | Average |
| 1 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 20 | 93 | 19.5 | 58.4 |

The results show a marked improvement. The high percentage of failing students could be due to the fact that this was a pilot, that students are tired at the end of the semester, that students did not read instructions before testing, that they took the test too quickly, etc, etc. Even given these odds, the percentage of correct answers has improved considerably, thus putting the pilot group firmly within the intermediate-low range (i.e. at 58%) of the ACTFL standards.

**FFREN 203 Oral Assessment.** The results of the oral assessment from spring 2017 were uploaded in Sakai Resources on the 203 Instructor Site, in a folder marked Assessment.

5 instructors were asked to assess 10 recordings each, a task which, through attrition, yielded a result of 40 students assessed. As per suggestion of Dean A. Panter, the sections, instructors assessing, and the students were then mixed in order to try to remain as impartial/anonymous as possible. This took several hours to put together. All of the recordings are in Warpwire.

Of the group of 40 student pairs thus assessed twice (by two different instructors), the majority (27/40) received matching grades or grades within 1-3 points difference on a scale of 1-100 (= 67.5 %). 8 student pairs of 40 showed a difference between 4-6 points on a scale of 1-100 (= 20 %). And 5 student pairs showed a difference of 8-11 points in a scale of 1-100 (= 12.5 %).

The average of the two oral interview grades yielded the following results for the group of 40 pair interviews:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A | B | C | D | F  | High | Low | Average |
| 2  | 34 | 4 | - | - | 97 | 77 | 84 |

All of the students assessed therefore reached the desired level of intermediate-low in their oral skills.

**Difficulties with the oral assessment as reported by FREN 203 instructors:**

The process is time consuming as the entretien/interview occurs in the second part of the semester. It took about 2 weeks for the instructors’ assessments to be received by the LRC and then a couple more weeks to all be uploaded. This meant that they were not ready to be assessed until near the end of the semester (April 17th) which made it hard for assessors to meet the deadline (more than half were received well after the semester had ended). Not everyone was willing to assess, even after repeated emails, so results are incomplete.

Some interviews were difficult to assess because they did not consistently follow the directions: interviews with only 1 student instead of 2 or with 3 students (those were discarded); entretiens that were only 7-8mns instead of 10-12mns required; names said on recordings when numbers or letters only were asked to protect anonymity; not knowing who was who because of the anonymity (even if the names were said) likewise made them harder to assess. It was reported that it is much harder to assess a recording vs recording a student present, which may account for discrepancies in grades for some students (sometimes the recordings were a bit hard to hear; they also picked up surrounding noises such as office mates). This led to instructors having to listen several times to the recordings. Recorders didn’t always work or stopped mid-way. Instructors reported that some recordings from their classes were missing in Warpwire.

**G2. SPAN 203.** For Spanish, the Spanish 203 coordinator chose a cohort of 8 sections of SPAN 203 (out of 49 total sections) to participate in a pilot assessment of oral proficiency. The instrument used was the oral interview and rubric. The oral interviews of all the students in the eight sections were recorded. From this cohort of sections, 46 students' interviews were randomly selected to be evaluated by a second rater. The second raters were also assigned randomly, with care that they were not re-grading their own students. Through this pilot, the coordinator is not only examining data to determine the overall proficiency outcomes of students, but rather is also seeking to ensure consistent evaluation of students’ oral proficiency across sections of SPAN 203.

SPAN 203 PILOT DATA ORAL INTERVIEW SPRING 2017

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student number | Grade given by instructor | Grade given by second rater | Discrepancy? | Grade given by third rater |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017-07 | 8 | 8 | 0 |  |
| 2017-12 | 8 | 9 | -1 |  |
| 2017-13 | 10 | 12 | -2 |  |
| 2017-17 | 9 | 11  | -2 |  |
| 2017-24 | 9 | 9 | 0 |  |
| 2017-25 | 12.5 | 7.5 | -5 | 9 |
| 2017-26 | 8.5 | 7 | -1.5 |  |
| 2017-30 | 7.5 | 10 | -2.5 |  |
| 2017-33 | 13 | 8 | -5 | 6 |
| 2017-35 | 14 | 13 | -1 |  |
| 2017-36 | 10.5 | 10 | -0.5 |  |
| 2017-37 | 12 | 10 | -2 |  |
| 2017-39 | 12 | 13 | -1 |  |
| 2017-42 | 10.5 | 11 | -0.5 |  |
| 2017-47 | 10.5 | 10 | -0.5 |  |
| 2017-49 | 12 | 7 | -5 | 9 |
| 2017-51 | 12.5 | 9 | -2.5 |  |
| 2017-57 | 6 | 5 | -1 |  |
| 2017-59 | 10 | 11 | -1 |  |
| 2017-61 | 8 | 10 | -2 |  |
| 2017-70 | 10 | 10 | 0 |  |
| 2017-74 | 11 | 6 | -5 | 8.5 |
| 2017-76 | 12.5 | 11.5 | -1 |  |
| 2017-83 | 6 | 10 | -4 | 4.5 |
| 2017-86 | 11 | 10 | -1 |  |
| 2017-88 | 14 | 11 | -3 | 8 |
| 2017-98 | 12 | 11 | -1 |  |
| 2017-104 | 8 | 13  | -5 | 12.5  |
| 2017-105 | 8 | 5 | -3 | 7 |
| 2017-107 | 10 | 8 | -2 |  |
| 2017-106 | 9 | 11 | -2 |  |
| 2017-109 | 10 | 12 | -2 |  |
| 2017-111 | 9 | 8 | -1 |  |
| 2017-116 | 13 | 12.5 | -0.5 |  |
| 2017-117 | 10 | 9.5 | -0.5 |  |
| 2017-119 | 7 | 8 | -1 |  |
| 2017-120 | 11 | 8 | -3 | 8 |
| 2017-122 | 10 | 8.5 | -1.5 |  |
| 2017-125 | 13 | 11 | -2 |  |
| 2017-127 | 13 | 12.5 | -1.5 |  |
| 2017-129 | 12 | 10 | -2 |  |
| 2017-133 | 10 | 9 | -1 |  |
| 2017-136 | 12 | 11  | -1 |  |
| 2017-141 | 11 | 10 | -1 |  |
| 2017-143 | 9 | 7.5  | -1.5 |  |

Almost half of all students in the sample (21/46) earned scores from both raters that were within one point of each other (raw scores, not percentage point). One third (15/46) earned scores from both raters that were within 1.5-2.5 points of each other (raw scores, not percentage points). One fifth (9/46) differed by 3 or more points (raw score) between the two raters. These nine students were graded by a third rater. There was one case in this group where we assumed the raters were getting the students confused with their partners on the recordings. That case is not included in the sample ratios.

With this last group, where there was the largest discrepancy between raters, we noted that sometimes the score assigned by Grader 3 fell almost exactly in between Grader 1 and 2. Sometimes they were equal or close to one or the other, which helped give a more accurate portrayal of the student’s actual performance. Some of the scores given by the third rater were lower than either of the other ratings. This is attributed in part to the fact that the third rating took place several months after the original assessment.

The raw scores on the rubric correspond to the following letter grade ranges:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A range | B range | C range | D range | F range |
| 14-12 | 11-9 | 8-6 | 5-3 | 2-0 |

Almost 100% of the students in the sample earned a grade in the A-C grade ranges. Only 3 out of the 49 were rated in the D range by any rater. No one in the sample failed. These data demonstrate that students are meeting our oral proficiency outcomes in SPAN 203.

**G3. Follow-up Meeting and Suggestions**

A follow-up meeting was held on November 20, 2017. Participants were the SPAN 203 instructors who participated in the pilot (Anastacia Kohl-coordinator, Michelle Gravatt, and Cristina Carrasco) and the FREN 203 instructors (Valérie Pruvost-coordinator, Dorothea Heitsch). The follow-ups for assessment are always scheduled for the following semester so as to allow for time to collect, tabulate, and discuss.

As one result, SPAN 203 has developed a diagnostic online test similar to the one being used for FREN 203. In addition, SPAN 203 has moved to requiring instructors to do individual rather than paired interviews that last at least 7 (preferably 10) minutes to ensure that students are given the opportunity to produce enough language to be accurately assessed. This style of interview will also make it easier to correct accurate data.

SPAN 203 will work on ways to better train instructors in conducting and assessing oral interviews, as it was noted that there are greatly varying styles and degrees of effectiveness in assessment, even across experienced SPAN 203 instructors. The rubric is being revised to become more objective and easy to use. Also, guiding materials for instructors have been developed as a result of the pilot. The coordinator of SPAN 203 also has made clear to the instructors that privacy and a distraction-free environment is essential for students’ success in the oral interview.

FREN 203 has integrated its interviews into the class meetings, rather than adding extra days to conduct them. FREN 203 has also reduced homework in order to make it more manageable for students and instructors.

Further Suggestions:

Do not make the oral assessment anonymous. This would save time and the results would be more telling because they could be matched with the written assessment.

Adjust assessment tools for ITAL and PORT so as to have comparable results. This may entail creating an electronic diagnostic test and using sakai gradebook for the language sequences ITAL/PORT 101-204.

Create a sakai site for ROMS Assessment where materials can be stored and accessed. Currently, only the Assessment Plan & Report is available on Faculty Space.

**G4. Follow-up Meetings on 203/204 to 300-level Assessment**

The Programs Assessment Committee decided to create diagnostic tests online for ITAL and PORT 203, after the successful completion of the FREN and SPAN pilot.

 The Committee also decided to adjust its assessment procedure:

ITAL 203: ensure that assessment is the same throughout all classes (use of rubrics); assess all upper-level classes given the small size of the ITAL program.

SPAN 204: ensure clear instructions for peer-reading assessment. Adjust cohort building to SPAN undergraduate program changes.

PORT 203: ensure clear instructions.

**G5. Workshops organized by ROMS Programs Assessment Committee**

As a result of its work and as a capstone project, the ROMS Programs Assessment Committee has organized and conducted two workshops. One on April 9, 2019 titled “100-Level Across Languages” and a second workshop on October 7, 2019 titled “Teaching Online in ROMS”. Both were well attended.

**H. ROMS Assessment Cycle 2019-2022**

The Programs Assessment Committee started a new assessment cycle of its Undergraduate Major in Romance Languages in Fall 2019 to be submitted to the <https://oira.unc.edu/assessment/>

1. Undergraduate Bulletin. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See NCSSFL-ACTFL, *Can-Do Statements. Performance Indicators for Languages Learners*, 4-5 (<https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/Can-Do_Statements_2015.pdf>). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Adapted from Paul Sandrock, *The Keys to Assessing Language Performance*. Alexandria, VA: The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), 2010, 94. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The equivalent of FREN/ ITAL/ SPAN 300 is PORT 310. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. For the respective course descriptions, see the following from the Undergraduate Bulletin:

**FREN 300 French Composition and Grammar Review (3).** Prerequisite, FREN 204, 212, or 402. Recommended preparation, FREN 250, 255, or 260. Intensive grammar review and composition to improve accuracy and develop writing skills, using process and task-oriented approaches.

**ITAL 300 Communicating in Italian: Media, Culture, and Society (3).** Prerequisite, ITAL 204 or 402. Intensive grammar review and composition designed to improve accuracy and develop writing skills, using process and task-oriented approaches.

**PORT 310 Intensive Oral Communication in Portuguese (3).** Prerequisite, PORT 204 or 402. Development of speaking skills through discussion of media, popular music, and selected texts.

**SPAN 300 Spanish Composition and Grammar Review (3).** Prerequisite, SPAN 250, 255, or 260. Intensive grammar review and composition designed to improve accuracy and develop writing skills, using process and task-oriented approaches. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Sandrock, *The Keys to Assessing Language Performance*. 95-7. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. According to the Undergraduate Bulletin. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. We do not assess this phase following the CAS directives. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Adapted from Sandrock, *The Keys to Assessing Language Performance*, 7. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. See Gerald Graff <https://www.mla.org/Membership/MLA-Newsletter/Newsletter-Archive/Newsletter-Tables-of-Contents/Newsletter-Column-Archive/Assessment-Changes-Everything>. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Some students do take the equivalent course of 300 during study abroad but Prof. Abel Muñoz (Study Abroad Advisor for Program in Spain and Latin America) reviews those courses before awarding equivalency. While we do not have the ability to offer UNC graded credit for the 300 course offered in Sevilla, that course uses the same textbook and syllabus as the UNC 300. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Students should be able to evaluate their peers according to these criteria. The criteria themselves can be changed, adapted, according to instructors’ preferences. The best way to grade such an assessment is in a scale from 1 to 3, with 1 = Not there yet/ Does not meet Expectations, 2 = Meets Expectations, and 3 = Exceeds Expectations. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Adapted from Sandrock, *The Keys to Assessing Language Performance*, 94. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The assessment **instrument** was a composition related to the theme of a unit on the Italian economy. Students had to use the specialized lexicon and the knowledge they had learned from the chapter and from class discussions (regarding the issues facing the Italian economy) to explore a challenge facing the American economy. They had a choice among topics: the shadow economy, student debt, free trade, or social mobility, and they were asked to write a persuasive essay using the lexical and syntactical knowledge gained from the current chapter of the textbook. Each student was assessed on the basis of the content of their observations (relevance, completeness, and lack of repetition), the organization of that content (including smooth transitions), a precise and well-chosen lexicon (including words and phrases relevant to the unit); and grammar (accuracy, specifically as it related to the grammar points under study in the current chapter, and fluency). For the 300-level assessment, the assessment coordinator was also the instructor, and she used a rubric that allowed evaluation of the constituent criteria mentioned above. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. <https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/publications/standards/World-ReadinessStandardsforLearningLanguages.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-15)