

**Course Assessment Report  
Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Spanish (new)	201	SPN 201 08/15/2023- Second Year Spanish I
College	Division	Department
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Foreign Languages
Faculty Preparer		Michelle Garey
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

**I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.**

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

No

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

3.

4. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

5.

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

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

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Oral report given by individual students during the semester.
  - Assessment Date: Fall 2010
  - Course section(s)/other population: Random sample of sections.
  - Number students to be assessed: 25% or a minimum of 10 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 intermediate-low level or higher.
- Who will score and analyze the data: Instructor

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)
2022		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
18	15

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.

Fifteen of the eighteen students enrolled in the course were assessed. The three students that were not assessed did not complete the assessment activity for outcome one.

Although the three students did not *officially* withdraw, they had stopped attending class prior to completing the assessment activity.

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.

One section of SPN 201 generally runs per year in the fall term.

SPN 201 is only offered in face-to-face format and is scheduled during the day, on the main campus, to maximize enrollments. Currently no evening, extension center, MM or DL sections are offered.

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 on an aspect of Hispanic culture

**Scoring:** The oral presentation was scored using a departmentally-developed rubric.

**Performance indicators include:** Authentic pronunciation, sentence structure, word usage, deep understanding of cultural content, effective presentation/communication.

A component of this assessment activity also required students to ask five relevant follow-up questions (in Spanish) after listening to their classmates' presentations. This component assessed students' listening comprehension skills, as well as spontaneous speaking and communication.

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

**Yes**, the standard of success was met for outcome one. **93% of students** (14 of 15) met the SOS for outcome one by scoring 75% or higher on the rubric.

Note - the SOS used to evaluate outcome one was **75% of students will score 75% or higher** on the rubric.

This SOS differs from the standard of success outlined on the master syllabus (and auto-populated on this CAR), which states that 70% of students will score at the *intermediate-low level or higher*. This type of scoring criteria is often used for standardized language testing, such as that used by ACTFL, The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. However, an embedded assessment tool (an oral presentation) was used to assess outcome one, not a standardized test, and a faculty-developed rubric was used to score it.

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

Students accurately applied several grammatical concepts, including subject/verb and gender/number agreement, as well as utilized a variety of verb tenses and moods in their oral presentations. The average score on the grammar portion of the rubric was 89%.

In addition, they incorporated varied, accurate, and appropriate Spanish vocabulary, including connectors and transition words, as well as new vocabulary covered in SPN 201. The average score on the vocabulary/word usage portion of the rubric was 98%.

Overall students were able to communicate and express themselves very effectively and pronunciation was strong, with little English or outside language

interference. The average score for pronunciation and effective communication was 88%.

Lastly, students demonstrated a high level of understanding of their respective research topics, which required them to read and comprehend sources written in the target language, Spanish.

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.

While the standard of success was overwhelmingly met for outcome one, there are two primary areas to target for improvement - effective communication and speaking spontaneously.

Many students achieved a high level of effective communication throughout their presentations, but communication was hindered, at times, by pronunciation errors and/or stops and starts.

Furthermore, students were required to ask at least five follow-up questions after hearing their classmates' oral presentations. This required both a high level of understanding, as well as the ability to express complex thoughts spontaneously. This was the weakest area of student achievement, with an average score of 77%. Some students struggled to ask the minimum requirement of five follow-up questions and some students struggled to form questions that revealed depth of thought and engagement with the topic.

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

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Common question(s) on a written examination which will be short-essay style (based on cultural products studied in the course) and to which the student will respond in written Spanish.
  - Assessment Date: Fall 2010
  - Course section(s)/other population: Random sample of completers of course
  - Number students to be assessed: 25% or a minimum of 10 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-low 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)
2022		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
18	15

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.

Fifteen of the eighteen students enrolled in the course were assessed. The three students that were not assessed did not complete the assessment activity for outcome two.

Although the three students did not *officially* withdraw, they had stopped attending class prior to completing the assessment activity.

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.

One section of SPN 201 generally runs per year in the fall term.

SPN 201 is only offered in face-to-face format and is scheduled during the day, on the main campus, to maximize enrollments. Currently no evening, extension center, MM or DL sections are offered.

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

**Assessment tool:** Composition/Paper on an important aspect of Hispanic culture.

**Scoring:** The composition was scored using a departmentally developed rubric.

**Performance indicators include:** Grammar, vocabulary and spelling, clear and organized presentation of well researched content. Note - research sources included those written in the target language (Spanish).

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>
<b>Yes</b> , the standard of success was met for outcome two. <b>93% of students</b> (14 of 15) met the SOS by scoring 75% or higher on the rubric.
Note - the SOS used to evaluate outcome two was <b>75% of students will score 75% or higher</b> on the rubric.
This SOS differs from the standard of success outlined on the master syllabus (and auto-populated on this CAR), which states that 70% of students will score at the <i>intermediate-low level or higher</i> . This type of scoring criteria is often used for standardized language testing, such as that used by ACTFL, The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. However, an embedded assessment tool (a composition/paper) was used to assess outcome two, not a standardized test, and a faculty-developed rubric was used to score it.

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

Students incorporated varied, accurate, and appropriate Spanish vocabulary, with an average score of 92%. Students also successfully incorporated <i>palabras claves</i> - new vocabulary items and expressions presented in the course, with an average score of 96% on this metric.
Overall, compositions were well organized and incorporated good transitions.
In addition, students scored well on their topic proposals and outlines - both of which were written in Spanish. Students also demonstrated a high level of understanding of their respective research topics, which required them to comprehend Spanish language research sources.

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.

While the standard of success was met, there was a slight drop in the average score on the grammar portion of the rubric for outcome two (composition/writing) vs. the average score for grammar on the rubric for outcome one (oral presentation). One possible explanation is that students frequently incorporate more complex structures into their compositions, whereas they often utilize more simplified structures in oral presentations.
--

Furthermore, while students did exceptionally well crafting their outlines and drafts, they had a more difficult time crafting thoroughly explored, engaging, and well-organized compositions.

### III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

This is the first assessment report for SPN 201.

Given recent departmental changes, this course will now be included in the regular curriculum and assessment cycle.

2. 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?

It was surprising how well students were able to conduct research in Spanish and effectively and articulately communicate and express themselves in both written and spoken form.

Many of these students began their Spanish studies just two semesters previously. It is remarkable to see how far they have progressed from writing simple sentences in SPN 111, to paragraphs in SPN 122, to compositions in SPN 201. Their speaking skills were also strong.

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

Results of this assessment will be shared with Spanish instructors during a departmental meeting this academic year.

4. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	Plan to reword outcome language.	Outcomes are awkwardly worded.	2024
Assessment Tool	Adding "outcome-related" to assessment tools.	Consistency in assessment planning.	2024

	Will be including language that specifies the same rubric will be used to assess the outcome 3 tool regardless of which option the instructors choose.		
Objectives	Add objectives.	Not all course objectives are currently included in the master syllabus.	2024

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

No, thank you.

**III. Attached Files**

- [SPN 201 Oral Presentation Rubric](#)
- [SPN 201 Composition Rubric](#)
- [SPN 201 Oral Presentation Scores \(Outcome 1\)](#)
- [SPN 201 Composition Scores \(Outcome 2\)](#)

**Faculty/Preparer:** Michelle Garey **Date:** 08/20/2023  
**Department Chair:** Elisabeth Thoburn **Date:** 08/21/2023  
**Dean:** Victor Vega **Date:** 08/30/2023  
**Assessment Committee Chair:** Jessica Hale **Date:** 06/09/2024