Core Curriculum Annual Assessment
Annual Program Report

Year:	2022/2023
Course number and name	SPAN 1311 Beginners Spanish I
Component Area:	Communication
Number of sections offered:	**Fall 2022: 5** (1311: 4 face to face, and 1 online); **Spring 2023: 3** (1311:3 face to face) **Total sections: 8**
Number of students enrolled:	**Fall 2022:** 132; **Spring 2023:** 72 **Total enrollment:** 204
Contact Person (include email & phone#)	Damián Robles Garcia droblesgarci@lamar.edu X 8593

Summary of Continuous Improvement Efforts since Last Report

Provide a brief description of how assessment results have been used for program improvement. Point to a specific example of how an assessment provided the program with data it could use for improvement and what that improvement was, if possible, also show evidence of the improvement. You may look at data from the two previous academic years to support this case.

Respond here: Assessment is an integral part of our program—a reliable and well conducted assessment informs faculty on new ways to modify the course objectives, adapt assignments, create realistic expectations and goals that will measure and improve students' learning process and outcomes effectively. Therefore, assessment is always an intrinsic aspect of our core course planning. Assessment also tells the instructor whether a target goal has been met, and what components are still necessary for improvement.

SPAN 1311 is a course option under the Communication Core Curriculum. In our department—English and Modern Languages— we coordinate writing assignments, outcomes, and expectations for all our courses. It was agreed by the Spanish faculty that we evaluate at the end of the semester, per each SPAN 1311 course, a sample of 50% of students, which is randomly selected. Therefore, we use assessment to help coordinate and balance these courses. To improve assessment results, we regularly offer meetings and discussions on grading and assessment. Communication and critical thinking are the chief outcomes of our sequence of courses. In addition, writing and critical thinking/literary/cultural analysis are the basis of our program assessments. One specific example, which shows that we are continuously reflecting on improvement, is our regular group meetings/workshops (among senior and new faculty) to assess students' work/performance. The rationale is that by sharing our results—using the same metric of rubric—we can all have uniform assessment experience.

Program Highlights Since Last Report

Identify and briefly discuss any programmatic curriculum changes made since the last report (e.g. new courses, course changes, SLO changes, course deletions).
Respond here: The last time we collected data—based on our rubrics—was in Spring 2022. The gathered data was sent to Tim Roden, Ph.D., Co-Chair of Core Curriculum Assessment Committee, and Associate Dean of College of Arts and Sciences. On a yearly basis, the Spanish Faculty Committee gets together to discuss assessment findings and used that information to inform our decision-making process, in conjunction with some other variables. To address any programmatic curriculum changes since the last report, we have adapted our curriculum to incorporate new technologies; we have also considered all the possible interference and variables that could have in the assessment of the students, demonstrating written/oral proficiency in the learning of Spanish as a second and heritage language. More changes since the last report include revision of common syllabi, which lists course core outcomes; we make sure to explain these outcomes to new faculty and we work closely as a team to ensure that students are attaining the learning outcomes highlighted on the core curriculum.

Table 1. Assessment Results and Analyses for Current Cycle.

STAGE 1: PLAN				STAGE 2: DO		STAGE 3: STUDY
Departmental Student Learning Goal Required Core Objectives to assess	**Program Student Learning Outcome**	**Assessment**	**Assessment Method/Location**	**Benchmark Expectations**	**Data Results**	**Actions/Goals Based on Data Results*** What do the data tell you? How will you use this data? How were data from the last cycle used to make changes during this cycle, and What were the results of those changes?
1. **Critical Thinking**	**CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS** (To include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation, and synthesis of information)	Exploring Spanish speaking world or the idea of traveling abroad research	The traveling abroad research papers will be evaluated using the ML Critical Thinking Rubric.	70% of students will perform at acceptable or proficient level (capstone 3 & 4) ; and 30% will perform at the marginal level (capstone 2) on the ML Critical Thinking Rubric.	77 (75%) out of 102 (100%) students evaluated attained an acceptable or proficient score (capstone 3 -4) 22 (22%) attained marginal (capstone 2) and 3 (3%) were at the developing range of performance (capstone 1) in their research paper. **TARGET MET**	Students struggle when working on a research paper, therefore, an emphasis should be made on how to address and provide assistance to students during class time.
2. Communication	**ORAL/WRITTEN COMMUNICATION SKILL** (To include effective development, interpretation, and expression of ideas through written, oral, and visual communication)	Final Oral presentation	The Final Oral Presentations will be evaluated using the **Rubric ML-communication** to determine the students' communication outcomes. (Spanish faculty, will randomly select, and evaluate a sample of 50%	75% of students will perform at acceptable or better Mid/High range of performance (in accord with ACTFL American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages Proficiency Guidelines-Speaking 2012) or capstone 3-4 on the rubric; and 25% at the Novice Low/Mid-range of performance or capstone 2 on the rubric.	82 (81%) out of 102 (100%) students evaluated attained an acceptable or better proficient score (capstone 3-4) 17 (16%) attained novice Low/Mid-range (capstone 2) and 3 (3%) were at the developing range of performance (capstone 1) in their final presentation. **TARGET MET**	(ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012 are a description of what individuals can do with language in terms of speaking, writing, listening, and reading in real-world situations in a spontaneous and non-rehearsed context.) Even though the target was met, in the next faculty meeting we can discuss in ways to help more students to attain capstone 3 and 4

			of the Oral presentation of the students enrolled in 1311)			
3. Teamwork	**TEAMWORK** (To include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal)	Cultural Presentation	The Cultural Presentations will be evaluated using the Teamwork Rubric to measure the student's leadership, quality, and cooperation (communicating face-to-face or in a virtual manner, gather information, and offer their input regarding technological skills) when working as a team.	It is expected that throughout the process and delivery of the presentation 75% of students will actively engage at the acceptable or proficient level, and 25% of the students will contribute at the marginal level, based on the Teamwork Rubric.	Findings, 84 (82%) out of 102 (100%) students evaluated attained an acceptable or proficient score, 16 (16%) attained the marginal, and 2 (2%) attained the developing level of performance on the Teamwork Rubric criteria. **TARGET MET**	We will discuss raising the 75% expectation to 78% in the next meeting.

Table 2. Continuous Improvement Results Since Last Report

Stage 4: ACT		
Actions/Goals Based on Data Results *Copy last cycle's actions/goals and report on progress toward continuous improvement on those here.*	**Status** *C=Complete* *P=Progressing* *N=No Action Taken*	**Discussion of Status** *If C, describe efforts that led to accomplishment of actions/goals.* *If P, provide update on progress made toward accomplishing actions/goals and what tasks remain* *If N, discuss why action toward accomplishing actions/goals has been delayed and what work will be initiated toward accomplishment.*

1. Critical Thinking – Rubric

Outcome: In an essay written out-of-class or an in-class essay written with preparation and previous study or in presentation, students will analyze or assess

1. a literary or artistic work,
2. a political, sociological, philosophical, psychological, cultural, or historical movement, event, idea, argument, policy, belief, etc.

Rubric: Critical Thinking

Criteria	1 developing	2 marginal	3 acceptable	4 proficient	score
Explanation of Issues (Inquiry)	Problem was stated without clarification or description	Problem was stated, but some boundaries were undetermined	Problem was stated and described	Demonstrated the ability to use inquiry by clearly stating and comprehensively describing the problem.	
Creative Thinking, Innovation, Analysis, Evaluation, Synthesis	The essay or presentation summarizes the plot, main idea, or problem or describes a literary work(s), but does not critically analyze a literary or artistic work(s) or an idea, movement, epoch, event, etc. .	The essay or presentation reveals a familiarity with a literary or artistic work(s) or an idea, movement, epoch, event, etc.	An essay or presentation shows a firm understanding and exemplification in critically analyzing and evaluating a literary or artistic work(s) or an idea, movement, process, epoch, event, etc.	The essay or presentation shows in-depth thought in critically analyzing literary or artistic work(s) or an idea, movement, process, epoch, event, etc. Conclusions are synthesized and reflect originality and creativity.	

2. Communication - Oral or Written Rubric

Outcome: Students will present clear, salient, and supported oral/visual speeches/demonstrations. And/or students will discuss group or class topics.

Rubric: Communication - Oral/visual Presentation

Criteria	1 developing	2 marginal	3 acceptable	4 proficient	Score
Clear thesis, introduction, main body, and conclusion. **Development)**	The student does not establish or maintain a clear and specific thesis.	In a presentation, student presents a fuzzy thesis, offers, minimum support, and gives a reasonable conclusion.	In presentation, student articulates a clear, specific thesis and conclusion but does adequately support that thesis	In presentation, student articulates a clear, specific thesis and then distinctly introduces points to support that thesis and follows with a clear and logical conclusion.	
Performance **(Oral)**	Student is nervous, inarticulate, and	While showing evidence of a firm idea, the student does not adequately present the argument.	Student stumbles with some points.	Student is relaxed, articulate, and confident and integrates any visual or oral elements.	

	seemingly lacks confidence.				
Audience, Purpose	The presentation seems to disregard audience and purpose.	The presentation needs work to sustain a consistent and appropriate persona and style for the intended audience and purpose	Overall, but with a few lapses, the presentation sustains a consistent and appropriate persona and style for the intended audience and purpose.	The presentation has a consistent and appropriate persona and style for the intended audience and purpose.	
Visual components **(Visual)**	The presentation did not integrate the visuals	The presentation used visuals but did not integrate them.	The presentation integrated visuals.	The presentation smoothly and seamlessly integrated visuals.	

3: Teamwork Rubric (tentative, not approved)

As measured by a group project, oral or written presentations, the results of peer reviews/grading/ or editing, or in-class discussions, the following student performed as follows.

Rubric: Teamwork					
	Developing	**Marginal**	**Acceptable**	**Proficient**	score
Leadership	The student did not contribute.	The student reluctantly contributed to the team.	The student was a good lieutenant: cooperating and aiding the other students	The student took a leadership role in the project and thus influenced other students.	
quality	The student offered little or no input.	The student was content just observe and adopt.	The student offered sometimes valuable comments to the group.	The student's comments and actions led to the progress of the whole group	
cooperation	The student did not cooperate.	The student reluctantly cooperated with the group.	The student did participate.	The student worked well with other members and incorporated other members' comments.	