

World Language Core Outcome Assessment 2011-2012

Self Reflection

1. Describe changes that have been implemented towards improving students' attainment of outcomes that resulted from assessments carried out in 2010-2011. These may include but are not limited to changes to content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc.

In the 2011-2012 academic year, the World Languages SAC assessed three core outcomes: Critical Thinking, Communication, and Cultural Awareness. As a result of these assessments, instructors made changes to the content, materials and instruction of their first and second year language courses in order to improve students' attainment of these three outcomes. Changes include the following:

Critical Thinking:

- Incorporating reading activities that measure students' level of critical thinking by asking them to explain in English or the target language the logic they used to deduce meaning of vocabulary and the text as a whole. Students completed these activities as homework, in-class, or as part of final assessments.
- Incorporating more written compositions at the second year level that require more analysis and critical thinking.
- Incorporating student made grammar books in which they explain grammar and key concepts in English and the target language. These projects require students to think critically about the material they have learned and explain it in a meaningful way.

Communication:

- Incorporating more oral interviews to assess students' level of oral proficiency in the language. Some instructors who have not used oral interviews implemented them. Some instructors who have always used oral interviews began conducting them twice a term.
- Incorporating oral assessments that students record on WIMBA and submit at the end of each chapter. This allows instructors to assess students' oral skills as they progress through the class, and verify that they are achieving expected oral outcomes at the end of each chapter.
- Incorporating in-class written assessments that focus more on real communication, instead of just grammar. This allows instructors to assess students' written communication skills as they progress through the class, and verify that they are achieving expected writing outcomes at the end of each chapter.

Cultural Awareness:

- Incorporating more culturally based readings and realia whenever possible to increase the exposure that students have to the target culture.
- Incorporating more on-line videos and websites to further expose students to the target culture.
- Incorporating service-learning opportunities more and encouraging students volunteer. Participating students make class presentations about the cultural knowledge gained from the experience.

2. Describe the assessment design (tool and processes) used.

•Assessment tool:

To assess student outcomes for Self Reflection, the World Language SAC created a direct pre and post assessment survey and a rubric. Students in Fall 2011 first year language classes completed a pre survey in English that enabled instructors to rate a student's level of self reflection that pertain to their language learning strategies, their ability to value and challenge assumptions about new learning experiences and their willingness to think beyond the classroom to how they might interact with the target culture both locally and/or abroad. The results of the pre assessment survey were then compared to a post assessment survey that was administered to Spring 2012 second year language classes.

The rubric we used to assess students' responses is a modified version of the college-designed rubric for the Self Reflection Outcome. The main way it differs is that the World Language SAC rubric asks students to reflect on learning strategies, assumptions, goals, and their role in the community as it relates specifically to learning a language. We felt that this was the best way for us to provide the college with evidence of whether students in the World Languages program are developing "general" self reflection skills as well as how these skills coincide with our specific curriculum, so that we may make improvements where necessary.

•Student sample assessed:

107 out of 321 students enrolled spring 2012 in the third term of a second year language class (X203 courses) district wide completed this assessment.

We chose one first and one second-year language class per language per campus to participate. Whenever possible, a full-time instructor's class was chosen to prevent part-time instructors from having to perform an extra task. Due to the amount of time involved with assessing student responses, it was not possible to include more than one class per language per campus, if they were available. Student absences and failure to complete the assessment prevented us from having full participation. However, despite these obstacles, we were able to get an average participation rate of 69% from the first year classes chosen which represents 17% of all first year classes across the district. For second year classes chosen, we were able to get a participation rate of 81% which represents 43% of all second year students across the district. Sample sizes relative to the target student population in first and second year courses for each language are outlined as follows:

Self reflection sample size- First year:

Language-Campus	Number of students assessed	Percentage participation for class	Total 101 students	Percentage participation for language
Chinese	20 of 28	71%	53	38%
French-SYL	26 of 34	76%	172	15%
French-RC	19 of 25	76%	75	25%
German-SYL	29 of 35	82%	102	28%

German-RC	0	0%	53	0%
Japanese-SYL	26 of 33	79%	111	23%
Japanese-RC	20 of 26	77%	86	23%
Russian	26 of 35	74%	105	25%
Spanish-SYL	23 of 27	85%	199	11.5%
Spanish-CA	20 of 27	74%	235	8.5%
Spanish-RC	21 of 27	77%	163	13%

230 total students participated out of 1,354 = 17% of students enrolled in 101 courses

Self reflection sample size- Second year:

Language-Campus	Number of students assessed	Percentage participation for class	Total 203 students	Percentage participation for language
Chinese	8 of 11	72%	11	72%
French-SYL	17 of 21	80%	56	30%
French-RC	7 of 12	58%	12	58%
German	10 of 13	77%	39	26%
Japanese-SYL	10 of 12	83%	23	43%
Japanese-RC	15 of 22	68%	22	68%
Russian	19 of 21	90%	33	57%
Spanish-SYL	18 of 24	75%	34	52%
Spanish-CA	19 of 26	73%	53	36%
Spanish-RC	15 of 18	83%	36	41%

138 total students participated out of 319 = 43% of students enrolled in 203 courses

•Assessment survey:

First year language students completed the following pre assessment survey in October 2012.

Self Reflection Survey

Self reflections plays a large part in the language learning process. World Languages is conducting an anonymous pre-assessment for self-reflection with first year students across the district to eventually compare with second year students soon to exit our program. We are asking that you complete this assessment as a homework assignment, outside of class, in English. Please write your answers in paragraph format on this sheet and incorporate as much detail as possible. Thank you for your participation in this assessment—you play an integral role in our continued success and improvement!

1. Based on what you know about yourself, what language learning strategies do you expect to use in this class? Please elaborate in depth. What are your goals for this course?
2. Please reflect in depth on the immersion format and the abundant group work in this class. What are you nervous and/or excited about regarding these elements?
3. What expectations or assumptions do you think exist in our society about the language learning process? How do you think this class might challenge or confirm these assumptions?
4. Besides the actual language, what else do you think you'll learn in this class that could apply to other areas of your life?
5. What do you hope to learn about the _____-speaking community, either locally or internationally? Do you envision yourself interacting with the _____-speaking community?

Second year language students completed the following post assessment survey in April 2012.

Self reflections plays a large part in the language learning process. World Languages is conducting an anonymous post-assessment for self-reflection with second year students across the district to compare with first year students who already completed a pre-assessment. We are asking that you complete this assessment as a homework assignment, outside of class, in English. Please write your answers in paragraph format on this sheet and incorporate as much detail as possible. Thank you for your participation in this assessment—you play an integral role in our continued success and improvement!

1. Based on what you know or have learned about yourself, what language learning strategies have you employed and found to work well for you in this class? Please elaborate in depth. What are your goals for this course and how might your goals have changed over the course of the 2-year program?
2. Please reflect in depth on the immersion format and the abundant group work in this class. How did these elements affect your learning experience negatively or positively? Please

elaborate.

3. What expectations or assumptions do you think exist in our society about the language learning process? How do you think this class has challenged or confirmed these assumptions?

4. Besides the actual language, what else do you think you've learned in this class that could apply to other areas of your life?

5. What have you learned about the _____-speaking community, either locally or internationally? In what ways do you envision yourself interacting with the _____ -speaking community following this class?

•**Rubric:**

Student responses to the survey were assessed using the following rubric created by the World Languages SAC:

	Students at this level can:
Level 1 Limited demonstration or application of knowledge and skills.	Identify some general learning strategies and general appreciation for language learning. Express minimal understanding or acceptance of alternative learning experiences (i.e. immersion method) and participatory role in the classroom community. Recognize general assumptions about the language learning process. Express minimal or very general interest in the target culture.
Level 2 Basic demonstration and application of knowledge and skills.	Identify specific language learning strategies and recognize some broader applications of language learning. Demonstrate some awareness of alternative learning experiences (i.e. immersion method) and consider some general implications of a participatory role in the classroom community. Identify and question general assumptions about the language learning process. Express interest in, and general curiosity about, the target culture.
Level 3 Demonstrates comprehension and is able to apply essential	Identify and analyze personalized language learning strategies and identify specific applications of language learning, academically and/or professionally. Demonstrate understanding of alternative learning experiences (i.e. immersion method) and the importance of a participatory role in the classroom community.

knowledge and skill.	<p>Identify and reconsider relevant assumptions about the language learning process.</p> <p>Express particular interest in learning more about and interacting with the target culture.</p>
Level 4 Demonstrates thorough, effective and/or sophisticated application of knowledge and skills.	<p>Use self-appraisal to set a variety of well-defined and relevant academic goals, modify personal behavior and as motivation toward goal achievement, both academically and professionally.</p> <p>Appreciate and value new learning experiences (i.e. immersion method) and the multiple benefits of supportive group interaction/learning in the classroom community.</p> <p>Articulate, insightfully analyze and challenge relevant assumptions about the language learning process.</p> <p>Expresses meaningful interest and identifies specific opportunities to interact with and/or contribute to the target culture locally and/or abroad.</p>

•Assessment and analysis of results:

Three full-time World Language instructors assessed all student surveys using the above rubrics to determine their appropriate level of Self Reflection. In order to ensure reliability of results, the group of assessors was kept to only three instructors. Before beginning, we normed the rubric to assure that all results would be consistent from one evaluator to another. To do this, we chose a random sample of 10 student surveys that each of us read and evaluated. Then we discussed our results and any inconsistencies that we found. Once we all felt comfortable that we would be applying the rubric in the same ways, we split the samples up and made sure not to assess any of our own students. Once results were obtained, we did statistical analysis of them.

3. Discussion of results on student outcomes

Number of 1st year students performing at each level

1 st Yr	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	Total
Chinese	0	2	13	5	0	0	0	20
French-SYL	1	4	10	11				26
French-RC	2	6	7	4	0	0	0	19
German	3	5	16	5	0	0	0	29
Japanese-SYL	9	2	9	6	0	0	0	26
Japanese-RC	4	9	7	0	0	0	0	20
Russian	10	5	6	5	0	0	0	26
Spanish-SYL	1	13	5	4	0	0	0	23
Spanish-	3	8	5	4	0	0	0	20

CA								
Spanish-RC	7	4	9	1	0	0	0	21

Percentage of 1st year students performing at each level

1 st Yr	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	Total
Chinese	5%	10%	65%	25%	0%	0%	0%	100%
French-SYL	4%	15%	38.5%	42.5%	0%	0%	0%	100%
French-RC	10.5%	31.5%	37%	21%	0%	0%	0%	100%
German	10.5%	17.25%	55%	17.25%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Japanese-SYL	34.5%	8%	34.5%	23%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Japanese-RC	20%	45%	35%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Russian	38.5%	19%	23.5%	19%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Spanish-SYL	4.5%	56.5%	22%	17%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Spanish-CA	15%	40%	25%	20%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Spanish-RC	33%	19%	43%	5%	0%	0%	0%	100%

When assessing the student surveys, three new sub-categories were added to the rubric for scoring purposes: Level 1.5, Level 2.5 and Level 3.5. The pre assessment survey results are outlined below and include student comments as support:

Level 1 students: These students are able to identify at least 1 general learning strategy that may be very superficial (i.e. “I plan to listen in class.”), recognize (but not necessarily accept or appreciate the value of) alternative methods being used (i.e. “I know we have to do immersion but I’d much rather my teacher speak English.”), recognize at least 1 general assumption about the language learning process (i.e. “A lot of people think learning a language is hard.”), and express very general appreciation for language learning (“I want to be able to order food.”) and interest in the target culture/community (i.e. “I want to travel there.”).

The range of students falling at a Level 1 ranged from 5-10% with the exception of Russian and Japanese where the percentage was higher (ranging between 20-38%), which is interesting because of the presumed difficulty of these languages. Ironically, some of the students expressed very little forethought or planning as to how they were going to learn these languages and how they could potentially use them for personal/professional goals. It’s not surprising however to find that many first year level students are unaware of even the basic language learning strategies and have not put much thought into their goals at this stage, since many of them are entering college for the first time. Students displaying some attributes characteristic of level 2 were scored at a 1.5. For example, some students were able to list more specific learning strategies

(i.e. “I plan to make flashcards.”) but were unable to recognize the value of group work or immersion, stating “I prefer that the instructor lecture in English” or “I prefer to work alone”.

Level 2 students: These students are able to identify at least a couple of specific learning strategies (i.e. “I plan to make flashcards”, or “I will review lessons at home” or “I will work with tutors/partners outside of class”), recognize (but not necessarily appreciate) the value of alternative methods being used (i.e. “I realize immersion works better but I don’t really like it.”), recognize and question at least 1 general assumption about the language learning process (i.e. “People say learning a language is harder as you get older but I’m not sure.”), and express general goals and interest and curiosity about the target culture/community (i.e. “I’d like to be able to talk to people when I travel and get to learn more about their culture.”).

The majority of our first year students across the languages fell into the level 2 category, ranging from 23% to 65%. This is encouraging because it means that even our first year language students are beginning to develop goals, strategies for how to accomplish them, and are beginning to consider their role as a member of a global community. Students displaying some of the attributes of level 3 were scored at a level 2.5. For example, some students were able to begin analyzing their own learning style (i.e. “I’m a visual learner so I need to draw pictures to help me remember things”), or they understood the value of immersion (i.e. “I’m learning so much faster than I did in High School where we translated everything.”). However, most of our first year students were unable to articulate the complexities of learning a language or exactly how they might use these skills either personally/professionally or to interact with the target speaking community in a meaningful way. These are characteristics of level 3 on the rubric, and it was not surprising to see that no first year level students scored at this level. This leads us to the post assessment results for 2nd year language students.

Number of 2nd year students performing at each level

2 nd Yr	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	Total
Chinese	0	0	0	1	4	2	1	8
French-SYL	0	0	0	3	10	4	0	17
French-RC	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	7
German	0	3	0	1	5	1	0	10
Japanese-SYL	0	0	2	2	4	2	0	10
Japanese-RC	0	0	3	4	6	2	0	15
Russian	0	0	0	4	2	7	6	19
Spanish-SYL	0	0	0	10	4	4	0	18
Spanish-CA	0	0	1	11	5	2	0	19
Spanish-RC	0	0	2	9	3	1	0	15

Percentage of 2nd year students performing at each level

1 st Yr	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	Total
--------------------	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-------

Chinese	0%	0%	0%	12.5%	50%	25%	12.5%	100%
French-SYL	0%	0%	0%	17.5%	59%	23.5%	0%	100%
French-RC	0%	0%	0%	28.5%	57%	14.5%	0%	100%
German	0%	30%	0%	10%	50%	10%	0%	100%
Japanese-SYL	0%	0%	20%	20%	40%	20%	0%	100%
Japanese-RC	0%	0%	20%	26.5%	40%	13.5%	0%	100%
Russian	0%	0%	0%	21%	10.5%	37%	31.5%	100%
Spanish-SYL	0%	0%	0%	56%	22%	22%	0%	100%
Spanish-CA	0%	0%	5.5%	58%	26%	0%	0%	100%
Spanish-RC	0%	0%	13.5%	60%	20%	6.5%	0%	100%

As the above data demonstrates, our second year language students are anywhere between the level 2 and 4 with the majority being level 3 (ranging from 10.5-59%) which shows that students having completed two full years of language classes have made significant strides with respect to personal reflection.

Level 3 students: These students demonstrated all the outcomes of Level 2, and distinguished themselves by demonstrating the ability to identify as well as analyze personalized learning strategies (i.e. “I’m more of a visual/auditory/etc. learner so I need to supplement my coursework with more practice in these areas outside of class.”), by demonstrating an understanding of alternative learning experiences (“I can see how immersion speeds up the learning process” or “I can understand why group work is so important in language classes because we can learn from and teach each other.”), recognize and reconsider at least 1 general assumption about the language learning process (i.e. “People say learning a language is hard but you just need to know it takes time and takes a lot of outside work.”), identify specific applications for their language learning (“I want to get a degree in the language so I can maybe teach one day.”) and express interest in learning more about and interacting with the target culture/community (i.e. “I’d like to one day study or work abroad so I can learn more about the language/culture”). Some students at this level are demonstrating some of the attributes of level 4 and are scored at a level 3.5, for example they may see how modifying their behavior has helped them succeed as a student (i.e. “I now realize I need to manage my time and work consistently which has helped me succeed in all of my classes.”) or they may identify meaningful ways to contribute to the target community locally or abroad (“As a result of this class, I’ve learned about and volunteered with the refugee population in Portland and I now know I can really make a difference.”).

Level 4 students: These students demonstrated all of the outcomes of level 3 but were able to appraise and modify their learning strategies, (i.e. “I now know that my initial goals were unrealistic but that I’ve made huge strides and will continue to do so with hard work and perseverance”), by demonstrating an appreciation of alternative learning experiences (“I’ve seen how immersion has helped me to think and learn differently” or “Group work has taught me how to work with and help others and to accept help when I need it, rather than to always try to

succeed on my own.”), analyze and challenge at least 1 general assumption about the language learning process (i.e. “People often believe that learning a language can be done quickly or on their own by purchasing expensive language software or through osmosis by simply living in the country, but I’ve learned that it’s a continual process that requires a lot of guidance and practice with peers but that can be really rewarding and fun”), identify and evaluate how their specific skills could benefit them personally and/or professionally (“I want to get a degree in the language so I can work in the target speaking population in the medical community.”) and express meaningful interest in interacting with and contributing to the target culture/community (i.e. “As a result of this class, I learned about, applied for and received a grant to study Russian abroad and I now plan to pursue a degree in Russian so I can pursue a job in the government.”).

While only a very small percentage of our students scored at a level 4 (and only in Chinese and Russian with the latter having the highest percentage at 31.5%) it is notable that many of our second year students across all languages did score at the 3.5 level ranging from 10-30%, demonstrating some if not all of the attributes of a level 4. It can therefore be deduced that students are indeed making progress with respect to self reflection as they move through our 2 year language program.

4. Identify any changes that should, as a result of this assessment, be implemented to help improve students’ attainment of outcomes

From the results of these assessments, we can see that most students can potentially reach a level 3.5 with respect to self reflection. While most of our students are reaching a level 3 upon completion of the second year language program, there is definitely room for improvement. In discussing the results as a SAC, we identified some specific goals for coming year: 1. We are discussing the possibility of developing a standard packet of information that not only explains our department philosophy and method (i.e. immersion, student centered learning, group work, etc) as well as some specific language learning strategies which can be distributed across the district and which can serve as both a guide to students and teachers throughout their studies in our program 2. We will encourage all first and second year level teachers to incorporate at least one cultural activity per term whether it be a cultural reading, outside research, service learning, etc. that is related to the target speaking community either locally and/or abroad so that students are more aware of how they might interact with or contribute that community either now or in the future. Finally, instructors will continue to encourage students to take our elective culture classes, since these courses provide students with a deeper understanding of the target cultures and communities.

5. Reflect on the effectiveness of this assessment tool and assessment process. Please describe any changes to assessment methodology that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome). Is there a different kind of assessment tool or process that the SAC would like to use for this outcome in the future? If the assessment tool and processes does not need to be revised, please indicate this.

We feel that this survey was an effective tool for assessing student outcomes for self reflection. Because it was in essay format, students were able to give detailed information regarding their own learning strategies and goals. This allowed us to easily assess the quality of their answers in order to place them at the appropriate level on the rubric designed for this task. We do not plan to revise this tool, and we will use it again in the future.

There were several changes that we made in this assessment as a result of the three assessments we did last year. Last year only one language completed each assessment, and only one language

class was assessed. This produced a very small sample size and results that were not representative of the entire World Languages SAC. This year we significantly increased the sample size by having each language at every campus assess one course. We also created and administered a pre and post assessment in order to better assess and compare the skill set of our students at both the outset and upon completion of their language studies. The results of this assessment represent the skill levels of both first and second year students in every language in our SAC, which makes the data much more meaningful. We also normed our rubric this year to make sure that assessors would be scoring the same way and achieving consistent results.

We expect to use this same assessment survey next time we assess student outcomes for self reflection. However, there are some changes in administering it that would help us achieve a larger sample and better results. We need to guarantee that more students complete the survey. This should be easier next time, since the survey will not need to be created and will be available far in advance. This should allow instructors more time for students to complete it. This year most instructors had students complete the survey at home as part of their homework. But, many students failed to turn it in, despite it being worth points. Perhaps, next time, instructors should set aside class time and have the students complete the survey in class to make sure they do it. Thirdly, we need to make sure that instructors are giving clear instructions to their students about how to complete this survey, so that they understand the importance of completing every section in a thorough manner. This is particularly important if a part-time instructor is giving out the survey.

Ideally we would like to have a larger sample size, but it is not feasible to survey more students, because of the time it takes to assess each survey. For this outcome assessment, it took at least 20 hours just to read and rate the surveys especially since there were two sets with the pre and post assessment. Two days of in-service is simply not enough to complete these outcome assessment tasks, especially when faculty are expected to design the assessments and rubrics. For just this one outcome assessment, the WL SAC spent 8 hours at the October in-service designing the survey and rubric (which later had to be revised by the SAC Chair because there was too much dissension due to the ample size of the group involved initially). It took 2 hours to norm the rubric, at least 20 hours to read and assess the surveys, 2 hours to gather the data and do statistical analysis, and 10 hours to write this report. That makes at least 42 hours spent on this Outcome Assessment, and the position of SAC chair has no extra pay or release time. We have spent almost the same amount of time on the Community and Environmental Responsibility Assessment that we also completed this year. Because we are all full-time instructors who already work 50-60 hours a week, it is imperative that some form of release time or extra pay be given to SAC Chairs for undertaking these assessments. This year, I had to request that my colleague, Kristine Shmakov, step in to be co-SAC Chair, because I was overwhelmed by trying to be SAC Chair, Department Chair for French, Department Chair for World Languages and a full-time French instructor. Being SAC Chair without any release time or extra pay is simply way too much extra work to be doing on top of our regular teaching duties. This is an unsustainable situation and too much of a burden for the SAC Chair to continue to bear. We ask that something be done to remedy the situation, especially since we have to continue to reassess two outcomes each year for the foreseeable future.

World Language Core Outcome Assessment 2011-2012

Community and Environmental Responsibility

1. Describe changes that have been implemented towards improving students' attainment of outcomes that resulted from assessments carried out in 2010-2011. These may include but are not limited to changes to content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc.

In the 2011-2012 academic year, the World Languages SAC assessed three core outcomes: Critical Thinking, Communication, and Cultural Awareness. As a result of these assessments, instructors made changes to the content, materials and instruction of their first and second year language courses in order to improve students' attainment of these three outcomes. Changes include the following:

Critical Thinking:

- Incorporating reading activities that measure students' level of critical thinking by asking them to explain in English or the target language the logic they used to deduce meaning of vocabulary and the text as a whole. Students completed these activities as homework, in-class, or as part of final assessments.
- Incorporating more written compositions at the second year level that require more analysis and critical thinking.
- Incorporating student made grammar books in which they explain grammar and key concepts in English and the target language. These projects require students to think critically about the material they have learned and explain it in a meaningful way.

Communication:

- Incorporating more oral interviews to assess students' level of oral proficiency in the language. Some instructors who have not used oral interviews implemented them. Some instructors who have always used oral interviews began conducting them twice a term.
- Incorporating oral assessments that students record on WIMBA and submit at the end of each chapter. This allows instructors to assess students' oral skills as they progress through the class, and verify that they are achieving expected oral outcomes at the end of each chapter.
- Incorporating in-class written assessments that focus more on real communication, instead of just grammar. This allows instructors to assess students' written communication skills as they progress through the class, and verify that they are achieving expected writing outcomes at the end of each chapter.

Cultural Awareness:

- Incorporating more culturally based readings and realia whenever possible to increase the exposure that students have to the target culture.

- Incorporating more on-line videos and websites to further expose students to the target culture.

- Incorporating service-learning opportunities more and encouraging students volunteer. Participating students make class presentations about the cultural knowledge gained from the experience.

2. Describe the assessment design (tool and processes) used.

•Assessment tool:

To assess student outcomes for Community and Environmental Responsibility, the World Language SAC created a direct assessment survey and a rubric. Students in Spring 2012 second year language classes (X203) completed a survey in English that enabled instructors to rate a student's level of knowledge about social and environmental issues that pertain to either the local target language-speaking community and/or to the country/countries where the target language is spoken. Students listed social and/or environment issues that they learned about in their language class. (We were very specific with students that they could only list issues that had been discussed in their language class, so that we could see what they had learned inside out classrooms, not outside.) Then they were asked to write paragraphs about what they thought might be potential causes and solutions to those problems, ways that people in the target-language speaking community might get involved with solving these problems, and, finally, any involvement that the student has had in helping to solve the issues raised.

The rubric we used to assess students' responses is a modified version of the college-designed rubric for the Community and Environmental Responsibility Outcome. The main way it differs is that the World Language SAC rubric asks students to discuss social and environmental problems that exist in the countries where the target-language is spoken or that affect the local target-language speaking immigrant populations here in Portland.

•Student sample assessed:

107 out of 321 students enrolled spring 2012 in the third term of a second year language class (X203 courses) district wide completed this assessment. We specifically chose to assess this outcome at the end of second year, because students must be at least Intermediate level on the ACTFL proficiency scale, in order to discuss social and/or environmental issues in the target language at even the most superficial levels. In difficult language like Chinese, Japanese, and Russian, students reach the Intermediate level only in 203 courses, so this is the earliest we can assess the Community and Environmental Responsibility Outcome in every language.

We chose one second-year language class per language per campus to participate. Whenever possible, a full-time instructor's class was chosen to prevent part-time instructors from having to perform an extra task. Due to the amount of time involved with assessing student responses, it was not possible to include more than one class per language per campus, if they were available. Student absences and failure to complete the assessment prevented us from having full participation. However, despite these obstacles, we were able to get a participation rate of 73% from those classes chosen. This represents

33% of students enrolled in 203 language classes. Samples size relative to the target student population in second year courses for each language is as follows:

Language-Campus	Number of students assessed	Percentage participation for class	Total 203 students	Percentage participation for language
Chinese	7 of 11	63%	11	63%
French-SYL	13 of 21	62%	56	23%
French-RC	6 of 12	50%	12	50%
German	11 of 13	84%	39	28%
Japanese-SYL	10 of 12	83%	23	43%
Japanese-RC	16 of 22	72%	22	72%
Russian	18 of 21	85%	33	54%
Spanish-SYL	0	0%	36	0%
Spanish-CA	16 of 26	61%	53	30%
Spanish-RC	12 of 18	66%	36	33%

•Assessment survey:

Second year language students completed the following assessment survey in May 2012.

<p align="center">Community and Environmental Responsibility Survey</p> <p><i>Community and environmental responsibility is one of the core outcomes of the college. To help ensure that World Languages works towards meeting this outcome, we are conducting an assessment with second year students across the district. We are asking that you complete this assessment as a homework assignment, outside of class, in English. Please write your answers in paragraph format on this sheet and incorporate as much detail as possible. You will be graded on the effort you put into your answers, not the content.</i></p> <p>Based on what you've learned in 1st and 2nd year <u>(insert language)</u> classes at PCC:</p> <p>1. What social and/or environmental issues affecting the _____-speaking community, either locally or internationally, can you identify? Did you research any of these issues in more depth as a result of topics introduced in your _____ classes?</p> <p>2. What do you see as the potential causes of any of these issues?</p>
--

3. What do you see as potential solutions to any these issues?
4. a. Please list some of the ways that an individual might help with any of these issues. What potential benefits might occur as a result?
- b. Have you personally helped with any of these issues or changed your actions as result of what you've learned? How?

Thank you for your participation in this assessment—you play an integral role in our continued success and improvement!

•**Rubric:**

Student responses to the survey were assessed using the following rubric created by the World Languages SAC:

Community and Environmental Responsibility-World Languages

	Students at this level can:
Level 1 Limited demonstration or application of knowledge and skills.	Identify current social and/or environmental issues related to _____ -speaking cultures List methods of participation in civic and/or environmental action related to the _____-speaking world
Level 2 Basic demonstration and application of knowledge and skills.	Identify causes of one or two social and/or environmental issues related to the _____-speaking community. Identify solutions to one or two social and/or environmental issues related to the _____-speaking community. Demonstrate participation in civic and environmental action related to the _____-speaking community. Identify the benefits of service to the _____-speaking community.
Level 3 Demonstrates comprehension and is able to apply essential knowledge and skill.	Provide evidence of information-gathering on a specific social and/or environmental issue related to the _____-speaking community. Suggest a new and unique solution to a

	<p>current social and/or environmental issue related to the _____-speaking community.</p> <p>Suggest a new and unique solution to a current social and/or environmental issue related to the _____-speaking community.</p> <p>Evaluate the impact of one's own daily actions on the _____-speaking community and/or the environment of _____-speaking culture(s).</p>
<p>Level 4 Demonstrates thorough, effective and/or sophisticated application of knowledge and skills.</p>	<p>Take active roles in community problem-solving.</p> <p>Critically evaluate the causes, consequences and solutions of social and/or environmental issues related to the _____-speaking community.</p> <p>Recommend a solution to a social and/or environmental issue related to the _____-speaking community, based on information collected.</p> <p>Critically evaluate the causes, consequences and solutions of social and/or environmental issues related to the _____-speaking community.</p> <p>Recommend a solution to a social and/or environmental issue related to the _____-speaking community, based on information collected.</p>

•**Assessment and analysis of results:**

Three full-time World Language instructors assessed all student surveys using the above rubric to determine their appropriate level of Community and Environmental Responsibility. In order to ensure reliability of results, the group of assessors was kept to only three instructors. Before beginning, we normed the rubric to assure that all results would be consistent from one evaluator to another. To do this, we chose a random sample of 10 student surveys that each of us read and evaluated. Then we discussed our results and any inconsistencies that we found. Once we all felt comfortable that we would be applying the rubric in the same ways, we split the samples up and made sure not to assess

any of our own students. Once results were obtained, we did statistical analysis of them, which will be presented in the next section.

We are very pleased to see the wide range of social and/or environmental issues that students mentioned in their surveys. They include: water and air pollution, nuclear power, deforestation, over-population, conservation efforts, recycling programs or lack of, sustainable farming, soil depletion, environmental impact on native tribes, impact of tourism, 2011 Japanese earthquake and tsunami, government oppression, freedom of speech, censorship, immigration, nationalism, economic crisis, gas prices, religious tensions, domestic violence, alcoholism, drug addiction, hate crimes, inflation, political corruption, unemployment, orphanages, immigrants having trouble assimilating into US culture, civil rights, crime, austerity reforms, civil unrest, poverty, drug cartels, and declining birthrates.

3. Discussion of results on student outcomes

Before discussing the results of this assessment, it is necessary to clarify why social and environmental issues play a smaller role in first and second year language courses at PCC. Students simply do not have the level of language needed to discuss social and environmental issues at more than a basic level, because they do not achieve higher than Intermediate Mid speaking skills by the end of second year. Even in Level 1 languages like Spanish and French, students rarely reach Intermediate High by the end of second year, with the majority of students reaching Intermediate Mid. In Level 3 languages like Russian and Level 4 languages like Chinese and Japanese, students reach only Intermediate Low to Mid at the end of 203 courses. Because our classes are taught in immersion, only the target language is used in class. Discussing social and/or environmental issues in the target language requires student to express abstract ideas, hypothesize, and use more complex, specialized vocabulary. These skills are only possible once a student has reached Intermediate High and Advanced Low speaking skills. The ACTFL (American Council of Teacher's of Foreign Languages) describes Advanced Low and Intermediate High Speaking skills:

Speakers at the **Advanced Low** sublevel are able to handle a variety of communicative tasks. They are able to participate in most informal and some formal conversations on topics related to school, home, and leisure activities. They can also speak about some topics related to employment, current events, and matters of public and community interest.

Intermediate High speakers are able to converse with ease and confidence when dealing with the routine tasks and social situations of the Intermediate level. They are able to handle successfully uncomplicated tasks and social situations requiring an exchange of basic information related to their work, school, recreation, particular interests, and areas of competence.

Intermediate High speakers can handle a substantial number of tasks associated with the Advanced level, but they are unable to sustain performance of all of these tasks all of the time. Intermediate High speakers can narrate and describe in all major time frames using connected discourse of paragraph length, but not all the

time. Typically, when Intermediate High speakers attempt to perform Advanced-level tasks, their speech exhibits one or more features of breakdown, such as the failure to carry out fully the narration or description in the appropriate major time frame, an inability to maintain paragraph-length discourse, or a reduction in breadth and appropriateness of vocabulary.

<http://actflproficiencyguidelines2012.org/speaking>

This is why social and environmental issues are standard curriculum in the third and fourth year language classes, but not in first and second year language courses. This means that while our students are capable of learning about social and environmental issues in our language classes, they are restricted discussing them at only a very basic level due to limitations in their target-language skills. As a result of this, we expected to see our student reaching Level 1 or 2 on the rubric, and not Level 3 or 4, because those higher levels require students to demonstrate in-depth analysis of causes and solutions, which they have not done in our language classes. Our results were consistent with our expectations:

Number of students performing at each level

	0	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	4	Total
Chinese	1	1	1	4	0	0	0	7
French	4	4	5	6	0	0	0	19
German	5	3	1	2	0	0	0	11
Japanese	3	11	5	5	2	0	0	26
Russian	1	3	6	6	2	0	0	18
Spanish	1	7	9	10	1	0	0	28

Percentage of students performing at each level

	0	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	4	Total
Chinese	14.25%	14.25%	14.25	57.25%	0%	0%	0%	100%
French	21%	21%	26.5%	31.5%	0%	0%	0%	100%
German	45.5%	27.5%	9%	18%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Japanese	11.5%	43%	19.25%	19.25%	7%	0%	0%	100%
Russian	5.5%	16.5%	33.5%	33.5%	11%	0%	0%	100%
Spanish	3.5%	25%	32%	36%	3.5%	0%	0%	100%

When assessing the student surveys, three new sub-categories were added to the rubric for scoring purposes: Level 0, Level 1.5 and Level 2.5.

Level 0 students: This new level was created for students who were unable to list a single social and/or environmental issue affecting the target-language speaking community either locally or abroad that they had learned about in their language class. Some students stated that they did not remember learning about any social and/or environmental issues in class. Some stated that they were not interested in these issues, so they had ignored this part of the class. Others seemed to misunderstand the survey questions and wrote instead about why they had chosen to study the language or why more Americans should study languages. (This was the case with many German students, and most likely the result of the survey being administered by a part-time instructor, who did not give clear directions to students.) Students in the Level 0 category were not able to subsequent questions on the survey.

Based on these results, it appears that Spanish and Russian are the most successful at incorporating social and/or environmental issues into their courses at the most basic level, since only 3.5% and 5.5% of students were unable to list any issues and scored at Level 0. German and French had the highest percent of students not able to list any social and/or environmental issues, with 45.5% and 21% respectively. In the case of German, poor instructions about the survey most likely lead to this unusually high number of students scoring a 0.

Level 1 students: These students are able to list at least one social and/or environmental issue related to the target-language speaking cultures, and at least one method of participation in civic and/or environmental action related to the target-language speaking world. However, they are not able to identify any real causes or solutions to the issue, nor do they demonstrate participation in civic and environmental action related to the target-speaking community.

Across all languages, anywhere from 14% to 27.5% of students are scoring at this level, with Japanese being the anomaly at 43%. Students who score at Level 1 most likely have not yet achieved the language skills needed to engage in high-level thinking needed to access causes and solutions in the target level. In the case of Japanese, the majority of students chose to discuss the earthquake and tsunami of March 2011. Because these were natural disasters, many students viewed these events as ones without any causes or solutions, and, thus, failed to answer those questions on the survey.

Level 1.5 students: These students fall between Level 1 and 2. They are able to list at least one social and/or environmental issue related to the target-language speaking cultures, at least one method of participation in civic and/or environmental action related to the target-language speaking world. In the Level 2 category, they are able identify causes and solutions to a social and/or environmental issue, and identify benefits of service to the target-language speaking community. However, they do not demonstrate participation in civic and environmental action related to the target-speaking community. This is what prevents them from scoring at a Level 2 on the rubric.

Across the languages, anywhere from 9% to 33.5% of our students scored at this level. This is encouraging because it means that not only do students have knowledge about

issues, causes and solution, but they are achieving the proficiency levels in the target language that they need in order to learn about these issues and to think about them at more than just a basic level.

Students who did not list any participation in civic and environmental action related to the target-speaking community many times stated that they do not have any time to volunteer on top of going to school and working. Other students seemed to think that involvement in helping with the issue was impossible, since they live in the US and not a target-language speaking country. Finally, students who did not list any participation may not have considered that their own personal behavior and actions related to the issue are actually involvement.

Level 2 students: Students scoring at this level are able to list at least one social and/or environmental issue related to the target-language speaking cultures, and at least one method of participation in civic and/or environmental action related to the target-language speaking world. They are also able to identify causes or solutions to the issue, identify the benefits of service to the target-language speaking community, and demonstrate personal participation in civic and environmental action related to the target-speaking community. For our second year language students, this is the highest level that is realistic for them to achieve in our immersion classes.

It is great to see that in all languages except German and Japanese, the highest percentage of students scored at Level 2. Like Level 1.5 students, Level 2 students are gaining knowledge about issues, causes, and solutions and achieving the proficiency levels in the target language they need to learn about these issues and to think about them at a higher level. However, they are going a step further and participating in civic and/or environmental action related to the target-language speaking community. Ways that students are helping be part of the solution to the issues they mentioned include:

Target-language speaking community involvement: Tutoring immigrants in English at PCC and local social service agencies; attending target-language community fundraisers; working with target-language speaking families; working with laborer's protection group; working with indigenous tribes in South America; teaching skills classes for immigrants; mentoring target-language speaking youths; mentoring target-language speaking domestic violence survivors; volunteering in orphanages in Kazakhstan and China.

Civic action: Participating in PCC Japanese Tsunami Anniversary ceremony; donating money to tsunami relief; fundraising for disaster relief; working at a wildlife refuge; signing petitions; donating money for wells in Haiti; donating money to prevent child abuse; designing energy efficient products.

Changes in personal behavior: recycling more; driving less; using reusable containers and bags; conserving energy and water; buying fair-trade products; no longer buying palm oil, soy or beef from South America; buying only seasonal produce and locally farmed meats.

Level 2.5 students: These students demonstrated all the outcomes of Level 2, and distinguished themselves by demonstrating a much higher level of civic involvement with the target-language speaking culture or a particularly strong knowledge about an issue as a result of personal research conducted outside of class in English. These students were the minority, as expected, due to proficiency limitations in the target language. Both the Japanese language students scoring at 2.5 had written research papers in English for other classes on the issues they mentioned and were able to propose detailed and unique solutions to them. The two Russian languages students scoring at 2.5 both work 20 hours a week mentoring Russian-speaking domestic violence survivors and teaching skill classes to women. Both are majoring in social work at PSU and planning careers in this field. The Spanish language student scoring at 2.5 already has a bachelor's degree in ecology, works at a wildlife refuge and was able to offer unique solutions to the problems of deforestation in the Amazon rainforests. While it is more likely that higher-level solutions could be discussed in a Spanish 203 classroom because students achieve higher language skills, the level of analysis that this student presented is most likely a result of previous study and work in ecology.

4. Identify any changes that should, as a result of this assessment, be implemented to help improve students' attainment of outcomes

As stated in question 3, Level 2 is the most realistic level for our second year language students to achieve, due to limitations in language proficiency needed to score at Level 3 and 4 on this rubric. Therefore, it is our goal to increase the number of students achieving Level 2 in Community and Environmental Responsibility. To do this, all instructors teaching second year language courses at PCC should incorporate social and/or environmental issues into the curriculum, wherever possible, even at a superficial level. This will increase exposure to a wider variety of issues. Languages that had a higher percentage of students scoring at Level 0 should make special effort to do this, so that student will be able to list at least one issue next time they do this survey. In order to help more students score at 1.5 or 2, students should be given time to engage in brainstorming causes and solution, in as much it is possible for them to do this in the target language. Japanese, Chinese, and Russian students may need to do this in English due to the sheer difficulty of such a task at the second year level. Instructors should also seek out more opportunities for students to volunteer within the target-language speaking communities locally and encourage more students to participate in service learning, though students' busy schedules limits how much they can. Finally, instructors will continue to encourage students to take our elective culture classes, since these courses focus entirely on social/and or environmental issues in the target-language speaking countries. The Russian, Chinese, Japanese, and German culture classes are all taught in English, which enables students to engage in critical thinking and complex discussions about these issues.

5. Reflect on the effectiveness of this assessment tool and assessment process. Please describe any changes to assessment methodology that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome). Is there a different kind of assessment tool or process that the SAC would like to use for this outcome in the future? If the assessment tool and processes does not need to be revised, please indicate this.

We feel that this survey was an effective tool for assessing student outcomes for Community and Environmental responsibility. Because it was in essay format, students were able to give detailed information about potential causes and solutions to the issues they mentioned. This allowed us to easily assess the quality of their answers in order to place them at the appropriate level on the rubric designed for this task. We do not plan to revise this tool, and we will use it again in the future.

There were several changes that we made in this assessment as a result of the three assessments we did last year. Last year only one language completed each assessment, and only one language class was assessed. This produced a very small sample size and results that were not representative of the entire World Languages SAC. This year we significantly increased the sample size by having each language at every campus assess one 203-language course. The results of this assessment represent the skill levels of second year students in every language in our SAC, which makes the data much more meaningful. We also normed our rubric this year to make sure that assessors would be scoring the same way and achieving consistent results.

We expect to use this same assessment survey next time we assess student outcomes for community and environmental responsibility. However, there are some changes in administering it that would help us achieve a larger sample and better results. First, we need to guarantee that every language at every campus participates. Spanish at Sylvania was the only language that was supposed to, but did not participate in this survey. As a result, the Spanish sample is smaller than it should be. Secondly, we need to guarantee that more students complete the survey. This should be easier next time, since the survey will not need to be created and will be available far in advance. This should allow instructors more time for students to complete it. This year most instructors had students complete the survey at home as part of their homework. But, many students failed to turn it in, despite it being worth points. Perhaps, next time, instructors should set aside class time and have the students complete the survey in class to make sure they do it. Thirdly, we need to make sure that instructors are giving clear instructions to their students about how to complete this survey, so that they do not write about things that are neither social nor environmental issues. This is particularly important if a part-time instructor is giving out the survey.

Ideally we would like to have a larger sample size, but it is not feasible to survey more students, because of the time it takes to assess each survey. For this outcome assessment, it took 16 hours just to read and rate the surveys. Two days of in-service is simply not enough to complete these outcome assessment tasks, especially when faculty are expected to design the assessments and rubrics. For just this one outcome assessment, the WL SAC spent 5 hours at the April in-service designing the survey and rubric. It took 2 hours to norm the rubric, 16 hours to read and assess the surveys, 2 hours to gather the data and do statistical analysis, and 10 hours to write this report. That makes 35 hours

spent on this Outcome Assessment, and the position of SAC chair has no extra pay or release time. We have spent even more time on the Self-Reflection Assessment that we also completed this year, since it involved a pre- and post-assessment, meaning twice as many surveys to read and assess. Because we are all full-time instructors who already work 50-60 hours a week, it is imperative that some form of release time or extra pay be given to SAC Chairs for undertaking these assessments. This year, I had to step in and be co-SAC Chair, because our single SAC Chair was overwhelmed by trying to be SAC Chair, Department Chair for French, Department Chair for World Languages and a full-time French instructor. Being SAC Chair without any release time or extra pay is simply way too much extra work to be doing on top of our regular teaching duties. This is an unsustainable situation and too much of a burden for the SAC Chair to continue to bear. We ask that something be done to remedy the situation, especially since we have to continue to reassess two outcomes each year for the foreseeable future.