**IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE**

**Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Assessment Cycle Form**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date: | 5-28-11 |  |  |
| Department Name: | Humanities |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Course Number/Title or Program Title: | French 100 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contact Person/Others Involved in Process: | Lead: Glenn Swiadon Others: |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| If course is part of a major(s), and/or certificate program(s), please list all below:  |  |  |  |  |
| Major(s): | Certificate(s): |  |  |  |  |  |
| French |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Humanities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Does course satisfy a community college GE requirement(s)?  | X | Yes  |  | No  |  | N/A |

If yes, check which requirement(s) below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | American Institutions |  | Language and Rationality – English Composition |
|  | Health Education |  | Language and Rationality – Communication and Analytical Thinking |
|  | Physical Education / Activity |  | Natural Science |
|  | Math Competency | X | Humanities |
|  | Reading Competency |  | Social and Behavioral Sciences |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **Student Learning Outcome** | **Assessment Tool**(e.g., exam, rubric, portfolio) | **Institutional Outcome\***(e.g., ISLO1, ISLO2) |
|  | Demonstrate comprehension of spoken French by responding to questions about every-day activities and occurrences. | Oral exam | ISLO1, ISLO2, ISLO3, ISLO5 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Each SLO should describe the knowledge, skills, and/or abilities students will have after successful**

**completion of course or as a result of participation in activity/program.** A minimum of one SLO is required

per course/program. You may identify more than one SLO, but please note that you will need to collect and

evaluate data for each SLO that you list above. Attach separate pages if needed. *For assistance contact: Toni Pfister* *toni.pfister@imperial.edu* *or X6546*

**\*Institutional Student Learning Outcomes: ISLO1** = communication skills; I**SLO2** = critical thinking skills;

**ISLO3** = personal responsibility; I**SLO4** = information literacy; I**SLO5** = global awareness

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Course Number & Date of Assessment Cycle Completion**  | **Course:** French 100 **Date:** 11-18-11 |
| **2. People involved in summarizing and evaluating data** | Glenn Swiadon |
| **3. Data Results**Briefly summarize the results of the data you collected. | **Outcome 1:** Data from three French 100 classes given spring 2011 was analyzed by comparing in which out of the six categories on the oral midterm exam rubric sixty-three students scored the highest and lowest. Highest scoring categories were comprehension, pronunciation and vocabulary. Lowest scoring categories were grammar and pronunciation. No one scored lowest in comprehension, indicating that comprehension skills were sufficiently developed in most students. This is consistent with accepted assumptions about foreign language pedagogy, to wit: passive skills such as comprehension are frequently mastered before productive linguistic skills. The fact that student scores were also high in the categories of productive skills, i.e., pronunciation and vocabulary, indicates that a balance between passive and active skills is being achieved. However, since almost as many students scored lowest in pronunciation as scored highest, it can be concluded that pronunciation presents a significant challenge for some French 100 students. This, too, is consistent with findings in foreign language pedagogy to the effect that pronunciation is perfected during the more advanced stages of language learning. |
| **4. Course / Program Improvement**Please describe what change(s) you plan to implement based on the above results. | The conclusion drawn from the data is that no changes to the course, the curriculum or the syllabus are necessary at this time. |
| **5. Next Year** Was the process effective? Will you change the outcome/ assessment for next year? (e.g., alter the SLO, assessment, faculty discussion process, strategy for providing SLO to student)? If so, how? | The process was extremely effective in providing evaluation and analysis of listening and speaking competency. A refinement of the rubric will allow the evaluator to identify student performance in certain skills more specifically. |
| **6. After-Thoughts** Feel free to celebrate, vent, or otherwise discuss the process. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |