

Course Assessment Report  
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Spanish (new)	111	SPN 111 08/13/2021-First Year Spanish I
College	Division	Department
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities, Language & the Arts	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?

Yes

The last assessment report posted on the WCC curriculum log is from Fall 2006.

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

**Overall:** The standard of success (SOS) for this assessment was met. 78% of students met the standard of success. Note: The outcomes were not assessed individually but rather holistically. Students had to meet the performance indicators for both outcomes to be considered successful. We now know SLOs must be assessed independently.

**Strengths:** Comprehension skills were particularly strong. Most students communicated effectively by properly applying a variety of vocabulary items and grammatical structures.

**Weaknesses:** The individual test items that earned the lowest scores included more complex skills and concepts that were taught toward the end of the semester. It also appeared that not all students had received the same rigor of instruction across all sections.

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

**Action Plan:** Spend more class time practicing the complex grammatical structures and communicative concepts covered toward the end of the term.

**Departmental Follow-up:** Clearly communicate the rigor expected across all sections of the course and encourage instructors to use informal assessments, using a similar format as the formal assessment tool, so students are not confused by an evaluation format they have never previously seen.

## II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Comprehend and communicate in Spanish at the elementary level.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Departmentally-developed and graded test in the form of comprehension questions. Half of the questions will be written and half will be given orally in the form of a "dictado." The format of a "dictado" is as follows: a. Instructor asks questions orally. b. Students write each question. c. Students respond to questions using complete sentences.
  - Assessment Date: Fall 2010
  - Course section(s)/other population: A random sample of one third of the students.
  - Number students to be assessed: Number of students to be assessed is approximately 100.
  - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric.
  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% or more of students receive 70% or higher on the dictado (refer to rubric for specifics).
  - Who will score and analyze the data: Full-time instructors.

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)

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
	55

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.

Assessment Data was collected in **Fall 2019**. According to the oraweb section status report from FA19, there were a total of **140 students enrolled** in SPN 111.

**4** students had **withdrawn** and **26** students were **absent** for the assessment. As such, there were **110 completed assessments**.

Of these, **50%** of were randomly selected, from all sections, for a total of **55** assessments.

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.

SPN 111 was only offered face-to-face during Fall 2019 and there was just one evening section. All sections and modalities were included in this assessment.

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

**Five oral questions**, with varying degrees of difficulty, were included on each instructor's final exam. Student responses were scored using a rubric that evaluated each student's level of comprehension (0-5 points), as well as how effectively they were able to articulate a response and *communicate* in the target language (0-5 points). See **attached rubric** and **spreadsheet** for detailed scoring criteria, raw data, and an item analysis.

Since there were 5 questions, each worth 10 points, the highest possible score was 50 points.

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

**Outcome 1 Assessment Data Summary:**

**94.5%** of students, **52/55**, scored 70% or higher and met the SOS for outcome one. **5.5%** of students, **3/55**, did not meet the SOS. The results break down as follows:

**43.6%**, 24/55, scored between **90-100%**.

**27.2%**, 15/55, scored between **80-89%**

**23.6%**, 13/55, scored between **70-79%**

**5.45%**, 3/55, scored **below 70%**

**85.7%** was the overall average for outcome 1.

We did an **item analysis** to see how well students scored on each individual question. (See attached spreadsheet). In general, students demonstrated a very high level of comprehension across all questions. However, many struggled to properly apply more challenging and complex grammatical structures, as reflected in the overall score for question two, where just 69% of students earned 70% or above. The two questions with the lowest scores, questions two and five, contain direct object pronouns - a topic that challenged many students. This will be an area to target for improvement.

#### **Item Analysis for Outcome 1:**

Question 1: **91%**, 50/55, met the SOS.

Question 2: **69%**, 38/55, earned 70% or higher. The SOS was not met for this question.

Note: The SOS was not met for question two. The grammatical structures in question two will be targeted for improvement. These include the application of direct object pronouns and responding to questions in the 2nd person plural, *ustedes*, form.

Question 3: **89%**, 49/55, met the SOS.

Question 4: **98%**, 54/55, met the SOS.

Question 5: **80%**, 44/55, met the SOS.

Question five also contained a direct object pronoun. Unlike question two, however, many students were able to articulate an effective response, while avoiding the use of a direct object pronoun.

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

The assessment results demonstrate that students' biggest strength is their ability to comprehend the target language, in this case, Spanish. Their responses showed strong comprehension skills - they overwhelmingly understood the questions, and they also demonstrated a good grasp of elementary-level Spanish vocabulary.

They did particularly well when responding to questions that targeted content from the first half of the semester.

Other strengths worth mentioning: The vast majority of students were able to respond with the proper verb tense and person to the questions asked, as well as deliver a coherent and logical response. Even when they struggled with sentence structure, they were often able to achieve a response that preserved effective communication.

While the scores for outcome one clearly show that students' comprehension skills are stronger than their ability to articulate a grammatically correct response, this should be expected. Similar to native language acquisition, language students develop listening and comprehension skills first and more quickly, whereas productive language skills take longer to develop.

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.

As mentioned in the previous section, students overwhelmingly understood the questions but were not always able to respond properly. As such, students could benefit from more opportunities to apply and practice the language in class. It is a big leap to go from guided practice activities to communicating in real time.

The item analysis shows that students were most challenged by the complex structures covered towards the end of the semester, such as the preterit (simple past) tense and direct object pronouns, which correlate to questions 3., 4., and 7. Since these structures are more complex in Spanish than in English, all students could benefit from incorporating more paired or small group oral practice exercises using these structures.

Outcome 2: Express information, thoughts and feelings using a variety of verb forms, vocabulary and grammatical structures.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Departmentally-developed and graded test in the form of comprehension questions. Half of the questions will be written and half will be given orally in the form of a "dictado." The format of a "dictado" is as follows: a. Instructor asks questions orally. b. Students write each question. c. Students respond to questions using complete sentences.
  - Assessment Date: Fall 2010
  - Course section(s)/other population: A random sample of one third of the students.

- Number students to be assessed: Number of students to be assessed is approximately 100.
- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric.
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% or more of students receive 70% or higher on the dictado (refer to rubric specifics).
- Who will score and analyze the data: Full-time instructors.

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)

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
	55

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.

Assessment Data was collected in **Fall 2019**. According to the oraweb section status report from FA19, there were a total of **140 students enrolled** in SPN 111.

**4** students had **withdrawn** and **26** students were **absent** for the assessment. As such, there were **110 completed assessments**.

Of these, **50%** of were randomly selected, from all sections, for a total of **55** assessments.

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.

SPN 111 was only offered face-to-face during Fall 2019 and there was just one evening section. All sections and modalities were included in this assessment.

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

Students were required to write a **paragraph** (minimum 8 sentences) in response to a prompt on the **final exam**. All instructors included two prompts on their final

exam and students were able to choose one of these and compose a paragraph by incorporating vocabulary and grammatical structures covered in SPN 111.

Responses were scored using a **rubric** that evaluated the students' *command of sentence structure* (1-10 points), *accurate application and variety of vocabulary* (1-5 pts.), and *effective and clear communication* (1-5 pts.). The maximum possible score was 20 points. See the attached **rubric** for detailed scoring criteria and **sheet two** of the attached **spreadsheet** for raw data and an item analysis.

Students were able to choose between two prompts: one in which they introduced themselves to their new classmates, described themselves (age, physical and personality traits), daily activities, likes/dislikes and hobbies. The second option was to describe their ideal vacation, including the weather, what they'd pack, and what activities they'd do while there.

In the original assessment plan, comprehension questions, like those used to assess outcome one, were going to be used to assess outcome two. However, we determined a paragraph would more accurately evaluate students' ability to *express information, thoughts and feelings using a variety of verb forms, vocabulary and grammatical structures*. Outcome two requires students to synthesize and apply what they've been studying all semester.

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

**Outcome 2 Assessment Data Summary:**

**82%** of students, **45/55**, scored 70% or higher and met the SOS for outcome two. **18%**, **10/55**, did not meet the SOS. The results break down as follows:

**35%**, 19/55, scored between **90-100%**.

**29%**, 16/55, scored between **80-89%**.

**18%**, 10/55, scored between **70-79%**

**18%**, 10/55, scored **below 70%**

**80%** was the overall average for outcome 2.

We did an **item analysis** to determine how well students scored on each **performance indicator** for outcome two. (See attached rubric and page two of spreadsheet).

**Item Analysis for Outcome 2:**

Command of Sentence Structure and Grammar: **85%**, 47/55, met the SOS. The overall average was 76%.

Accurate Application and Variety of Vocabulary: **82%**, 45/55, met the SOS. The overall average was 84%.

Effective, Appropriate, and Clear Communication: **80%**, 44/55, met the SOS. The overall average was 84%.

In a nutshell, the vast majority of students used a variety of vocabulary and were able to communicate effectively. Overall sentence structure was good and effective communication was often achieved, despite structural errors.

Note: Although the SOS was highest for sentence structure and grammar, individual student scores were lower overall for this performance indicator than for vocabulary usage and effective communication. (See average score for each performance indicator).

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

Overall, student achievement was strong for outcome two. The vast majority of students were able to compose a paragraph, utilizing a variety of vocabulary and grammatical concepts, to effectively communicate their thoughts. Some students had very few to no errors, which is impressive. For those whose paragraph contained occasional errors in word choice or structure, clear communication was often preserved in spite of these errors. Of the three performance indicators, students scored highest on vocabulary usage and effective communication, with an 84% average on both outcomes.

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.

The SOS was achieved for all three performance indicators: 85% met SOS for Sentence Structure, 82% met SOS for Application of Vocab., and 80% met SOS for Effective Communication.



However, if you drill down into the data, you will see that the average score for sentence structure/grammar was 76%, which is 8% points lower than the average scores for the other two performance indicators, which were both 84%.

Students spend a great deal of time developing comprehension skills in a first semester class, and when asked to write or speak, they often do so with just a one sentence response. In a similar vein, grammar is often tested in isolation, which is easier than applying several grammar rules simultaneously.

That said, incorporating more writing assignments will give students the opportunity to synthesize and apply the disparate grammar rules and individual vocab items they are learning in class.

### 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.

-There was a concern, identified in a previous assessment, that not all sections of SPN 111 were taught with the same level of rigor. Since that time, there has been increased communication among Spanish instructors, as well as professional development opportunities to help streamline instruction across all sections.

-The new assessment tool used for outcome two was a more informative tool than the one used in previous assessments. It required students to move beyond communicating at the sentence level.

-We also modified our rubrics and performance indicator criteria, which helped to identify strengths and areas to target for improvement.

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?

The United States is the second largest Spanish-speaking country in the world.

This course meets the needs of students that want to learn to communicate in Spanish. Based on this assessment, students' comprehension skills are strong after completing SPN 111. Likewise, students are able to use elementary-level vocab and grammar to communicate thoughts and factual information in Spanish. In addition to these beginning-level language skills, students are also introduced to the diversity of the Spanish-speaking world and the cultural richness and long-standing history of Hispanic cultures both outside and within the United States.

From a purely pragmatic view, this class transfers, one-to-one, to four-year schools as a first semester Spanish course. It also fulfills the Humanities Gen Ed. requirement at WCC.

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

We plan to discuss the assessment results and action plan during the fall 2021 in-service.

4. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Course Assignments	<p>-Incorporate more opportunities for students to develop writing skills, including low-stakes guided writing during class, as well as written assignments to be completed outside of class.</p> <p>-Incorporate more opportunities to practice direct object pronouns in a communicative context.</p> <p>-Include more questions that use the formal <i>you (usted)</i> and second person plural forms (<i>vosotros and/or ustedes</i>).</p>	<p>-Writing at the paragraph, rather than sentence, level forces students to dig more deeply into their linguistic resources and combine various linguistic elements to achieve a clear, coherent message.</p> <p>-The item analysis for outcome one demonstrates that students struggle with Spanish direct object pronouns. They would benefit from more in-class guided practice, as well as question/answer oral drills done in pairs and small groups.</p> <p>-There are four ways to express 'you' in Spanish. Students often</p>	2021

		<p>confuse <i>ustedes</i> (<i>plural you</i>) with <i>ellos</i> (<i>they</i>), since they share the same conjugation.</p> <p>Students are also less proficient using the formal (vs. informal) <i>you</i> (<i>usted</i>), since there is no English counterpart.</p> <p>Navigating these various forms of <i>you</i> is important for cross-cultural communication.</p>	
--	--	---	--

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

No.

### III. Attached Files

[Rubric: Outcome 1](#)

[Rubric: Outcome 2](#)

[SPN 111 Assessment Data Spreadsheet](#)

**Faculty/Preparer:** Michelle Garey **Date:** 08/21/2021

**Department Chair:** Elisabeth Thoburn **Date:** 08/24/2021

**Dean:** Scott Britten **Date:** 08/27/2021

**Assessment Committee Chair:** Shawn Deron **Date:** 11/10/2021

**COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**I. Background Information**

1. Course assessed:  
 Course Discipline Code and Number: **SPN 111**  
 Course Title: **First Year Spanish I**  
 Division/Department Codes: **FLG**
  
2. Semester assessment was conducted (check one):  
 **Fall 2006**  
 Winter 20\_\_  
 Spring/Summer 20\_\_
  
3. Assessment tool(s) used: check all that apply.  
 Portfolio  
 Standardized test  
 Other external certification/licensure exam (specify):  
 Survey  
 Prompt  
 Departmental exam  
 Capstone experience (specify):  
 Other (specify):
  
4. Have these tools been used before?  
 Yes  
 No

If yes, have the tools been altered since its last administration? If so, briefly describe changes made. N/A

5. Indicate the number of students assessed/total number of students enrolled in the course.

Five sections of SPN111 were assessed, for a total of 84 students. However, one instructor did not follow assessment instructions, thereby invalidating the assessment tool for her entire class. The data from this particular section are not included in the summary statistics. Accordingly, the results below account for the performance of 68 students.

The total number of students enrolled at the time of assessment administration was 241. As planned, the assessment was to have included at least 35% of the SPN111 student population. However, given the aforementioned administrative error in one section, the valid student sample is somewhat smaller than intended.

6. Describe how students were selected for the assessment.

Sections to be assessed were randomly selected at a department meeting. One faculty member wrote all section numbers, which totaled 13, on small slips of paper. These papers were placed in a hat and 5 were blindly selected for assessment.

**II. Results**

1. Briefly describe the changes that were implemented in the course as a result of the previous assessment.  
 N/A
  
2. State each outcome (verbatim) from the master syllabus for the course that was assessed.
  1. Comprehend and communicate in Spanish at the elementary level.
  2. Express information, thoughts, and feelings using a variety of verb forms, vocabulary and grammatical structures.

**COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT**

3. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected during the course assessment, demonstrating the extent to which students are achieving each of the learning outcomes listed above. *Please attach a summary of the data collected.*
- a. 78% of students assessed (53 students) demonstrated achievement of course outcomes.
  - b. 22% of students (15 total students) did not achieve course outcomes.
  - c. Of those students demonstrating success, 53% of students (36 students) received an 85% or higher on the assessment tool.

See attachments for: Assessment administered, copy of actual student assessment, scoring rubric, graphs showing detailed assessment data.

4. For each outcome assessed, indicate the standard of success used, and the percentage of students who achieved that level of success. *Please attach the rubric/scoring guide used for the assessment.*

The same assessment tool and rubric was used to simultaneously measure both course outcomes. (See attached rubric).

Standard of success: 70% or more of students receiving a 70% or higher on the assessment.

5. Describe the areas of strength and weakness in students' achievement of the learning outcomes shown in assessment results.
- Strengths:
- a. Our success criteria were met, with 80% of students achieving course outcomes.
  - b. Comprehension skills were particularly strong across all sections.
  - c. The majority of students also communicated effectively by properly applying a variety of vocabulary items and grammatical structures.
  - d. The majority of students demonstrating achievement of course outcomes (53%) actually earned an 85% or higher on the assessment tool.

Weaknesses: Overall the assessment results were strong. However, areas for consideration include:

- a. In one particular section, only 63% of students successfully completed the assessment, falling below our 70% success minimum. This may be explained by the proportionately smaller number of students in this section, only 15. Furthermore, the number of successful assessments was just 7% below our success criteria. As such, no action will be taken.
- b. Analysis of data across sections may indicate statistically meaningful variation. The assessment results of those sections taught by fulltime instructors were significantly stronger than those taught by part-time faculty. It could be coincidental but it is a trend we should be mindful of in the future.
- c. The individual questions/item numbers that earned the lowest scores by students contained grammatical structures taught toward the end of the semester, such as the preterit tense and direct object pronouns. These results are not surprising given that students have had less practice with these grammatical elements.

**COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**III. Changes influenced by assessment results**

1. If weaknesses were found (see above) or students did not meet expectations, describe the action that will be taken to address these weaknesses.

No action will be taken for items II 5a. and 5c., listed under *weakness* (see previous page).

With respect to item II 5b., possible statistically relevant variation between section numbers, the following action will be taken: The department chair should clearly communicate to all instructors the pace and rigor necessary to successfully achieve outcomes for this course. All instructors should also be encouraged to practice the type of comprehension questions used on the assessment tool throughout the semester, in order to familiarize students to this format.

2. Identify intended changes that will be instituted based on results of this assessment activity (check all that apply). Please describe changes and give rationale for change.

Please see section III above.

- a.  Outcomes/Assessments on the Master Syllabus  
Change/rationale:

- b.  Objectives/Evaluation on the Master Syllabus  
Change/rationale:

- c.  Course pre-requisites on the Master Syllabus  
Change/rationale:

- d.  1<sup>st</sup> Day Handouts  
Change/rationale:

- e.  Course assignments  
Change/rationale:

- f.  Course materials (check all that apply)  
 Textbook  
 Handouts  
 Other:

- g.  Instructional methods  
Change/rationale:

- h.  Individual lessons & activities  
Change/rationale:

3. What is the timeline for implementing these actions? Before the start of FA07.

**IV. Future plans**

1. Describe the extent to which the assessment tools used were effective in measuring student achievement of learning outcomes for this course.

This assessment tool effectively measured student achievement of course outcomes due to its format and content. Students were required to comprehend questions in the target language and communicate logical responses by expressing information, thoughts, and feelings. The questions chosen were a synthesis of the grammatical structures, vocabulary, and verb forms taught throughout the semester. A successful student response required initial comprehension of the question then proper application of course elements in order to achieve communicative competence.

**COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT**

2. If the assessment tools were not effective, describe the changes that will be made for future assessments.  
N/A

3. Which outcomes from the master syllabus have been addressed in this report?  
All  Selected

If "All", provide the report date for the next full review: FA09.

"Selected", provide the report date for remaining outcomes: N/A

**Submitted by:**

Name: Michelle Garey Michelle Garey Date: 3-12-2007  
Print/Signature

Department Chair: Michelle Garey Michelle Garey Date: 3-19-2007  
Print/Signature

Dean: [Signature] Date: MAR 20 2007  
Print/Signature