## CLA French French-International Trade BA 2017

There are two academic degree program options within the French program at Auburn University. Students seeking a BA degree in French will complete all university core requirements, all CLA core requirements, and a minimum of 39 credit hours in required and elective FLFR coursework. Required courses for the FLFR major constitute 21 credit hours including the one-hour Senior Capstone course. The remaining minimum 18 credit hours for the FLFR major are FLFR elective credit hours. Students seeking a BA degree in French-International Trade will complete all university core requirements and all CLA core requirements. In addition, FLFT students will complete 24 credit hours of supporting coursework within the College of Business. FLFT students must also complete 39 credit hours in required and elective FLFR coursework. Required courses for the FLFT major constitute 27 credit hours including six credits in business French and the one-hour Senior Capstone course.

The remaining minimum 12 credit hours for the FLFT major are FLFR elective credit hours.

## Student Learning Outcomes

### Specificity of Outcomes

By the time students complete the BA in French (FLFR or FLFT), they are expected to be able to: 1) identify important names, cultural objects, and significant dates and summarize their relevance to French and/or Francophone cultures; 2) produce oral communication in all major time frames in connected discourse (i.e. paragraph-length utterances); 3) compose written communication in all major time frames in connected discourse (i.e. multi-paragraph-length texts).

### Comprehensive Outcomes

The above list of student learning outcomes is comprehensive in that all coursework related to the major (FLFR/FLFT) contributes to the development and achievement of these three primary outcomes.

The French program measures the above-mentioned student learning outcomes (SLO) according to the ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) Proficiency Guidelines, a nationally recognized rubric for assessing language-learner proficiency. These standardized rubrics are nationally and internationally recognized by many major corporations and government agencies and are also aligned with evaluations of government agencies. They include detailed descriptions of what students must be able to tell, discuss, interpret, examine, formulate, and argue in the target language to demonstrate the respective proficiency level. Complete guidelines are available at: [ACTFL proficiency guidelines 2012](http://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012)

### Communicating Student Learning Outcomes

The French program shares its learning outcomes with all members of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures (FLL) faculty at the department faculty meeting in August. At individual program meetings throughout the academic year, faculty discuss the outcomes as well as possible methods to support and improve student learning. In the past, an electronic copy of the French/French-International Trade Program Assessment Report has been made available to members of the French section. In addition, the Assessment Committee of FLL calls for a FLL faculty meeting once per year to discuss program outcomes and suggests strategies for improved outcomes. The French program faculty also share student learning outcomes with students enrolled in the Senior Capstone course. Beginning in Fall 2017, undergraduate advisors/program directors will share SLOs with prospective majors during advising sessions. Also, effective Fall 2017, faculty teaching upper-level French courses will use class time to explain SLOs to students.

## Curriculum Map

### Curriculum Map

**French, BA (FLFR)**

Student Learning Outcomes

Students graduating with a BA degree in French (FLFR) will:

* 1. identify important names, cultural objects, and significant dates and summarize their relevance to French and/or Francophone cultures;
  2. produce oral communication in all major time frames in connected discourse;
  3. compose written communication in all major time frames in connected discourse.

| Required Coursework | Outcome 1  (Culture) | Outcome 2 (Oral) | Outcome 3  (Writing) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FLFR 2010 (Intermediate French I) | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| FLFR 2020 (Intermediate French II) | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| FLFR 3030 (Conversation); or FLFR  3010 (Phonetics); or FLFR 4030 (Continuing Conversation) | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| FLFR 3040 (Composition); or FLFR 4020  (Advanced Grammar); or FLFR 4040 (Continuing Composition) | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| FLFR 3100 (Intro. To French Lit.); or  FLFR 3140 (Survey of French Lit. I); or FLFR 3150 (Survey of French Lit. II) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| FLFR 3110 (Civilization) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| FLFR 4980 (Capstone) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| + 18 hours of elective coursework on the 3000- or 4000- level | 2/3 | 2/3 | 2/3 |

1=Introduced 2=Reinforced 3=Emphasized

**French-International Trade, BA (FLFT)**

Student Learning Outcomes

Students graduating with a BA degree in French (FLFT) will:

1. identify important names, cultural objects, and significant dates and summarize their relevance to French and/or Francophone businesses/cultures;
2. produce oral communication in all major time frames in connected discourse;
3. compose written communication in all major time frames in connected discourse.

| Required Coursework | Outcome 1 (Culture) | Outcome 2 (Oral) | Outcome 3 (Writing) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FLFR 2010 (Intermediate French I) | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| FLFR 2020 (Intermediate French II) | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| FLFR 3030 (Conversation); or FLFR 3010  (Phonetics); or FLFR 4030 (Continuing Conversation) | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| FLFR 3040 (Composition); or FLFR 4020 (Advanced Grammar); or FLFR 4040  (Continuing Composition) | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| FLFR 3100 (Intro. To French Lit.); or FLFR 3140  (Survey of French Lit. I); or FLFR 3150 (Survey of French Lit. II) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| FLFR 3110 (Civilization) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| FLFR 3310 (French for Business) | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| FLFR 4310 (French for International Trade) | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| FLFR 4980 (Capstone) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| + 12 hours of elective coursework on the  3000- or 4000- level | 2/3 | 2/3 | 2/3 |

1= Introduced 2=Reinforced 3=Emphasized

## Measurement

### Outcome-Measure Alignment

[Please provide a description of the assessment measures,noting how they were chosen/developed to align with the student learning outcomes.]

All French faculty assess the above-mentioned student learning outcomes in individual courses for which they are responsible for teaching. Iterations of these SLOs are explicitly stated on individual course syllabi. In order to measure students’ ability to identify important names, cultural objects, and significant dates and summarize their relevance to French and/or Francophone cultures, assignments include cultural comparisons, reflective journals, and response papers based on a cultural prompt. In order to measure students’ ability to produce oral communication in all major time frames in connected discourse (i.e. paragraph-length utterances), assignments include dialogues, role plays, skits, and in-class presentations. In order to measure students’ ability to compose written communication in all major time frames in connected discourse (i.e. multi-paragraph-length texts), assignments include, short essays, compositions, different modes of correspondence, and longer (research) papers.

During a student’s last semester prior to graduation, the student enrolls in a Senior Capstone course. This is a one-credit hour course for which students receive either a grade of S (Satisfactory) or U (Unsatisfactory). In order to measure students’ ability to identify important names, cultural objects, and significant dates and summarize their relevance to French and/or Francophone cultures, students are required to read and summarize a news or business article on an issue of current importance to a French-speaking country. Students meet with the Capstone professor and one other professor for a 15- to 20-minute interview during which students are asked to discuss 5 cultural questions chosen at random from a master list of culture questions. In order to measure students’ ability to produce oral communication in all major time frames in connected discourse (i.e. paragraph-length utterances), students are assessed during the above-mentioned cultural interview. This interview also allows for assessment of students’ reactions or responses to certain secondary questions posed by faculty in a more spontaneous manner of speech. In order to measure students’ ability to compose written communication in all major time frames in connected discourse (i.e. multi-paragraph-length texts), students read and provide a written summary of a news or business article on an issue of current importance to a French-speaking country. Additionally, students are given two questions adapted from ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) Proficiency Guidelines and need to write a short answer to them within a two-hour time frame.

### Direct Measures

[Please consider indicating which assessments are direct measures of student learning (e.g., exams, rubric scores).**]**

All of the measures mentioned above are direct measures of student learning.

### Data Collection

[Please provide a description of the assessment data collection process (i.e., information on how data were collected, who provided data, and the pertinent methodological details such as rating/scoring design).]

Not including data collection for individual courses throughout the sequence—because this varies widely according to instructor and would be extremely inefficient and impractical if not impossible to gather on a regular basis—our primary means of data collection is therefore based on our measurement of student learning outcomes as generated by students in the Senior Capstone course.

Therefore, data is collected as the Capstone faculty director as well as other French faculty complete a Senior Capstone Assessment Worksheet for each of the three SLOs identified above. The average scores from this year’s (2016-2017) data collection are provided below in #8 (Reporting Results). The templates of these assessment worksheets are found immediately below.

This data collection is coming from the oral and cultural face-to-face interview as well as the students’ writing samples. Because there are no standardized ACTFL guidelines for cultural assessment as there are for oral and written proficiency, students’ cultural knowledge is evaluated based on rubrics and a scale ranging from 1-4 (indicating: does not meet expectations, almost meets expectations, meets expectations, and exceeds expectations). For assessing oral and written communication our rubric is mapped onto the ACTFL guidelines whereby 1 equals Intermediate Low and Intermediate Mid; 2 equals Intermediate High; 3 equals Advanced Low and Advanced Mid; and 4 equals Advanced High and Superior.

Student , **C**ULTURE/**B**USINESS: Rubrics for Evaluation

| Score | Exceeds expectations **4** | Meets expectations **3** | Almost Meets expectations **2** | Does not meet expectations **1** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | C 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  B 1 2 3 4 5 | C 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  B 1 2 3 4 5 | C 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  B 1 2 3 4 5 | C 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Recall and Identification | Accurate identification of event, person, date, or business fact | Recognizes name but lacks specificity | Recall of name | No recognition or vague recall |
| Analysis of meaning and context | Accurate description of details and cultural/business context | Description of contexts lacks detail with some incoherence | Simple description, little coherence | Vague description (after interlocutor assisted with recall) |
| Interpretation of relevance | Precise interpretation of historical-cultural/business relevance for society today | Adequate explanation of relevance | Some, minimal explanation of relevance | Inadequate explanation  (after interlocutor assisted with recall) |

Student , ORAL PRODUCTION: Rubrics for Evaluation

| Score | Intermediate Low **1** | Intermediate Mid **1** | Intermediate High **2** | Advanced Low **3** | Advanced Mid  **3** | Advanced- High/Superior **4** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Language/  Vocabulary | Survival needs (food, making simple purchases) | Express personal meaning ; little circumlocution | Daily life and social situations, but limited when leaving the personal realm | Variety of communi- cative tasks; circumlocution and rephrasing | Large number of communicative tasks; circumlocution/ rephrasing | Abundant vocab on personal, inter/ national matters |
| Time frame | Present time | Present time  Difficulty manipulating time | Narrate and describe in all majors time frames most of the time | Narrate and describe in all major time frames; some control of aspect | Full accounts in all major time frames; good control of aspect | Explain in detail and narrate fully and accurately in all time frames |
| Topics/ Structure | Concrete topics; *limited* number of predictable topics social situations (self/family/ daily activities)  Reactive, struggle to answer direct questions | Handle variety of communicative tasks in straightforward social situations  Reactive, but capable of asking variety of questions to obtain information, strings of sentences | Ease and confidence in routine tasks and social situations related to work, school, and areas of competence  Some paragraph-length discourse | Personal topics as well as topics related to employment, current events; and matters of community interest  Linked sentences, connected discourse, paragraph length  Handle linguistic challenge by complications | Variety of topics related to work, school, leisure; and events of current/ public relevance. Narration combined and inter- woven in connected paragraph length dis- course. Handle linguistic challenge by complications | Variety of topics, structured arguments to support opinion, construction of hypotheses  Some topics dis- cussed abstractly but comfortable to discuss concretely |
| Pronunciation/ Comprehensi- bility | Pronunciation and syntax influenced heavily by first language  Generally understood by sympathetic interlocutors when accustomed to non-natives | Pauses and reformulations to find adequate vocabulary and syntax  Generally understood by sympathetic interlocutors when accustomed to non-natives | Generally understood by native speakers unaccustomed to non-natives, although interference from another language occurs (false cognates, literal translations) | Understood by native speakers unaccustomed to non-natives, with some repetition and restatement  Certain grammatical roughness | Readily under-stood by native speakers unaccustomed to non-natives  Substantial flow of speech | Readily by native speakers unaccustomed to non-natives  Great fluency and ease of speech |

Student\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, WRITTEN PRODUCTION: Rubrics for Evaluation:

| Score | Intermediate Low **1** | Intermediate Mid **1** | Intermediate High **2** | Advanced Low **3** | Advanced Mid  **3** | Advanced- High/Superior **4** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Vocabulary | Basic, elementary needs | Basic, personal and common needs | Basic, personal, social (work/ school) needs | Meets basic work and academic needs | Meets a range of work/academic needs | Wide general vocabulary for in/ formal correspondence |
| Time frame | Present time | Present time, contains reference to other time frames | Use different time frames, but inconsistent, with appropriate time markers | Describes in major time frames with control of aspect | Describes with detail in all major time frames, good control of aspect | Narrates and describes in major time frames, solid control of aspect |
| Function, Structure | Statements, quest-ions about familiar material  Simple, conversational type sentences, repetitive  Topics tied to personal information | Control of basic sentence structure, personal  Sentences loosely strung together  Resembles oral discourse  Personal topics, daily routines, common events | Compositions and simple summaries  Narrations often of paragraph length, correspond to spoken language  Descriptions, narrations about school experience | Compositions, brief summaries  Paragraph length and structure  Patterns of oral dis- course, resembles writing style of first language  Familiar topics | Cohesive, several paragraphs in length  control of frequent target language syntactic structure (and vocabulary)  Topics of general interest | Significant precision and details in sum- maries and reports  Topics relating to particular interests and special interests  (Inconsistent) construction of hypotheses |
| Comprehen- sibility | Understood by natives used to writing of non- natives (with some effort) | Understood easily by natives used to  writing of non-natives | Comprehensible to natives not used to the writing of non-natives | Understood by natives not accustomed to writing of non-natives (with some effort) | Understood readily by natives not used to the writing of non- natives | Some linguistic limitations may distract native reader from message |

## Results

### Reporting Results

[Please provide assessment resultsaligned with the student learning outcomes. If historical assessment data is available, consider providing this data to reveal any student learning trends.**]**

For comparative purposes, below are the assessment results for the ten graduating seniors during the academic year 2016-2017. These results encompass both FLFR and FLFT majors and include data from **Fall 2016 and Spring 2017**. The reported score is the average score from all faculty input received

**Fall 2016 and Spring 2017**

| Student | Outcome 1 (Culture) | Outcome 2 (Oral) | Outcome 3 (Writing) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student #1 | 1.3 | 3.58 | 3.83 |
| Student #2 | 1.6 | 1.91 | 2.16 |
| Student #3 | 3.5 | 3.83 | 2.25 |
| Student #4 | 3.25 | 3.0 | 2.5 |
| Student #5 | 3.87 | 3.0 | 2.56 |
| Student #6 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.18 |
| Student #7 | 3.06 | 2.87 | 3.06 |
| Student #8 | 2.25 | 2.0 | 2.5 |
| Student #9 | 3.08 | 2.33 | 2.62 |
| Student #10 | 2.37 | 2.0 | 2.5 |

For comparative purposes, below are the assessment results for the seven graduating seniors during the academic year 2015-2016. These results encompass both FLFR and FLFT majors and include data from **Fall 2015 and Spring 2016**. The reported score is the average score from all faculty input received.

**Fall 2015 and Spring 2016**

| Student | Outcome 1 (Culture) | Outcome 2 (Oral) | Outcome 3 (Writing) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student #1 | 4 | 4 | 3.85 |
| Student #2 | 3 | 2.5 | 3 |
| Student #3 | 3.85 | 3.5 | 3.85 |
| Student #4 | 2.75 | 3 | 3 |
| Student #5 | 2.25 | 3.75 | 3.75 |
| Student #6 | 2.63 | 2 | 2.25 |
| Student #7 | 0.50 | 0.75 | 2.5 |

### Interpreting Results

[Please provide an interpretation of the results aligned with the student learning outcomes. The interpretation should reflect consideration of factors (e.g., capabilities of a particular cohort, innovative curricular change) that may have affected the results. ]

Based on the above assessment results it appears that among our three identified student learning outcomes, students’ proficiency in writing continues to remain the strongest. This could be due to our push as a French section to include more writing activities in our curriculum across all levels of language instruction. The average score for the oral proficiency outcome (2.80) has only increased by two one-hundreths of a point since last year’s reporting (AY 2015-2016) of 2.78; however, this score is considerably below the 2.92 average score reported in AY 2013-2014. It could be that the lower- performing student (1.91) pulled down this average. The remaining student learning outcome—that related to cultural competency—has now increased since last year’s reporting. This year, the average score of this SLO is 2.82. This year’s Senior Capstone results differ from those reported in the previous year. Also, based on the 2013-2014 academic year, we see some differences in that—for AY 2013-2014, the learning outcome related to culture was the strongest component. The students who received higher scores are those that are native speakers, have had high-school instruction of French, and/or had participated in study abroad programs. No specific curriculum changes were made since the last reporting; therefore, these are not relevant factors. Although we have not made changes to the curriculum, we did, however, slightly change the Capstone course experience for Spring 2017 by requiring students to meet with us around mid-semester to assess their progress in their preparation of cultural questions. We were prompted to make this change after we saw the lower average score (2.13) in this SLO during data collection of Fall 2016.

### Communicating Results

[Please provide a very brief narrative describing with whom the results are shared (e.g., all program faculty).]

Once our assessment results are reported to the Office of Academic Assessment, a copy of our Program Assessment Report for the French program is circulated to other members of the French faculty by e-mail. Subsequently, this report is circulated again and discussed during a program faculty meeting in the following Fall semester. Therefore, this year’s AY 2016-2017 report will be shared, distributed, and discussed during the Fall 2017 semester. There are actually two meetings: one during a program-specific meeting and another during a special meeting of the FLL Department Assessment Committee—to which all department faculty are invited. Last year—during Fall 2016—two professors provided a PowerPoint presentation about the new assessment measures focusing specificially on the curriculum map and student learning outcomes—two areas that were singled out as needing improvement in the feedback received from the previous year. After this presentation, there were break-out groups for each program where faculty discussed assessment results as well as program- specific goals related to student learning outcomes and our curriculum.

## Use of Results

### Purposeful Reflection and Action Plan

[Please provide a narrativedescribing the process in which faculty engage to discuss assessment results and create actionable plans in an effort to improve student learning.]

Discussions of Senior Capstone results as well as revisiting questions of curriculum development based on our students’ performance always have a place during our program section meetings. In fact, four years ago, following the suggestion of our FLL Department Assessment Committee, the French section agreed to focus on improving one student learning outcome: students’ competence in written communication. From this effort, we were able identify the need for greater in-class writing assessment and implemented more opportunities for student improvement in our individual classroom instruction. No other action plan has been developed since that time; however, the French faculty did work to change our methods of data collection for the Senior Capstone course (as outlined above) in order to have a better sense of where our students fall on the proficiency scale.