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Part A
1. List of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

   5. Literacy: Ability to use appropriate terminology in linguistic, cultural, or literary analysis.
   6. Cultural Analysis and Comparison: Develop the students’ ability to draw upon their cultural knowledge of France and the Francophone world to analyze and compare a wide variety of texts.
   7. Literary and Cultural Texts and Traditions: Develop knowledge of major periods, genres, authors, movements of French and Francophone cultural history.
   8. Connections to Other Disciplines and Language Communities
   9. Technology: demonstrate information processing competency, use of appropriate technologies and tools for research, analysis, communication, and presentation.

The French faculty meet at least once per semester, typically near the end of the semester, to discuss the students’ overall performance in the French B.A. Program based on the courses offered in a given semester. The wording of the French B.A. PLOs is periodically revised to make them more proactive in demonstrating what the students are able to accomplish and how they meet the various PLOs. These are clearly spelled out with distinct and measurable standardized outcomes designed on a course by course basis following a logical progression in accordance with the course by course French B.A. assessment roadmap. PLOs 1 through 4 are tied closely and directly to language proficiency based on the French WebCape (Computer Adaptive Placement Exam) results and as determined as well by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the TEF guidelines based on the Common European Framework.
of Reference for Languages (CEFRL) following a logical progression for each of the four language skills: writing, reading, speaking and understanding. Every course in the French B.A. Program clearly identifies and assesses the students’ progress in these key knowledge and skill areas by providing appropriate objective and measurable benchmarks or minimum thresholds course by course at the beginning and end of the semester in order to assess the students’ proficiency level as they progress through the language sequence. For the less language-based French courses focusing more on PLOs 5 through 9, such as the culture and literature courses, the student learning outcomes focus and are based on more specialized, disciplinary knowledge and content. For example, in the culture classes, students need to demonstrate competence in a wide range of disciplines and perspectives relating to French and Francophone culture including but not limited to history, geography, literature, anthropology, sociology, political science, economics, folklore, music, fine and folk arts and dance in accordance with the course by course French B.A. assessment roadmap. Assessment data collected and analyzed highlights, however, certain weaknesses in the students’ ability to meet the overall Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) to satisfy required core student competencies.

2. Map of PLOs to University Learning Goals (ULGs)

**Specialized Knowledge**
- Depth of knowledge required for a degree, as identified by its program learning outcomes.

PLO 1  Language & Communication. Written Expression. Develop advanced (ACTFL) skills in writing French.

PLO 2  Language & Communication. Reading Comprehension. Develop advanced (ACTFL) skills in reading French.


PLO 4  Language & Communication. Listening Comprehension. Develop advanced (ACTFL) skills in understanding French.

**Broad Integrative Knowledge**
- Mastery in each step of an investigative, creative or practical project (e.g. brainstorming, planning, formulating hypotheses or complex questions, designing, creating, completing, and communicating).
- An understanding of the implications of results or findings from a particular work in a societal context (e.g. social or economic implications of a scientific finding).
Students graduating with a baccalaureate degree will have demonstrated an understanding of critical components of broad academic areas, the arts, humanities, social sciences, and sciences and their integration.

PLO 6 Cultural Analysis and Comparison: Develop the students’ ability to draw upon their cultural knowledge of France and the Francophone world to analyze and compare a wide variety of texts.

**Intellectual Skills**
- Fluency in the use of specific theories, tools, technology and graphical representation.
- Skills and abilities necessary for life-long learning: critical and creative thinking, effective communication, conscientious information gathering and processing, mastery of quantitative methodologies, and the ability to engage effectively in collaborative activities.

PLO 5 Literacy: Ability to use appropriate terminology in linguistic, cultural, or literary analysis.

PLO 9 Technology: demonstrate information processing competency, use of appropriate technologies and tools for research, analysis, communication, and presentation.

**Applied Knowledge**
- The ability to integrate theory, practice, and problem-solving to address practical issues.
- The ability to apply their knowledge and skills to new settings or in addressing complex problems.
- The ability to work productively as individuals and in groups

PLO 7 Literary and Cultural Texts and Traditions: Develop knowledge of major periods, genres, authors, movements of French and Francophone cultural history.

**Social and Global Responsibilities**
- The ability to act intentionally and ethically to address a global or local problem in an informed manner with a multicultural and historical perspective and a clear understanding of societal and civic responsibilities.
- Diverse and global perspectives through engagement with the multidimensional SJSU community.

PLO 8 Connections to Other Disciplines and Language Communities

Although some of the PLOs overlap in more than one ULG because of their interdependent and progressive nature as pointed out above in the explanation following the list of Program Learning Outcomes, this is the most distinct and precise means of associating and assigning discreet French B.A.
PLOs to University Learning Goals based on the specialized knowledge/skills criteria and the spirit of each ULG.

3. **Alignment – Matrix of PLOs to Courses**

| PLO #1 | 101A | 101B | 101C | PLO #2 | 101A | 101B | 101C | PLO #3 | 101A | 101B | 101C | PLO #4 | 101A | 101B | 101C | PLO #5 | 102A | 102B | 102C | 105 | 110 | 132 | 170 |
| PLO #6 | 102A | 102B | 102C | 120A | 120B | 140A | 140B | 160 | PLO #7 | 102A | 102B | 102C | 120A | 120B | 140A | 140B | 160 | PLO #8 | 102A | 102B | 102C | 120A | 120B | 140A | 140B | 160 | PLO #9 | All upper division courses |

4. **Planning – Assessment Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO #1</td>
<td>101A</td>
<td>101B</td>
<td>101A</td>
<td>101B</td>
<td>101A</td>
<td>101B</td>
<td>101A</td>
<td>101B</td>
<td>101A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140A</td>
<td>140B</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>101B</td>
<td>101C</td>
<td>102B</td>
<td>102A</td>
<td>120B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td>Course 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>101A</td>
<td>101B</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>101C</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101C</td>
<td>101C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>101C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101C</td>
<td>101C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>140A</td>
<td>140B</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>140B</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>120A</td>
<td>120B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td></td>
<td>102B</td>
<td>120B</td>
<td>102B</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>120A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>102B</td>
<td>140B</td>
<td>102B</td>
<td>120B</td>
<td>102B</td>
<td>120A</td>
<td>120A</td>
<td>120B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>102B</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>120A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>140B</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>120B</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>120A</td>
<td>120B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an identifiable and highlighted need across the B.A. curricula to continue to focus more on vocabulary building exercises, more frequent reading and listening comprehension exercises and testing by incorporating more vocabulary, reading and listening comprehension questions into the classroom activities and tests along with the testing of their knowledge of French grammar. For example, in the 101 course sequence, the students’ weakness in the areas mentioned above is clearly observable and measurable. As a result of the need for a more clearly defined and objective means of determining their
language proficiency, the internationally recognized TEF (Test d’Évaluation du français) used, for example, by Canadian Immigration, French Universities and for work to assess “comprehension and expression skills in French” by giving “a quantitative and qualitative measure of the level of candidate’s linguistic and communication skills” and offering “a detailed and personalized analysis of the results.” This has been implemented as in the course curricula as early as the second-year intermediate level course sequence and is an effective assessment tool for the proficiency-based language courses and an important component of the students’ overall course grade. Given this is a long-term process, the determination of the effectiveness of this crucial assessment tool will be on-going effort.

Previous assessment data also points to the need at the program level for students to further develop their information literacy and to learn how to properly document sources using an appropriate style guide, such as MLA. Students need to become more proficient and savvy at using internet and non-internet sources for the purpose of scholarly research. This new focus is clearly articulated in a standardized grading rubric for research-based writing assignments and will continue to be closely monitored by the French faculty for its overall effectiveness and impact on the program learning objectives and adjusted, if necessary, in the longer term. For example, this is especially true when students are asked to articulate or demonstrate the interrelatedness of knowledge between French courses, such as in culture and literature, by building on the body of knowledge which they have acquired in previous French courses and other university courses for that matter and by making the appropriate connections and drawing the necessary conclusions (PLO 8).

5. Student Experience

As of Fall 2013, a statement about the Program Learning Outcomes of the French Program appears in all course syllabi calendars as a discussion item for the first day of instruction. Furthermore, course activities are identified and tied closely to Program Learning Outcomes. PLOs are also clearly identified on the Department’s website under the French Program. Midterm course evaluations, informal surveys and SOTE results are taken into account when evaluating the effectiveness of on-going assessment strategies and the need for modifying and developing future assessment activities.

Part B

6. Graduation Rates for Total, Non URM and URM Students by Program

Note: URM = African-American, Hispanic, and American-Indians; Non-URM = White and Asian/Pacific Islander; Other = Other and Foreign
7. Headcount of Program Majors and New Students by Programs and Degree

Note: 1st Fr. = First-time Freshmen; Transf = Transfer Students; UGs = Undergraduate Students; Creds = Credential Students; Grads = Graduate Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World Languages and Literatures</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Entering</th>
<th>% Grad</th>
<th>New UG Transfers: 3 Year Graduation Rates</th>
<th>Grad : 3 Year Graduation Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2007 Cohort</td>
<td>Fall 2010 Cohort</td>
<td>Fall 2010 Cohort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entering</td>
<td>% Grad</td>
<td>Entering</td>
<td>% Grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-URM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. SFR (Exhibit 3) and Average Headcount per Section (Exhibit 2) by Course Prefix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix</th>
<th>Course Level</th>
<th>Student to Faculty Ratio (SFR)</th>
<th>Average Headcount per Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FREN - French</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Division</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Percentage of Full-time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) for tenured/tenure-track instructional faculty by Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World Languages &amp; Literatures</th>
<th>% Tenured/Prob</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Temp Lecturer</th>
<th>Probationary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>9.354</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part C

Closing the Loop/Recommended Actions

As outlined above after the assessment schedule and as a means of assessing PLOs 1 through 4, especially in the grammar/composition foundation courses such as French 101A, French 101B and 101C, in addition to the analysis of computerized placement exam scores at the beginning and at the end of
the respective semester, the most significant and beneficial modification has been the addition of TEF training exercises as class activities, mid-semester and final tests. Demonstration of listening comprehension at the advanced levels (ACTFL advanced low and superior, and CEFRL C1-C2) are routinely evaluated as part of the course grade. Specific listening comprehension tests/activities have been developed in order to evaluate various PLOs. Data is being collected in the form of oral test results conducted in class for further evaluation as to its long-term, overall program implications and benefits. Vocabulary building exercises, more frequent reading and listening comprehension exercises and testing by incorporating more vocabulary, reading and listening comprehension questions into the classroom activities and tests along with the testing of their knowledge of French grammar are being closely monitored as to their effectiveness in improving student success in more advanced courses and, likewise, in addressing perceived weaknesses in student performance in these courses. More emphasis is being placed on translation to compare English and French grammatical structures in support especially of PLO 1 and PLO 2. Preliminary data in the form of improved scores on exercises, quizzes, tests and writing assignments from prior semesters suggests that this renewed focus or emphasis has been successful.

6. Assessment Data

**Assessment French 101A Fall 2013:**

**PLO #1: Language & Communication. Written Expression. Develop advanced (ACTFL) skills in writing French.**

Students in the class took the WebCape Placement test at the beginning of the course and at the end of the semester. While some students made obvious progress in their results, other results of good students were not as convincing. We have to keep in mind, however, that the WebCape is a Placement test and not a reliable Proficiency test.

French 101A is the first part of the Advanced French Reading and Writing course, the last advanced language course along with French 101B in the French B.A. program which make those two courses essential and a key for success in more advanced courses in literature and culture in the program. In the class, we reviewed the grammatical concepts acquired in the first and second years in French. In addition, as a means of improving their written and reading proficiency in French, students studied advanced literary verb tenses as they related to one another.

Through reading two (unabridged) novels, students were able to increase and enrich their vocabulary and express themselves more accurately and comprehensibly using more precise and specialized terminology and vocabulary.

Students were able to use grammatical knowledge practically and critically by completing and analyzing grammar exercises in their book, workbook and supplementary materials.

A major goal in the class was that the writing of the students be understandable to native French
speakers not used to the writing of non-natives. With a couple of exceptions, most students in the class (some through extra work) reached that goal. We had many written assignments and readings throughout the semester. Students read about 10 to 15 pages in French each week at the beginning of the semester and ended by reading 25 to 30 pages a week by the end of the semester. The level in reading comprehension was tested regularly through quizzes, a midterm, two major exams and a final. The students’ reading progress, despite their early complaints, was the most dramatic.

Students in the class were able to write routine informal and some formal correspondence, as well as narratives, descriptions, and summaries of a factual nature. They could narrate and describe in the major time frames of past, present, and future, using paraphrasing and elaboration to provide clarity. Most of them were able to produce connected discourse of paragraph length and structure. A few did show good control of the most frequently used structures and generic vocabulary, allowing them to be understood by those unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives.

The testing for writing proficiency was done in the majority of our activities in class and in homework through reports and analyses (3 per book read for a total of 6) essay questions in all exams, a midterm and a final. While most students did well in the class, some struggled really hard. As a result, 101A and 101B should be made repeatable for credit.

**Assessment French 110 Fall 2013:**

**PLO 1. Advanced writing skills in French.**

Assessment materials: three (3) translation homework (French into English, English into French), in-class production exercises and sentence transformation (dialog to indirect speech), and two (2) exams (ability to use/identify linguistic terminology and style).

Assessment: This PLO was moderately and indirectly addressed by the translation homework assignments which were assigned in order for students to evaluate their own needs to expand their writing skills at the advanced and superior levels. For most of the students, the big challenge when translating a literary text was to render its content faithfully, with clarity, which they could only achieve at the expense of style in the target language, sometimes even of grammar. However, all students who did the translation activities became more aware of the need and of the means through which they could improve their style when writing in French, especially in order to be able to express complex ideas in multiple-clause sentences.

**PLO 2. Advanced reading comprehension in French.**

Assessment materials: weekly in-class sight reading and discussions, grammatical analysis, and translation; three (3) translation homework assignments (French into English) and two (2) grammatical and sentence analysis exams.
Assessment: The students in this class get exposure to complex literary texts and are expected to bring their comprehension to the advanced plus level through analysis and translation. Superior syntactic analysis and translation both require superior reading comprehension. The students’ average level in FREN 110 is advanced, and the readings were chosen to challenge them with a variety of exercises at various difficulty levels, even beyond their own level. At the beginning of the semester, the students struggled with having to understand complex sentences, but they soon discovered that grammatical analysis could help them improve their comprehension. They worked with unfamiliar, specialized vocabulary which they learned to progressively master; as for cultural comprehension, they learned to enhance their competency through class activities around the texts to be translated, as well as through individual research. The course definitely helped the students make progress in reading comprehension.

Interestingly but not surprisingly, at least 30% of the students whose mother tongue was not English had greater difficulty understanding the English text, Stevenson’s *Silverado Squatters*, than the French one, Apostolidès *L’Indien Lacandon*. The requirement of a translator to develop superior reading competency in both languages was a discovery that will probably motivate the students to read more in both languages and get into the habit of consulting information tools when they encounter topics they don’t know in texts they have to read.

**PLO 5. Advanced literacy, i.e. knowledge and application of linguistic terminology in linguistic and textual analysis.**

Assessment materials: Assessed by weekly grammatical analysis homework assignments, in-class exercises, and two (2) exams. Mock exams.

Assessment: The students learned to describe linguistic material using appropriate techniques and terminology. For most of them, it was the first course of their curriculum that focused on formal linguistics. At the beginning of the semester, linguistic analysis was challenging for third-year students (70% of the class), most of whom had never had classes in formal grammar before. The 30% who were familiar with formal linguistics were a great help to make the others aware of the skills that were expected of them. Through regular attendance, class activities, and weekly homework assignments, the majority of the students became familiar within two weeks with the analytical perspective, the terminology and the techniques they were asked to apply in their homework assignments, in-class activities, and tests. By mid-semester, the majority could analyze words in sentences and divide sentences into clauses. On the final exam at the end of the semester, 30% of students received 90% or above, 13% received a B, a B+ or a B-, 43% received a C, a C+ or a C-. The students who failed the class or who did not develop their skills in grammatical analysis and translation also missed numerous classes and did not seek help to catch up.

Exams were not the only mode of evaluation. The homework assignments and in-class activities yielded much higher scores as the semester progressed and demonstrated clear progress for all students who turned them in on a regular basis. Mock-exams are definitely of use in this class. They were made available three classes ahead of the real exams, along with the correction. They were also discussed in
class before the exams.

PLO 8. Advanced competency at connecting French studies to other disciplines and language communities.

Assessment materials: In-class readings and preparation for translation homework assignments; translation homework; three (3) French into English translations; two (2) English-French translations. Two literary texts were used to explore some major syntactical similarities and differences in both languages: Silverado Squatters by R. L. Stevenson, and L’Indien Lacandon by J.-M. Apostolidès.

Assessment: During the semester, students became more aware of linguistic and cultural variations within the English language as well as within the French language. They understood the necessity to expand their knowledge of the two cultures and, more importantly, for the need to know where to find information on topics or facts that the texts they have to translate might contain. Students became quickly and keenly aware of needing to do some research before undertaking a translation. For example, knowing the geography in and around Mount Saint Helena is necessary to translate some passages of Silverado Squatters that were chosen precisely in order to test the students’ ability to quickly identify the problems and solve them; identifying humor and finding equivalencies was a challenge in translating Stevenson’s text, as well as for the text in French, L’Indien Lacandon.

Only a small number of students arrived prepared for the in-class discussions. It would be better to do the preparation in-class and leave enough time for the students to figure out the facts they needed to check and indicate to them the linguistic and comparative stylistic traps they need to pay attention to.

The new textbook was not an improvement. We need to use a textbook geared toward translation. Contrastes seems the best candidate.

French 101B Spring 2014

All students took the WebCape Placement test at the beginning and at the end of the semester. Please read my comments about the uneven results of the WebCape.

PLO #1: Language & Communication. Written Expression. Develop advanced (ACTFL) skills in writing French.

French 101B is the continuation of French 101A. Students who took 101A in the fall semester were strongly encouraged to continue with this course to avoid a gap in their studies and to achieve better results in their advanced fluency in French.

In reading, we selected two longer novels more abstract in nature and more prone to argumentation than the books chosen for 101A, which were more descriptive. Our theme was the fantastic novel (La
Vénus d’Ille by Prosper Mérimée) and La Planète des singes by Pierre Boulle. Students were introduced to literary analysis in order to help them read and write more effectively in the advanced French linguistic and literature courses. The reading knowledge of students was tested regularly through six reports and comments of the chapters they read and through quizzes, two exams, one midterm and one final exam.

After a quick and constant review during the semester of all verb tenses in French, we reviewed the relative pronouns, the use of prepositions, the personal pronouns, the complex sentence, etc.

At this level, students were able to meet a range of work and/or academic writing needs. They demonstrated the ability to narrate and describe in detail all major time frames with good control of aspect. Most could write straightforward summaries on topics of general interest. Their writing exhibited, for the most part, a variety of cohesive devices in texts up to several paragraphs in length. There was good control of the most frequently used target-language syntactic structures and a range of general vocabulary. Most often, thoughts were expressed clearly and supported by some elaboration. Their writing incorporated organizational features both of the target language and the writer’s first language and did resemble at times oral discourse.

Overall, the majority of students made sufficient progress in the class so that they can register for more advanced-level courses in the French B.A. Three to four students in the class, who barely made it or did fail the class, would greatly benefit from repeating the course (see my last remarks for French 101A).

French 120B: French Literature of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries (Spring 2014). This seminar is an advanced survey course taught in French; a cultural and literary introduction to major literary works, literary and artistic movements of the XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries with major historical and cultural events. This advanced comprehensive class was an important course for both the students in the B.A. and M.A. programs in French. Students in the MA program had additional work, such as the reading, analysis and presentation in class of two additional novels, a final research paper and an oral presentation. Twenty-three students were enrolled in French 120B.

The following PLOs were assessed for this seminar:

PLO #1: Language & Communication. Written Expression. Develop advanced (ACTFL) skills in writing French.

Be able to read in the target language, analyze and comment classical texts and plays of the French Classical period and age of Enlightenment, as well as learn some specific playwright terminology to better describe works of art. Students enriched their literary and artistic vocabulary and acquired precise vocabulary for their literary essays, quizzes and group discussions in class. They also were more
readily able to identify various stylistic devices and appreciate French versification rules and nuances of the language which, though evident, are not always clearly expressed.

For some students in the B.A. program coming straight out of French 101B, this was particularly challenging but with a lot of practice in class and through regular homework and quizzes and additional materials put on Canvas, the level of the class slowly improved.

Except for a couple of students in the class, the majority of students were successful in this major PLO.

**PLO #5: Literacy: Ability to use appropriate terminology in linguistic, cultural, or literary analysis.**

This course emphasized the historical, socio-economical, and cultural context of the French classical period and the Age of Enlightenment with special emphasis on the theater. Students studied and analyzed the connections and lasting impact on French literature and the arts (e.g. baroque, préciosité, classicism, rococo, the writings of the philosophers, the theater of Beaumarchais and its pre-revolutionary ideas the neo-classicism of J.L. David).

Students learned how to present on a weekly basis through quizzes or group discussions in class critical opinions and how to express more clearly and coherently ideas based on their readings using proper terminology at an advanced level of proficiency in French.

In addition, they practiced essay writing during the semester (3 essay assignments: a play of Corneille, Racine and Molière), analysis on various topics (4 quizzes, one midterm and a final exam) for the students in the French B.A. program. Students in the MA program had to design an outline for their research paper and oral presentation. Both groups had to use the methodology, technique and language of argumentation; quotations, bibliography, references, footnotes, etc.

The final results were mixed. For the majority of students in the class, this was their first literature course in French, which explains the challenges with this specific PLO. Eight students (mainly graduate students) did well with PLO 5. Ten obtained satisfactory results, three barely made it and a couple failed. As mentioned in previous assessment reports, students must take FORL 100W beforehand and **must apply** what they have learned in their literature classes.

**PLO#7: Literary and Cultural Texts and Traditions: Develop knowledge of major periods, genres, authors, movements of French and Francophone cultural history.**

French 120B covered 200 years of history and culture and many different regimes (from Henri IV to Louis XIII, the Sun King, Louis XIV, the Regent, Duke of Orleans, Louis XV and finally Louis XVI and the rise of the French Revolution) until the French Revolution and the end of the absolute monarchy. Students learned about many historical, literary and artistic movements, such as préciosité, the baroque, the events of the Fronde, the rise of Louis XIV and the golden age of Classicism, the Libertine movement, the rococo, the age of the Philosophers, the Encyclopedia, the discontent and the rise of the bourgeoisie
and the decadence of the aristocracy, the involvement of France in the American revolution, the loss of the French colonies in America. A lot of documentary films were shown to the students to complete what the students learned in class.

This PLO was tested through several quizzes. Numerous materials were posted on Canvas to help the students assimilate the complex period of the golden age and decline of the French monarchy. The students’ knowledge in that area was tested throughout the semester in several quizzes, a midterm and a final exam.

The majority of students were passionate about the historical and cultural aspects of the seminar; consequently, they did well with this PLO with the exception of a couple of students who missed class on a regular basis.

PLO#9: Technology: demonstrate information processing competency, use of appropriate technologies and tools for research, analysis, communication, and presentation.

Most students did very well with this PLO. Some students opted to present a pedagogical project instead of a research paper and created a teaching unit. They included a short XVI\textsuperscript{th} or XVII\textsuperscript{th} century text, such as a fable by Jean de La Fontaine, cultural points related to the text (e.g. the class system at the time of Louis XIV), a biography of the author, a grammar point, exercises, etc.. Some of the projects were impressive.

Most of the students are able to use effectively technology and know how to use tools for research and presentations in class. For presentations in class, students are required to submit their PowerPoint presentation to the instructor at least one week before the assigned date and make all the corrections required by the instructor to be allowed to present. Students make an extra effort when they know it will be part of their final grade.

7. Analysis
   See item #6 above for assessment data as it relates to the analysis of the students’ ability to achieve each PLO and progress made on recommended actions. As a result of the rewording of the French B.A. PLOs, faculty are able to more easily and clearly identify and measure which PLOs and to what degree students are able to accomplish them. It has been especially helpful to clearly spell out with distinct and measurable standardized outcomes designed on a course by course basis following a logical progression in accordance with the course by course French B.A. assessment roadmap.

8. Proposed changes and goals (if any)
   Based on certain student results and as pointed out above, because of their role as foundation grammar and composition courses, as well as an introduction to literature, French 101A and French 101B should be made repeatable for credit to allow certain students to retake these courses before progressing to the more advanced courses.
As discussed earlier in the report, there is an identifiable and highlighted need across the B.A. curricula to continue to focus more on vocabulary building exercises, more frequent reading and listening comprehension exercises and testing by incorporating more vocabulary, reading and listening comprehension questions into the classroom activities and tests along with the testing of their knowledge of French grammar. Previous assessment data also points to the need at the program level for students to further develop their information literacy and to learn how to properly document sources using an appropriate style guide, such as MLA. Students need to become more proficient and savvy at using internet and non-internet sources for the purpose of scholarly research. Based on this assessment data and analysis, these areas will continue to be closely monitored for signs of progress or improvement (see table above identifying areas to be assessed in the coming semesters).