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 3** Language & Communication. Oral Expression. Develop advanced (ACTFL) skills in speaking 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO #1</th>
<th>101A</th>
<th>101B</th>
<th>101C</th>
<th>101A</th>
<th>101B</th>
<th>101C</th>
<th>101A</th>
<th>101B</th>
<th>101C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO #2</th>
<th>101A</th>
<th>101B</th>
<th>101C</th>
<th>101A</th>
<th>101B</th>
<th>101C</th>
<th>101A</th>
<th>101B</th>
<th>101C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO #3</th>
<th>101A</th>
<th>101B</th>
<th>101C</th>
<th>101A</th>
<th>101B</th>
<th>101C</th>
<th>101A</th>
<th>101B</th>
<th>101C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO #4</th>
<th>101A</th>
<th>101B</th>
<th>101C</th>
<th>101A</th>
<th>101B</th>
<th>101C</th>
<th>101A</th>
<th>101B</th>
<th>101C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO #5</th>
<th>102A</th>
<th>102B</th>
<th>102C</th>
<th>105</th>
<th>110</th>
<th>132</th>
<th>170</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO #6</th>
<th>102A</th>
<th>102B</th>
<th>102C</th>
<th>140A</th>
<th>140B</th>
<th>160</th>
<th>120A</th>
<th>140A</th>
<th>140B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO #7</th>
<th>102A</th>
<th>102B</th>
<th>102C</th>
<th>120A</th>
<th>120B</th>
<th>160</th>
<th>120A</th>
<th>140A</th>
<th>140B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO #8</th>
<th>102A</th>
<th>102B</th>
<th>102C</th>
<th>120A</th>
<th>120B</th>
<th>160</th>
<th>120A</th>
<th>140A</th>
<th>140B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO #9</th>
<th>102A</th>
<th>102B</th>
<th>102C</th>
<th>120A</th>
<th>120B</th>
<th>160</th>
<th>120A</th>
<th>140A</th>
<th>140B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All upper division courses</th>
<th>102A</th>
<th>102B</th>
<th>102C</th>
<th>105</th>
<th>110</th>
<th>132</th>
<th>170</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO #1</td>
<td>140A</td>
<td>101A</td>
<td>101B</td>
<td>101B</td>
<td>101A</td>
<td>101B</td>
<td>101A</td>
<td>101B</td>
<td>102A</td>
<td>101B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140B</td>
<td>101B</td>
<td>101C</td>
<td>102B</td>
<td>102A</td>
<td>120B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 de 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 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

**Item 6. Graduation Rates by Entering Cohorts: World Languages and Literatures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2011 Cohort 5-Year Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Fall 2011 Cohort 3-Year Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Fall 2011 Cohort 3-Year Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Count Size</td>
<td>Program Grad Rate</td>
<td>Program Grad Rate</td>
<td>Program Grad Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Average Grad Rate - All Students Who Entered the College</td>
<td>University Average Grad Rate - All Students Who Entered the University</td>
<td>University Average Grad Rate - All Students Who Entered the University</td>
<td>University Average Grad Rate - All Students Who Entered the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Time Freshmen</td>
<td>Fall 2008 Cohort 5-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort 5-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort 5-Year Graduation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Transfer</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort 5-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort 5-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort 5-Year Graduation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Graduate</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort 5-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort 5-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort 5-Year Graduation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time Graduate</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort 5-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort 5-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort 5-Year Graduation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14 90.0% 48.7% 18 60.0% 55.3% 0 10 0 8.3% 23 72.0% 55.3% 60.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>0 90.0% 48.7% 18 60.0% 55.3% 0 10 0 8.3% 23 72.0% 55.3% 60.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non URM</td>
<td>4 90.0% 48.7% 18 60.0% 55.3% 0 10 0 8.3% 23 72.0% 55.3% 60.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>2 90.0% 48.7% 18 60.0% 55.3% 0 10 0 8.3% 23 72.0% 55.3% 60.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part C
Closing the Loop/Recommended Actions

As outlined above based on 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 throughout the semester in French 101C. 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
As noted in previous assessment reports, there has been an identifiable and highlighted need across the B.A. curricula 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 curricula. French 101C attempts to address this issue. As a means of assessing PLO 3 and 4 in French 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 made to French 101C in Fall 2014 was the creation and conversion from an in-class advanced conversation course to a completely online oral communication version of French 101C in Canvas covering a myriad of oral/aural language skills. The most significant benefit of going to this mode of instruction was to give students extensive exposure and practice in the first module of the course to badly needed vocabulary building exercises, grammar and reading comprehension review exercises. In the second module, students completed extensive TEF oral comprehension training exercises at progressive difficulty levels to test their listening comprehension skills in accordance with their language level training. This was in response to a more clearly defined and objective means of determining the students’ oral/aural language proficiency. The internationally recognized TEF (Test d’Évaluation de français), which is comparable to the TOEFL, is used, for example, by Canadian Immigration, French Universities and for work to assess “comprehension and expression skills in French.” As such, it is an ideal instrument by providing “a quantitative and qualitative measure of the level of candidate’s linguistic and communication skills.” The third module consisted of a series of individual oral proficiency interviews conducted online whereby student responses were recorded and evaluated based on various oral proficiency criteria, such as pronunciation and complexity of vocabulary and sentence structures.

**PLO #3: Language & Communication. Oral Expression. Develop advanced (ACTFL) skills in speaking French.**

Oral expression was assessed primarily by the completion of French 101C Module 3 activities as described above: Oral production and pronunciation tests (10) in Computer Assisted Screening Tool (CAST) graded on overall percentage earned in this category based on five (5) best test results out of ten (10) worth 33.4% of overall course grade. Out of a total of 19 students, the overall Module 3 average was 87.1%. Six students received an A and thirteen students received a B. In addition to oral proficiency interviews for all French 101C students, French majors should be encouraged to take the TEF exam. Expected scores should range between 600 (B2) and 900 (C2). French majors will especially be encouraged to take the TEF exam. Expected scores should range between 600 (B2) and 900 (C2). These oral proficiency exams have proven to be an effective means of evaluating our students’ oral proficiency.

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

Demonstration of listening comprehension at the advanced levels (ACTFL advanced low and superior, and CEFRL C1-C2) were set as 33.3% of the course grade. Specific listening comprehension tests/activities were developed and completed by students in Canvas in order to evaluate this PLO. Out of a total of 19 students, the overall Module 2 average was 87%. Based on 19 students, 7 placed as
Advanced High and Superior (ACTFL) or B2 (CEFRL) in listening comprehension. This is the desired level for an advanced class. In other words, more work is needed in the 101 sequence to get the remaining students to this oral/aural proficiency level. Seven students received an A, nine students received a B, three students received a C. Further attention will be given to improving the students’ performance and developing further more precise instruments and measures to evaluate the success of our students in meeting PLOs at the program level.

**French 102B Fall 2014:**

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

Students in French 102B are assessed for their knowledge of cultural texts and traditions primarily by completing readings in three works: Christopher Miller’s *Blank Darkness*, V.Y. Mudimbe’s *The Invention of Africa*, and Edward Said’s *Orientalism*. Students are given a theoretical base or framework at the beginning of the semester through online lecture presentations, readings and completion of reading assignment questions based on these readings. Students are required to apply their critical thinking skills by answering a series of extensive and exhaustive comprehension questions on these texts. The three essays, as well as the exercise activities, the midterm, final, and research paper also call upon the students' theoretical knowledge obtained from these readings to recognize, analyze and critique all forms of printed and visual discourse. Based on the writing assignments, such as the three essays, a sufficient number of students continues to struggle in making these connections or comparisons because of insufficient knowledge of historical contexts of ideas and cultural traditions or an inability to implement critical thinking skills in their writing and reasoning. Even though results or assessment data of the three writing assignments and the midterm exam are encouraging, activities need to be further tweaked to get a clearer and more accurate evaluation of the students’ ability to satisfy 102B PLO7. One of the lessons learned from the assessment was that students needed to be asked in no ambiguous or uncertain terms in their assignments to demonstrate through more concrete examples and cultural comparisons how they relate or correspond to the course PLOs. Although a small number of students is incapable or still does not adequately make the historical and cultural connections, as the data assessment below illustrates based on the newly, reworded questions, a greater percentage of students are drawing meaningful conclusions and comparisons with regard to PLO7. This was also a result of the creation and implementation of a more detailed grading rubric as of Fall 2011 to help students to more clearly identify how well these assignments addressed PLO7 and the other course PLOs.

The assessment data from the reading comprehension questions in modules 2, 3 & 4, three writing assignments and midterm was used as an assessment tool in Fall 2014 in addition to the final exam to assess the students’ ability to address PLO7. Grading rubric category #1, critical thinking skills, is the

---

1 CEFRL: Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, the European equivalent of ACTFL proficiency guidelines for measuring second language proficiency.
heart of French 102B and all SJSU Studies courses in general. Furthermore, students were given more meaningful feedback through a more transparent grading rubric serving as an integrated assessment tool tied to the course student learning objectives to improve the quality of their future and overall submissions. Detailed feedback for each category was emailed to each individual student.

**Overall class performance:** Out of 17 students enrolled the first week of class, 13 remained enrolled and completed all or most assignments. 12 students received a passing grade (C or better), 2 students received A or A-, 7 received B+, B or B-, 3 received C+ or C and 1 received an F. The number of grades in the lowest grading range was higher than in previous semesters because most of these students just stopped turning in assignments or were subject to a late submission penalty.

*Overall performance on assignments assessing PLO7:*

- **Reading comprehension questions (modules 2, 3 & 4):** 90.7% (10 A, 2 B, 1 C)
- **Writing assignment #1:** 86.4% (1A, 12 B)
- **Writing Assignment #2:** 82.3% (1 A, 7B, 5 C)
- **Writing Assignment #3:** 84.9% (4 A, 7 B, 2 C)
- **Midterm:** 85.2% (3 A, 8 B, 2 C)
- **Final exam:** (5 A, 6 B, 2 C)

**General comments:** Improvements were the most noticeable in the critical thinking category versus, for example, writing skills. One of the greatest challenges for students has been turning in on time their assignments, especially their writing assignments. As a means of helping students to turn in on time their assignments, the course schedule or calendar will be modified next time French 102B is offered so that students are afforded more time between major writing assignments, such as the essays and the midterm exam. This will be accomplished by requiring earlier module assignments to be turned in earlier in the semester so that the major writing assignments are spaced out more throughout the semester.

**PLO #8:** Connections to Other Disciplines and Language Communities.

Students in French 102B are assessed for making connections to other disciplines and language communities primarily by completing the film review worksheets and the GE assessment worksheets in modules 2 through 10. The three essays, as well as the exercise activities, the midterm, final, and research paper also call upon the students' theoretical knowledge obtained from completing the various activities to make these connections and see their relevance to other language communities. As noted above, a sufficient number of students continues to struggle in making these connections or
comparisons because of insufficient knowledge of historical contexts of ideas and cultural traditions or an inability to implement critical thinking skills in their writing and reasoning. Even though results or assessment data of the three writing assignments and the midterm exam are encouraging, activities need to be further tweaked to get a clearer and more accurate evaluation of the students’ ability to satisfy 102B PLO8.

*Overall performance on assignments assessing PLO8:

Film review worksheets: 88.8% (8 A, 4 B, 1 C)

GE assessment worksheets: 89.2% (7 A, 5 B, 1 C)

Writing assignment #1: 86.4% (1 A, 12 B)

Writing Assignment #2: 82.3% (1 A, 7 B, 5 C)

Writing Assignment #3: 84.9% (4 A, 7 B, 2 C)

Midterm: 85.2% (3 A, 8 B, 2 C)

Final exam: (5 A, 6 B, 2 C)

French 140A Fall 2014:

14 B.A. students (including 2 Post-baccalaureate; 2 undergraduate students stopped doing the assignments at mid-semester)

N. B. FREN 140A students were deeply affected by the loss at mid-semester of their instructor, Prof. van Hoooff. One undergraduate student withdrew from the class and a second one did not complete the course.

PLO #1. Advanced writing skills in French. Develop advanced (ACTFL) skills in writing French.

The students wrote two ‘text analyses,’ actually essays, on two literary works La petite Fadette and Un cœur simple. They had received guidelines on how to compose their essays. In their first essay, most students followed the guidelines for the outline of their work; they were also able to write summaries and some of them to briefly analyze the characters and the plots, but in general, the twelve B.A. students needed more precise instruction in order to understand what they were supposed to do. The introductions included irrelevant facts, most of them copied from websites, sometimes containing errors in dates, names, facts, etc. The summaries of the plots were too long, contained events that had no relevance to the following analysis, and the analytic parts were sketchy or non-existant. The students
were offered the possibility of revising their first essay, and some took advantage of this opportunity to improve their grade. In general, for most students, the second essay showed clear improvement in most of the above aspects, except for character and story analysis, which remained challenging for all undergraduate students.

Seven (7) B.A. students received B and above (80%-90%) in the essay part of the evaluation, five (5) received C and above (70%-79%), two (2) received F. The A-B group understood and followed the guidelines, had a good outline, wrote in complete, well-built sentences, used appropriate terminology, and could comment on the plot and the characters, making clear distinctions between the summary and the analytical parts.

Observation

Some students in this course needed to learn how to appropriately use information retrieved from the Internet. This instructor had to require all students to turn in their papers as Word files in Canvas and to activate Turnitin. This yielded a large amount of passages copied from websites in a good half of the student papers. Once the students were made aware of the rules regarding plagiarism, they adopted better practices, identified quoted passages and cited their sources.

The students took better care of the quality of their writing after being distributed the grading rubric, which allocates 20% of the total grade to spelling, grammar, and style.

PLO #2. Advanced reading comprehension in French. Develop advanced (ACTFL) skills in reading French.

This PLO was to be assessed through two reading tests, one mid-term exam, and one final open book exam done at home.

The reading tests did not yield good evaluation material for this PLO. They consisted mostly of objective questions that could be answered by anyone who had read the texts in English, or had attended the lectures and discussions without actually having read the books in French.

The readings for this course were definitely too long and too difficult for most B.A. students. They included three novels of more than 300 pages each, and one 60 page novella. These works written by Balzac, Zola, Sand, Flaubert, feature complex stories, very elaborate narration, and rare vocabulary and style. French students would also struggle if they had to read these novels in three months. The B.A. students who read all texts in French are to be commended: they certainly made progress, but their achievement of this PLO needed to be assessed by comparing results in oral reading tests given at the beginning and the end of the semester rather than by multiple-choice tests.

Recommendation
In order to ensure that students read the texts in French and meet this PLO in literature classes, this instructor suggests to 1) limit the selection to one novel such as Sand’s *La petite Fadette* or Ferragus by Balzac, and one or two short stories by Flaubert and Maupassant; use an anthology (such as Lagarde et Michard) for the literary history component of the course; 2) base written reading assessments on essay questions in mid and final exams, and give individual oral exams in reading at the beginning and the end of the semester in order to compare the students’ proficiency in reading comprehension; 3) practice oral reading in class, stressing rhythmic groups, intonation, and expressivity, three aspects that reflect reading comprehension and can be evaluated.

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

Assessment of this PLO was based on two exams and two essays. It must be noted that the students received the grading rubric for essay writing (implemented throughout the curriculum in 2011) only after this instructor took over teaching the class, i.e. after they had already turned in their first essays.

**Literary Analysis**

By the middle of the semester, only a few B.A. students could use French terminology to write or speak of literature (*roman, nouvelle, conte, narrateur, auteur, personnage, intrigue, réalisme, romantisme, mouvement littéraire*); most confused *résumé, description and analyse, auteur and narrateur, caractère and personnage, époque de l’action and époque de publication*. After receiving instruction on literary terminology, most students made an effort to use the terms in their second papers and were able to define and use the appropriate terminology in their final exam.

**Cultural Analysis**

One of the course’s objectives was to give instruction on the political context in which literary and artistic movements rapidly succeeded one another in France between 1800 and 1871. That period was particularly troubled, and the students had to learn not only the revolutions and government changes that occurred during the period but also how these social and political troubles were reflected in the literary texts they were reading.

This program required more structured instruction than the students received during the first month of instruction. This instructor, who took over teaching the course by mid-October, gave a few lectures on the political history of France in the 19th century. In the final assignment and in their papers, 80% of the students were able to identify the revolutions, the governments, the political leaders, and the major
artistic and literary movements of the period. Some students, however, were completely overwhelmed by having to learn so many historical names and facts.

Recommendation

Since the 19th century political context is covered in FREN 102C, we could limit the program of this literature course to giving instruction on the main artistic and literary movements, i.e. in literature: romanticism, realism, naturalism in the novel, and symbolism in poetry; in the arts: romanticism, realism, impressionism and post-impressionism. The following course FREN 140B, could focus on the “Cézanne revolution,” Cubism, Surrealism, and show the relationships between these movements and modern literature.

French 170 Fall 2014

French 170 was not offered in Fall 2014. Assessment data was collected in Spring 2015 (see assessment data below for FREN 170 in Spring 2015).

French 101B Spring 2015

French 101B was not offered in Spring 2015. Assessment data will be collected in Spring 2016 in accordance with Assessment Schedule.

French 140B Spring 2015

French 140B was not offered in Spring 2015. Assessment data will be collected in Fall 2015 when the course is offered.

French 170 Spring 2015

16 students: 9 French B.A.; 3 cond. classified French M.A. taking the course as preparation for taking the M.A. classification exam; 3 classified French M.A.; 1 English M.A.

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

Assessment of this PLO is based on the summative assignment, a take-home exam in which there were three essay questions and one analysis exercise consisting of describing the translation techniques used in ten pairs of translated sentences. The students needed to (1) identify the techniques they commented
on using the terminology learned during the semester; (2) describe them using analysis techniques they learned by attending fifteen lectures and demonstrations, doing ten homework, and taking four quizzes.

Throughout the semester the students received extensive instruction in comparative stylistics theory and practice. They attended weekly lectures and demonstrations and did weekly exercises from the textbook given as homework. The last four lectures and assignments specifically focused on terminology and on the linguistic analysis of translated texts. They took four objective tests that required understanding the descriptive language used to compare sentences translated from both the English and the French into the opposite. These assignments and quizzes were formative and are not being considered in this assessment.

On fifteen (15) students, B.A. and M.A., ten (10: 7 M.A., 3 B.A.) demonstrated good to excellent (80%-100%) command of this learning objective in all assignments, 4 average to good (70%-80%); 1 student did not turn in this assignment nor any other during the semester. A majority of B.A. students did not reach grade B in this assignment, being able however to make it to C.

Comment on B.A. PLO #5 Assessment

Normally FREN 170 is taken by students who have completed FREN 101A and B, Advanced Grammar and Reading and Composition, and FREN 110, Advanced Grammar: Morphology and Syntax Analysis. Due to several course cancellations over the past four semesters, the students could not complete the normal course sequence, and had to enroll in FREN 170 this semester since it was the only advanced language course that we could schedule. Some students who had taken FREN 110 in fall 2013, as well as those who had previously studied formal grammar or linguistics, had a clear advantage over those who never received formal linguistic instruction, neither in French nor English. One interesting point is that the five (5) foreign students enrolled in this course seem to have received sufficient formal preparation in language analysis to be able to rapidly adjust to the subject and fulfill the requirements.

The mastery of linguistic terminology and sentence analysis makes a substantial part of the advanced curriculum of a B.A. degree in foreign languages. A B.A. degree in this subject means that the students are specialists of the language, that they can teach it, author teaching and testing materials, and work in the textbook and testing industry. These last two rapidly growing industries hire language specialists trained in formal grammar and linguistics. Grammatical terminology and linguistic analysis are the working tools of language specialists the same way other professions may have their language and methods. By ensuring our French students take the courses they need to complete a sound advanced program in language analysis, we greatly enhance their competitiveness as French specialists.

Recommendation

PLO #5 was mainly assessed over the past ten years through the linguistics courses. FREN 101A-B-C should also be assessed for this PLO in the future.
PLO#9: Technology: demonstrate information processing competency, use of appropriate technologies and tools for research, analysis, communication, and presentation.

Assessment of this PLO at the B.A. level is based on question #3 of the summative assignment. That question specifically required to evaluate translation resources that the students had been asked to explore and use during the semester.

Several online dictionaries and translation tools were demonstrated and recommended for the students to explore and use while doing their assignments. These included WordReference, Thesaurus.com, TLFi, Littré, Larousse, Dictionnaire des synonymes, Atlas sémantique visuel, and some useful websites to search for idioms and proverbs. The demonstrations stressed the quality and quantity of information provided by the online tools, as well as their grammatical, semantic, idiomatic, and stylistic reliability. The demonstration showed how to search the sites and complement them with one another in order to find the appropriate answers to translation problems. The students were trained to read through the dictionary entries instead of taking the first translation being offered, to interpret the grammatical abbreviations, and personalize some websites for their future use.

The final assignment included one question requiring an evaluation of three online translation tools that could be recommended to translators.

Five (5) out of nine (9) B.A. students understood the question and commented on websites that were presented in class or chose other high-quality sites that they had used, and they reported on the linguistic quality of these sites. The other four B.A. students chose either resources that were not discussed in class or were remotely relevant to translation. These students were also unable to demonstrate the value of the sites for translation purposes. Their comments were limited to saying that the sites appeared to be either “good” or “bad,” without giving further explanations.

In spite of many warnings addressed to the group and to individuals that online translation software should not be used at all neither in FREN 170 nor in any other French classes, a few students ignored this rule and did their homework and translations using such online resources. Some even ignored it as far as to choose to comment on Google software (!) or other similar resources in the essay question about resources in the final assignment.

Recommendation

1. Include PLO #9 in the participation section of the course grading scale of in-class advanced courses with online supplements. For online classes, this PLO should be the major component of participation, and should be assigned at least 10% of the total grade.

2. When recommending websites in their courses, the French faculty should briefly describe their purpose, quality, and the best way to use them.

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.

Limited course offerings and cancellations did not allow the current student body to follow the progressive sequence that the French program is built on. For most students, completion of the core courses FREN 101A-B-C, and at least one culture class (102A or C), and one linguistics course (105 or 110), provides the extensive immersion in the target language needed to undertake the more advanced literature and translation courses. Although this issue is being partially addressed by the creation of online versions of these courses so that students can complete, when needed, the course sequence in a timely manner, students need the classroom contact hours in order to be better prepared and succeed in their more advanced French courses.

8. Proposed changes and goals (if any)

In addition to the recommendations above as they relate to individual courses or course sequences and as noted in previous assessment reports, there is an identifiable and highlighted need across the B.A. curricula, despite improvements in student performance as a result of redesigning French 101C to address these issues, 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).

With regard to French 102B and as noted above, as a means of improving student performance the course schedule or calendar will be modified next time French 102B is offered so that students are afforded more time between major writing assignments, such as the essays and the midterm exam.