SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): **Spanish**	Department: **Languages, Literatures & Cultures**
Degree or Certificate Level: **MA**	College/School: **Arts & Sciences**
Date (Month/Year): **September 2022**	Assessment Contact: **Dr. Amy E. Wright**

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? **2021-22**

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? **2021-22 [see attached 2021-22 plan]**

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please list the full, complete learning outcome statements and not just numbers, e.g., Outcomes 1 and 2.)

We updated the 4 categories of our Program Assessment Plan, which constitute our current SLOs:

1. Graduates will be able to dialogue with (summarize and synthesize; critically and analytically respond to; compare and contrast) key works and recent scholarship in Hispanic Literatures, Cultures & Linguistics.
2. Graduates will be able to write and conduct research in Spanish, evidencing analysis, argumentation and organization.
3. Graduates will be able to speak about and present on their coursework and research in Spanish.
4. Graduates will be able to teach language and cultures of the Spanish-speaking world, using current methods in Foreign Language Pedagogy, with a deep understanding of their historical development as well as current relevance.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe and identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

One M.A. candidate graduated in 2021-22 and was evaluated using our Final Written and Oral Examination. In these years of transition to new student learning outcomes, SLOs 1-3 have been evaluated cumulatively via a Final Written Examination (SLOs 1 & 2) and Final Oral Exam (SLOs 1 & 3; please see 2021-22 Assessment Plan for more details). Our cumulative assessment of SLO 4 remains in evolution, as we are working on revising our course SPAN 5040 with regards to assessments for our relatively new learning outcome for pedagogy.

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (please do not just refer to the assessment plan).

4 of our 6 graduate faculty members were directly involved in data collection for assessment in 2021-22, by serving as members of final written and oral examination juries.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

Our candidate passed both the required (written and oral) examinations.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

Our program continues to meet its stated outcomes.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of <u>Current</u> Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

This student's assessment was given and evaluated in Spring 2022. Results/findings will be discussed in Spanish Graduate Faculty meetings in Academic Year 2022-23.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies
- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites
- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan
- Student learning outcomes
- Artifacts of student learning
- Evaluation process
- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

We will continue to work with our Pedagogy instructors in Academic Year 2022-23 to establish assessments for SLO #4.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

n/a

7. Closing the Loop: Review of <u>Previous</u> Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

In Spring 2022 we made improvements to our internal cumulative oral assessment rubric, which we piloted for the first time in Spring 2022.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

We will continue to assess these rubrics throughout the coming year (2022-23): we anticipate that in Fall 2022 one student will be taking their Final Written and Oral Examinations, and that in Spring 2023 another three students will take their exams.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

To be determined.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

We will continue to work under the new Program Outcomes to add courses that are of increasing value to our population according to the data collected through our 2020 student survey. Additionally, we will continue to design and implement assessments for our new pedagogy-related SLO #4.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document.

<u>**Languages, Literatures & Cultures - Saint Louis University- Spanish M.A. – Cumulative Oral Rubric**</u>

Please use these guidelines when assessing the candidate's final score.

This rubric will be shared with the Oral Examination Committee Chair then Graduate Program Director, to be kept for *internal* records.

Candidate's Name: **Exam Date:**

Holistically score **the entire exam** using the following categories & accompanying scales. Add comments/examples to support your rating when useful.

1 • Content Quality:		
The issues/questions are accurately addressed and fully treated in the responses, with a wide body of knowledge appropriately covered.		
0 - 3	**4 - 7**	**8 - 10**
•Irrelevant answer. •Persistent inaccuracies. •Content not sufficiently covered. •Appropriate references and definitions lacking. •Candidate is not able to provide accurate or sufficient information about the works/studies under question. •Few or no specific details/examples are given to support argument. •No mention made of critical responses to the works/studies.	•Adequate answer. •Mostly confident response, some doubt expressed. •Content adequately covered by mostly accurate answer. •Most aspects of question addressed. •Correct references and definitions offered. •Provides information about the works/studies under question, summarizing and synthesizing sufficiently, with some effective comparison & contrast. •Goes beyond broad generalizations to offer some specific details. •Some concrete examples offered to support argument. • Candidate may limit response either to anecdotal or superficial observations, or to repetition of critics' opinions.	•Offers consistently relevant, detailed, expansive, profound and confident answers. •Thorough: each aspect of the questions are addressed. •Consistently appropriate references and accurate definitions; candidate specifies with ease. •Demonstrates wide range of knowledge. •Numerous correct details/examples are given to support arguments. •Moves beyond summarizing and synthesizing accurately to effective comparison & contrast. •Candidate is able to combine their opinions about the work, expressed in their own voice, with what others/critics/studies have said.
2 • Content Organization & Presentation:		
The organization and presentation of the responses are clear, consistent, and logical, with ideas presented in an orderly and intelligible fashion.		
0 - 1	**2 - 3**	**4 - 5**
•Responses tend to be disorganized, inconsistent or illogical. •Doubt and confusion prevail. •Rambling and repetition are frequent. •Ideas are unclearly presented or ordered, seeming more like a stream of consciousness. •Organization interferes with clarity of argument. •Difficult to follow argument, and discern material commented, from candidate's response.	•Responses are prevalently organized, consistent and logical. •Ideas are mostly clear and ordered. •Organization supports clarity of argument. •Listener who has not read the book/study/article, or taken the course, can follow the argument and remain engaged.	• Consistent logic and organization. • Outstanding and ordered expression of Ideas. • Clear argumentation and organization, demonstrating an effective sense of introduction, development and conclusion. •Listener who has not read the book/study/article, or taken the course, can follow the argument and can learn something new from candidate's response.
3 • Oral Expression:		
Expression is smooth and concise, demonstrating correct grammar, appropriate usage and register, allowing for ease of understanding.		
0 - 1	**2 - 3**	**4 - 5**
•Error-filled answer in terms of grammar and usage. •Inappropriate tone/register. •Wordy, rambling, and/or repetitive. •Expression impedes understanding.	•Some errors in grammar and usage. •Inconsistent tone/register. •At times smooth & concise. •Expression allows for understanding.	•Grammar and usage are correct. •Consistent & appropriate tone/register. •Smooth & concise expression. •Expression enhances understanding.

edited 4/15/2022

For each of the 3 areas below, circle your general response as: **Fail, Pass,** or **Excellent.**

1) Content Quality: 70% _____ Circle Your Assessment=> Fail (0-3)   Pass (4-7)   Excellent (8-10)

Comments:

2) Content Organization/Presentation: 15% _____ Circle Your Assessment=> Fail (0-1)   Pass (2-3)   Excellent (4-5)

Comments:

3) Oral Expression: 15z% _____ Circle Your Assessment=> Fail (0-1)   Pass (2-3)   Excellent (4-5)

Comments:

Please Circle Your OVERALL ASSESSMENT =>   Fail (0-6)   **Pass** (7-15)   **Excellent** (16-20)

Signature: _____   **Date:** _____

Languages, Literatures & Cultures - Saint Louis University- Spanish M.A. – Cumulative Written Assessment

Return this 2-page signed/dated evaluation to Graduate Program Director, who will share compiled (anonymous) results with Candidate.

Candidate's Name: _____   **Exam Date:** _____

Rank each question using the accompanying scale, adding comments/examples to each category to support your rating.

A • Content Quality:		
The issue/question is accurately addressed and fully treated in the response, with a wide body of knowledge appropriately covered.		
0 - 3	**4 - 7**	**8 - 10**
•Irrelevant answer. •Persistent inaccuracies. •Content not sufficiently covered. •Appropriate references and definitions lacking. •Candidate is not able to provide accurate or sufficient information about the works/studies under question. •Few or no specific details/examples are given to support argument. •No mention made of critical responses to the works/studies.	•Adequate answer. •Content adequately covered by mostly accurate answer. •Most aspects of question addressed. •Correct references and definitions offered. •Provides information about the works/studies under question, summarizing and synthesizing sufficiently, with some effective comparison & contrast. •Some details/examples offered to support argument. • Candidate may limit response either to anecdotal or superficial observations, or to repetition of critics' opinions.	•Relevant detailed answer. •Thorough: each aspect of the question is addressed. •Appropriate references and accurate definitions. •Demonstrates wide range of knowledge. •Numerous correct details/examples are given to support argument. •Moves beyond summarizing and synthesizing accurately to effective comparison & contrast. •Candidate is able to combine their opinions about the work, expressed in their own voice, with what others/critics have said.
B • Content Organization:		
The organization of the response is clear, consistent, and logical, with ideas presented in an orderly and intelligible fashion.		
0 - 1	**2 - 3**	**4 - 5**
•Writing is disorganized, inconsistent or illogical •Ideas are unclearly presented or ordered, seeming more like a stream of consciousness •Organization interferes with clarity of argument •Absence of effective structure that reinforces argument.	•Writing is mostly organized, consistent and logical •Ideas are mostly clear and ordered • Organization supports clarity of argument • Introduction or conclusion may be weak or absent.	• Consistent logic and organization • Outstanding and ordered expression of Ideas • Clear argumentation and organization, demonstrating an effective sense of introduction, development and conclusion.
C • Written Expression:		
Written expression is smooth and concise, demonstrating standard correct grammar and spelling, appropriate usage and register.		
0 - 1	**2 - 3**	**4 - 5**
•Error-filled answer in terms of grammar, usage and/or accents. Editing not evident. •Inappropriate tone/register •Wordy or rambling •Expression impedes understanding	•Some errors in grammar, usage, and/or accents; poorly proofed or edited. •Inconsistent tone/register •At times smooth & concise •Expression allows for understanding	•Grammar, usage and accents are well-proofed, correct; editing evident. •Consistent & appropriate tone/register •Smooth & concise expression •Expression enhances understanding

For each of the 3 areas below, tally points to offer a numerical score, and circle your response as: **Fail, Pass,** or **Excellent.**

I: Latin American: SCORE=_____   **Fail** (0-6)   **Pass** (7-15)   **Excellent** (16-20)

A • Content Quality: _____ / 10   **Comments:**

B • Content Organization: _____ / 5

C • Written Expression: _____ / 5

II: Peninsular: SCORE=_____   **Fail** (0-6)   **Pass** (7-15)   **Excellent** (16-20)

A • Content Quality: _____ / 10   **Comments:**

B • Content Organization: _____ / 5

C • Written Expression: _____ / 5

III: Linguistics: SCORE=_____   **Fail** (0-6)   **Pass** (7-15)   **Excellent** (16-20)

A • Content Quality: _____ / 10   **Comments:**

B • Content Organization: _____ / 5

C • Written Expression: _____ / 5

Tally points and circle response: **TOTAL SCORE=**_____   **Fail** (0-19)   **Pass** (20-46)   **Excellent** (47-60)

Signature: _____   **Date:** _____

rev'd 4/15/2022

LITERATURA LATINOAMERICANA

Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz. *La Respuesta & Poems*. [CUNY.]

Darío, Rubén. *Azul/Cantos de vida y esperanza.* [Cátedra.]

---. *Cuentos.* [Espasa Calpe.]

Agustini, Delmira. *Poesías completas.* [Cátedra.]

Vallejo, César. *Obra poética completa.* [Alianza.]

Neruda, Pablo. *Antología general.* [RAE.]

Paz, Octavio. *Libertad bajo palabra.* [Fondo de Cultura Económica.]

Echeverría, Esteban. *El matadero.* [Emecé.]

Quiroga, Horacio. *Cuentos de amor, de locura y de muerte*. [EDAF.]

Bombal, María Luisa. *La última niebla; La amortajada.* [Seix Barral.]

Borges, J.L. *El Aleph.* [Alianza.]

Cortázar, Julio. *La autopista del sur y otros cuentos.* [Penguin.]

García Márquez, Gabriel. *Cien años de soledad*. [Cátedra.]

---. *La increíble y triste historia de la cándida Eréndira y otros cuentos.* [Vintage.]

Sánchez, Florencio. *Barranca abajo*. [Cátedra.]

Usigli, Rodolfo. *El gesticulador*. [Cátedra.]

Rodó, José Enrique. *Ariel*. [Cátedra.]

Galeano, Eduardo. *Las venas abiertas de América Latina*. [Siglo XXI.]

Azuela, Mariano. *Los de abajo*. [Cátedra.]

Rulfo, Juan. *Pedro Páramo*. [Cátedra.]

LITERATURA PENINSULAR

Anónimo. *Poema de Mio Cid*. [Ed. Ian Michael. Madrid: Castalia.]

Don Juan Manuel. *El conde Lucanor, o Libro de los enxiemplos del conde Lucanor et de Patronio*. [Ed. José Manuel Blecua. Madrid: Castalia, 2003.]

Fernando de Rojas. *La Celestina*. [Ed. Dorothy Severyn. Madrid: Cátedra, 1987.]

Anónimo. *Lazarillo de Tormes*. [Ed. Francisco Rico. Madrid: Cátedra.]

Miguel de Cervantes. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. [Newark: Juan de la Cuesta.]

Lope de Vega. *Fuenteovejuna*. [Madrid: Cátedra.]

Pedro Calderón de la Barca. *La vida es sueño*. [Madrid: Cátedra o Letras hispánicas.]

José Cadalso. *Noches lúgubres*. [Barcelona: Crítica.]

Benito Pérez Galdós. *La de Bringas*. [Madrid: Cátedra.]

Emilia Pardo Bazán. *El áncora y otras novelas cortas*. [FL: Stockcero Editions.]

Leandro Fernández de Moratín. *El sí de las niñas*. [Barcelona: Crítica.]

José de Zorrilla. *Don Juan Tenorio*. [Barcelona: Crítica.]

Duque de Rivas. *Don Álvaro o la fuerza del sino*. [Barcelona: Crítica.]

Antonio Machado. *Soledades, galerías y otros poemas*.

Blas de Otero. *Pido la paz y la palabra*.

Miguel de Unamuno. *Niebla*. [Madrid: Cátedra.]

Miguel Delibes. *Cinco horas con Mario*.
[Barcelona: Clásicos contemporáneos comentados.]

Ana María Matute. *Historias de Artámila*.

Federico García Lorca. *La casa de Bernarda Alba*. [Madrid: Cátedra.]

Alfonso Sastre. *Escuadra hacia la muerte*. [Madrid: Clásicos Castalia.]

LINGÜÍSTICA

Díaz-Campos, M. 2014. *Introducción a la sociolingüística hispánica*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Muñoz-Basols, J., Moreno, N., Taboada, I., Lacorte, M. 2017. *Introducción a la lingüística hispánica actual: Teoría y práctica*. London: Routledge.

Silva-Corvalán, C., Enrique-Arias, A. 2017. *Sociolingüística y pragmática del español*. Segunda edición. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Baker, C. 1993. "Capítulo 10: Teorías cognitivas del bilingüismo y el plan de estudios". *Fundamentos de educación bilingüe y bilingüismo*. Madrid: Cátedra, 189-208.

Bialystok, E. 2009. "Bilingualism: The good, the bad, and the indifferent." *Bilingualism: Language and cognition,* 12(1), 3-11.

Cashman, H. R. 2003. "Red social y bilingüismo (inglés/español) en Detroit, Michigan". *Revista internacional de lingüística iberoamericana* 3: 59-78.

Chang, C. B. 2008. "Variation in Palatal Production in Buenos Aires Spanish." In *Selected Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics*, ed. Maurice Westmoreland and Juan Antonio Thomas, 54-63. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Cid-Hazard, S.M. 2003. "Style variation in relation to the phonological variable /s/ in the Spanish of Santiago, Chile." *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 22(2). 13-43.

Díaz-Campos, M., Fafulas, M., Gradoville, M. 2011. "Going Retro: An Analysis of the Interplay between Socioeconomic Class and Age in Caracas Spanish." In J. Michnowicz and R. Dodsworth (Eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics*, 65-78. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Félix-Brasdefer, J.C. 2009. "Pragmatic variation across Spanish(es): Requesting in Mexican, Costa Rican, and Dominican Spanish." *Intercultural Pragmatics,* 6(4), 473-515.

Grosjean, F. 2000. "Processing mixed language: issues, findings and models." In L. Wei (Ed), *The Bilingualism Reader*, 443-471. London: Routledge.

Johnson, M., Barnes, S. 2013. "*Haya* vs. *Haiga*: An Analysis of the Variation Observed in Mexican Spanish Using a Mixed Effects Model." In *Selected Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics*, ed. Ana M. Carvalho and Sara Beaudrie, 32-40. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Lipski, J. 2005. "Code-switching or borrowing? No sé *so* no puedo decir, *you know*." In L Sayahi & M. Westmoreland (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the second workshop on Spanish sociolinguistics,* 1-15. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Placencia, M.E. 2005. "Pragmatic variation in corner store interactions in Quito and

Madrid." *Hispania* 88, 583-598.

Potowski, K. 2004. "Student Spanish use and investment in a dual immersion classroom: Implications for second language acquisition and heritage language maintenance." *Modern Language Journal*, 88(1), 75-101.

Schwartz, A. 2011. "Mockery and Appropriation of Spanish in White Spaces: Perceptions of Latinos in the United States." In Manuel Díaz-Campos (ed.), *The Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics*, 646-664. Malden: Massachusetts: Wiley Blackwell.

Toribio, J. 2004. "Spanish/English Speech Practices: Bringing Chaos to Order." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7(2/3), 133-155.

Torres Cacoullos, R. 1999. "Variation and grammaticalization in progressives: Spanish -*ndo* constructions. *Studies in Language* 23, 25-59.

Uber, D. R. 2011. "Forms of Address: The Effect of the Context." In Manuel Díaz-Campos (ed.), *The Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics*, 244-262. Malden: Massachusetts: Wiley Blackwell.

Vickers, C., Goble, R., Deckert, S. 2015. "Third party interaction in the medical context: Code-switching and control." *Journal of Pragmatics* 84, 154-171.