CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT REPORT
Spring 2021

General Information	
General Education Assessment Area	Language Inquiry
Department/ School	N/A
Number of students currently in the discipline	1008 (as of 6/8/2021; Data retrieved from Panther Analytics)
Contact Person	
Name *(Person coordinating assessment effort)*	Richard Ruppel, Director of General Education
E-mail address	ruppel@chapman.edu

OVERVIEW/DESCRIPTION

Students complete part of their general education (GE) program in a language other than English; this requirement contributes to the Chapman University mission that our students learn "to lead inquiring, ethical and productive lives as global citizens." This may be accomplished by completing a language class at the intermediate or above level (i.e., language 201 or higher). Learning a second language helps students transcend political borders and promotes cross-cultural understanding.

Students who complete the 201 Language GE Requirement have the skills to continue with more advanced language and culture studies in a major or minor in a language and/or use their knowledge in a variety of academic fields. For example, many students use their knowledge of language/culture at the 201 level in such fields as Business, Health, Communications, Public Relations, Education and Political Science and Sociology, among others.

The language assessment performed Spring, 2021, followed the same format and process as the language assessment of 2017-18, which assessed only French, Italian, and Spanish. As noted below, the 2021 results marked a significant improvement in scores for Spanish and, especially, Italian. This year's assessment included Arabic, Chinese, German, Greek, and Japanese as well as French, Italian, and Spanish.* As noted below, the scores for Greek and, especially, Japanese did not reach the intermediate (2) level. The World Languages department will address these deficiencies. Their faculty should be applauded for successfully addressing the problems uncovered during the last General Education assessment.

*American Sign Language was the only language not assessed.

Learning Outcome I. Process:	
Student Learning Outcome	• Students will understand, speak, read and write the target language at the intermediate or above level as defined by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL) proficiency guidelines. • Students will demonstrate an understanding of culture(s) where the target language is spoken and will compare similarities and differences across languages and cultures (according to National Standards in Foreign Language Education –Known as 'The Five Cs').
Supports University Theme *(Some or all of the program's learning outcomes must support at least two of the university's strategic themes)* • *Themes: Internationalization, Personalized Education, Faculty/Student Research, Interdisciplinarity, or Student Writing* • *Describe how the theme is supported by the learning outcome*	**Global Citizenship**: Familiarity with a foreign language helps students transcend political borders while improving cross-cultural understanding. **Personalized Education**: Students may complete personalized research projects and/or presentations, which involve individualized feedback by faculty. **Student Writing**: Students write in the target language for in-class writing responses, drafts, journals, and/or essays. Drafts are either self-edited or peer-edited.
Supports WASC Core Competency, For Undergraduate Programs Only *(Please indicate whether this outcome supports any of WASC's core competencies)* • *Oral Communication* • *Written communication* • *Information Literacy* • *Quantitative Reasoning* • *Critical Thinking*	The Language Inquiry GE category supports the following WASC Core Competencies: • Oral Communication • Written Communication • Critical Thinking
Where is the outcome published for students? • *Syllabi (If syllabi, list course numbers)* • *Website* • *Handbook*	The GE Language Inquiry Learning Outcome is published on all courses that fulfill the GE Language Inquiry requirement. The learning outcome also is published on the GE web page: https://www.chapman.edu/academics/learning-at-chapman/general-education-outcomes/language-study-assessment.aspx
Evidence of Learning • *capstone project* • *presentation* • *performance* • *course-embedded exam* • *assignment* • *standardized test* • *portfolio*	GE Language Inquiry (LC) instructors were instructed to choose an assignment from their courses that would address the LC Learning Outcome sufficiently (see assessment instructions below). Given the variety of courses in different programs that meet the GE LC requirement, it was not possible to assign a common assignment. This challenge and requirements for choosing an appropriate assignment were discussed and agreed to during the initial assessment meeting on 1/15/2021 with the instructors. As such, there were a variety of assignments chosen for this assessment (see assignment prompts folder). • GE LC Instructions for Instructors • GE LC Assignment Prompts

	When instructors decide to use the final exams to assess the LC Learning Outcome, it is not included in the assignment prompt folder in order to protect the exam from unauthorized distribution.

Collecting and Analyzing the Data
• *How did you select the sample?*
• *What was your sample size (number of students)?*
• *Provide the percentage of the sample size as compared to the relevant population.*
• *How did you assess the student work/data collected?*
  • *Possible Tools: rubric, exam questions, portfolio samples*
  • *Attach all assessment tools*
	In Spring 2021, Chapman University offered 34 GE LC courses, with 67 sections altogether. There were a total of 1008 students enrolled in these courses.
	  • [GE LC Course List](#)
	
	In order to achieve a representative sample across the programs, we employed a stratified sampling design. From each program, we randomly selected instructors and asked if they would be interested in participating in the GE assessment. 9 instructors teaching 16 sections volunteered to participate. The enrollment for these course sections are as follows:
	
	TABLE_BELOW
	
	The overall sample size was 257 students (26% of students enrolled for GE LC).
	
	Instructors assessed their chosen assignment using the GE LC Learning Outcome Rubric (see below). They were instructed to choose an assignment toward the end of the course. The GE LC Learning Outcome Rubric has five assessment criteria: (1) Speaking, (2) Reading/Comprehension, (3) Writing, (4) Cultural Understanding, and (5) Cultural Comparison.
	
	[GE LC Rubric](#)

Course	Sample
ARAB 301	7
CHIN 201	42
FREN 201	64
GER 201	18
GRK 201	13
ITAL 201	23
JPN 201	35
SPAN 201	55

Expected Level of Achievement • *What was your target(s) for student performance for this outcome? (This should tie to the methods in which you assessed the students and collected and analyzed data in the section above.)*	90% of the students are expected to demonstrate intermediate proficiency level or above (i.e., rubric score of 2 or above) in the target language by presenting their ideas in fluid speech with appropriate vocabulary, grammar and syntax and by writing an in-class essay in the target language with an explicit and clear thesis in which they demonstrate an awareness of cultural specificities

II. Performance

Have expected levels of achievement been met for this outcome? Explain.	The expected levels of achievement were met in all languages except Greek and Japanese. See below.
Please provide a summary of the assessment data in a table, along with a brief analysis of the results.	The GE LC assessment data is as follows:

	N	Mean	SD	Below 2

Criterion 1	239	2.22	.58	18
Criterion 2	257	2.28	.68	31
Criterion 3	257	2.38	.58	11
Criterion 4	222	2.36	.55	6
Criterion 5	222	2.36	.58	10

For criterion 1 (Speaking), 221 students (92%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 18 students who did not score 2 or above, 17 students received a score between 1-1.99 and 1 student received a score of .99 and below.

For criterion 2 (Reading/Comprehension), 226 students (88%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 31 students who did not score 2 or above, 30 students received a score between 1-1.99 and 1 student received a score of .99 and below.

For criterion 3 (Writing), 246 students (96%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 11 students who did not score 2 or above, 10 students received a score between 1-1.99 and 1 student received a score of .99 and below.

For criterion 4 (Cultural Understanding), 216 students (97%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 6 students who did not score 2 or above, 5 students received a score between 1-1.99 and 1 student received a score of .99 and below.

For criterion 5 (Cultural Comparisons), 212 students (96%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 10 students who did not score 2 or above, 9 students received a score between 1-1.99 and 1 student received a score of .99 and below.

Below is a link to the complete assessment data table:
- 2021 GE LC Assessment Data

How will results be shared and evidence used to make decisions? Was it shared with faculty (full time and adjunct) and students?	The results will be shared with the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education, Vice Provost of Institutional Effectiveness, Director of General Education, and General Education Faculty Committee for their review and feedback. The results will also be shared with all the departments and faculty who teach LC designated courses.

III. Progress

1. How have previous years' findings been used to improve learning, courses and program in relation to this outcome? Specify. • *Refer to previous years' assessment reports/responses for this section.* • *How did this year's achievement level compare to past years?* • *Show year-to-year progress, preferably in a data table.*	Overall, the results were good and show significant improvement in all five categories over the last assessment from 2017-18. Spanish and, especially, Italian improved significantly in all five categories. The results for Japanese however, which was not assessed in 2017-18, are not as good. Students scored below 2 (~1.6) on the 3 categories the assessor scored. (Cultural Understanding and Comparisons were not scored.) This is significant in part because, unlike all the other languages assessed, **the teachers of the Japanese classes did not score their own students**. The two Japanese teachers provided a third faculty member with their assignments, which he then assessed. This suggests that teachers who assess their own students might introduce systemic bias that raises scores.

	The Greek scores are also problematic; 13 students were assessed in the 5 categories for a total of 65 scores. **Of the 65 scores, 62 earned a score of 2 – only 3 earned a score of 1**. This suggests that the Greek assessor might not have had a thorough understanding of how to score the assignments.
2. Based on your analysis and review, what improvements (if any) will the program initiate in the coming academic year?	Based on this assessment data, student achievement in Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Italian, and Spanish is good. As noted above, the assessment of Japanese and Greek reveal problems that will need to be addressed. More broadly, the Japanese assessment suggests that we will reduce systematic bias if we are able to have faculty who did not teach the assessed students score the results. This should be possible in languages with multiple sections and teachers, less feasible with Arabic, Greek, and other languages with one or few faculty members.