



HAMPDEN-SYDNEY  
COLLEGE

## Italian Major (Example) Academic Assessment Report 2024-25

Department	<a href="#">Modern Languages</a>
Faculty Member Completing Report	H. DiPaolo

### Department/Program Mission

Hampden-Sydney's Department of Modern Languages Mission is dedicated to engaging students in the study of foreign languages, literatures, and cultures. We seek to foster a greater sensitivity to and appreciation of diverse cultural contexts. Upon completing the language requirement, students will receive a functional competence in a language other than their own, which will facilitate communication across cultures and disciplines. The department supports the College's Mission as a good citizen is one who is aware of and sensitive to a variety of world views and can communicate with other citizens of diverse cultures. The Department's mission is to prepare young men for understanding the increasingly globalized world in which they will live and work after graduation. In that sense, the department's mission reflects the broader college mission of educating good men to be good citizens in the college community and beyond.

### Assessment Resources

Add links to assessment resources (e.g., rubrics, Excel files) that you use to evaluate SLOs.

[Italian Speaking Rubric](#)

**Commented [HD1]:** Copies of rubrics and/or analysis of data should be linked here.

### Who is assessed?

[Due to the low number of Italian Major graduates \(average of < 3/year\), all students enrolled in Italian courses will be assessed.](#)

**Commented [HD2]:** States which students are assessed.

## Plan for Assessing Student Learning Outcomes

What should students know at the completion of the program?

Complete one section per student learning outcome.

### Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 1

Italian students will be able to demonstrate advanced proficiency in speaking Italian.

**Commented [HD3]:** SLO is simple and measurable.

#### SLO 1 Assessment

	Assessment Tools	Student Performance Targets	Results	Analysis										
SLO 1a	<p>Speaking portion of the final exam for ITAL 102 scored using a 5-point Italian Speaking rubric that contains the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pronunciation</li> <li>2. Grammatic Structure</li> <li>3. Fluency</li> <li>4. Vocabulary</li> </ol> <p>Note: ITAL 102 is offered each fall. Students have 3 formative speaking assessments throughout the semester before the summative exam assessment.</p>	<p>80% of students will score a 3 out of 5 on the Italian Speaking Rubric.</p> <p>Rubric scores:            1 – emerging speaker            2 – limited proficient            3 – proficient            4 – advanced proficient            5 – fluent</p>	<p>19 out of 22 (86%) students scored at least a 3 out of 5 on the Italian Speaking Final Exam for ITAL 101 with a range of 2.7 -- 4.1</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Overall Mean</th> <th>3.6</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pronunciation</td> <td>3.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grammatical Structure</td> <td>3.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fluency</td> <td>2.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vocabulary</td> <td>4.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Overall Mean	3.6	Pronunciation	3.9	Grammatical Structure	3.3	Fluency	2.9	Vocabulary	4.3	<p><b>Strengths:</b> Students performed best on Vocabulary (4.3) and Pronunciation (3.9). This makes sense because in an introductory level class, more emphasis is put on vocabulary and the correct pronunciation of words. One student scored "proficient" overall.</p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b> Students were weakest in the areas of Fluency (2.9) and Grammatic Structure (3.3). Again, students in this class are not expected to be as fluent as later in their academic careers.</p> <p>The 3 students who did not meet the benchmark were each missing a minimum of 2 homework assignments and were the only ones to not seek assistance from the Italian tutor in the fall.</p> <p><b>Previous Improvements:</b> The written and oral vocabulary warm-ups that we do at the beginning of each class period seemed to reinforce the vocabulary learned in each chapter of the textbook.</p>
Overall Mean	3.6													
Pronunciation	3.9													
Grammatical Structure	3.3													
Fluency	2.9													
Vocabulary	4.3													

**Commented [HD4]:** Lists the assignment, the class, the scoring tool (rubric) and components of the score related to the SLO. The assessment cycle is also provided.

**Commented [HD6]:** Results reported in the same format as the performance targets: "X% of students will score X."

Rubric scores reported holistically and individually.

**Commented [HD5]:** Performance targets state the target threshold and maximum score achievable. Additionally, the rubric scores define the levels of proficiency associated with each score.

**Commented [HD7]:** This is an example of things faculty cannot control. It is also why it is best to plan improvements based on things faculty CAN control such as curriculum, delivery of curriculum, in-class activities, etc.

**Commented [HD8]:** Identifies strengths and weaknesses based on results. Offers reasons for the nature of results. Connects results to previous improvements.

<b>SLO 1b</b>	Speaking portion of the final exam for ITAL 307 “Advanced Conversation in Italian” scored using a 5-point rubric that contains the following components:  1. Pronunciation 2. Grammatic Structure 3. Fluency 4. Vocabulary  Note: ITAL 307 is offered each spring. Students have 3 formative speaking assessments throughout the semester before the summative exam assessment.	80% of students will score a 4 out of 5 on the Italian Speaking Rubric.  Rubric scores: 1 – emerging speaker 2 – limited proficient 3 – proficient 4 – advanced proficient 5 – fluent	9 out of 12 (75%) students scored a 4 out of 5 on the Italian Speaking Exam for ITAL 307 with a range of 3.2 -- 4.8	<b>Strengths:</b> Students performed best on Vocabulary (4.9) and Pronunciation (4.7). This makes sense because vocabulary and pronunciation are the foundation of introductory classes.  <b>Weaknesses:</b> Students were weakest in the areas of Fluency (3.9) and Grammatic Structure (4.2). One student’s fluency score (1.4) brought the average down. Several students are leaving out articles and failed to correctly use the subjunctive mood.  <b>Previous Improvements:</b> While short writing exercises did increase the Grammatic Structure component scores (up from 3.9 last year), requiring students to visit the Italian language table once per semester did not increase fluency as much as we had hoped.						
			<table border="1"> <tr><td>Overall Mean</td><td>4.4</td></tr> <tr><td>Pronunciation</td><td>4.7</td></tr> <tr><td>Grammatical Structure</td><td>4.2</td></tr> <tr><td>Fluency</td><td>3.9</td></tr> <tr><td>Vocabulary</td><td>4.9</td></tr> </table>		Overall Mean	4.4	Pronunciation	4.7	Grammatical Structure	4.2
Overall Mean	4.4									
Pronunciation	4.7									
Grammatical Structure	4.2									
Fluency	3.9									
Vocabulary	4.9									

**Commented [HD11]:** It is okay that the goal was not met because we are constantly using results to look for ways to improve.

**Commented [HD10]:** Performance targets adjusted to reflect advanced level.

**Commented [HD9]:** Same assignment given in a more advanced class to show growth.

### SLO 1 Improvement Plan

	Improvements Implemented in 2023-2024	Were the 2023-2024 improvements successful?	Improvements Planned for 2024-2025
SLO 1a	We implemented written and oral vocabulary warmups at the beginning of each class meeting to reinforce each chapter’s vocabulary and pronunciation.	The vocabulary warmups did help students with recognizing and pronouncing individual vocabulary words.	Improvements tied to student learning: We will continue the vocabulary warmups but plan to add a sentence writing portion as well. This will reinforce the grammatical structure and fluency as students practice reading them aloud too.
SLO 1b	We implemented short writing assignments and required students to attend the Italian Language Table discussions at least once during the semester.	The short writing assignments and language table visit showed modest improvements but not enough to be truly successful.	We plan to implement weekly speaking practice assignments into the class and add a 4 <sup>th</sup> formative speaking assessment to provide more feedback to students.

**Commented [HD12]:** Stated and analyzed last year’s improvements.

**Commented [HD13]:** Planned improvement related to student learning in the classroom. Improvements may also be related to curriculum/course design and assessment planning.