

Endorsement Review Report

Institution: Washington State University

Endorsement: Designated World Languages

Department or Unit Preparing the Report:
Foreign Languages & Cultures Department

I. Data Summaries. For each endorsement, provide the aggregate data requested.

A. **WEST-E.** For each reporting year, provide aggregate pass rate and mean score.

Endorsement	04-05		05-06		06-07	
	#pass / #test takers (% pass)	WSU Mean (State) ^a	#pass / #test takers (% pass)	WSU Mean (State)	#pass / #test takers (% pass)	WSU Mean (State)
Spanish	NA ^b /2	--	5/6 ^c (83%)	169 ^d (173)	3/9 (33%)	153 (173)
French	NA ^b /1	--	2/2 ^c (100%)	190 ^d (177)	0	
German	0	--	0		2/2 (100%)	174 (184)
Russian	0	--	0		0	

^aState mean not reported in 04-05.

^bFewer than 5 test takers that year.

^cAggregated across previous year(s) in which there were fewer than 5 plus current year.

^dMean is for a single year and is for the year listed at the top of the column.

Spanish

According to the updated 2006-08 ETS data reviewed, 7 students took the Spanish exam. Their scores are after the date in parentheses.

Student 1– took the exam in 6/06 (148) and 9/06 (151) and never passed – she withdrew from student teaching in Fall 2006

Student 2– took exam on 11/06 (158) and did not pass. She passed in 3/07 (168)

Student 3– passed 6/07 (182)

Student 4– took exams in 6/07 (152), 9/07 (159), 11/07 (149) without passing. He passed on 3/08 (162).

Student 5 – took the exam on 8/07 (147) and did not pass. She passed in 11/07 (163). Jane returned to complete her teacher preparation program 9 years after degree had been granted.

Student 6– took the exam in 4/07 (154) and did not pass. She passed in 11/07 (170)

Student 7– passed in 4/07(163)

The Spanish program decided to ask a current graduate student who knows our program fairly well to take the WEST-E exam, so he could give us his opinion on the exam as a whole. The student took the exam (scored 196) and reported to us that he felt we did not need program changes, but that a workshop for students might be helpful. The workshop could provide better training for taking a multiple-choice exam such as the WEST-E. This suggestion seemed to align with the data. Of the 7 students who took the exam, 2 were in special circumstances (student 1 and 5); 2 passed the first time they took it (#s3 and 7) and 2 passed the 2nd time (#s 2 and 6). The difficulties experienced by student 4 came as no surprise to the Program faculty. Student 6 –a

good student- improved her score by 14 points when she took it the second time; that is, when she knew the format and expectations of the WEST-E.

The workshop has been initiated and was offered for the first time last year. We intend to continue offering it and intend to interview students who have taken the WEST-E to ascertain if they feel the workshop was helpful to them. We will take into account the rate of success among WEST-E test-takers and their opinions about the workshop before considering any other changes. When the new WEST-E test is available and being used, we will continue to monitor our students' progress, and make program improvements based on the students' performance.

The Spanish section would like to know, if possible, if the Praxis Series (or the new Pearson series) has any information concerning what percentage of the students who have taken the exam were foreign-born or heritage-speakers.

French

According to the data reviewed, 2 students took the French WEST-E in 2005-2006 with 100% passing rate, and mean scores that were above the state mean.

German

According to the data reviewed, 2 students took the German WEST-E in 2006-2007 with 100% passing rate but mean scores were below the state mean.

Russian

No students took the Russian WEST-E in the past three years.

- B. **Pedagogy Assessment.** For each reporting year, provide aggregate pass rate. For candidates not passing, indicate (in aggregate form) which sections were not passed. (Where the number of candidates in a given year is less than five, the data may be excluded; in those cases, if there are five or more candidates when aggregated across reporting years, those data should be reported).

Endorsement	04-05		05-06		06-07		07-08	
	#pass/#St. Teach. (% pass)	PPA areas not passed	#pass/#St. Teach. (% pass)	PPA areas not passed	#pass/#St. Teach. (% pass)	PPA areas not passed	#pass/#St. Teach. (% pass)	PPA areas not passed
Spanish			3/3 (100%)		2/2 (100%)		4/4 (100%)	
French	1/1 (100%)		1/1 (100%)					
German								
Russian								

We have reviewed the PPA data. All students in the Spanish and French Endorsement passed the PPA 2004-2007. No students in the German and Russian Endorsements have taken the PPA, 2004-2007. Based on the limited amount of data we have received at this point, no modifications or additions, other than continuing with the workshop referred to above will be recommended.

- C. **One other assessment.** For each reporting year, provide assessment data from one other key assessment used within the endorsement program. (This may be a course-based assessment, a portfolio, or any assessment which can be aggregated.) Where the number of candidates in a given year is less than five, the data may be excluded; in those cases, if there are five or more candidates when aggregated across reporting years, those data should be reported.

Department of Foreign Languages and Cultures has an end-of-program assessment for all of its majors. See Appendix A for a complete description of how we collect data, analyze data, and make decisions based on data and outcomes included in the following documents: the Department of Foreign Languages & Cultures Program Assessment Plan, the Oral and Written Proficiency Rubrics, the Bachelor's Degree Assessment Process, and the Master's in Foreign Languages and Cultures Assessment Procedures.

Program faculty regularly (at least once per year) review students' performance on the end-of-program performance of its students. Adjustments to courses, sequencing of courses, and assignments are modified in alignment with those data. In Appendix A you will also see the overall assessment process and products, rubrics, and data collection at the bachelor's and master's levels.

II. Report. Provide a narrative that describes:

- A. The process by which the department /administrative unit responsible for the endorsement reviews assessment data including, but not limited to, the data listed above,

and,

- B. Conclusions reached and modifications made as the result of recent reviews.

Recently, our Program faculty examined the end-of-program assessment data and with that examined the new competencies for the Spanish, German, French, and Russian Endorsements. The course work and the evidence of mastery for each competency were revised to not only meet the new competencies, but insure that our end-of-program assessment was still valid. With our new re-alignment of courses, assignments, and experiences, we will be watching to see our students' performance on the new WEST-E (Pearson). If students' scores are strong, then the alignment, etc. will continue. If students do not do well on the new test, we will have to go back and re-examine course work, assignments, and the end-of-program assessment.

See Appendix A for a complete description of how we collect data, analyze data, and make decisions based on data and outcomes (including our Conclusions and Modifications to programs). The documents included in Appendix A are: Department of Foreign Languages & Cultures Program Assessment Plan, the Oral and Written Proficiency Rubrics, the Bachelor's Degree Assessment Process, and the Master's in Foreign Languages and Cultures Assessment Procedure.

In addition to our Program meetings at which we examine student performance data, our students participate in four signature assignments in their teacher certification core in the Department of Teaching and Learning. The Teacher Education program in the College of Education (COE) has four signature assignments that all Teacher Education students complete: Technology Enhanced Lesson Plan, Classroom Management Plan, Integrated Unit Plan, and Positive Impact on Student Learning. These signature assignments are aligned with the COE Conceptual Framework, the Teacher Education learning outcomes, as well as state and national standards. Each signature assignment is evaluated with a standardized rubric. Faculty are asked to conduct evaluations of the signature assignments using those rubrics and on a

rotating basis. Endorsement area faculty are part of the rotation for participating in those evaluations. All WSU students completing endorsements and who are also completing student teaching for a Residency Certificate complete all four key signature assignments. The reports for all of the signature assignments and assessments are shared with TEC so that the representatives can share the information with endorsement area faculty for program improvement purposes.

The Teacher Education Committee (TEC), a University-wide committee, annually reviews the WEST-E and PPA passing rates for each endorsement area. The TEC then discusses program changes and improvements relevant to the data presented. Each endorsement area has a representative on TEC and that representative reports back to the faculty responsible for that endorsement, sharing with them the data, the discussion, and the program recommendations. The Designated World Languages Endorsement is represented on the TEC by the Chair of the Department, Dr. Eloy Gonzales. The faculty responsible (i.e., faculty in each endorsement area) then discuss the recommendations and data and take appropriate action (e.g., make program changes, modifications, etc.).

III. PEAB review. Verify that this report has been reviewed by the PEAB.

Review Data: _____

Outcome of Review: _____

Appendix A

(Appendix is in small font and single-spaced to save paper.)

Department of Foreign Languages & Cultures

Program Assessment

Spring 2008

February 7, 2008

I. INTRODUCTION

In the spring semester of 2008, the department revised its departmental assessment to more closely match and support WSU's Six Learning Goals of the Baccalaureate, which are:

- Critical & Creative Thinking
- Quantitative and Symbolic Reasoning
- Information Literacy
- Communication
- Self in Society
- Specialty

In addition, the department also aligned learning outcomes standards with national professional associations related to Second Language Acquisition, i.e., the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), and the Common European Framework academic standards.

Of these WSU learning goals, the Department of Foreign Languages and Cultures (DFLC) faculty have identified **Communication** (writing and speaking courses) and **Culture/Film/Literature** (cultural content courses) as most vital to the departmental curricular mission.

Students who complete the Foreign Languages and Cultures program will demonstrate high levels of competence by actively and critically engaging – in their target language – in oral and written interpersonal communication, thereby developing a deeper sense of self *and* others through the study of foreign languages, culture, film and literature.

The reports that will be generated from the spring 2008 semester onward will focus on the department's use of its "Critical and Integrative Thinking" rubrics, in order to guide all FLC students, but especially our FLC majors and minors, in their study of the target language. These rubrics and reports will produce a set of summary results to provide baseline information useful in program evaluation and development.

These rubrics will also be shared with students by being integrated into the syllabi of designated courses. This will enhance student familiarity with the rubrics. It is hoped that this knowledge will motivate students to then complete assignments in a way that confirms that the learning goals were actually the focus of the assignments. The rubrics will include and reference the Six Learning Goals at Washington State University.

Courses that have been identified in Chinese, French, German and Spanish as constituting a standard basis for collecting papers, oral interviews and the evaluative materials are:

- CHIN / GER / FREN / SPAN 307 / 407 ("Intermediate / Advanced Speaking and Listening")
- CHIN / GER / FREN / SPAN 308 / 408 ("Intermediate / Advanced Grammar and Writing")
- Several from among culture, film and/or literature courses that are offered on a rotating schedule each semester and/or academic year.

By assessing a student's coursework prepared according to the pertinent rubric, the faculty of the department will be able to measure and discuss student learning outcomes. These will be produced in summary assessment reports and will be used to enhance, modify, or continue curricular efforts.

II. GOALS & OUTCOMES

This assessment has several goals:

1. Using the assessment process – *critical and integrative thinking in the languages* – to improve the language proficiency, as well as cultural awareness and appreciation of students graduating in Foreign Languages and Cultures, through coursework involving language in demonstrating, and the ability to analyze and critically assess works of literature and film
2. The assessment supports WSU's institutional goals – quantitative and symbolic reasoning, critical and creative reasoning, information fluency, students' communication skills and their understanding of self and society.
3. In addition to meeting WSU's Six Learning Goals, for students to meet the standards of ACTFL in:
Communication: (*writing and speaking courses*) Communication standards adapted from ACTFL guidelines of Foreign Language learning:

- Students demonstrate ability to understand and interpret written and spoken language on a variety of topics.
- Students demonstrate ability to present information, concepts and ideas, orally and in writing, to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics.
- Students engage in conversations, provide and obtain information, express feelings and emotions and exchange opinions.
- Students achieve a level of proficiency in writing, speaking, listening, and reading.

Culture: (*culture, film, and literature courses*)

- Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the practices, products, and perspectives, and distinctive viewpoints of the cultures studied (Cultures and Connections Standard).
 - Students demonstrate an understanding of the concept of culture through comparisons of the cultures studied and their own (Comparisons Standard).
4. Overall, students who complete the Foreign Languages curriculum will obtain competency to successfully and at a high level demonstrate these **essential outcomes**:
 - Use of oral communication in the language
 - Use of written communication in the language
 - Knowledge of other world cultures through their film and literature
 - Ease in accessing information tools to get relevant answers
 - Knowledge of who she or he is in a complex world
 - Engagement in active and critical verbal and/or written discussion of issues
 - Employment of "other" interpretations and perspectives, and consideration of a range of human experiences in the analysis of the issue.

MAPPING TO WSU SIX LEARNING GOALS

Figure 1 illustrates how the six institutional outcomes—critical thinking, quantitative and symbolic reasoning, information literacy, communication, specialty, and self in society—are embedded into the Foreign Languages and Cultures assessment strategy.

Figure 1

Students will demonstrate critical and integrative thinking in Foreign Languages and Cultures						
WSU's SIX LEARNING GOALS						
Program Evaluative	Critical/Creative Thinking	Quant & Symbolic Reasoning	Information Literacy	Communication	Self & Society	Specialty
307/407 (Speaking & Listening)	X	X	X	X	X	X
308/408 (Grammar & Writing)	X	X	X	X	X	X
Culture, Literature, Or Film	X		X	X	X	X

III. PROCEDURES & METHODS

The assessment will be comprised of two parts and will be conducted each Fall and Spring semester: (1) the assessment of rubrics from each language using evaluative materials from three selected courses; and (2) the end-of-program survey questionnaire.

(1) Rubrics

To assess critical and integrative thinking, a sample of student evaluative materials from foreign languages courses listed below will be gathered. A sample of 25% of enrolled students will be evaluated, or no fewer than 5. If enrollment in the higher level courses (407/408) is insufficient, students in the intermediate level classes (307/308) will be used.

Faculty from each language section will evaluate the following course materials using the assigned point values and ratings specified on rubrics for these identified courses:

CHIN/FREN/GER/SPAN 307/407 – evaluation of final exam

CHIN/FREN/GER/SPAN 308/408- evaluation of taped oral presentation

CHIN/FREN/GER/SPAN Culture/Film/Lit courses – evaluation of essay paper.

After faculty have evaluated coursework from each course for each semester, findings will be presented in the form of summaries mapped to the WSU “Six Learning Goals of the Baccalaureate” and will be discussed in the language area. The summaries will also be reviewed and analyzed in totality every four semesters or 2 years for the purpose of discovering any recurring problems or, preferably, outcome improvements. The analysis will take into consideration all findings, and if programmatic changes are needed, this will be discussed by the language coordinator in consultation with the chair and department at large. Changes will be considered and implemented as needed and as possible, given staffing and curricular considerations.

(2) End of Program Survey Questionnaire

Students are given the opportunity to rate faculty and departmental performance in the areas of curricular offerings, advising, and professional skills training, as well as their contributions to overall learning at the university level.

Each semester, all of the language areas are evaluated by students graduating from that program. These results are shared with the language area, as well as with the entire department. Programmatic suggestions are taken into consideration, and implemented when needed and possible. The following pages contain rubrics from 307 / 407, 308 / 408, and one content course focusing on culture, literature, and/or film, as well as the DFCL End of Program Survey.

Guide to Rating Undergraduate Oral Proficiency
FREN/GER/SPAN 407
Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures
Washington State University

Name: _____

Course/ Semester: _____

Type of speech sample evaluated: _____

For each of the seven criteria below, assess the work by:

- a) circling specific phrases that describe the work, and writing comments
- b) circling a numeric score; use only .5 increments

1. Content (*Learning Goals: Critical/Creative Thinking; Quantitative and Symbolic Reasoning, Information Literacy; Communication, Specialty*)

Emerging
Mastering

Developing

1	2	3	4	5
Much too brief, almost no coherent sentences.	Too short, incomplete statements.	Good, satisfactory length.	Very good, responds extensively.	Excellent and very extensive response.
Comments:				

2. Coherence and Fluency.

Emerging
Mastering

Developing

1	2	3	4	5
Disjointed, main points are unclear.	Halting and fragmented, making some passages incomprehensible.	Not consistently coherent.	Good, coherent, appropriate tempo.	Very good, clearly coherent, appropriate tempo.
Comments:				

3. Breadth and Appropriateness of Vocabulary.

**Emerging
Mastering**

Developing

1	2	3	4	5
For the most part, completely incomprehensible.	Limited and unsuitable vocabulary for extended passages.	Basic and at times appropriate vocabulary.	Fairly extensive and appropriate vocabulary.	Excellent and extensive vocabulary.

Comments:

4. Morphology and Syntax.

**Emerging
Mastering**

Developing

1	2	3	4	5
Numerous mistakes, comprehension almost impossible.	Numerous mistakes, comprehension difficult.	Some mistakes, some passages difficult to understand.	A few obvious mistakes, comprehension not impacted.	Hardly any mistakes.

Comments:

5. Pronunciation and Intonation.

**Emerging
Mastering**

Developing

1	2	3	4	5
Accent makes comprehension impossible.	Accent requires extremely "active listening" in order to be understood.	Clearly evident deviations, which at times impede comprehension.	A few noticeable deviations, which do not influence comprehension.	Almost imperceptible foreign accent.

Comments:

Guide to Rating Undergraduate Written Proficiency
FREN/GER/SPAN 408
Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures
Washington State University

Name: _____

Course/ Semester: _____

Type of text evaluated: _____

For each of the seven criteria below, assess the work by:

- a) circling specific phrases that describe the work, and writing comments
- b) circling a numeric score; use only .5 increments

1. Content (*Learning Goals: Critical/Creative Thinking; Quantitative and Symbolic Reasoning, Information Literacy; Communication, Specialty*)

Emerging
Mastering

Developing

1	2	3	4	5
Completely misses the mark.	Topic handled only superficially, numerous unclear passages.	Sufficient treatment of the topic.	Good and fairly extensive treatment of the topic.	Excellent and extensive treatment of the topic.

Comments:

2. Organization and Coherency.

Emerging
Mastering

Developing

1	2	3	4	5
Incoherent, lacking recognizable organization.	Sentences strung together, but not recognizable organization.	Contains some well structured passages.	Reads fairly coherently.	Reads very coherently.

Comments:

3. Breadth and Appropriateness of Vocabulary.

**Emerging
Mastering**

Developing

1	2	3	4	5
For the most part completely incomprehensible.	Unsuitable vocabulary for extended passages.	At times appropriate and suitable vocabulary.	Fairly extensive and appropriate vocabulary.	Excellent and extensive vocabulary.
Comments:				

4. Morphology and Syntax.

**Emerging
Mastering**

Developing

1	2	3	4	5
Numerous mistakes, comprehension almost impossible.	Numerous mistakes, comprehension difficult.	Some mistakes, some passages difficult to understand.	A few obvious mistakes, comprehension not impacted.	Hardly any mistakes.
Comments:				

Guide to Rating Critical Thinking in a Cultural Context
Department of Foreign Languages and Cultures
Washington State University

Student: _____

Course/ Semester: _____

Type of text

evaluated: _____

1. Identifies and formulates the thesis or research question(s). (Learning goals: Critical/ Creative Thinking; Communication)

<i>Emerging</i>	<i>Developing</i>			<i>Mastering</i>
1	2	3	4	5
This dimension focuses on topic identification and the definition of a thesis, including subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the research question and the appropriate discourse integral to effective analysis.				
Comments:				

2. Identifies and considers the topic in context. (Learning goals: Critical/ Creative thinking; Self in Society)

<i>Emerging</i>	<i>Developing</i>			<i>Mastering</i>
1	2	3	4	5
This dimension focuses on context for the thesis or research question. Analyzes the topic with a clear sense of scope and places it in one or more contexts – cultural, economic, ethical, gender, racial, historical, political, religious, social, etc., considering how they may shape the texts/ issue.				
Comments:				

3. When appropriate, develops, formulates and communicates a hypothesis or position. (Learning goals: Critical/ Creative Thinking; Self in Society)

<i>Emerging</i>	<i>Developing</i>			<i>Mastering</i>
1	2	3	4	5
This dimension focuses on ownership of an issue, indicated by the justification and advancement of an original view or hypothesis. Provides a critical analysis that supports the arguments and conclusions through examples chosen from relevant texts.				
Comments:				

4. Presents, assesses, and analyzes appropriate supporting evidence within a body of knowledge. (Learning goals: Critical/ Creative Thinking; Information Literacy; Symbolic Reasoning; Specialty/ Disciplinary Knowledge)

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>
1	2	3	4	5
This dimension focuses on recognition, analysis and understanding of specialty-based supporting materials that convey a sense of understanding of a body of knowledge; when original research is required, demonstrates the ability to implement the appropriate methodology efficiently and effectively.				
Comments:				

5. Integrates issue using OTHER (disciplinary/ theoretical) **perspectives and positions**. (Learning goals: Disciplinary Knowledge; Communication)

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>
1	2	3	4	5
This dimension focuses on integrating previous dimensions and extending them through additional positions drawn from disciplinary appropriate theories, as appropriate.				
Comments:				

6. Identifies conclusions and assesses findings, and implications. (Learning goals: Critical/ Creative Thinking; Symbolic Reasoning; Communication)

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>
1	2	3	4	5
This dimension focuses on well developed conclusions that do more than summarize. They suggest implications and new directions for future research.				
Comments:				

7. Communicates effectively. (Learning goals: Communication; Information Literacy; Specialty/ Disciplinary Knowledge)

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>
1	2	3	4	5
This dimension focuses on mechanics and presentation. Language use (structure, word choice, grammar) is level-appropriate and facilitates the expression of ideas with minimal errors. No unnecessary duplication of ideas or information. Organized effectively; cited correctly; style and format are appropriate for academic audience.				

Comments:

Overall Rating

	Criteria	Score
1.	Identify problem, question, or issue	
2.	Consider context and assumptions	
3.	Develop own position or hypothesis	
4.	Present and analyze supporting evidence	
5.	Integrate other disciplinary/ theoretical perspectives	
6.	Identify conclusions and implications	
7.	Communicate effectively	

Comments:

Foreign Languages End-of-Program Assessment

Please consider the questions carefully before responding. We estimate that the survey will require approximately 15 minutes to complete.

ZS37558

In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?

Select the appropriate radio button. Were you/Did you:		You will be able to select only one radio button per question.			
		Very often	Often	Sometimes	Never
1.	Encouraged to ask questions in class or contribute to class discussions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.	Make a class presentation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.	Prepare two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.	Work on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5.	Encouraged to include diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6.	Work with other students on projects during class	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7.	Work with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8.	Encouraged to put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9.	Use an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.)to discuss or complete an assignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10.	Use e-mail to communicate with an instructor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	Receive prompt feedback from faculty on your academic performance (written or oral)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.	Work harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	Discuss ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

How much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities?					
Select the appropriate radio button.		You will be able to select only one radio button per question.			
		Very much	Quite a bit	Some	Very little
14.	Memorizing grammatical structures, vocabulary, idiomatic expressions, verb conjugations, etc from your courses and readings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15.	Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining in film, culture and literature a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.	Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences in film, culture and literature into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17.	Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods in film, culture and literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18.	Applying theories or concepts learned in film, culture and literature courses to real life situations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

To what extent has your experience in this program contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?					
Select the appropriate radio button.		You will be able to select only one radio button per question.			
		Very much	Quite a bit	Some	Very little
19.	Acquiring a broad general education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20.	Acquiring job or work related knowledge or skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21.	Writing clearly and effectively	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.	Speaking clearly and effectively	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23.	Thinking critically and analytically	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24.	Using computing and information technology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

25.	Working effectively with others	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26.	Learning effectively on your own	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27.	Understanding yourself	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28.	Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29.	Solving complex real-world problems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30.	Developing a personal code of values and ethics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

31. Select the response that best represents the extent to which your course examinations challenged you to do your best work.

- 1 - Very little
- 2 ---
- 3 ---
- 4 ---
- 5 ---
- 6 ---
- 7 - Very much

32. Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received in this Department?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

33. How would you evaluate your entire educational experience in this Department?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

34. If you could start over again, would you go to the same department you are now attending?

- Definitely yes

- Probably yes
- Probably no
- Definitely no

Select the response that best represents the quality of your relationships with people in this Department.							
Please select the appropriate radio button.		You will be able to select only one response per question.					
		1 - Unfriendly, Unsupportive, Sense of Alienation	2 - - -	3 - - -	4 - - -	5 - - -	6 - - -
35.	Other Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
36.	Faculty Members	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
37.	Departmental Administrative Personnel and Offices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

On the average, how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following?							
Please select the appropriate radio button.		You will be able to select only one response per question.					
		0 hours	1-5 hours	6-10 hours	11- 15 hours	16- 20 hours	21- 25 hours
38.	Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
39.	Working for pay on or off campus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40.	Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, social fraternity or sorority intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41.	Providing care for dependents living with you (parents, children, spouse, etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

42. If applicable, please list your second major or your expected second major (not minor, concentration, etc).

43. Please indicate the strengths of this program.

44. Please indicate any weaknesses of this program.

45. Do you have any ideas for the improvement of this program?

IV. RESULTS

Rating Session Results

- Faculty meet regularly to identify and implement changes, and should be consulted as to strategies for revising assignments to improve program outcomes.
- Faculty develop a formalized timeline for rating sessions and the use of their results.

To make use of rating session results, a suggested repeated semester model timeline is indicated below.

Sample Timeline for One Semester Assessment				
Pre-term		Mid-semester		Post-term
Design course, assignments and activities. Collaboratively review these materials to identify and enhance the alignment of outcomes criteria.	Provide outcomes criteria to students and opportunity to norm on sample work. Use criteria to support student learning (faculty feedback, peer feedback, self-reflection). Provide opportunities for students to revise their work based on feedback.	Provide explicit mid-term feedback to students using criteria and collect feedback from students about criteria and assignments. Examine how the criteria are being used; faculty share observations and make notes for improvement of rubric, assignments, processes, etc.	Continue using criteria to support student learning.	Conduct outcomes assessment of student evaluative materials. Use results to enhance alignment of outcomes, assignments, activities, and to identify refinements for next cycle.

V. DISCUSSION AND NEXT STEPS

Spring 2008 is the first semester that the department has implemented the use of assessment by rubrics, and we are looking forward to the summaries of those results. The department has made great progress in formalizing this assessment of WSU's Six Learning Goals, and we expect that this process will demonstrate growing and continuing engagement of students and faculty alike.

We anticipate that the use of the rubrics in tracking student performance and the summaries will help the department make the most out of the Foreign Languages Outcomes:

- By using the rubrics as guides in instruction and in grading the current courses used for assessment. This will strengthen the alignment between assignments and the outcomes/criteria.
- By maximizing students' ability to understand and apply the rubrics by providing them in the course syllabi and linking them to assignments.

Department of Foreign Languages
BA Assessment Process

&
BA Education Accreditation Process

BA Departmental Assessment		BA Education Accreditation
PROCESS	Provide evaluation of one sample of work per student: e.g., final exam, final paper, tape oral interviewing oral proficiency courses.	Provide evaluation of notion of progress (3 samples per student), e.g., early semester, mid-semester, end of semester.
Evaluative Materials:	Final exam, final paper, taped oral interview from oral proficiency courses.	Final exam, final paper, taped oral interview from oral proficiency courses.
Assessment:	<p>Rubrics will be used to assess the evaluative material in each targeted course, and then assessed as a whole by faculty of each language section.</p> <p>End of Program Assessment Survey which students fill out themselves from a provided website.</p> <p>An assessment report is produced by each language area at the end of the semester that is filed in the department office.</p>	<p>3 samples of graded evaluative materials per student from early, mid, and end of semester targeted courses which show progress.</p> <p>Syllabi must be submitted for each course, and must also include the conceptual statement.</p> <p>World Languages Competency Chart (previously determined – Laurie sends this)</p>
Quantity Evaluated:	25% of the class or at least 5 students of identified courses.	Tracking only the Teach-option majors in identified courses. These majors will be identified each semester (Laurie provides a list, as well as instructors will check with students in each class).
Courses from the languages of:	CHIN/FREN/GER/SPAN: 307/407; 308/408; content course from one culture, literature, or film course.	FREN/GER/SPAN: 306; 307/407; 308/408; content course from one culture, literature, or film course. FOR L 440 & 441
Evaluated:	Each Semester, and every Four Semesters for possible program changes.	Each Semester – only evaluative materials are submitted to Education for their files/records.
ASSESSMENTS SUBMITTED TO LAURIE FOR PROCESSING		

**MA IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND CULTURES
PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE**

I. INTRODUCTION

The Master of Arts in Foreign Languages and Cultures prepares students for success in the fields of Spanish/ Latin American, German, French, and Russian literatures, and Applied Linguistics/ Pedagogy. It serves a dual mission: first, it provides a solid foundation at an advanced level for students wishing to pursue a Ph.D. program in literatures or Applied Linguistics by increasing their knowledge of literature, culture, language, and Second-Language Acquisition methodology, and by developing their oral and writing skills, their critical and integrative thinking skills, and their ability to effect disciplinary research. Second, for students wishing to become effective high school or college teachers, the program provides a theoretical foundation and practical application of linguistics and foreign language pedagogy, as well as in the use of technology in the foreign language classroom. In addition, the program may also prepare students for careers outside the academic world wherever superior analytical and communication skills in The chosen language and knowledge of literary/cultural traditions are essential.

II. PROGRAM LEARNING GOALS AND OUTCOMES

A. Learning Goals

1. Students will demonstrate a broad critical and integrative knowledge of literary theory, disciplinary research methodology, and Applied Linguistics/ pedagogy.
2. Students will demonstrate the ability to conduct critical thinking of literature and other artistic expressions such as film, in a cultural context.
3. Students will demonstrate the ability to conduct disciplinary research.
4. Students will demonstrate the potential for developing original research in the discipline.
5. Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate their acquired knowledge in the language at an Advanced/ Superior (Near-Native) level.
6. Students will demonstrate the ability to teach the language at various skill levels.

These goals tie in with WSU's Learning goals, as follows:

Program Learning Goals Correspondence to WSU 6

	Critical/ Creative Thinking	Quant & Symbolic Reasoning	Info Fluency	Comm	Self & Society	Specialty
Knowledge	X		X		X	X
Critical Thinking	X		X		X	X
Disciplinary Research	X	X	X		X	X
Creative Thinking	X				X	X
Communication	X	X	X	X	X	X
Teaching Ability	X	X	X	X	X	X
WSU 6	100%	50%	83%	33%	100%	100%

B. Outcomes

1. Students will be prepared for success in Ph.D. programs in the language of choice; or for success in other areas of advanced graduate education.
2. Students will be prepared for teaching careers as instructors in community colleges or universities. (In the case of students who have earned their Teaching Certificates at the undergraduate level awarded by the college of Education, completion of the MA will increase

their knowledge and preparedness to teach the language at the K-12 level, and increase their chances for promotion.)

- Students will be prepared for careers outside academia that require advanced analytical and communication skills.

III. METHODS

The assessment of student performance regarding of all learning goals and specific outcomes will be carried out as follows:

A. Methods for Assessment of Learning Goals

- Evaluation of **sample coursework** produced by the student during each semester, based on a **“Critical and Integrative Thinking” rubric** (Appendix A). This rubric specifically addresses elements related to learning goals 1-5. Each semester, one graduate seminar will be chosen to conduct this assessment, and the instructor will apply it to the students’ final research papers. The results will be added to an individual table tracking every student’s performance in the four semesters of the program, and this data will be part of their annual review. By tracking individual performance across time, in different subject matters, and by different faculty members, we hope to provide a fair assessment of student progress.

Student Name	Graduate Critical Thinking and Integrative Thinking Rating					
	Course / Year/ Semester					
Rubric Dimension	Span 557	Span 55X	Span 55X	Span 55X		AVG
	2008-1	2008-3	2009-1	2009-3		
Thesis/ Question						
Context						
Own Perspective						
Supporting Data						
Other Views						
Conclusions						
Avg. per semester						
Mean						

- A second grid resulting from a summary evaluation of sample course work by 25% of students per course, per semester, will evaluate overall performance in each dimension, and provide a mean for the individual grid above. All Languages Section faculty members will meet to conduct the review, at the end of each semester. Each sample will be evaluated by each faculty member; the results will be tallied, and an average result incorporated into the grid for every rubric dimension. The result per semester will produce a **mean** or average to compare with individual performance.

3.

25% Sample Graduate Critical Thinking and Integrative Thinking Rating

Rubric Dimension	Course / Year/ Semester					
	Span 557	Span 55X	Span 55X	Span 55X	Span 55X	Span 55X
	2008-1	2008-3	2009-1	2009-3	2010-1	2010-3
Thesis/ Question						
Context						
Own Perspective						
Supporting Data						
Other Views						

Conclusions						
Mean						

4. Copies of the **TA coordinator teaching evaluation** after each visit, and copies of students' evaluations of courses taught by TA. This addresses goal 6 - Teaching Abilities.
5. Copies of the "**Graduate Student Annual Review**" provided to each student at the end of their second and fourth semester; continued participation in the second year of the program and reappointment to a Teaching Assistantship depends on satisfactory performance in this review. In that review, we include information pertaining the student's cumulative record, including the summary of scores from the "Critical and Integrative Thinking" rubric; progress since last review; a qualitative assessment by faculty of progress in research and teaching; a statement as to the rate of progress, i.e., satisfactory or unsatisfactory; and a summary of expectations for the next review period.

In extraordinary cases of performance below expectation at the end of any semester, the student will meet with the Graduate Advisor and the Teaching Assistants Coordinator, in the presence of the Department's Chair, to address changes and expectations for the coming semester, and a written memo summarizing the discussion/ agreements will be placed in the student's file, and incorporated into the Annual Review.

Students who engage in academically inappropriate behavior (such as Plagiarism, or Sexual Harassment), or who are academically deficient (falling below a 3.0 GPA), will be terminated from the program.

6. A **thesis or research paper** requirement that demonstrates the student's command of literary movements and/or critical theories as well as literary analysis methodology, and that the MA committee qualifies as "publishable." All faculty members are part of the MA committee for each student. They must all approve the thesis or research paper before the student is allowed to request the oral exam date. The final deadline for submission of the thesis or research paper is March 1st for students finishing in the spring semester, and October 1st for students finishing in December. Faculty members will provide feedback on these essays to the student who will then rewrite and resubmit a week before the oral exam. Any lingering questions of the thesis or research paper are asked during the first part of the oral exam. Faculty members will rate the exam according to the following qualitative/ numeric scale:

Pass with distinction: 5

Pass: 3-4

Low Pass: 1 -2

No Pass: 0

7. **Three written examinations** related to their literary studies (literary analysis, literary history, thematic); and **one written exam on pedagogy** that includes both theoretical components and their application. Each written exam is read by all committee members, but the faculty member who wrote that particular exam will rate the same according to the following qualitative/ numeric scale:

Pass with distinction: 5

Pass: 3-4

Low Pass: 1 -2

No Pass: 0

If a student does pass an exam but faculty members have some questions, they are presented to the student in the first part of the oral exam. Students receiving a "No Pass" grade are allowed to repeat the written exam in the same area but with a different question, once. If the student fails the exam two times, the committee will meet to discuss if the student should be asked to repeat the course related to the area being examined, or be allowed to take the exam in a different area, or be terminated from the program. (We have never had a

case like this, but we would take all necessary steps to ensure that fairness to the student prevails, and to allow him or her to complete this requirement successfully, and long as we are not compromising the integrity and quality of the program.)

8. A **comprehensive oral examination** required of all MA students at the end of their coursework. This exam consists of three parts: questions regarding the thesis or research paper; questions regarding the written examinations; questions regarding all areas of the Reading List. The Reading List covers Literature from the Middle Ages to Contemporary literature; Latin American literature from Colonial times to the present; and Pedagogy. In the oral exam, students are assessed according to the breadth of their knowledge and effectiveness of presentation. All faculty members ask questions specific to their areas of expertise and make independent judgments on performance to assure the reliability of the oral examination assessment. All committee members vote to pass the student, or not, with a majority of 3 out of 5 needed for a pass. As with the research paper and written exams, the student will be assessed according to the following qualitative/ numeric scale, to be awarded by the examining committee at the end of the exam, with the student outside the room:

Pass with distinction: 5
Pass: 3-4
Low Pass: 1 -2
No Pass: 0

Once all the results are compiled in the MA Evaluation Form (Appendix B), the results will be tallied to obtain a final rating for the student's performance in the program. The student's file will include a memo regarding this assessment, and the student will be advised of the result, and may include it in his/her resume.

9. Quantifiable data in the form of the **average GPA** of graduate students finishing the program that academic year. This average will in turn be broken down in a table, as follows:

Average GPA of Students Completing Program

	2005	2006	2007	2008
% of students GPA ranging from 3.9 to 4.0				
% of students GPA ranging from 3.5 to 3.8				
% of students GPA ranging from 3.0 to 3.4				

10. **Students End-of-Program Evaluation:** A written evaluation is filled by each student individually and anonymously during finals week of their last semester, after they have taken their oral exam (Appendix C). The questions address different aspects of the program and provide us with feedback that can be considered in order to improve the program. Basically, it gives the MA students the chance to evaluate both components of their experience here, namely their work as students and their work as teachers, and allow them to indicate strengths and weaknesses, etc. Upon getting these, the Graduate Advisor summarizes the comments and submits a report to the Chair and the faculty members, and the section meets (annually) to discuss any recommendations and deliberate on whether we need to make any changes. Students assessed are those completing their MA program, so the survey will be offered during the semester when the student(s) is expected to finish the program. In the past, students' suggestions from different versions of this survey have led to specific changes, such as reorganizing how many credits are required of first year students, when the ForL pedagogy courses are offered, providing special topics 2-credit seminars, changes in the reading list, and so forth.

Once we have this version in place, all potential changes will be discussed and approved by the section. The discussion will take place in May, after graduation, so all potential changes that are not of a programmatic scale that would need official approval from the various university committees, can be implemented for the next year. In the cases of those changes that do entail official action, the requests will go in by October 1st of the fall semester.

B. Methods for Assessment of Outcomes

1. **Success at doctoral level:** This outcome is assessed by keeping track of acceptance rates into doctoral programs of students choosing to pursue a PhD program immediately after completing the MA, or within a year of obtaining their degree.
2. **Success in teaching careers:** This outcome is assessed by our students' success in becoming employed in education related areas immediately after graduation. In 2006, of five students not choosing to pursue a PhD, but rather entering the Education job market, one is employed by the Spanish government as a teacher; one is teaching at the elementary level and has now decided to apply to an MA program in "Cultural Studies and Social Thought in Education"; one is teaching at Boise State University as an instructor; one is teaching Spanish at the high school level; and one is an instructor in our Spanish program at WSU. Reasons for not pursuing a PhD were a desire to travel and live abroad; student loan debts; a tempting job offer in the place she wanted to live in; wanting to teach and coach at the K-12 level (for which a PhD is unnecessary); marriage.
3. **Success in non-Education related careers:** This outcome is assessed by the success of our students in obtaining a job in business, publishing, government, not-for-profit fields, or other fields that are not related to teaching. The data reflects the number of students following this option, and the % of successful placement. We also track the career fields they entered, for future reference. For example, in 2006, the only student who chose not to pursue a PhD (though she was accepted into a doctoral program) or an Education related position is working as a Spanish/ English translator in a law firm in Houston, TX. Her reason for this choice was personal.

IV. RESULTS

- A. Regarding the **learning goals**, we produce several sets of data that are reviewed by the TA Coordinator and Graduate Advisor on a semester basis, and by all the Language Section faculty members on a yearly basis. Based on that data, we have observed the following preliminary results:

25% Sample Graduate Critical Thinking and Integrative Thinking Rating Outcomes

Rubric Dimension	Course / Year/ Semester				AVG
	Span 557	Span 55X	Span 55X	Span 55X	
	2008-1	2008-3	2009-1	2009-3	
Thesis/ Question					
Context					
Own Perspective					
Supporting Data					
Other Views					
Conclusions					

2007 Rating Summary of MA Exams and Research Papers

	# of students	Pass with Distinction/ pts.	Pass/ Pts.	Low Pass/ Pts.	No Pass	AVG
Oral	4		3/ 9	1/ 1		2.8

Thesis/ RP	4		4/ 12			3
Lit. analysis	2*		2/ 3			3
History	4		4/ 12			3
Theme	4	1/ 5	3/ 9			3.5
Pedagogy	4	1/ 5	3/ 9			3.5
AVG		22%	66%	16%		3.13

*Second FL option= one less MA exam Rating: Pass with distinction: 5
Pass: 3-4
Low Pass: 1-2
No Pass: 0

2007 Rating Summary of MA Exams and Research Paper PER STUDENT

	Oral	RP	Lit. An	History	Theme	Pedagogy	AVG
Bonds	2.8	3	3	3	3	5	3.3
López	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Rincón	2	3	*	3	3	3	2.8
Serna	3.4	3	*	3	5	3	3.48
Avg. all	2.8	3	3	3	3.5	3.5	3.13

Average GPA of Students Completing Program

	2005- 4	2006- 6	2007- 6	2008- 6	2008- 1	2009- 4
AVG GPA	3.93	3.9	3.91			
% of students GPA ranging from 3.9 to 4.0	75% (3)	83% (5)	83% (5)			
% of students GPA ranging from 3.5 to 3.8	25% (1)	17% (1)	17% (1)			
% of students GPA ranging from 3.0 to 3.4	-	-	-			

B. Regarding **outcomes**, given that our program is small with 4-8 students finishing per year, we have been able to provide close mentoring and keep track of students' immediate acceptance into graduate programs or job positions, as shown in the grids included in section III. We are extremely active in helping them obtain their goals by advising them as to potential graduate programs in their areas of interest, providing assistance in the form of recommendations and/or scholarship money to help defray doctoral program application's costs; alerting them to job positions, and other. The following tables trace our rate of success placing students in their three potential routes immediately after completing the MA: further graduate studies; Education-related position, non-Education related position. Obtaining any pertinent data after years after graduation would largely depend on the good will of our graduates, and could result in incomplete data so we will not keep specific track of this information for statistics purposes. We do keep in touch with many MAs through our website's alumni site, concurrent attendance at professional conferences, occasional visits, etc.

PhD Programs	Total # of students completing program	# and % of students <u>applying to PhD</u>	# of students accepted	Rate of acceptance
2005	4	4 (100%)	4	100%
2006	6	3 (50%)	3	100%
2007	6	2 (33%)	2	100%
2008	6			
2009				

Education Jobs	Total # of students completing program	# and % of students <u>applying to jobs in Education</u>	# of students placed	Rate of acceptance
2005	4	n/a	n/a	n/a
2006	6	3 (50%)	3	100%
2007	6	4 (66%)	4	100%
2008	6			
2009				

Non-Education Jobs	Total # of students completing program	# and % of students <u>applying to non-Education jobs</u>	# of students placed	Rate of acceptance
2005	4	n/a	n/a	n/a
2006	6	1* (16%)	1*	100% (Translation)
2007	6	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008	6			n/a
2009				n/a

*Student also applied to doctoral program and was accepted, but decided to enter job market instead.

V. DISCUSSION AND NEXT STEPS:

The “Critical and Integrative Thinking” rubric used to assess students coursework each semester ensures that we will have a basis for gauging each student’s progress during their participation in the program. At the same time, a cumulative grid using data from these rubrics will provide a basis for comparison on a year by year basis, enhancing our ability to assess students’ progress, and develop corrective strategies when necessary.

The “2007 Rating Summary of MA Exams and Research Papers,” is preliminary in nature, as the assessment system was a work in progress at the time when those students were evaluated. However, we find it valuable as a point of departure, in order to establish a tentative basis for comparison with 2008 results, when the system will be in place. So, based on those very preliminary results, we can state that most (66%) rank as “Pass” even when their GPAs were very good, which does point out that the “Pass with Distinction” rank is not being abused but, on the contrary, being preserved for those truly outstanding cases.

The “Average GPA of Students Completing Program” is another source for historical comparison, and reflects stability for the last two years. The fact that the highest percentage (83%) of our students has obtained excellent grades in courses ranging from Medieval Literature to the Use of Technology in

the Foreign Language Classroom speaks to the quality of their intellect and to their wide-range abilities as scholars and teachers.

The “End-of-Program Survey” provides the Language Program faculty members with very specific information that will be discussed and considered by all, once we get them back before the end of this current semester (Spring 08).

Regarding percentages of students choosing to pursue further graduate education or enter the job market tracked in the Outcomes Tables, they will oscillate depending of the students themselves. We do get a wide variety of national and international, minority or non minority students, with diverse personal responsibilities and a similar diversity of goals. Our aim is to facilitate those goals and enable students to succeed in the step they choose to take after completing the program. We believe we have an outstanding record of having been able to do that.

APPENDIX A

**Guide to Rating Graduate
Critical & Integrative Thinking
Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures
Washington State University**

Name: _____ Course/ Semester: _____

Type of text evaluated: _____

For each of the seven criteria below, assess the work by:

- a) circling specific phrases that describe the work, and writing comments
- b) circling a numeric score; use only .5 increments

Note: A score of 4 represents competency for a graduate student in our program.

8. Identifies, summarizes (and appropriately reformulates) the thesis, question, or issue (Learning goals: Critical/ Creative Thinking; Communication)

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>	
1	2	3	4	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not attempt to or fails to identify thesis and/or issues; goals or objectives are vague or incomplete. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarizes issue, though some aspects are too general, incorrect or confused. Key details are missing or glossed over. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly identifies the thesis/ research question/ issue • Goals/ objectives are clear 	
Comments:					

9. Identifies and considers the influence of **context** * and **assumptions**. (Learning goals: Critical/ Creative thinking; Self in Society)

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>	
1	2	3	4	5	
Approach to the issue is in		• Provides some recognition of		Context and assumptions	

egocentric or socio-centric terms. Does not relate issue to other contexts (cultural, political, historical, etc.)	context and consideration of assumptions and their implications, but in a limited way.	are identified and considered, including integral relationships essential to analyzing the topic, with a clear sense of connections.
Analysis is grounded in absolutes, with little acknowledgment or questioning of own biases or other's assumptions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis includes some outside verification, but primarily relies on established authorities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies influence of context and questions pre-established assumptions.
Comments:		

Contexts may include:

Cultural/social Group, national, ethnic behavior/attitude/ beliefs Educational Schooling, formal training Literary History/ Genre/ Style Political Organizational or governmental	Scientific Conceptual, basic science, scientific method Economic Trade, business concerns costs Ethical Values Personal Experience Personal observation, informal character
--	--

10. Develops, presents, and communicates OWN perspective, hypothesis or position. (Learning goals: Critical/ Creative Thinking; Self in Society)

Emerging		Developing		Mastering
1	2	3	4	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Position or hypothesis is clearly inherited or adopted with little original consideration. • Addresses a single source or view of the argument, failing to clarify the established position relative to one's own. • Fails to present and justify own opinion or forward hypothesis. • Position or hypothesis is unclear or simplistic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Position includes some original thinking that acknowledges, refutes, synthesizes or extends other assertions, although some aspects may have been adopted. • Presents own position or hypothesis, though inconsistently. • Presents and justifies own position without addressing other views, or does so superficially. • Position or hypothesis is generally clear, although gaps may exist. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Position demonstrates ownership for constructing knowledge or framing original questions, integrating objective analysis and intuition. • Appropriately identifies own position on the issue, drawing support from experience, and information not available from assigned sources. Clearly presents and justifies own view or hypothesis while qualifying or integrating contrary views or interpretations. • Position or hypothesis demonstrates 		

	sophisticated, integrative thought and is developed clearly throughout.
Comments:	

11. Presents, assesses, and analyzes appropriate **supporting evidence/ body of knowledge**. (Learning goals: Critical/ Creative Thinking; Information Literacy; Symbolic Reasoning; Specialty/ Disciplinary Knowledge)

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of search, selection or source evaluation skills. • Repeats information provided without question or dismisses evidence without adequate justification. • Does not distinguish among fact, opinion, and value judgments. • Conflates cause and correlation; presents evidence and ideas out of sequence. <p>Data/evidence or sources are simplistic, inappropriate, or not related to topic.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates adequate skill in searching, selecting, and evaluating sources to meet the information need. • Use of evidence is qualified and selective. • Discerns fact from opinion and may recognize bias in evidence, although attribution is inappropriate. • Distinguishes causality from correlation, though presentation may be flawed. • Appropriate data/evidence or sources provided, although exploration appears to have been routine. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of search, selection, and source evaluation skills; notable identification of uniquely salient resources. Examines evidence and its source; questions its accuracy, relevance, and completeness. Evidence is sufficient and well utilized. Demonstrates understanding of how facts shape but may not confirm opinion. Recognizes bias, including selection bias. Correlations are distinct from causal relationships between and among ideas. Sequence of presentation reflects clear organization of ideas, subordinating for importance and impact. • Information need is clearly defined and integrated to meet and exceed assignment, course or personal interests. 	
Comments:					

12. Integrates issue using OTHER (disciplinary/ theoretical) **perspectives and positions**. (Learning goals: Disciplinary Knowledge; Communication)

Emerging		Developing		Mastering
1	2	3	4	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deals with a single perspective and fails to discuss others' perspectives. • Adopts a single idea or limited ideas with little question. If more than one idea is presented, alternatives are not integrated. • Engages ideas that are obvious or agreeable. Avoids challenging or discomforting ideas. • Treats other positions superficially or misrepresents them. • Little integration of perspectives and little or no evidence of attending to others' views. No evidence of reflection or self-assessment. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begins to relate alternative views to qualify analysis. • Rough integration of multiple viewpoints and comparison of ideas or perspectives. Ideas are investigated and integrated, but in a limited way. • Engages challenging ideas tentatively or in ways that overstate the conflict. May dismiss alternative views hastily. • Analysis of other positions is thoughtful and mostly accurate. • Acknowledges and integrates different ways of knowing. Some evidence of reflection and/or self-assessment. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses theoretical perspectives and additional positions drawn from disciplinary appropriate theories. • Integrates own and others' ideas in a complex process of judgment and justification. Clearly justifies own view while respecting views of others. • Integrates different disciplinary and epistemological ways of knowing. Evidence of reflection and self-assessment.
Comments:				

13. Identifies and assesses **conclusions, implications, and consequences.** (Learning goals: Critical/Creative Thinking; Symbolic Reasoning; Communication)

Emerging		Developing		Mastering
1	2	3	4	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences, or conclusion is a simplistic summary. • Conclusions presented as absolute, and may attribute conclusion to external authority. 		<p>Conclusions consider or provide evidence of consequences extending beyond a single discipline or issue. Presents implications that may impact other people or issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents conclusions as relative and only loosely related to consequences. Implications may include vague reference to conclusions. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies, discusses, and extends conclusions, implications, and consequences. Considers context, assumptions, data, and evidence. Qualifies own assertions with balance. • Conclusions are qualified as the best available evidence within the context. Consequences are considered and integrated. Implications are clearly

MA EXAMS/ RESEARCH PAPER EVALUATION (May 2007 graduates)

EVALUATORS

Angela Bonds:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral	Pass	Pass	Low Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass (2.8)
Thesis/ RP	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass (3)
Lit. analysis			Pass			Pass (3)
History	Pass					Pass (3)
Theme			Pass			Pass (3)
Pedagogy				Pass w/ D		Pass w/ D (5)
						Pass (3.3)

Sonia López:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass (3)
Thesis/ RP	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass (3)
Lit. analysis					Pass	Pass (3)
History	Pass					Pass (3)
Theme		Pass				Pass (3)
Pedagogy				Pass		Pass (3)
						Pass (3)

Miguel Rincón:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral	Pass	Low Pass	No Pass	Pass	Low Pass	Low Pass (2)
Thesis/ RP	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass (3)
Lit. analysis						*
History	Pass					Pass (3)
Theme					Pass	Pass (3)
Pedagogy				Pass		Pass (3)
						Pass (2.8)

Iñigo Serna:	EG	FMR	VND	SP	AMRV	Final
Oral	Pass	Pass w/ D	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass (3.4)
Thesis/ RP	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass (3)
Lit. analysis						*
History	Pass					Pass (3)
Theme					Pass w/ D	Pass w/ D (5)
Pedagogy				Pass		Pass (3)
						Pass (3.48)

*Second Language= one less MA exam (Lit Analysis)

Rate for Oral Exams: Pass w/ Dist. 5
 Pass 3-4
 Low Pass 1-2
 No Pass 0

2007 Rating Summary of MA Exams and Research Paper PER STUDENT

	Oral	RP	Lit. An	History	Theme	Pedagogy	AVG
Bonds	2.8	3	3	3	3	5	3.3
López	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Rincón	2	3	*	3	3	3	2.8
Serna	3.4	3	*	3	5	3	3.48
Avg. all	2.8	3	3	3	3.5	3.5	3.13

APPENDIX C

**MA IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES
END-OF-PROGRAM EVALUATION SURVEY
2006-2007**

In your experience in our graduate program, about how often were you encouraged to do or did you do each of the following?

		Very often	Often	Sometimes	Never
1.	Encouraged to ask questions in class or contribute to class discussions				
2.	Make a class presentation				
3.	Prepare two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in				
4.	Work on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources				
5.	Encouraged to include diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments				
6.	Work with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments				
7.	Encouraged to put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions				
8.	Receive feedback from faculty on your academic performance (written or oral)				
9.	Work harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations				

How much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities?

		Very often	Often	Sometimes	Never
10.	Examining in film and/or literature a particular idea, case or situation in depth and considering its components				
11.	Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences in film and/or literature into new, more complex interpretations and relationships				
12.	Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods in film and/or literature				
13.	Applying theories/concepts learned in courses to real life situations				

On a scale of 0-5, with 5 being *Always*, and 0 being *Never*, rate to what extent your experience in this program has contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas:

14	Acquiring job or work related knowledge or skills			
15	Writing clearly and effectively			
16	Speaking clearly and effectively			
17	Thinking critically and analytically			
18	Using computing and information technology			
19	Working effectively with others			
20	Learning effectively on your own			
21	Developing a personal and professional code of values and ethics			
22.	Select the response that best represents the extent to which your course assignments or examinations challenged you to do your best work.			
	5. Always			
	4. Very often			
	3. Often			
	2. Sometimes			
	1. Very little			
	0. Never			
23.	How would you evaluate your entire educational experience in this program?			
	5. Outstanding			
	4. Excellent			
	3. Good			
	2. Fair			
	1. Poor			
	0. No opinion			
24.	If you could start over again, would you attend this program?			
	5. Definitely yes			
	4. Probably yes			
	3. Perhaps yes			
	2. Perhaps no			
	1. Probably no			

	0. Definitely no						
Select the response that best represents the quality of your relationships with people in this Department.							
	0 - Unfriendly, Sense of Alienation, Unsupportive	1	2	3	4	5 - Friendly, Supportive, Sense of Belonging	
25.	Other Students						
26.	Faculty Members						
27.	Departmental Administrative Personnel and Offices						
On a scale of 0-5, with 5 being <i>Always</i>, and 0 being <i>Never</i>, rate the quality of academic advising you have received in the program.							
28.	The amount of time provided to me to discuss my academic schedule and program of studies was ...						
29.	The quality of assistance provided to me in planning my academic schedule and program of studies was ...						
30.	The quality of assistance provided to me in clarifying my academic goals was ...						

Do you have any additional comments relating to academic advising you have received in the program?

Please indicate the strengths of this program.

Please indicate any weaknesses of this program.

Do you have any ideas for the improvement of this program?

APPENDIX D

MA Graduates and GPA; academic/ professional activity after MA

Year	Student	GPA	Activity
2005	Student names not included for confidentiality.	3.8	PhD
		4.0	PhD
		3.9	PhD

		4.0	PhD
2006		3.5	Education
		3.9	Education
		3.9	Education
		4.0	PhD
		4.0	PhD
		3.9	Translation
2007		3.8	Education
		3.9	PhD
		3.9	Education
		4.0	Education
		3.9	PhD
		3.9	Education
2008			PhD
			PhD
			PhD
			Education
			2 nd MA
			Education