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**What follows is the report for the French section:**

**Assessment of goals and learning objectives/outcomes in 2008-2009**

1. **Learning objectives/outcomes assessed in 2008-2009**

   **Learning outcomes 1.2 (speaking and listening skills)** through evaluation of outcomes and assessment tools for Fren 125 (Quebec and French in North America).

2. **Description, date administered, and results**

   **Rubric for mastery of Communicative Learning Outcome 1.2 - demonstrating speaking and listening skills**

   We continued to use the rubric from Fall 2007 to collect data to assess learning outcomes for communication (1.2). In Fall 2008, we used the rubric to assess students’ communicative skills in Fren 125 (Quebec and French in North America). We then analyzed the results and added them to our data bank on speaking and listening skills. As time goes by, we will gather data in order to evaluate the degree to which our students are meeting the Communicative Learning Outcome 1.2 (demonstrating speaking and learning skills).

   During the Fall 2008 semester, assessment of the learning outcomes was carried out by evaluating weekly in-class discussions and an oral presentation given in front of the class in the second last week of the semester. For the oral presentation, students gave an interactive portrayal in French of a Franco-American character (fictional or historical) as if they were an exhibit in a wax museum. The students responded to questions from the audience (of other students) and the instructor.

   Using the same “Rubric for Evaluating Conversations” as in Fall 2007, which was included in Appendix B of the 2007-2008 report, the students’ weekly in-class discussions and oral presentation were evaluated for completion of task, fluency, level of discourse, comprehensibility of message, vocabulary, and language control.

   Fren 125 was chosen as a site to directly evaluate student oral proficiency since it stresses the use of authentic oral French through its focus on weekly class discussion in French (15% of overall grade) and its inclusion of a substantial oral presentation that also counts for 15% of the overall grade.

**Enrollment**

This class had 18 total students: 11 Majors; 9 students had spent a year or more in France or were native speakers; 6 students already spoke two other languages; for all but one student this was at least their third d upper division class. It is common for our classes to have this variety in terms
of previous practice of the language and, as we decide what standards to use to assess our classes, it is essential to take into account that we can have a broad spectrum of abilities in the class.

Conclusions (See tabulated results on next page)

Class discussions: (Class discussions were evaluated every five weeks (three times in all) and the range represents the change from the first evaluation to the last).

- completion of task ranged from 3.2 to 3.6
- fluency ranged from 3.0 to 3.3
- level of discourse ranged from 2.6 to 3.45
- comprehensibility of message ranged from 3.3 to 3.6
- vocabulary ranged from 3.0 – 3.3
- language control ranged from 3.2 to 3.63

Oral Presentations: (There was one oral presentation during the second last week of the semester)

- completion of task was 3.7
- fluency was 3.4
- level of discourse was 3.6
- comprehensibility of message was 3.6
- vocabulary was 3.5
- language control was 3.6

It is the feeling of our faculty that our goal should be to have students’ scores average above 3.5 by the end of the class in discussions and presentations. Based on this goal, we can draw some conclusions.

Data analysis of oral proficiency using the rubric scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Out of 4 points</th>
<th>Average Class Discussion 1st 5 weeks</th>
<th>Average Class Discussion 2nd 5 weeks</th>
<th>Average Class Discussion 3rd 5 weeks</th>
<th>Average Oral Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Completion</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Discourse</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility of Message</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areas in which students do well

Class Discussion
The scores show that students improved as the semester went along as they got used to using French in class discussions and became more familiar with the material. Students completed the tasks at an appropriate level by the end of the class, so we can also conclude that they had a better understanding of the material as the class went along. Their language control (grammar, syntax, proper register) and comprehensibility of message (making themselves understood to others) also improved to satisfactory levels.

Oral Presentation
In the oral presentation, students on the average reach a satisfactory level (3.5) in all areas except fluency. But even in fluency, the score of 3.45 indicates students reached a level of fluency close to the satisfactory level of 3.5.

Areas for improvement
Like last year, our areas of concern are the scores in fluency, level of discourse, and students’ ability to use a wide range of vocabulary including incorporating new vocabulary into their dialogues and conversations.

We notice that when given an assignment such as an oral presentation on an historical or fictional figure, students score well – satisfactory in 5 out 6 areas. However, in the class discussions, where there is more spontaneity, scores are lower falling below satisfactory. Students can prepare well for a subject, talk about it and interact at a level that is satisfactory and above. However, in more open-ended situations, such as class discussions, where the dialogue moves around several subjects, they are not as proficient.

3. Anticipated Program Changes based on faculty reflection on these results
a. We will continue to try to improve these scores in the following ways:
   - Instructors must use French in the classroom with the students at all times
   - Instructors must insist that students get used to using French in the classroom at all times, and also should be strongly encouraged to use French when consulting with the instructor (advising, office hours, email, casual encounters on campus, in the corridor etc)
   - We should make more effort to bring into the classroom guests who are native speakers in order to encourage more interaction in French
   - We should find ways to get students to practice French outside of the classroom with local French-speaking activities (movies, speakers, events etc)

b. We will know if these changes achieved the desired results by monitoring the scores in classes where mastery of oral proficiency is one of the stated goals of the class.
c. We can also assess if our students are making connection with the French-speaking community by using the survey for learning outcomes in Communities (5.1 and 5.2). (Survey questions are included in the Other Assessment Activities section)

4. Other Assessment Activities in 2008-09
We began to develop assessment tools for written communication (learning outcome 1.3). We chose a writing rubric. For learning outcomes 2.1 and 2.2, we wrote a rubric and used it in class, but are not satisfied that it covers what we want to know, so we have not compiled any results this year. We wrote a survey to assess student outcomes for the communities section of our learning objectives (outcomes 5.1 and 5.2)

Written Communication
In 2008-09, we went to the web and looked at rubrics that were available from some pedagogical sites. We chose a fairly simple rubric (see below) that we can begin to use to collect data on written communication beginning in Fall 2009. We chose a fairly uncomplicated rubric so that we could develop it into a tool for assessing our students’ writing in French. This is for learning outcome 1.3:

Students can communicate effectively in written language:
- write a long report (10 pages); several short reports; use email and internet tools for written communication.

This rubric comes from an Internet site: Fairfax County Public Schools - PALS: Performance Assessment for Language:
Student http://www.fcps.edu/DIS/OHSICS/forlang/PALS/rubrics/2wrt_an.htm

Task Completion
1 --Minimal completion of the task, and/or content frequently inappropriate
2 --Partial completion of the task, content mostly appropriate, ideas are undeveloped
3 --Completion of the task, content appropriate, ideas adequately developed
4 --Superior completion of the task, content appropriate, ideas well-developed and well-organized

Comprehensibility
1 --Text barely comprehensible
2 --Text mostly comprehensible, requiring interpretation on the part of the reader
3 --Text comprehensible, requiring minimal interpretation on the part of the reader
4 --Text readily comprehensible, requiring no interpretation on the part of the reader

Level of Discourse
1 --Predominant use of complete, yet repetitive sentences, no or almost no cohesive devices
2 --Use of complete sentences, some repetitive, few cohesive devices
3 --Emerging variety of complete sentences, some cohesive devices
4 --Variety of complete sentences and of cohesive devices

Vocabulary
1 --Inadequate and/or inaccurate use of vocabulary
2 --Somewhat inadequate and/or inaccurate use of vocabulary and too basic for this level
3 --Adequate and accurate use of vocabulary for this level
4 --Rich use of vocabulary
Grammar
1 -- Inadequate and/or inaccurate use of basic language structures
2 -- Emerging use of basic language structures
3 -- Emerging control of basic language structures.
4 -- Control of basic language structures

Mechanics
1 -- Inaccurate spelling, use of diacritical marks, punctuation and/or capitalization
2 -- Somewhat inaccurate spelling, use of diacritical marks, punctuation and/or capitalization
3 -- Mostly accurate spelling, use of diacritical marks, punctuation and/or capitalization
4 -- Few or no errors in spelling, use of diacritical marks, punctuation and/or capitalization

Learning Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2
We wrote the rubric for cultural proficiency on the next page. Its objective is to assess cultural proficiency in students’ writing. We did not compile data on this rubric since we are not sure if the rubric dovetails with the learning outcomes. The Learning Outcomes are:

2.1 - Students demonstrate knowledge of traditions and institutions of the target culture, such as marriage, work, social stratification, political organization
2.2 - Students demonstrate knowledge of artistic expressions of the target culture such as paintings, music, literature, architecture
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Average:</th>
<th>Development of ideas</th>
<th>Avoid generalization</th>
<th>Full and complete sentences</th>
<th>Grammar and vocabulary</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cultural Destructiveness</td>
<td>Undeveloped ideas with no examples.</td>
<td>Generalizations read like bumper stickers or political slogans to fill space</td>
<td>Little or no sentence structure</td>
<td>Poor grammar and limited vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cultural Incapacity</td>
<td>Ideas only take into account a kind of sloganeering of student's own culture</td>
<td>Generalizations about the superiority of student's own culture</td>
<td>Sentences are uneven not linked together</td>
<td>Grammar and vocabulary are Ok in simple sentences but little or no development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cultural Blindness</td>
<td>Ideas are there but their substantiation is based solely on the student's own culture.</td>
<td>Generalizations that do not take into account the other culture</td>
<td>Sentences are strung together but do not seem to go anywhere in particular</td>
<td>Grammar and vocabulary are passable, but Show or suggest student is uninvolved with subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cultural Precompetence</td>
<td>Ideas are somewhat developed with references to examples from student's own culture and from other culture; lack of deep development</td>
<td>More complex ideas expressed but lack in depth analysis: a beginning of complexity</td>
<td>Sentences build towards paragraphs and hang together mostly</td>
<td>Grammar and vocabulary are developing; they show that student cares about what she/he is writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cultural Competence</td>
<td>Well-developed ideas with some appropriate examples given to back up the ideas</td>
<td>Expresses ideas in fairly well developed way avoiding generalizations or at least avoiding over generalization</td>
<td>Sentences hang well together forming good paragraphs</td>
<td>Solid grammar and varied vocabulary show student's desire to connect with audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Cultural Proficiency</td>
<td>Very well developed ideas with appropriate examples given to back up the ideas.</td>
<td>Ideas expressed in a very balanced clearly aware manner that shows how cultures are intricate.</td>
<td>Sentences hang well together forming good paragraphs that lead clearly towards the main point of the paper</td>
<td>Very good grammar and thoughtful vocabulary show student's respect or desire to understand all kinds of culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Outcomes 5.1 and 5.2
These learning outcomes are under the heading Communities, and they state:

5.1 Students are exposed to the use of the target language beyond the school setting by participating in outside of the classroom activities, such as study abroad in the target culture, engagement with local cultural organizations, or internships with local businesses associated with French
5.2 Students effectively find information regarding the target culture using sources in the target language

In order to begin to assess the student outcomes in the area of Communities, we drew up the following survey.

Communities Survey

1. During the course of your studies in French, did you participate in outside of the classroom activities? Was French spoken at these activities? Did you speak French with other participants?

2. Did you do study abroad in a French-speaking country? How long were you there? What effect did study abroad in a French-speaking country have on your proficiency in French language?

3. Did you participate in any French activities or activities where French was spoken that were organized by local or regional French or French-speaking organizations? Where did the activities take place? What kind of activities were there? Did the participants speak French? Were you able to speak French with people at the events?

4. In what way did participating in any of the above mentioned French activities improve or affect your knowledge or cultural awareness of French-speaking culture?

5. During your French studies at CSUS, were you able to use sources and resources (Internet sites, books, journals, magazines, newspapers, movies, TV, radio, local organizations etc) in the target language (French) in order to help you find out more about French-speaking culture? How useful did you find the sources and resources. What did you use them for: writing a paper, preparing an oral presentation, or personal enrichment etc?

5. Plans for future assessment
In 2009-10 we plan to continue assessing oral proficiency. We will compile data based on the rubrics for written communication (learning outcome 1.3) and cultural proficiency (outcomes 2.1 and 2.2), and the survey for communities (outcomes 5.1 and 5.2). We will also assess and improve the rubrics to better evaluate student outcomes. We will also use the survey used by colleagues in Spanish to measure students' perception of the development of their critical and analytical skills and their developed familiarity with literary and cultural theories. The survey questions cover the learning outcomes 3.1 and 3.2 in the Connections section.
What follows is the report for the Spanish section:

Option 1: Narrative Submission: please address the following questions.

1. What goals or learning objectives/outcomes were assessed in AY 2008-2009?  
This year, the assessment committee for the Spanish section decided to assess again learning objective 1.3: Students can communicate effectively in written language under testing conditions.

The report for last year (AY 2007-2008) scored essays from students enrolled in the Advanced Spanish Grammar course, Spanish 103, which was chosen for direct assessment of student writing skills because it is a course that is required of all Spanish majors. The data collected in this course, however, were more of a formative assessment as they did not assess learning outcomes of students near graduation. Of the 28 students enrolled in the Spanish 103 course in the Fall 2007, only two were Spanish seniors. The report, then, included also the compositions of two students in their junior year and three graduate students also enrolled in the course for a total of 7 students assessed.

Data gathered by the Office of Institutional Research suggested that the courses with more seniors are Spanish 110, 111, 113, 114 and 153. It was decided, then, that in order to assess senior students' writing skills for the current report (AY 2008-2009), the committee would need to gather data from any of these courses with a concentration of seniors. Spanish 113 was chosen as the site for gathering student work for direct assessment of student writing skills because in the Fall of 2008, 87% of students enrolled in this course were seniors.

The committee also assessed learning objective 3.2: Students discuss literary and intellectual developments in the target culture.

2. How did you assess these learning outcomes?

a. Describe the measures you used and the information gathered? (Description, date administered, results)
We used data collected from three sources: i) Compositions (direct measure), ii) Graduate Exam (direct measure), iii) Self-evaluation questionnaire (indirect measure), and iv) data gathered by the Office of Institutional Research (indirect measure).

i) Compositions. Assessment of the learning outcomes was carried out during the Fall 2008 by evaluating two compositions submitted by 14 of the students enrolled in the Latin American Literature, Beginnings to Modernism course, Spanish 113.

These two sets of writings are referred below as Composition 1 and Composition 2. Each of the compositions was evaluated by two raters. The scores obtained by the two raters were submitted to a paired T-Test to determine inter-rater reliability. The results for Essay 1 (t = -0.6058, p = 0.5499) and Essay 2 (t = -0.7274, p = 0.4735) showed consensus in the ratings given by judges.
Using the same "Rubric for Writing" presented in Appendix A of last-year report (2007-2008), each set of compositions was evaluated for clarity of thesis, knowledge of Spanish conventions in writing, organization and coherence, and vocabulary. Percentages were calculated for general proficiency. Language competence was then broken down into four main components:

1. clarity of thesis;
2. knowledge of writing conventions (grammar; spelling, accent marks, etc.);
3. organization and coherence;
4. vocabulary.

Data analysis of the compositions yielded the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition 1</th>
<th>Rater 1</th>
<th>Rater 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average score (Total: 100 points)</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students scoring 90-100 (excellent)</td>
<td>(5) 35.7%</td>
<td>(6) 42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students scoring 80-89 (good)</td>
<td>(5) 35.7%</td>
<td>(5) 35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students scoring 70-79 (average)</td>
<td>(4) 28.5%</td>
<td>(2) 14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students scoring &gt;69 (poor)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition 2</th>
<th>Rater 1</th>
<th>Rater 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average score (Total: 100 points)</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students scoring 90-100 (excellent)</td>
<td>(5) 35.7%</td>
<td>(6) 42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students scoring 80-89 (good)</td>
<td>(7) 50%</td>
<td>(5) 35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students scoring 70-79 (average)</td>
<td>(2) 14.3%</td>
<td>(3) 21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. (Thesis)
- Average score Composition 1 | 83 | 85 |
- Average score Composition 2 | 85 | 89 |

B. (Conventions)
- Average score Composition 1 | 84 | 87 |
- Average score Composition 2 | 87 | 88 |

C. (Organization)
- Average score Composition 1 | 87 | 90 |
- Average score Composition 2 | 88 | 90 |

D. (Vocabulary)
- Average score Composition 1 | 86 | 86 |
- Average score Composition 2 | 87 | 88 |
The results suggest a slight improvement in the writing of the second composition. However, the analysis of the data to measure the difference of means within subjects (e.g., the change of means observed between the first and second composition) did not show statistical significance (for Rater 1, p = 0.5807; for Rater 2, p = 0.6169).

In general, the data indicate that senior students in the Spanish program effectively present ideas in a clear and logical order in writing, although some learners may still have difficulties with transitions and the development of some ideas. Furthermore, although most students are obtaining a good or excellent score (80 or above), the results indicate that some students still struggle with writing assignments in their senior year. This is an area the needs further attention.

As it was observed in last-year's report, the main difficulty faced by students is with the formal conventions of the language (accents, spelling, and grammar) as well as with the development of a clear and original thesis that matches the writing assignment. The first writing task, in particular, was more problematic possibly because of the nature of the assignment which consisted of short identifications and did not allow for a more extensive writing sample with a well developed thesis and relevant evidence. Conversely, the second and longer writing sample proved difficult for those students who do not have a good command of the conventions of the language and have a limited range of vocabulary.

**ii) Graduate Exam (G-Exam).** Appendix B shows the results from the G-Exam administered to seniors in Fall 2008, and Spring 2009. The exam evaluates oral and written comprehension, vocabulary, knowledge of grammatical structures in Spanish, knowledge of the conjugation system (verbs), grammatical theory, spelling, writing and oral skills. A passing score is 14 or above; scores below 14 are shown in brackets.

Data analysis of the G-Exam shows mixed results in terms of writing skills. For instance, in the Fall 2008, 61.1% of students taking the exam for the first time in the obtained a passing score in the composition, while 90% passed this component in the Spring 2009.

The results of the G-Exam also indicate that many senior students continue having difficulties with knowledge of the conventions of Spanish, a finding that supports the results from the assessment of compositions and the findings from last-year report. The data show 33% did not pass the section on Grammatical Theory in the Fall 2008, and 50% of students did not pass it in the Spring 2009. The data suggest this component to be the most problematic for students, whether they are taking the exam for the first-time or not. In fact, of those students who retook the G-Exam in the Fall 2008, 70% failed this portion of the exam, and 83% failed to pass it in the Spring 2009.

**iii) Self-evaluation questionnaire.** Students in Latin American Literature, Beginnings to Modernism course, Spanish 113 were also given a questionnaire, in which they were asked to self-assess to what extent their courses and assignments have helped them with: a. the development of their critical and analytical skills, both orally and in writing; b. the developed familiarity with literary and cultural theories.
There were 28 students who completed this questionnaire. To the first question, regarding the development of critical and analytical skills, 15 students (54%) said the courses have helped them to develop their critical and analytical skills; however, 10 students (36%) specifically mention the need to have more writing assignments.

Moreover, 13 students (46%) agreed that the program has helped them to become more familiar with literary and cultural theories. In particular, they stated that the course Spanish 113 has helped them in this regard. However, in their answer to the second question, students again mentioned the need to have more graded writing assignments to help them to improve their writing skills and Spanish grammar.

Although students' self-evaluations confirmed the need to strengthen the writing component of the program, these results are tentative because no every student answered all of the questions.

iv) Other reports. As in the previous year, this report includes information gathered by the Office of Institutional Research concerning enrollment of Foreign Language Majors. The data for AY 2008-2009 support last year findings (i.e., the majority of Spanish Language Majors are transferred students who did not take Lower Division courses (1A-2B) at CSUS). Combining the information from the Fall 2008 and Spring 2009, the data show that 51% of our Spanish language majors (that is, 138 students of 271) are transferred students, and the majority enroll in courses numbered 42, Conversation in Spanish, or above. Moreover, only 20% (55 students) are "native" (i.e., students who enrolled in a lower division course).

The data collected for this report support the findings of the previous year: there is a dire need to strengthen the program at the second and third years, which are the point of entrance for many of our transfer students. Moreover, students' self-assessment indicates the need to emphasize the writing component in the program.

b. As a result of these assessments what did you learn about the program’s success in helping its students achieve these learning outcomes?

Although the results from the G-Exam showed mixed results, assessment of the writing task of seniors suggest that, in general, the sequence of courses (Span 103 and 106) is helping learners communicate effectively in written language. Moreover, even though Spanish 103 is basically a grammar course, students are required to write short compositions to help them to relate meaning to form (i.e., to understand why a particular structure is used in a given context). Students are also given the opportunity to re-write their compositions after reviewing the feedback provided by the instructor in order to reinforce the learning of grammar in context.

After taking Spanish 103, students majoring in Spanish continue with Spanish 106, Advanced Composition.
c. In what areas are students doing well and achieving expectations?
Analysis of the compositions collected in the senior course (Span 113) supports the results of the assessment report presented last AY 2007-2008: most students can communicate effectively in writing under testing conditions.

d. What areas are seen as needing improvement within your program?
Some learners still have difficulties applying the conventions of Spanish, in particular spelling and grammar.

3. As a result of faculty reflection on these results, are there any program changes anticipated?
a) If so, what are those changes?
The results for this report confirm the data collected last year: although the majority of learners write compositions scored as "good" or "excellent", many still need to improve their knowledge of grammar and their writing skills. The faculty has decided to have SPAN 47 (Introduction to Composition and Grammar Review) as a required course in the B.A. program before students enroll in SPAN 103. It is envisioned that the sequence of courses (Span 47, 103 and 106) will strengthen the writing component and provide students with more practice before they advance to senior courses. This change will likely take place starting in Fall 2009.

b) How will you know if these changes achieve the anticipated results?
The committee will again collect essays from any of the senior courses for assessment in two or three years in order to allow the requirement of Span 47 to take place. A self-evaluation questionnaire concerning the development of students writing skills will be given to learners in the courses where the writing samples will be assessed.

4. Did your department engage in any other assessment activities such as the development of rubrics, course alignment?
In 2008-09, we tested a self-evaluation questionnaire to measure students' perception of the development of their critical and analytical skills and their developed familiarity with literary and cultural theories (learning objective 3.2: Students discuss literary and intellectual developments in the target culture.)

This questionnaire comes from the Bowling Green State University website: http://www.bgsu.edu/downloads/provost/file47768.pdf

Each of the questions in this questionnaire, however, has 2 or 3 embedded questions, so some students did not answer all of the questions, but gave instead an overall answer. Moreover, this questionnaire was designed with graduate students in mind. For the future, we will streamline the questionnaire and change it to assess the goals of our undergraduate program.
Self Evaluation Questionnaire
Please answer the following questions when writing your self-assessment.

1. To what extent have your courses and assignment helped you to develop your critical and analytical thinking skills, both orally and in writing? Is there anything you could have done differently to develop your critical and analytical thinking skills more? Is there anything the program could have done to help you develop those skills more?

2. How has your participation in the program --both your time spent abroad and on campus-- helped you to enhance your competence in the Spanish language? What has been most helpful to you? What do you think you, or the program, could have done to advance your language skills more?

3. Based on your courses and papers, do you feel that you have developed familiarity with literary and cultural theories? Have you learned the appropriate research tools (e.g., MLA or APA styles) to complete your assignments?

5. What assessment activities are planned for the upcoming academic year?

For the upcoming academic year, we propose to:

- Assess oral communication skills,
- Develop a tool to assess the oral communication skills, and
- Streamline and structure the format of the self-evaluation questionnaire concerning students' perception of the development of their critical, analytical and writing skills in order to reduce the chance of varied and unanticipated findings.

---

1 It was difficult to sum the responses to this question because of the different background and language experience of students. In the future, the self-questionnaire will be administered as a Likert Test to facilitate analysis.