

2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

This template intends to make our annual assessment and its reports simple, clear, and of high quality not only for this academic year but also for the years to come. Thus, it explicitly specifies some of the best assessment practices and/or expectations implied in the four WASC assessment rubrics we have used in the last few years (see the information below* that has appeared in Appendices 1, 2a, 2b, and 7 in the *Feedback for the 2011-2012 Assessment Report*; Appendix 2 in the *Feedback for the 2012-2013 Assessment Report*, and Appendices 5 to 8 in the *2013-2014 Annual Assessment Guideline*).

We understand some of our programs/departments have not used and/or adopted these best practices this year, and that is okay. You do not need to do anything extra this year, and ALL YOU NEED TO DO is to report what you have done this academic year. However, we hope our programs will use many of these best practices in the annual assessment in the future.

We also hope to use the information from this template to build a digital database that is simple, clear, and of high quality. If you find it necessary to modify or refine the wording or the content of some of the questions to address the specific needs of your program, please make the changes and highlight them in red. We will consider your suggestion(s). Thank you!

If you have any questions or need any help, please send an email to Dr. Amy Liu (liuqa@csus.edu), Director of University Assessment. We are looking forward to working with you.

*The four WASC rubrics refer to: 1) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes”; 2) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Capstone Experience for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes”; 3) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Portfolio for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes”; and 4) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews”.

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: [__BA in Spanish ____]

B2. Report author(s): [__María Mayberry__]

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: [_104_]

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment: (<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

x	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
	3. Master’s degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed **in 2013-2014**.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess **in 2013-2014**? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1)*
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
x	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above : a. b. c.

* One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance **at graduation** in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy**.

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
x	2. No (If no, go to Q1.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q1.4)

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)** to develop your PLO(s)?

x	1. Yes
	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details: http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf and <http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html>.

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication rubric.)

x	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	3. No (If no, go to Q2.2)
	4. Don't know (Go to Q2.2)
	5. Not Applicable (Go to Q2.2)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

The Spanish undergraduate program has developed five program learning outcomes (See Appendix 1 for more details) adapted from the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (see: http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/StandardsforFLLexecsumm_rev.pdf), known as the “five C’s of foreign language education”: Communication, Culture, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities.

This year, we have assessed program learning outcome 1.3 (**PLO 1.3**): writing skills. Spanish undergraduate students will demonstrate the ability to communicate their ideas and explore issues in writing by presenting a clear thesis and relevant supporting evidence in a clear and logical order, showing a mastery of the Spanish conventions, and consistently incorporating a range of sentence patterns to reveal syntactic fluency as well as an extensive range of vocabulary: they will (**PLO 1.3: Writing**):

- 1.3.1: Clearly state an original thesis; provide relevant evidence that supports thesis, and provide details for a full understanding of the topic. (**1.3.1: Thesis and evidence**).
- 1.3.2: Show mastery of conventions of construction of sentences in the target language and mastery of conventions of spelling, punctuation, and accent marks. (**1.3.2: Knowledge of conventions**)
- 1.3.3: Logical order of ideas and details with skillful use of transition words and phrases to show the relationship among ideas. Transitions are internally coherent. (**1.3.3: Organization and coherence**).
- 1.3.4: Consistently and effectively incorporates a range of varied sentence patterns to reveal syntactic fluency. (**1.3.4: Sentence/Fluency**);
- 1.3.5: Consistent use of extensive range of vocabulary; precise word choices; effective use of idioms, appropriate register. (**1.3.5: Vocabulary**).

Q2.2. Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s)** you assessed in 2013-2014?

x	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q3.1)

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

x	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014?

x	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014?

x	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.3. If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s)** for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

We used data collected from two sources: Compositions (direct measure), and Students' unofficial transcripts (indirect measure).

Data from the analysis of the compositions for the writing ability of our undergraduate students are presented in Table 1.

Table I: The Results for Writing Skill

Different Levels Five Criteria (Areas)	Accomp. (5)	Compet (4 or 4.5)	Good (3 or 3.5)	Develop (2 or 2.5)	Total (N=9)
1.3.1: Thesis and Evidence	50%	30%		10%	4.39 (100%, N=9)
1.3.2: Conventions	10%	50%	20%	10%	3.89 (100%, N=9)
1.3.3: Organization and coherence	10%	50%	30%		3.89 (100%, N=9)
1.3.4: Sentence/fluency		60%	20%	10%	3.78 (100%, N=9)
1.3.5: Vocabulary		50%	40%		3.89 (100%, N=9)

Based on the standards and criteria from 1.3.1 to 1.3.5 in the writing rubric in Appendix II, the majority of the students, except one, seemed to have achieved the expected learning outcomes of the B. A. in Spanish. Remember that it is expected that 70% of our undergraduate students should score **3 or above** in their senior year. However, the data collected in this course were more of a formative assessment for most of the students assessed because they have taken less than 10 of the 12 upper division (UD) courses required in the Spanish B.A. before spring 2014, the semester of data collection. Only two (22.2% of those assessed) of the 10 student have taken 10 or more of the UD required coursework, while only five (55.5% of students assessed) have taken half or less than half of the 12 required UD coursework.

The "Rubric for Writing"—presented in Appendix II—shows each of five components of written language competence: clarity of thesis, knowledge of conventions (grammar; spelling, accent marks, etc.), organization and coherence; sentence fluency; and vocabulary. Percentages were calculated for general proficiency and for each of the language components per rater. An averaged of the raters' scores was also calculated. Data analysis of the **compositions** yielded the following results:

Overall Score	Rater 1	Rater 2	Average
• Average score (Total: 25 points)	21.33	18.44	19.89
• Students scoring 24-25 (accomplished)	(4) 44.4%		(1) 11.1%
• Students scoring 20-23 (competent)	(3) 33.3%	(3) 33.3%	(5) 55.5%
• Students scoring 15-19 (good)	(1) 11.1%	(5) 55.5%	(2) 22.2%
• Students scoring 10-14 (developing)	(1) 11.1%	(1) 11.1%	(1) 11.1%
• Students scoring >9 (beginning)			
1.3.1. Thesis Average score (5 points maximum)	4.44	4.33	4.39
1.3.2. Conventions Average score (5 points maximum)	4.11	3.67	3.89
1.3.3. Organization Average score (5 points maximum)	4.22	3.56	3.89
1.3.4. Sentence Fluency Average score (5 points maximum)	4.33	3.22	3.78
1.3.5. Vocabulary Average score (5 points maximum)	4.22	3.56	3.89

In general, the data indicate that the majority of students in the B.A. program effectively present ideas in Spanish in a clear and logical order in writing. However, although most students are obtaining a good or competent score (3 or above) in each category, an analysis of the writing samples indicate that some students still struggle with writing assignments. This is particular true for those students who have only taken one or two upper division courses before enrolling in this course.

In previous reports, the main difficulty observed has been with 1.3.2, the formal conventions of the language (accents, spelling, and grammar) as well as with 1.3.1, the development of a clear and original thesis that matches the writing assignment. The writing sampled for this report showed some difficulties in these areas, but not as much as expected, probably because students prepared this assignment at home and, therefore, had the opportunity of using dictionaries and/or spelling-devices to check for spelling and grammar usage. This report, however, revealed that with a longer writing sample some students had also difficulties maintaining coherence (1.3.3) and incorporating a variety of sentence patterns (1.3.4) to smooth transitions from one idea to the next.

ii) Students' Transcripts. In order to form a clearer picture of the development of students' writing skills with respect to our program, the students' progress in the program was examined. This analysis showed that the three students with an average overall score of less than 20 had only taken five or less of the 12 Spanish UD courses before enrolling in the Spanish 151 course. Moreover, the level of coursework taken was another factor that influenced the results. Although the student with the lowest score (an average of 13.5) had taken five courses before the spring 2014, only one was UD (SPAN142, an advance conversation course); this learner began with two lower-division courses during the first two semesters of instruction (SPAN 1A and SPAN 2B, respectively), and the following semesters took two transitional courses (SPAN 42 and 47). These observations indicate this student had not enough opportunities to develop writing skills before attempting the kind of advanced coursework expected of students in their senior year.

On the other hand, the student with the highest overall score of 24 points had only taken seven courses before taking Spanish 151; however, only one of these courses was transitional (SPAN 42), while the rest were upper-division (SPAN 100, 102, 103, 110, 113, and 142), suggesting a more advanced proficiency at the onset of the student's Spanish B.A. experience at CSUS. As mentioned in previous reports, these findings suggest that the class-level classification is misleading; instead, a better indicator of whether the program helps to enhance students' writing competence is to examine the number and level of Spanish courses taken prior to and during the program. Moreover, advising in following a curricular degree plan is crucial in helping students to achieve the written communication learning goals of the program. Several courses in B.A. in Spanish offer opportunities to write several papers in Spanish in order to develop the writing skills needed for more advanced courses; for this to happen, however, a proper sequencing of courses is recommended.

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

Q3.4.1. First PLO: [Writing]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs **in total** did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year? [1]

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? [Check all that apply]

	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
X	3. Key assignments from other classes
	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive

	exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

A final assignment for the semester included an essay that focused on Spanish American Civilization and Culture.

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [**Select one only**]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
X	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [**Select one only**]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
X	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

We randomly selected 9 papers from the Civilization and Culture of Hispanic America, Spanish 151.

Indirect Measures

Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
X	7. Others, specify: Transcript analysis

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate? N/A.

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.6)

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (Go to Q4.7)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.7)

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [_____]

Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Assessment of the learning outcome was carried out during the Spring 2014 by evaluating one composition submitted as a final assignment by 9 of the students enrolled in the Civilization and Culture of Hispanic America, Spanish 151; this course was chosen for direct assessment of student writing skills because it is a course that is required of all Spanish majors.

The composition was evaluated by two faculty members. The scores obtained by the two raters were submitted to a paired T-Test to determine inter-rater reliability. The results of the overall scores ($t = 0.0037567$) showed consensus in the ratings given by judges, despite some observed discrepancies in particular in the organization, sentence/fluency, and vocabulary criteria. One of the faculty members was on sabbatical and the other is retiring after spring 2014; therefore, there were no opportunities to meet to resolve these discrepancies, but an average was provided to guide the analysis of the data.

For future reports, it is expected that there will be at least two faculty members evaluating the assessed material, and that these evaluators will be calibrated in the use of assessment criteria.

Moreover, assessment for this report was based on a take-home essay; therefore, it is assumed that assessment based on writing tasks under testing-conditions may produce different results. In the future, the standards for take-home assignments will be adjusted accordingly in order to account for the use of a dictionary to check for the conventions of the language (e.g., accent marks, spelling) and vocabulary. Nevertheless, the data provided insights into other challenges faced by students that were not evident in previous reports, were the focus had been with the difficulties faced by learners with language conventions. This report made it evident that there has to be more emphasis in the development of other writing skills such as organization and coherence and sentence fluency.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [_2_____]

NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2013-2014** been used for? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses			X		
2. Modifying curriculum					X
3. Improving advising and mentoring	X				
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals		X			
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	X				
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	X				
7. Annual assessment reports	X				
8. Program review			X		
9. Prospective student and family information			X		
10. Alumni communication				X	
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)		X			
12. Program accreditation					X
13. External accountability reporting requirement					X
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X
15. Strategic planning				X	
16. Institutional benchmarking				X	
17. Academic policy development or modification				X	
18. Institutional Improvement				X	
19. Resource allocation and budgeting			X		
20. New faculty hiring			X		
21. Professional development for faculty and staff			X		
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

After this report, the faculty in the Department of Foreign Languages will revise our rubrics and assessment plan to align our assessment efforts with the university's. One of the priorities will be to incorporate criteria from the VALUE rubrics into our own rubrics. Another example is the improving of advising and mentoring to help students choose a more curricular path to graduation in order to help them achieve the program learning goals.

Q5.2. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q5.3)
X	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [**WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS**]

Overall, the required sequence of grammar/writing courses (Spanish 103--Advanced Grammar--before Spanish 106--Advanced Composition) is effective in helping students to acquire written language skills. However, since

some students are not able to take these courses to improve their knowledge of grammar and their writing skills before attempting more advanced coursework still need, the writing component has been strengthened in Spanish 103. This course now includes a re-write of their compositions after reviewing the feedback provided by the instructor and a final writing project.

However, Spanish 47 (Introduction to Composition and Grammar Review) has been proposed as a pre-requisite for Spanish 103. The sequence of courses (Spanish 47, 103 and 106) will strengthen the program at the second and third years and will provide students with more writing practice before they advance to senior courses. However, this change has not taken place yet. A substantive change such as this requirement needs to be evaluated carefully by the faculty in order to avoid increasing the units required to complete the B.A. program in Spanish. Moreover, the considerable reduction in workforce in the Spanish area (due to retirements in the last four years) has made it difficult to offer more sections of the required courses that count towards the B. A. in Spanish.

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

No.

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
X	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above: a. b. c.

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
X	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet developed a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
X	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet updated the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [_____]

A6. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: [__Spanish __]

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: [__Foreign Languages __]

A9. Department Chair's Name: [__Dr. Bernice Bass de Martinez__]

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [__4__]

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

X	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):

A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: [__5__]

A12.1. List all the name(s): [__B.A.French; B.A.Spanish; minor in French, German, Italian, Japanese, Spanish]

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [__0__]

Master Degree Program(s):

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [__1__]

A13.1. List all the name(s): [__MA in Spanish__]

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [__0__]

Credential Program(s):

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [__0__]

A14.1. List all the names: [_____]

Doctorate Program(s)

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [__0__]

A15.1. List the name(s): [_____]

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

	1. Yes
X	2. No

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: _____

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: _____

Appendix I: Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for the Spanish Undergraduate Program

Here is the list of the detailed program learning outcomes (PLOs) for the Spanish undergraduate program:

DEPARTMENT LEARNING GOALS

Goals and Objectives of the Language Areas in the Foreign Language Department

Program Goals	Learning Objectives/Outcomes
1. Communicate in languages other than English	1.1 Students can engage in oral communications as evidenced by their ability to present an oral report on a given topic under testing conditions.
	1.2 Students engage in conversations in the target language in a variety of topics under testing conditions.
	1.3 Students can communicate in written language as evidenced by their ability to write a report on a given topic
2. Gain knowledge and understanding of other cultures	2.1 Students demonstrate knowledge of traditions and institutions of the target culture, such as marriage, work, social stratification
	2.2 Students identify and/or discuss artistic expressions of the target culture, such as paintings, music, literature, architecture
	2.3 Students demonstrate knowledge of everyday or "popular" culture, such as eating, shopping, travel, lodging
3. Develop critical thinking skills by the connection with other disciplines	3.1 Students demonstrate basic knowledge of the history and current social and political developments in the target culture
	3.2 Students identify and/or discuss literary and intellectual developments in the target culture
4. Develop critical thinking skills and information literacy through insight into the nature of language and culture	4.1 Students describe and/ or discuss linguistic similarities and differences between the target language and their own
	4.2 Students identify cultural similarities and differences between the target culture and their own
5. Participate in multilingual communities and acquire information	5.1 Students will gain exposure to use the target language beyond the school setting by participating in out of school activities/study-abroad programs using the target language
	5.2 Students find information regarding the target culture using sources in the target language

Appendix II: Writing Rubric for PLO 1.3: Writing Skills

Criterion	Accomplished 5	Competent 4	Good 3	Developing 2	Beginning 1
1.3.1 Thesis and evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thesis is original, clear and closely matches the writing assignment; relevant evidence supports thesis. Writing is full of details; supports what is important about the topic. (5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although not original, thesis is fairly clear and matches the writing task, although evidence supports all statements. Details are present but not developed. (4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thesis is somewhat clear but evidence sometimes is inadequate to support all statements. Details are general and not specific. Topic may be too big. (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thesis is ambiguous or very vague or ignores the purpose of the assignment; evidence loosely related to the writing task. Details are not clear. (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thesis is missing and/or absence of relevant evidence and details. (1)
1.3.2 Knowledge of Conventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows mastery of conventions of construction of sentences (word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions). Mastery of conventions of spelling, punctuation, and accent marks. (5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few grammatical errors that cause the reader some distraction; effective but simple constructions; several errors in word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions. Occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, accent marks; <i>meaning seldom obscured</i>. (4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More frequent errors in word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions. More errors of spelling, punctuation, accent marks; <i>meaning is obscured in some areas</i>. (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major weaknesses in grammar that cause significant distraction; frequent errors in word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions; reads like a translation from English.. Frequent errors of spelling, accent marks, punctuation; <i>meaning is confused or obscured</i>. (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows no mastery of conventions; poor grammar; no mastery of sentence construction rules; does not communicate. Dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, accent marks; <i>meaning is lost</i>. (1)
1.3.3 Organization and Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original title. The paper has a clear beginning, middle & ending. Ideas & details are presented in logical order. Skillful use of transition words and phrases to show the relationships among ideas. Transitions are internally coherent. Paper is complete. (5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An appropriate title is present. Ideas/details are mostly presented in logical order. Some irrelevant ideas/paragraphs included; some ideas are omitted/not fully developed. Attempt to use some transitions words and phrases to show the relationships among ideas. Transitions are somewhat fluid. Paper seems complete. (4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A title is present. The paper is somewhat organized, but seems unfinished. Many irrelevant ideas/paragraphs included; many ideas omitted or not fully developed. Inconsistent use of basic transition words or phrases; It is not clear how some details are connected to the main idea or story. Some details are not in the right spot. (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little organization to the paper. Frequent digressions; loose connection of ideas; serious omissions or underdevelopment. Little attempt to use transition words and phrases; writing does not connect to the main idea or story. Ending is missing or does not connect to the story or main idea. (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No organization to the paper. No explicit relationships among ideas. Many one-sentence paragraphs. Lack of transition words/phrases. There is no beginning or end to the paper; ideas seem disconnected and do not fit with the main idea or story. Paper is confusing. (1)
1.3.4 Sentence/fluency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently and effectively incorporates a range of varied sentence patterns to reveal syntactic fluency. The writing is natural and flows smoothly. (5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectively incorporates a range of varied sentence patterns to reveal syntactic fluency. Paper flows smoothly, but has some rough spots. (4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes a range of varied sentence patterns. Some parts of the paper are difficult to read. (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attempt to include different sentence patterns but with uneven success. Paper does not flow smoothly. Choppy or awkward sentences and many parts are difficult to read (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple sentence patterns. Paper is difficult to read. Difficult time identifying where one idea ends and the next begins. (1)
1.3.5 Vocabulary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive and sophisticated range of vocabulary. Precise word choices; effective use of idioms, appropriate register. <i>Clear meaning</i>. Interesting to read. (5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate range of vocabulary. Occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, and usage, <i>but meaning is not obscured</i>. Some interesting words and phrases that are clear. (4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate range of vocabulary. Word choices get the message across but frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, and usage. <i>Meaning is not obscured</i>. (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vocabulary is not all translation. Word choices make the writing unclear to the reader. <i>Word choices confuse the meaning</i>. (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vocabulary is essentially translation; invented words; clear projection from English. Confusing word choices. <i>Meaning is unclear</i>. (1)

Standards and Achievement Targets: 70% of our undergraduate students should score **3 or above** in their senior year; 70 % of our first year graduate students should score **3 or above**, and get **4 or above** by the time of their graduation.

Appendix III: Critical Thinking Rubric for PLO 3.2: Connections to other disciplines

Criterion	Accomplished 5	Competent 4	Good 3	Developing 2	Beginning 1
3.2.1 Thesis and evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thesis is original, clear and closely matches the writing assignment; relevant evidence supports thesis. • Writing is full of details; supports what is important about the topic. (5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although not original, thesis is fairly clear and matches the writing task, although evidence supports all statements. • Details are present but not developed.(4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thesis is somewhat clear but evidence sometimes is inadequate to support all statements. • Details are general and not specific. Topic may be too big. (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thesis is ambiguous or very vague or ignores the purpose of the assignment; evidence loosely related to the writing task. • Details are not clear. (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thesis is missing and/or absence of relevant evidence and details. (1)
3.2.2 Content and Ideas/ Reflection on context and assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture qualified by considerations of experiences, circumstances, conditions and environment that influence perspectives and the implications of those perspectives.(5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented with recognition of contextual sources of bias, assumptions and possible implications of bias. (4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented tentatively. • Emerging awareness of own and others' biases, ethical and political, historical sources and implications of bias. (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented with little recognition of own personal and cultural bias. • Little recognition of ethical, political, historical considerations. (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of literary and/or intellectual developments in target culture presented in absolutes. No recognition of own personal and cultural bias. • No recognition of ethical, political, historical considerations. (1)
3.2.3 Conclusions, implications and consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies conclusions / implications relative to the contexts important to the issue / topic at hand. • Conclusions are based on a synthesis of evidence from various sources. • Evidence that has been evaluated from disparate viewpoints. • Analysis of implications indicates awareness of ambiguity.(5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies conclusions / implications as having connections to some relevant contexts. but in a limited fashion • Conclusions and evidence are relatively obvious, with synthesis drawn from selected (cherry picked) evidence. • Assertions of cause are also selective. • Considerations of consequences are timid or obvious and easy (4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies conclusions / implications as having connections to other contexts, but in a limited fashion. • Conclusions are somewhat supported by evidence, with only emerging synthesis. • Assertions of cause are vague supported mostly by opinion • Considerations of consequences are narrow, exaggerated, dichotomous. (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies conclusions / implications, but within a single context. • Conclusions are not supported by evidence or repeat the evidence with emerging synthesis and elaboration. • Assertions of cause are doubtful, without support of evidence • Considerations of consequences are sketchy, and drawn in absolutes. (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences of the issue or the key relationships between the other elements of the problem, such as context, assumptions, data and evidence. • Tendency to confuse correlation and cause. • Considerations of consequences are absent. (1)

Standards and Achievement Targets: 70% of our undergraduate students should score **3 or above** in their senior year; 70 % of our first year graduate students should score **3 or above**, and get **4 or above** by the time of their graduation.