

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 (liuga@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: [__MA in Spanish ____]

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

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: [_25. ***Notice that this number reported in the Fact Book does not include students enrolled in our Summer Spanish M.A. pathway, although the report includes an analysis of data from learners participating in both, the local and the summer pathways.***]

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]

	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
x	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 programs (graduate and undergraduate) has five PLOs (See Appendix I 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. As noted in the “Rubric for Writing”, presented in Appendix II, the Standards and Achievement Targets are different for each program: 70% of our undergraduate students should score **3 or above** in their senior year; while 70 % of our first year graduate students are expected to score **3 or above**, and get **4 or above** by the time of their graduation (i.e., culminating experience).

This year, we have assessed program learning outcome 1.3 (**PLO 1.3**): writing skills. Spanish graduate 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. The following are the criteria for the assessment of **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
x	10. In other places, specify: Advising sessions with students at the beginning of program, during the program, and when students are preparing for the Culminating Experience (i.e., Comprehensive Examination.)

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 three sources: Compositions (direct measure), students' unofficial transcripts (indirect measure), and students formative assessment (direct measure assessment of learners' coursework.)

Results of the analysis of the compositions to assess the writing ability of graduate students are presented in Table 1. Percentages were calculated for general proficiency and for each of the language writing areas. Data analysis of the **compositions** yielded the following results:

Table I: The Results for Writing Skill

Different Levels Five Criteria (Areas)	Accomp. (5)	Compet (4 to 4.5)	Good (3 to 3.5)	Develop (2 to 2.5)	Total (N=9)
1.3.1: Thesis and Evidence	33.3%	55.5%	11%		4.42 (100%, N=9)
1.3.2: Conventions		66.6%	33.3%		3.94 (100%, N=9)
1.3.3: Organization and coherence	22.2%	33.3%	44.4%		4.08 (100%, N=9)
1.3.4: Sentence/fluency	22.2%	55.5%	22.2%		4.25 (100%, N=9)
1.3.5: Vocabulary	22.2%	66.6%	11%		4.31 (100%, N=9)

A comparison of the data with the standards and criteria from 1.3.1 to 1.3.5 in the writing rubric in Appendix II suggests that the majority of the students assessed seemed to have achieved the expected learning outcomes of the M. A. in Spanish: students are able to present ideas in Spanish in a clear and logical order in writing. However, problematic areas were observed in two criteria: 1.3.2 (Knowledge of Conventions) and 1.3.3 (Organization and Coherence.) Remember that it is expected that 70% of graduate students in the M.A. in Spanish score **4 or above** in their Spanish writing skills by the time of their graduation (i.e., culminating experience such as the Comprehensive Examination).

Although very close to the standard performance, for area 1.3.2., 66.6% of students (of the goal of 70%) scored 4 to 4.5, thus, showing that they were able to write in Spanish with few grammatical errors that cause the reader some distraction, and meaning was seldom obscured. None of the students achieved the score of 5 in this area of the criteria. Moreover, this was the area in which the average (3.94) was below the goal of 4 or above. This finding indicates that, in general, knowledge of the Spanish written conventions is still a challenging area for students at the end of the the M.A. in Spanish, in particular for those who begin the program with Spanish writing skills that are below the expected proficiency of 3 at the onset of the M.A., as will be shown later in this report. These results are consistent with last year's findings in the Assessment Report 2012-2013 (AR 2012-2013) of the M.A. in Spanish, in which formative assessment—i.e., data collected in writing assignments in classes—showed that area 1.3.2, Knowledge of Spanish Conventions in writing, was the most challenging area for students.

Moreover, despite results in Table I that show that the average score was above the goal of 4 in most areas (except in 1.3.2)—suggesting that the majority of students achieved the writing learning goals by the end of the M.A. program—an analysis of the writing samples is presented Appendix III, showing that by the time of graduation some students are still having difficulties maintaining focus and coherence (PLO 1.3.3: Organization and Coherence) by making skillful use of transition words and phrases to show the relationships among ideas; some learners also continued to struggle to incorporate a varied sentence patterns to reveal syntactic fluency (PLO 1.3.4: Sentence/Fluency).

Appendix III shows that two learners (students 4 and 9) were rated by both faculty below the goal of 4 in more than one area. Student 4 scored below the goal of 4 in 1.3.2 (Conventions) and 1.3.3 (Organization); while student 9 scored below the goal of 4 in all criteria, except in 1.3.1 (Thesis). The next section show how an analysis of learners' transcripts provides insights into students' path to graduation that may explain these results.

These findings support the results in AR 2012-2013, which showed average scores for 1.3.2, 1.3.3 and 1.3.4 to be the lowest, although still above the expected goal of 4. As mentioned in the previous report, these findings are

consistent with what is expected at the master's level, considering that the development of academic writing skills is a long process (in first and second language) that may take between four and seven years (Hakuta, et al, 2000.)

ii) Students' Transcripts. In order to form a clearer picture of the development of students' writing skills with respect to the Spanish graduate program, the students' progress was examined by an analysis of their transcripts and the sequence of classes they took during the M.A. program. This analysis showed that student 9, who scored an average below the goal of 4 in four of the five criteria, was taking only undergraduate courses during the first summer term of graduate course work. In general, although the requirement for the M.A. degree is to complete at least 18 units of graduate coursework (i.e., up to 9 units may be taken at the undergraduate level), it is very informative that this particular student—a non-native Spanish speaker—choose to take only undergraduate coursework during the first term, suggesting a lower proficiency at the onset of this student's Spanish M.A. experience at CSUS. These findings support the results gathered from the comprehensive exams that show that student 9 obtained an average below the goal of 4 or above in four of the five criteria.

On the other hand, analysis of the transcripts shows that although Student 3, who obtained the highest overall score of 24.5 points, also took three undergraduate courses, the courses were taken in different semesters; moreover, other factors may explain student 3's more advanced proficiency at the onset of the student's M.A. experience at CSUS such as the fact that this learner is a native Spanish speaker that was already teaching Spanish at the High School level before beginning graduate studies.

iii) Assessment of Students' coursework.

This report will include information gathered by contrasting learners' formative assessment data (i.e., assessment of essays written for graduate courses) to summative assessment in order to examine the development of writing skills during the M.A. program. At the moment, the Rubric for writing skills has been piloted in few courses; therefore, there are data for a few students, one of them being student 9 (who obtained the lowest scores) and, another one, student 3 (who obtained the highest scores).

The writing sample obtained for student 9 was gathered during the third of the four summer terms the student was enrolled in the Summer Pathway of the Spanish M.A. program. Data were collected using the term paper for the graduate seminar SPAN 201D (Applied Spanish Linguistics). The paper was due at the end of the four-week program.

Data from assessment of student 9's work show the following results in Table II:

Table II: Results for Student 9

AVG- Criteria (5 points maximum each)	Formative Assessment	Summative Assessment
Overall essay score	17	16.5
1.3.1: Thesis/ Evidence	4	3.5
1.3.2: Conventions	3.5	3.25
1.3.3: Organization/ Coherence	3.5	3.25
1.3.4: Sentence/Fluency	3	3.25
1.3.5: Vocabulary	3	3.25

Although a contrast of the data suggest that student 9's scores are slightly lower in some areas of the summative assessment (i.e., comprehensive examination), one must remember that the summative assessment was done under test conditions, without the opportunity to use dictionaries or any help to check for spelling and grammar usage, while the formative assessment was an assignment done at home which provided more time for editing. Unfortunately, no data were obtained for this learner during the first term of graduate studies, which would have provided the level of proficiency at the beginning of the M.A. program to assess the student's writing proficiency development during the course of graduate studies. However, the fact that student 9 was able to write an essay in Spanish under testing conditions suggest some development of writing skills due to program impact.

In contrast, a comparison of the formative assessment and summative assessment data for student 3 (shown in Table III) indicates that this learner had already achieved a higher level of proficiency by the time data for the formative assessment were collected (i.e., spring 2013, which was the semester prior to taking the comprehensive exam.)

Table III: Results for Student 3

AVG- Criteria (5 points maximum each)	Formative Assessment	Summative Assessment
Overall essay score	24	24.5
1.3.1: Thesis/ Evidence	5	5
1.3.2: Conventions	4.5	4.5
1.3.3: Organization/ Coherence	4.5	5
1.3.4: Sentence/Fluency	5	5
1.3.5: Vocabulary	5	5

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
X	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]

Data collection for this Assessment Report included the essay on the Hispanic Culture section written by all nine students taking the fall 2013 Comprehensive Examination for the Master of Arts in Spanish; students have 90 minutes to choose one topic of the three options provided to write an essay in Spanish on Spanish American Civilization and Culture.

Another direct measure was the term paper written by those students enrolled in the graduate seminar SPAN 201D (Applied Spanish Linguistics) in summer 2011 and in spring 2013 was also collected in order to contrast the writing skills displayed in the term paper to those achieved in the essays collected from the fall 2013 Comprehensive Examination for the Spanish M.A.

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:

The sample consisted of the essays on the Hispanic Culture section written by all nine students taking the comprehensive examination in fall 2013. The comprehensive examination is the culminating experience for the M.A. in Spanish, which consists of four written parts: Latin American Literature, Spanish Peninsular Literature, Hispanic Culture and Linguistics. Students have 90 minutes to write an essay in Spanish for each part without the help of dictionaries, spell-checkers or any other aids.

Data from the term paper analyzed for this report included essays written by those students enrolled in the graduate seminar SPAN 201D (Applied Spanish Linguistics) in summer 2011 and in spring 2013.

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; comparison of formative and summative assessment data

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 by evaluating the essays on the Hispanic Culture section written by all nine students taking the comprehensive examination in fall 2013. The essays were evaluated by two faculty members; and the scores obtained were submitted to a paired T-Test to determine inter-rater reliability (see Table IV).

Table IV: Results per rater

Overall Score	Rater 1	Rater 2	Average score Total (N=9)	Pair t-test
Average score given (Total: 25 points)	22.11	19.89	21.00	p = 0.01625834
# Students scoring 24-25 (%) (Accomplished=5)	(2) 22.2%	(1) 11.1%	(2) 22.2%	
Students scoring 20-23 (%) (Competent=4)	(6) 66.6%	(4) 44.4%	(5) 55.5%	
Students scoring 15-19 (%) (Good=3)	(1) 11.1%	(4) 44.4%	(2) 22.2%	
Students scoring 10-14 (%) (Developing=2)				
Students scoring < 9 (%) (Beginning=1)				
AVG- Criteria (5 points maximum each)	Rater 1	Rater 2	Average Score Total (N=9)	Pair t-test
1.3.1: Thesis/ Evidence	4.61	4.22	4.42 (100%, N=9)	p = 0.025
1.3.2: Conventions	4.28	3.61	3.94 (100%, N=9)	p = 0.01
1.3.3: Organization/ Coherence	4.28	3.89	4.08 (100%, N=9)	p = 0.08
1.3.4: Sentence/Fluency	4.44	4.06	4.25 (100%, N=9)	p = 0.04
1.3.5: Vocabulary	4.50	4.11	4.31 (100%, N=9)	p = 0.14

The results of the overall scores showed consensus in the ratings given by judges ($p= 0.01625834$), despite some observed discrepancies in particular in the organization, sentence/fluency, and vocabulary criteria. There were no opportunities to meet to resolve these discrepancies because one of the faculty members was on sabbatical and the other is retiring after spring 2014; however, 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 as it was done in previous reports.

Nevertheless, the data provided insights into the challenges faced by students under testing conditions, in which they have to write in Spanish without the **help of dictionaries and/or spelling-devices to check for spelling and grammar usage.**

Moreover, in order to increase the credibility and validity of the results, a triangulation of methods was used to analyze the findings. An analysis of students' transcripts and a comparison of some students' formative assessment data with their summative assessment results were used to further examine impact of the M.A. in Spanish program in the learners' development of their writing skills.

In the future, however, to further assess the impact of the Spanish M.A. program in students' achievement of the PLOs, data should be collected during all learners' first term of graduate studies in order to show their level of proficiency at the onset of the M.A. program.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [_3___]

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 the rubrics and assessment plan to align the department's assessment efforts with the University's. One of the priorities will be to incorporate criteria from the VALUE rubrics into the department's own rubrics. Assessment data will be also used to improve advising and mentoring to help students choose a sequence of courses to help them achieve the program learning goals that builds upon their proficiency level at the onset of the M.A. program.

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]

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 Graduate Program

Here is the list of the detailed program learning outcomes (PLOs) for the Spanish M.A. 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: Assessment Scores and Average – Spanish M. A.															
	Overall score		Rate-AVG												
	Rater 1	Rater 2													
student 1	22.5	20	21.25												
student 2	21.5	20	20.75												
student 3	25	24	24.5												
student 4	20	16.5	18.25												
student 5	23	23	23												
student 6	21.5	18.5	20												
student 7	22.5	19	20.75												
student 8	25	23	24												
student 9	18	15	16.5												
AVG	22.11	19.89	21.00												
paired t-test	0.0163														
	Thesis		Thesis-AVG	Conv.		Conv-AVG	Org.		Org AVG	Sent/Fluen		Sent/FI-AVG	Vocab.		AVG Vocab
	Rater 1	Rater 2		Rater 1	Rater 2		Rater 1	Rater 2		Rater 1	Rater 2		Rater 1	Rater 2	
student 1	4.5	4	4.25	4.5	4	4.25	4.5	4	4.25	4.5	4	4.25	4.5	4	4.25
student 2	4.5	4	4.25	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.5	4	4.25	4.5	4	4.25
student 3	5	5	5	5	4	4.5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
student 4	4.5	4	4.25	3.5	3	3.25	3.5	3	3.25	4	3	3.5	4.5	3.5	4
student 5	5	5	5	4.5	4	4.25	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	5	4.75
student 6	4.5	4	4.25	4	3.5	3.75	4	3.5	3.75	4.5	4	4.25	4.5	3.5	4
student 7	4.5	4	4.25	4.5	4	4.25	4.5	3	3.75	4.5	4	4.25	4.5	4	4.25
student 8	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
student 9	4	3	3.5	3.5	3	3.25	3.5	3	3.25	3.5	3	3.25	3.5	3	3.25
	4.61	4.22	4.42	4.28	3.61	3.94	4.28	3.89	4.08	4.44	4.06	4.25	4.50	4.11	4.31
paired t-test	0.025			0.01			0.08			0.04			0.14		

Bibliography

Hakuta, Kenji, Yuko Goto Butler, and Daria Witt. 2000. "How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency? The University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute. Policy report 2000-1."

National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (1999). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century*. Yonkers, NY: Author. - See more at:
http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/StandardsforFLLexecsumm_rev.pdf

