Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1. Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) **did you assess in 2014-2015**? **[Check all that apply]**

X	1. Critical thinking
	2. Information literacy
X	3. Written communication
	4. Oral communication
	5. Quantitative literacy
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement
	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, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above:

a.

b.

c.

Q1.3. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

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

Q1.4. Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (Go to **Q1.5**)
	3. Don't know (Go to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1. If the answer to Q1.4 is yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

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

Q1.5. Did your program use the *Degree Qualification Profile* (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?

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

Q1.6. Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable (See Attachment I)?
Yes.

Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs were **explicitly** linked to the Sac State BLGs:	**Q1.2.1.** Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

The Spanish undergraduate program has five program learning outcomes 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. These learning outcomes have been explicitly linked to the Sac State BLGs as shown in Appendix I. The alignment, however, is still under revision.

This year, we have assessed program learning outcome 1.3 (**PLO 1.3**): Written Communication and 3.1 (**PLO 3.1**) Critical Thinking in Connections with Other Disciplines (historical and current social and political developments in the target culture). 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; they will demonstrate **(PLO 1.3) Written Communication**:

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

Spanish graduate students will demonstrate the ability to explore issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion; they will demonstrate (**PLO 3.1**) Critical Thinking in Connections with Other Disciplines (historical and current social and political developments in the target culture):

- **3.1.1.** Describes issues/problems comprehensively. (3.1.1. **Explanation of issues/ Content Development**).
- **3.1.2.** Selects and uses information to investigate a point of view or conclusion. (3.1.2. **Sources and evidence) - THIS WAS NOT ASSESSED FOR THIS REPORT (See answer to Q3.2A).**

Q1.2.1. Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

☐ 1. Yes, for all PLOs
☒ 2. Yes, but for some PLOs
☐ 3. No rubrics for PLOs
☐ N/A, other (please specify)

IN QUESTIONS 2 THROUGH 5, REPORT IN DETAIL ON ONE PLO THAT YOU ASSESSED IN 2014-2015

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the selected PLO

Q 2.1. Specify one PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you checked the correct box for this PLO in Q1.1): Written Communication and Critical Thinking in Connections with Other Disciplines (historical and current social and political developments in the target culture).	Q2.2. Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO? [X] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No [ ] 3. Don't know [ ] 4. N/A

Q2.3. Please provide the rubric(s) and standard of performance that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix:

[Word limit: 300]

See rubric in Appendix II.

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

Q2.4. Please indicate the category in which the selected PLO falls into.

[X] 1. Critical thinking
[ ] 2. Information literacy
[X] 3. Written communication
[ ] 4. Oral communication
[ ] 5. Quantitative literacy
[ ] 6. Inquiry and analysis
[ ] 7. Creative thinking
[ ] 8. Reading
[ ] 9. Team work
[ ] 10. Problem solving
[ ] 11. Civic knowledge and engagement
[ ] 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:

Please indicate where you have published the PLO, the standard of performance, and the rubric that measures the PLO:	Q2.5 (1) PLO	Q2.6 (2) Standards of Performance	Q2.7 (3) Rubrics
1. In **SOME** course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO	X		X
2. In **ALL** course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO			
3. In the student handbook/advising handbook			
4. In the university catalogue			
5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters			
6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources or activities	X	X	X
7. In 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. Other, specify:			

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO in 2014-2015? [X] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No (Skip to **Q6**) [ ] 3. Don't know (Skip to **Q6**) [ ] 4. N/A (Skip to **Q6**)	**Q3.2. If** yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO in 2014-2015? [X] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No (Skip to **Q6**) [ ] 3. Don't know (Skip to **Q6**) [ ] 4. N/A (Skip to **Q6**)
Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? 2	**Q3.2A** Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected (see Attachment II)? **[Word limit: 300]** Assessment of the learning outcome was carried out during the Fall 2014 by evaluating one composition submitted by 7 of the 17 students enrolled in the Spanish Applied Linguistics, Spanish 201D; this course was chosen for direct assessment of student writing skills because it is a course that is required of all Spanish MA students. Two faculty members, each of whom read the 7 papers, evaluated the composition. To determine the final scores, the faculty came together to discuss the similarities and differences of scores until a consensus was reached of exact or adjacent agreement (within one score point) in each of the criteria between raters. 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 suggest that the difference between rates is not significant ($p= 0.320808097$) which indicate consensus in the ratings given by judges. The rubric was used to get a baseline assessment of students' writing skills in Spanish; the assignment consisted of a short (2-page) analytical/expository essay, and students were not required to provide additional sources other than the book. Assessment of this assignment made it evident that there has to be more emphasis in the development of writing and critical thinking skills throughout the program.

Moreover, the instructor of the course started to implement a hybrid and flipped modality of the class, where students watch video-lectures at home, while class-time was devoted to class discussion. Students' feedback to this approach has varied, but it indicated that the majority of students were not ready for a flipped-environment as the following comments suggest:

"The only comment I have is that I would've liked to go over the material in class first, instead of the other way around. Having to do the lessons, questions, lectures, etc. first, made it difficult for me but once I came to class the professor was very clear and was excellent at explaining the concepts. Overall, this class was great and I would recommend it."

In fact, eight of the 15 evaluations made reference to 'frustration' of having a 'hybrid' course because of the amount of work to do or because they rather had the explanation from the professor first, because they had a hard time understanding the book.

An emphasis on critical thinking to help students become self-learners is clearly needed even among graduate students.

Q3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios)

Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO?

[X] 1. Yes
[ ] 2. No (Go to **Q3.7**)
[ ] 3. Don't know (Go to **Q3.7**)

Q3.3.2. Please attach the direct measure you used to collect data.

Write a short analytical/expository essays in Spanish no more than 2 pages to describe, analyze and evaluate the different issues related to the acquisition (in Spanish as a second language) of your topic (Spanish pronouns or Contrast of Preterite and Imperfect). Although you need to be brief, you need to use the terminology learned in class in order to demonstrate how well you understand these issues.

Q3.3.1. 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 required classes in the program
[ ] 3. Key assignments from elective classes
[ ] 4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
[ ] 5. External performance assessments such as internship or other community based projects
[ ] 6. E-Portfolios
[ ] 7. Other portfolios
[X] 8. Other measure. Specify:
    Writing assessment in Spanish to establish baseline.

Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? **[Select only one]**

☐	1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (Go to **Q3.5**)
☐	2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
X	3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
☐	4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
☐	5. The VALUE rubric(s)
☐	6. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
☐	7. Used other means. Specify:

Q3.4.1. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?	**Q3.4.2.** Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric?	**Q3.4.3.** Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?
[X] 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know ☐ 4. N/A	[X] 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know ☐ 4. N/A	[X] 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know ☐ 4. N/A

Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO? 2	**Q3.5.1. If** the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)? [X] 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know
Q3.6. How did you **select** the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]? Random selection based on scores. There were only two non-Spanish speakers in the class.	**Q3.6.1.** How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review? We decided to select samples from 7 (41%) of the 17 students taking the class.

Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program? 17	**Q3.6.3.** How many samples of student work did you evaluate? 7	**Q3.6.4.** Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate? [X] 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know

Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO? [X] 1. Yes ☐ 2. No (Skip to **Q3.8**) ☐ 3. Don't know	**Q3.7.1.** Which of the following indirect measures were used? **[Check all that apply]** ☐ 1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE) ☐ 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)
Q3.7.2 If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided?	☐ 3. College/Department/program 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. Other, specify: Analysis of transcripts

Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected your sample.	Q3.7.4. If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

Q3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

Q3.8. Were external benchmarking data such as licensing exams or standardized tests used to assess the PLO? ☐ 1. Yes X 2. No (Go to **Q3.8.2**) ☐ 3. Don't know	Q3.8.1. Which of the following measures were used? ☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, et ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc.) ☐ 4. Other, specify:
Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO? ☐ 1. Yes X 2. No (Go to **Q3.9**) ☐ 3. Don't know (Go to **Q3.9**)	Q3.8.3. If other measures were used, please specify:

Q3D: Alignment and Quality

Q3.9. Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO? X 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know	Q3.9.1. 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 4: Data, Findings and Conclusions

Q4.1. Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions: (see Attachment III) **[Word limit: 600 for selected PLO]**

Data for the written and critical thinking ability of our undergraduate graduate students are presented in Table 1.

Table I: The Results for Written Communication and Critical Thinking

Levels / Criteria	Accomplished (5)	4.75-4.5	Competent (4.25-4)	3.75-3.5	Good (3.25-3)	2.75-2.5	Developing (2.25-2)	Bench mark (1)	Total (N =7)
1.3.1: Thesis/Organization/Coherence		2 28.6%		2 28.6%	3 42.9%				3.68 (100%, N=7)
1.3.2: Sentence fluency/ Conventions	2 28.6%	1 14.3%	1 14.3%	1 14.3%	2 28.6%				4.11 (100%, N=7)
1.3.3: Vocabulary	3 42.9%		3 42.9%		1 14.3%				4.29 (100%, N=7)
3.1.1: Explanation of Issues/Content	1 14.3%	1 14.3%	1 14.3%	2 28.6%	1 14.3%	1 14.3%			3.71 (100%, N=7)

Based on the standards and criteria from 1.3.1 to 1.3.3 and 3.1.1 in the written communication and critical thinking rubric in Appendix II, the majority of the students achieved the expected learning outcomes, except for one student who scored an average of 2.5 in learning outcome 3.1.1, Explanation of Issues and Content Development. Remember, however, that it is expected that 70 % of first year graduate students score **3 or above**, and get **4 or above** by the time of their graduation. A transcript analysis showed that of the seven students assessed, two students were in their first semester of the M.A. program; three were in their second semester; and two have one more semester left of coursework; therefore, they all were expected to score 3 or above in assessment.

The average in all of the criteria was well above the score of 3, and 100% of the students obtained a score of 3 or above (with the one exception mentioned earlier) in the following learning outcomes: 3.68 for 1.3.1, Thesis/Organization/Coherence; and above a score of 4 in learning outcome 1.3.2, Sentence Fluency and Conventions, and 4.29 in learning outcome 1.3.3, Vocabulary. In learning outcome 3.1.1 (Explanation of Issues and Content Development), 85.7% of students (that is 6 of 7) scored above 3, with an average of 3.71. The student who scored below 3 was in her first semester of the M.A. program, and was enrolled in four courses during the semester of data collection.

A comparison of these data with the results of last year's Assessment Report, in which almost all the averages were above the score of 4—except the learning outcome of conventions, in which the average was 3.94— suggests that the M. A. program is helping students achieve the PLOs. Moreover, remember that last semester's report included a summative assessment under test conditions i.e., data was collected from students taking the comprehensive exams (at end of the M.A. program), which suggest a more advanced proficiency. The report of this semester, however, is more a formative assessment, as the data was collected as part of class assignment.

Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

 "Second language instruction should both teach the mechanics of writing in the target language and stress that writing builds critical thinking skills and ultimately produces more proficient writers in both native and second language." (Terrio, 1986) More recently, others (Bean, 2011; Simpson and Courtney, 2007) have also examined the interrelationship between writing and critical thinking skills. Bean's (2011) work suggests that this relationship is not exclusive to second/foreign languages classrooms because as writers struggle to verbalize the ideas they want to communicate, thinking occurs. Thus, our assessment plans continue to include assessment of writing together with critical thinking.

To that effect, we are trying to refine one single rubric that can assess both skills. Although results from this report suggest students are progressing in the development of their writing skills, there is not enough evidence in the data collected to suggest the development of critical thinking skills. The results, however, indicate that there is room for improvement of the learning outcomes of Thesis/Organization/Coherence and Explanation of Issues and Content Development.

As mentioned in the report for the B.A.in Spanish, we have started to provide students with opportunities to develop their critical thinking skills through the development of their writing skills. We have also designed activities that help students to improve their performance of these skills in a developmental fashion. As suggested by our colleagues in the Sociology department, it is important to teach our students how to think critically. Moreover, we need to explain to students what critical thinking is and how to approach it in order to analyze the different perspectives on a particular issue. Also, students need to be aware of their assumptions and others' assumptions so as to reflect on new perspectives on a topic or an expansion to their original assumption based on class discussions. They also need to learn to support their arguments with evidence. As mentioned earlier, students need to become self-sufficient learners.

Q4.3. For **selected** PLO, the student performance:

	1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
X	2. **Met** expectation/standard
	3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
	4. **Did not meet** expectation/standard

5. No expectation or standard has been specified	
6. Don't know	

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2014-2015** and based on the prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (Go to **Q6**)
	3. Don't know (Go to **Q6**)

Q5.1.2. Do you have a plan to assess the impact of the changes that you anticipate making?

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

Q5.1.1. Please describe what changes you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes. **[Word limit: 300 words]**

To improve students' writing and critical thinking skills, the chair of the assessment committee will address colleagues in the Spanish area for possible ways to include the explicit teaching of critical thinking and writing skills in M.A. graduate seminars.

As suggested by colleagues in the Sociology department, this would include helping students to define issues/problems, to provide supporting evidence through sources or numerical data, to explore new perspectives on a topic or an expansion to students' original assumption on a topic based on class discussions.

Other activities would include lectures to explicitly discuss what critical thinking is, and to continue to design activities to give students opportunities to develop their critical thinking skill through writing and groups discussions.

For that purpose, as mentioned earlier, we have been working on the development of one single rubric that can assess both the writing and critical thinking skills.

Moreover, it has been observed that many of our graduate students have completed the B.A. in Spanish in our department. For instance, six of the seven students assessed came from our undergraduate program at Sac State. Therefore, the changes proposed for our Spanish B.A. (a required sequence of grammar/writing courses; more activities to promote the development of written communication and critical thinking) will undoubtedly benefit our graduate students, too.

Q5.2. How have the assessment data from last year (**2013 - 2014**) been used so far? **[Check all that apply]**

	(1) Very Much	(2) Quite a Bit	(3) Some	(4) Not at all	(8) N/A
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. Recruitment of new students			X		
23. Other Specify:					

Q5.2.1. Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above.

We have used the assessment data to promote participation in the Faculty Learning Community workshops for faculty to learn about the AACU rubrics. We have developed a modified version of the AACU rubrics that we have used in some classes; we hope to start using these rubrics in all the core courses in the program. Assessment date has also helped us in the refinement of the program curriculum map.

Also, the faculty in the Department of Foreign Languages has revised our rubrics and assessment plan to align our assessment efforts with the university's. One of the priorities has been 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.

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to PLOs (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on the program elements, please briefly report your results here. **[Word limit: 300]**

Q7. What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year?

X	1. Critical thinking
	2. Information literacy
	3. Written communication
	4. Oral communication
	5. Quantitative literacy
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement
	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, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above:
	a.
	b.
	c.

Q8. Have you attached any appendices? If yes, please list them all here:

Appendix I. Foreign Language Department Learning Goals and Learning Objectives/Outcomes

Appendix II. Rubric PLO 1.3: Written Communication and PLO 3.1 Critical Thinking in Connection with other disciplines

Appendix III. My Discussion-Participation Rubric and Discussion Self-Audit

Program Information

P1. Program/Concentration Name(s): MA in Spanish **P1.1.** Report Authors: María Mayberry	**P2.** Program Director: **P2.1.** Department Chair: Bernice Bass de Martinez
P3. Academic unit: Department, Program, or College: Department of Foreign Languages	**P4.** College: Arts and Letters
P5. Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit *(See [Department Fact Book 2014](#) by the Office of Institutional Research for fall 2014 enrollment:* 25 (The report does not show Fall 2014; the latest semester it shows is Fall 2013)	**P6.** Program Type: **[Select only one]** ☐ 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major ☐ 2. Credential ☒ 3. Master's degree ☐ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d)

		5. Other. Please specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):	*Master Degree Program(s):*
P7. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: 8	**P8.** Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: 1
P7.1. List all the name(s): B.A.French; B.A.Spanish; minor in Chinese, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Spanish	**P8.1.** List all the name(s): MA in Spanish
P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? 0	**P8.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? 0

Credential Program(s):	*Doctorate Program(s)*
P9. Number of credential programs the academic unit has: 0	**P10.** Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0
P9.1. List all the names:	**P10.1.** List all the name(s):

When was your assessment plan?	1. Before 2007-08	2. 2007-08	3. 2008-09	4. 2009-10	5. 2010-11	6. 2011-12	7. 2012-13	8. 2013-14	9. 2014-15	10. No formal plan
P11. Developed							X			
P12. Last updated								X		

	1. Yes	2. No	3. Don't Know
P13. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?	X		
P14. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?		X	
P15. Does the program have any capstone class?		X	
P16. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?		X	

Appendix I: Foreign Language Department Learning Goals and Learning Objectives/Outcomes

Program Goals (5 C's)	Alignment with BLG21/CSUS	Learning Objectives/Outcomes
1. Communicate in languages other than English	Oral Communication VALUE Rubric	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.
	Oral Communication VALUE Rubric	1.2 Students engage in conversations in the target language in a variety of topics under testing conditions.
	Written Communication VALUE Rubric	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	Intercultural Knowledge and competence (12th VALUE Rubric)	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 connection with other disciplines	Critical Thinking (VALUE Rubric) and	3.1 Students demonstrate basic knowledge of the history and current social and political developments in the target culture
	Integrative and Applied Learning (VALUE Rubric)	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	Information Literacy (VALUE Rubric)	4.1 Students describe and/ or discuss linguistic similarities and differences between the target language and their own
	Critical Thinking (VALUE Rubric)	4.2 Students identify, evaluate and analyze cultural similarities and differences between the target culture and their own
5. Participate in multilingual communities and acquire information	Global Learning (VALUE Rubric)	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: Rubric PLO 1.3: Written Communication and PLO 3.1 Critical Thinking in Connection with other disciplines

Criterion	Accomplished 5	Competent 4	Good 3	Developing 2	Beginning 1
1.3.1.Thesis, Organization, and Coherence	• Thesis is original, clear and closely matches writing assignment; relevant evidence supports thesis. • Ideas & details are presented in logical order; and paper has a clear beginning, middle & ending; it is full of details; supports what is important about the topic. • Skillful use of transition words and phrases to show the relationships among ideas. Transitions are internally coherent. • Paper is complete.	• Although not original, thesis is fairly clear and matches writing task; evidence supports all statements. • Ideas/details are mostly presented in logical order but not fully developed. • Some irrelevant ideas/paragraphs included. • Attempt to use some transitions words and phrases to show the relationships among ideas. Transitions are somewhat fluid. • Paper seems complete.	• Thesis is somewhat clear but evidence sometimes is inadequate to support all statements. • Paper is somewhat organized but seems unfinished. Details are general and not specific. Topic may be too big. • Unclear how some details are connected to main idea or story. • Inconsistent use of basic transition words or phrases. • Some details are not in the right spot.	• Thesis is ambiguous, very vague or ignores the purpose of assignment; evidence loosely related to writing task. • Little organization to the paper. • Details are not clear and/or not clearly connected; writing does not connect to main idea or story. • Little attempt to use transition words and phrases. • Ending is missing or does not connect to the story or main idea.	• Thesis is missing and/or absence of relevant evidence and details. • No organization to the paper; ideas seem disconnected and do not fit with main idea or story. • Lack of transition words/phrases. There is no beginning or end to the paper. (12 or below)
1.3.2. Sentence/fluency and Knowledge of Conventions (control of syntax and mechanics)	• Consistently and effectively incorporates a range of varied sentence patterns to reveal syntactic fluency. Sentences are complete. • Use of language skillfully communicates meaning to readers; writing is virtually error-free and shows mastery of conventions of construction of sentences (word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions) and spelling, punctuation, and accent marks.	• Effectively incorporates a range of sentence patterns to reveal syntactic fluency with effective but simple constructions. • Most sentences are complete, but there are a few fragments. • Use of straightforward language generally conveys meaning to readers with few errors. *Meaning seldom obscured* • Paper flows smoothly, but has some rough spots due to occasional errors in word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions, spelling, punctuation, accent marks.	• Includes a range of varied sentence patterns, with some success. • Many one-sentence paragraphs and many fragments. • Use of language generally conveys meaning to readers; *meaning is obscured in some areas* because of errors. • Some parts of the paper are difficult to read due to frequent errors in word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions, spelling, punctuation, accent marks.	• Attempt to include different sentence patterns with uneven success. • Choppy/awkward sentences and frequent use of fragments make paper difficult to read. • Use of language sometimes *obscures or confused meaning* because of errors. • Paper does not flow smoothly due to major weaknesses in sentence construction (word order, agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions), spelling, accent marks, punctuation that cause significant distraction; reads like a translation from English.	• Paper is full of fragments. • Use of language *obscures meaning* because of errors. • Paper is difficult to read due to no mastery of sentence construction, spelling, punctuation, accent marks; *meaning **is** lost*.
1.3.3. Vocabulary	• Extensive and sophisticated range of vocabulary. • Precise word choices; effective use of idioms, appropriate register.	• Adequate range of vocabulary. • Occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, and usage, *but meaning is not obscured*.	• Adequate range of vocabulary. • Word choices get the message across but frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, *obscured meaning in some areas*.	• Vocabulary is not all translation. •Word choices make the writing unclear to the reader. • *Word choices confuse the meaning.*	• Vocabulary is essentially translation from English; invented words. • Confusing word choices. • *Meaning is unclear*.
3. 1.1 Explanation of issues/ Content Development	• Issue/problem to be considered is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding	• Issue/problem to be considered is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions	• Issue/problem to be considered is stated but described leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, and boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	• Issue/problem to be considered is stated without clarification or description	• Does not state issue/problem.
3.1.2. Sources and evidence	• Takes information from sources with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. • Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly. • Skillful use of style and of high-quality, credible, and relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for discipline and genre.	• Takes information from sources with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. • Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning. • Consistent use of style and of credible and relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for discipline and genre.	• Takes information from sources with some interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. • Although discerning fact from opinion, viewpoints of experts are not consistently questioned. • An attempt to use style and credible and/or relevant sources as evidence to support ideas that are appropriate for discipline and genre. (15-16)	• Takes information from sources with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. • Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning. • Rare use of style and sources as evidence to support ideas that are appropriate for discipline and genre.	• Takes information from sources without any interpretation/evaluation. • Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question. • Does not use style or sources as evidence to support ideas that are appropriate for discipline and genre.
Totals	25	20	15	10	5

mm-9-7-2014

Appendix III. My Discussion-Participation Rubric and Discussion Self-Audit:
SPAN 152. Civilization and Culture of Spain.   Name: _____
Prof. María Mayberry   Week# _____Date: _____

During the first 4 weeks of the semester, your participation was graded based on your written answers to the discussion questions.
Starting with week 5, your participation will be graded based on:
1. the "My Discussion-Participation Rubric";
2. your completion of the "Discussion Self-Audit";
3. your participation in class-discussions (e.g., when you volunteer to answer and participate in class discussions).

IMPORTANT: Keep all of your rubrics and self-audits in order.
I will collect the first Rubric and Self-Audit on Week 6 (based on week 5's discussion).
I will collect the first Rubric and Self-Audit on Week 9 (based on week 8's online discussion).
Summary. You will need to prepare a summary of all your rubrics and self-audits. In the summary identify patterns of your assumptions and the assumptions of other students; similarities, contradictions, and discrepancies of your assumptions with those of other students; include any surprises.
Due at the beginning of last day of class: A portfolio with all your rubrics, self-audits, and the summary.
is summary (not the individual weekly entries) and the rubrics and self-audits for weeks 6 and 9 will be part of your grade for participation and discussion.

Discussion Self-Audit

Instructions: Please write down anything that occurs to you about your contributions to the discussions we have had in class this week and anything you may have learned from the discussions. The following questions may be helpful to you. You do not need to answer every one of them. There are here to help you with your reflections about the discussions and your learning from them.

Assumption = a statement accepted as true without proof. (The American Heritage Dictionary. 1983. 2nd College Edition)

1. List the assumptions that you held about the topic of the discussion this week that were uncovered or clarified for you.

2. Of these assumptions, which did you feel were accurate and valid? Try to write down what was said about the discussions that confirmed the accuracy of you assumptions.

3. Of these assumptions, which did you feel were more challenged by the discussion? Try to write down what was said about the discussions that challenged the accuracy of you assumptions.

4. What different perspectives on the topics were suggested for you by our discussions?

5. What is the most important learning you have taken from this week's discussions?

6. What is the most pressing question you are left with about the topic as a result of this week's discussion?

7. Re-write your answer to one of the questions discussed this week's that reflect a new perspective on the topic or an expansion to your original assumption (answer) on the topic based on class discussions. (Attach original response)

SPAN 152. Civilization and Culture of Spain.   Name: _____

Prof. María Mayberry   Week# _____Date: _____

MY Rubric for Classroom Discussions and Participation

Criteria	Exemplary	Accomplished	Good	Developing
Level of Engagement and active participation	☐ I **proactively and regularly** contribute to class discussions ☐ I initiate discussion on issues related to class topic ☐ I **actively** engage others in class discussions by inviting their comments (4)	☐ I **proactively** contribute to class discussions ☐ I often ask questions and respond to direct questions ☐ I **often** engage others in class discussions by inviting their comments (3)	☐ I **occasionally** contribute to class discussion. ☐ I seldom volunteer but respond to direct questions ☐ I **sometimes** engage others in class discussions (2)	☐ I do not contribute **enough** to class discussions ☐ I do not respond to direct questions ☐ I rarely invite comments/opinions from other students (1)
Listening skills	☐ I listen to contributions of others ☐ I **respond and expand** on the contributions of other students (4)	☐ I listen to contributions of others ☐ I **appropriately respond** to contributions of other students (3)	☐ I listen to contributions of others ☐ I **do not always respond to contributions** of other students (2)	☐ I listen to contributions of others ☐ I **do not respond** to contributions of other students (1)
Relevance of Contribution to topic under discussion	☐ My contributions are relevant and promote deeper analysis of topic (e.g., I ask questions to further discussion) (4)	☐ My contributions are relevant (3)	☐ My contributions sometimes are off-topic (2)	☐ I do not contribute to class discussions. (1)
Preparedness	☐ I **am always prepared** for class with assignments and required materials (4)	☐ I **am usually prepared** with assignments and required materials (3)	☐ I am **seldom prepared** with assignments and required material (2)	☐ I am consistently **unprepared** for class (1)

Assignment Score _____

Adapted from following sources:
1. Texas Education Agency. (2006).
2. Mayer, C. (2011). Rubric for Evaluation of Class Participation.