1. **What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?**

   In answering this question, please identify the specific student learning outcomes you assessed this year, reasons for assessing these outcomes, with the outcomes written in clear, measurable terms, and note how the outcomes are linked to department, college and university mission and goals.

   Japanese writing proficiency was the outcome assessed this year. The course **Japanese 462: Japanese Cinema** was chosen as the venue to assess student ability. In this class, the students were required to demonstrate the ability to watch and comprehend Japanese cinema and comment on it in Japanese through writing assignments. I volunteered to use this course and its outcomes and objectives as a test run for the creation of a potential capstone course which could be applied to most of the languages in the department. (See Assessment of Student Learning Report 2009 - 2010.)

2. **How were they assessed?**

   In answering these questions, please concisely describe the specific methods used in assessing student learning. Please also specify the population assessed, when the assessment took place, and the standard of mastery (criterion) against which you will compare your assessment results. If appropriate, please list survey or questionnaire response rate from total population.

   The students (Japanese language majors and minors) were required to keep journals in Japanese, or write three 5-7 page papers. Both the journal and the papers were assessed and returned to the students. The papers could be resubmitted for revision and rewriting (except for the final assignment). Student writing was assessed for grammatical accuracy, style, content, and length and appropriateness of topic.

   **A) What methods were used?**

   Journals or essays were chosen by the students. Students were given the option of writing journals on a daily basis or submitting three 5-7 page papers throughout the quarter.

   **B) Who was assessed?**
Japanese majors and minors were assessed through this activity.

C) When was it assessed?

Spring quarter 2011.

3. What was learned?
In answering this question, please report results in specific qualitative or quantitative terms, with the results linked to the outcomes you assessed, and compared to the standard of mastery (criterion) you noted above. Please also include a concise interpretation or analysis of the results.

As a result of the institution of electronic gaming system used to teach and reinforce Japanese orthography (Kakitoriikun) along with the more intensive writing curriculum of the third year and upper division elective Japanese classes, we know that the majors and minors are writing more than they were four years ago. Empirically we know this because we have assigned more assessed writing. We are sure that this has also resulted in an increase in the ability of the students to produce grammatically and calligraphically correct Japanese, however, we do not have an assessment instrument whereby we could demonstrate objectively and empirically that this is the case. Our experience as instructors, however, makes us confident that the students are doing better in this narrowly defined area of language skill. We will search for an tool which would allow us to assess and record student performance, however, a cursory search for one available to language programs has not turned up anything yet. The Japanese Ministry of Science and Education administers a Japanese Language Proficiency Test several times a year and this is becoming more and more of a standard used by government and industry to place employees in positions requiring all four language skills, however it is unlikely that we will be able to use it to guide the development of our curriculum and programmatic offerings here.

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information?
In answering this question, please note specific changes to your program as they affect student learning, and as they are related to results from the assessment process. If no changes are planned, please describe why no changes are needed. In addition, how will the department report the results and changes to internal and external constituents (e.g., advisory groups, newsletters, forums, etc.).

There has been discussion at the departmental level on the creation of a capstone course either for all language programs or for specific languages. We hope that the lessons learned through this course and others like it will guide the development of this course or these courses.

5. What did the department or program do in response to last year’s assessment information?
In answering this question, please describe any changes that have been made to improve student learning based on previous assessment results. Please also discuss any changes you have made to your assessment plan or assessment methods.

The decision to base this year’s assessment report on a portfolio project in Japanese was in response to last year’s assessment report. While the Japanese language is definitely the most difficult in terms of its orthographic system, which would lead to a capstone course centering mainly on that writing system to the exclusion of conversation and listening comprehension, other languages as well could use this kind of curriculum to create artifacts for portfolios and to satisfy the demands of assessment requirements,
6. Questions or suggestions concerning Assessment of Student Learning at Central Washington University: