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

Four different outcomes were assessed in each of our four majors via direct measures:

   A) **Japanese**: Learning outcome #3 - Development of reading skills in target language at the intermediate level in accordance with American Council on Teaching Foreign Languages (ACTFL) guidelines and metalinguistic terminology that describes reading comprehension.

   B) **Spanish**: Learning outcome #5. Development of pronunciation skills in the target language at the intermediate level in accordance with American Council on Teaching Foreign Languages (ACTFL) guidelines and metalinguistic terminology that describes oral production.

   C) **Russian**: Learning outcome #2. Development of speaking skills in target language at the intermediate level in accordance with American Council on Teaching Foreign Languages (ACTFUL) guidelines and metalinguistic terminology that describes speaking competences.

   D) **French**: Learning outcome #7. Students will acquire an overview of historical and cultural features of the country/countries in which the target language is spoken.

These outcomes were assessed because they align with both our departmental goal #3 (“To offer students opportunities to engage in meaningful experience within their target language(s)”, and the university’s goal #1 (“Integrate international experiences and global education in curricular and co-curricular initiatives”).

The data that we collected also gave us indirect information about the other SLOs due to the natural overlap that exists among all of them.

2. How they were assessed?

   A) **Japanese**: 9 students in Japanese 442: Translation and Interpretation were assessed according to completion of 8 translations of Japanese language texts taken from various sources: newspapers, editorials, textbooks, poetry, and narration.

   Under the rubric of reading comprehension, the skill areas assessed were Literal Comprehension, Interpretative Comprehension, and Cultural Awareness. The methodology of assessment consisted of the assessment and grading of submitted translation copy.

   Assessment was based on the "Pre-Advanced Interpretive Rubric" (see appendix): student exceeds expectations (EE), student meets expectations (ME), student does not meet expectations (DNME).
B) Spanish: 15 students in Spanish 385: Spanish Phonetics (excluding heritage students) were assessed on a 50-point examination on pronunciation. Under the "Rubric for Scoring Pronunciation" (see appendix) the areas assessed were the /b/, the silent "h," /l/, /s/, and the liaisons ("sinalefas"). The methodology consisted of assessing a recorded paragraph read by the students, and grading of the submitted recording.

Assessment was based on the "Rubric for Scoring Pronunciation" (see appendix): student exceeds expectations (EE), student meets expectations (ME), student does not meet expectations (DNME).

C) Russian: 9 students in Russian 445: Russian Language and Literature were assessed through Oral Interviews, in-class Oral Presentations and in-class discussions in the target language. Students’ communicative competences were assessed via the following categories: Language functions (grammar); comprehensibility (pronunciation); vocabulary and comprehension.

Assessment was done according to the “Pre-Advanced Interpersonal Rubric” (see appendix), students were assessed as Meeting Expectations (ME), exceeding expectations (EE) or not meeting expectations (DNME).

D) French: 9 students in French 380: Contemporary France were assessed via five quizzes administered over the course of the spring quarter. Because the overall focus of the course is "French culture" in a fairly broad sense that includes history, politics, geography, language, and more, the instructor took all five of the quizzes administered in FR380 over the course of the spring quarter into consideration.

All quizzes were graded on a 25-point scale. Scores of 16 or below were considered as not meeting the expectations (DNME), scores between 17 and 23 as meeting the expectations (ME), and scores between 24 and 25 as exceeding the expectations (EE).

Students were also assessed via an indirect measure, an exit survey. The survey was sent to all World Languages majors who graduated in 2013-2014. The survey was sent in June of 2014, shortly after graduation. We received 25 responses to the survey, 21 of whom answered all of the questions.

3. What was learned?

A) Japanese 442
Literal Comprehension: 2 EE, 7 ME, 0 DNME.
Interpretative Comprehension: 2EE, 7ME, 0 DNME.
Cultural Awareness: 3 EE, 6 ME, 0 DNME.

B) Spanish 385
4 EE
9 ME
2 DNME

C) Russian 445
Language functions (grammar): 5 ME, 4 EE
Comprehensibility (pronunciation): 4 ME, 4 EE, 1 DNME
Vocabulary: 4 ME, 4 EE, 1 DME
Participation in our exit survey was less robust this year than last. Out of 25 graduating seniors who participated, 21 completed all of the answers. Consequently, all comments are based on data garnered from the 21 participating students. What we learned focuses on the skill areas related to questions 18-21 and 23 in the survey. These quantitative data measure discrete language skills that are targeted in our program, specifically, listening (Q18), speaking (Q20), reading (Q18), writing (Q19, Q21), grammar (Q18), culture (Q21), and pronunciation (Q23), and those that most closely parallel the learner outcomes that are measured in SLOP document.

Q18 gives an overview of students’ grammar, listening comprehension, and reading skills. The average this year is 3.875 out of 5, slightly down from the previous year's average of 4 out of 5 on the same question, suggesting a moderate degree of perceived attainment in those skills. Q19 focuses on students’ ability to write for real world purposes, such as letters of application. The overall average here is 3.55 out of five, slightly down from the previous year's average of 3.66 out of 5 on the same question, implying a moderate degree of perceived attainment. Q20 concentrates on students’ ability to speak in the target language on a wide range of topics. The average is 4.05 out of five, essentially the same as the previous year's average of 4.03 out of 5, indicating a moderate to high degree of perceived attainment. Q21 emphasizes the ability to write for a variety of academic purposes that include knowledge of past, present, and future verb tenses, indicative and subjunctive moods, and hypothetical situations in academic and target language settings. It also includes an ability to discuss the target language culture. The average is 4.15 out of 5, slightly above the previous year's average of 3.9 out of 5, pointing to a moderate to high degree of perceived attainment. Q23 addresses pronunciation skills. The average is 4.26 out of 5, slightly higher than the previous year's average of 4.2 out of 5, signaling a moderate to high degree of perceived attainment.

In fact, the overall average of all of these questions is 3.977 out of 5, slightly higher than the previous year's average of 3.972 out of 5, signifying a moderate to high degree of perceived attainment in all measured skill areas.

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information?

We will continue to revise departmental SLOs in such a way as to be easily measured and to reflect more accurately our ever-evolving mission(s) as four distinct language programs and as a department. We also intend to standardize the assessment process across the different programs in such a way that will make it easier to establish a baseline from which to glean meaningful and usable data in future assessments. Finally, we would like to revisit the survey in order to place more emphasis on SLOs targeting critical reasoning skills and cultural/historical knowledge, which are at least equally important as language proficiency in a liberal arts major.

The committee will submit this report to the department
- making recommendations for a consistent and ongoing assessment of student learning,
- making recommendations for next year’s assessment plan, and
- developing and providing rubrics for the assessment of the major programs for the next assessment cycle (2014-15).
5. **What did the department or program do in response to last year’s assessment?**

The assessment committee last year was charged to revise SLOPs and PAPs, to better quantify student assessment, to identify the courses to be assessed for the 2013-14 academic year, and to develop the rubrics to be used by the instructors in their assessment of students.

The exit survey results from last year's assessment contributed partially to departmental discussion concerning the value of the four teaching majors. A vote was made to put the teaching programs on hiatus last week.

6. **Questions or suggestions concerning Assessment of Student Learning at Central Washington University?**

We have none at this time.
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