

Department of Modern Languages

Undergraduate Language Program

Program Review 2006-2007 Academic Year

Department Chair:

Dr. Ann K. Hills

Program Chairs:

Dr. Gerard Lavatori (French)

Dr. Roswitha Brooks (German)

Dr. Ann K. Hills (Spanish)

Executive Summary

The Department of Modern Languages offers undergraduate majors and minors in French, German, and Spanish, as well as courses in Japanese. In 2006, our language programs delivered a total of 2,692 credit hours, which represented an increase of 799 credit hours since 2000. German, Japanese, Literature, and Spanish were among the 18 of 43 subjects (42%) in the College of Arts and Sciences that showed an increase over the six-year span.¹

The French, German, and Spanish major programs consist of 40 units, while the minor varies from 20 to 24 units, depending upon the level at which each student commences the program. Over the past five years, the number of majors and minors in the Spanish Program has grown steadily, while the number of majors and minors in the French and German Programs has remained fairly constant.² According to the most recent lists of advisees issued by the Office of the Registrar (Spring 2007), there are 24 declared Spanish majors and 7 minors; 2 French majors and 2 minors; and 1 German major. In a typical semester, more than half of all language courses are taught by part-time faculty. The average class size is approximately 13 students.

The great majority of all language majors and minors are traditional age, first generation college students. A few majors are part of the Campus Accelerated Program for Adults (CAPA). Approximately 72% of language majors and minors are Hispanic (80% in the Spanish Program), as compared to 38% among the university's general population of undergraduate and graduate students (2005-06 Common Data Set). Language majors and minors are officially advised by full-time faculty only.

The learning outcomes for language majors include the acquisition of knowledge of and communicative skills in the target language, the development of critical thinking and literary analysis skills, and an understanding and appreciation of diverse cultures.

Assessment procedures utilized in this program review included a senior exit survey, alumni survey, language student survey, content analysis of course evaluations, syllabi reviews, senior project analysis, and faculty interviews. Our findings suggest the following:

1. Students indicate that our language programs have provided them with a strong foundation in oral and written communication skills in the target language; however, there is a need for standardized oral and written assessment rubrics, as well as additional oral assessment tools.
2. Majors report satisfaction with the skills and knowledge they receive in the areas of literary theory and literary and cultural analysis, but are dissatisfied in general with the preparation they receive with regard to the senior project.

¹ Source: "Total Credit Hours Delivered by Subject," spreadsheet compiled from data extracted from Banner Databases on 03/03/06 and 12/01/06.

² Sources: "Unduplicated Undergraduate Headcount by Major at all ULV Campuses, Fall 2002 – Fall 2006," University of La Verne Fact Book 2002–2006, pg. 2, and "Active UG Students by Advisor" (2006–2007 Academic Year).

3. Many course outlines are outdated and do not reflect current program goals and learning outcomes, as articulated in course syllabi.
4. The study abroad component continues to offer invaluable and life-altering experiences for our language majors, who unanimously praise the program and its inclusion as a requirement for the major. Faculty would like to consider additional study abroad program options, such as those led by faculty.
5. Many students indicated that the language laboratory was ill equipped to meet their language learning needs.

Recommendations for action:

1. Develop standardized rubrics for oral and written assessment.
2. Investigate alternative oral assessment modes, such as software or Internet-based tools.
3. Consider alternate models for the senior culminating activity, including the possible addition of a comprehensive examination for Spanish majors and/or a revision of the current nature of the senior project. Consider adding an oral assessment component, such as an oral presentation or defense of the senior project before a committee and fellow language majors.
4. Address the needs of majors in the process of preparing their senior project; to this end, evaluate the success of the newly introduced Spanish 499, Senior Project class (Fall 2007).
5. Create an *Introduction to Literary Studies* course as a core requirement for the Spanish major and a prerequisite for the following literature courses: SPAN 430, 431, 432, and 433.
6. Revise course outlines to reflect the current syllabi, course objectives and learning outcomes, and ensure that course goals, expectations, and policies are clearly communicated to students.
7. Investigate alternate study abroad options.
8. Incorporate innovative multi-media resources into the language classroom and the language laboratory; assess the ways in which the lab is currently used, its current materials, resources, etc.

I. Program Mission

The mission of our language programs is to familiarize students with the cultural richness and diversity of the world through the intensive study of the linguistic, literary, and cultural expressions of other nations, and to prepare students for their academic, professional, and personal futures as informed world citizens.

II. Program Goals and Learning Outcomes

The Department of Modern Languages expects its majors, at the conclusion of their course of study, to be able to:

1. Participate actively in target language conversations in most informal and some formal settings on topics of personal and general interest, using appropriate structures that would be easily comprehensible to a native speaker.
2. Write routine informal and some formal correspondence in the target language, including narratives, descriptions, and summaries of a factual nature, all of which would be easily comprehensible to a native speaker.
3. Demonstrate, both orally and in written form, an understanding of and ability to analyze various literary genres in the target language and cultures.
4. Demonstrate, both orally and in written form, an understanding and appreciation of significant aspects of the target cultures, including, but not limited to: social conventions, folklore and belief systems, history, fine arts, literature, etc.
5. Produce an original research paper in the target language, using appropriate vocabulary, syntax, grammar, register, and documentation.

III. Program Description

A. Organization

The Department of Modern Languages offers a Bachelor's of Arts degree in French, German, and Spanish, minors in the aforementioned language programs, and courses in Japanese. The Department of Modern Languages also houses the Writing Program and the English as a Second Language Program. These two programs will be reviewed separately from the language programs. Program Chairs, as well as the Writing Program Director, report to the Department Chair, who in turn reports directly to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Major and minor programs in languages are available only on the main campus; therefore, language courses offered at RCA sites (such as Spanish courses offered at the ABTC Ecumenical Center) will not be included in this review process.

B. Faculty

During the 2006-2007 academic year, the Department of Modern Languages had 4.5 full-time language faculty members, distributed in the following language programs as such: 1 in French; 1 in German; and 2.5³ in Spanish. As a result of the retirement of Dr. Roswitha Brooks in June 2007 and the upcoming retirement of Dr. Andrea Labinger in June 2008, we will have only 3 full-time language faculty members as of Fall 2008 (1 in French, 2 in Spanish).

Our language programs rely heavily upon the dedication and efforts of part-time faculty. In the 2006-2007 academic year, part-time instructors taught 26 of the 49 language courses offered (53%). This percentage is identical to that of part-time faculty in all departments on the main campus, according to the 2005-06 Common Data Set. A senior adjunct instructor is responsible for all of our course offerings in Japanese. Within the distinct language programs, the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty is as follows: French – 1 FT: 1 PT; German – 1 FT: 1 PT (0 FT as of Fall 2007); Japanese – 0 FT: 1 PT; Spanish – 2.5 FT: 4 PT (2 FT in Fall 2008). *Appendix A* provides a list of language faculty.

C. Courses

The requirements for the major in German, French, and Spanish include the completion of 40 semester hours, a culminating senior project (a research paper of approximately 30 pages in length), and a minimum of one semester (French and Spanish) or one year (German) of study abroad (See *Appendix B* for major requirements). Currently, students may study abroad through one of two approved study abroad programs—Brethren Colleges Abroad (BCA), or the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE)—in the following locations: Germany; France; Barcelona, Ecuador, or Mexico. Additionally, requirements for the majors in French and in German include a senior comprehensive examination that tests language proficiency and reading skills.

All courses have a unit value of 4, with the exception of GERM/FREN/SPAN 499, Senior Project, which has a variable unit value of 1 to 4 semester hours to accommodate the needs of graduating seniors. In response to a university-wide call for the elimination of 3 semester hour classes and in an effort to broaden the scope of our curriculum, the department elected to change SPAN 314 (*Spanish Composition & Advanced Grammar*) from a 3 to a 4 semester hour course in Fall 2006; similarly, GERM/FREN/SPAN 330, Second Language Teaching, and FREN/LIT 365, French Literature in Translation, will be 4 semester hour courses beginning in Spring 2008.

The analysis of course syllabi (*Appendix C*) indicates that program goals and learning outcomes are receiving superior coverage across the board. As expected, the development and refinement of oral and written skills in the respective target language constitute an essential part of nearly all

³ Dr. Andrea Labinger holds a split appointment as Professor of Spanish and Director of the Honors Program; thus, her teaching load in the Spanish Program consists of 3 courses/year, i.e., half of that of a full-time faculty member.

of our classes, with the obvious exception of those courses in which English is the language of instruction (e.g., Literature in Translation courses). Culture is integrated into all courses; literature is introduced on a small scale in the lower division language courses and becomes increasingly prevalent as students progress through the sequence of courses. Syllabi also reflect excellent coverage of many relevant General Education competencies, such as writing, issues of diversity and international/intercultural consciousness, critical thinking, and values orientation. The latter goal is less explicitly articulated in the actual syllabi but can be inferred from similar goals (as well as from students' comments on course evaluations); therefore, faculty will discuss the need to revise some syllabi to reflect said goal. There is adequate to fair coverage in the area of information literacy: the higher the course number, the more adept students must be in the use of library and technology sources to be able to successfully complete a variety of assignments. There is a need for some course outlines to be updated to reflect current course curriculum, objectives and learning outcomes, as noted in our action recommendations.

D. Majors

The table below summarizes the enrollment and graduation trends during the period of Fall 2002 to Fall 2006, including the number of majors, bachelor's degrees conferred, and new traditional age freshmen and transfer students. Included is data relative to International Business and Language, a major that is also supported by our language programs. As noted above, the number of majors in the Spanish Program has grown steadily, while the number of majors and minors in the French and German Programs has remained low but fairly constant. The number of degrees conferred in the Spanish Program should increase greatly in the next few years in proportion to the increase in recently declared majors.

Table 1: Enrollment and Graduation Trends⁴										
	Year									
	2002		2003		2004		2005		2006	
	n	% of A&S	n	% of A&S	n	% of A&S	n		n	% of A&S
Majors										
French	1	0.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0
German	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Spanish	6	0.5	7	0.6	7	0.5	14	0.9	16	0.11
Intl Bus / Language	24	2.0	21	1.7	15	1.0	22	1.5	21	1.4
Degrees Conferred										
French	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
German	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Spanish	2	0.7	1	0.4	2	0.8	2	0.6	2	0.6
Intl Bus / Language	3	1.0	2	0.8	7	2.8	4	1.1	3	0.8
New Traditional Age Freshmen										
French	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

⁴ Source: University of La Verne Fact Book, 2002–2006, pp.2, 25-26, 37.

German	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Spanish	0	0.0	2	1.3	0	0.0	2	0.9	0	0.0
Intl Bus / Language	8	4.2	1	0.6	3	1.3	2	0.9	3	1.5
New Traditional Age Transfers										
French	1	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
German	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Spanish	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.2	2	2.7	0	0.0
Intl Bus / Language	4	6.9	1	1.4	0	0.0	2	2.7	0	0.0

According to data extracted on 9/26/07 by the Office of Institutional Research, the number of minors in our programs over a similar time period was as follows:

Table 2: Unduplicated Undergraduate Headcount by Minor: 2001-02 through 2006-07						
	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
French	1	6	1	2	2	2
German						
Spanish			1	5	5	9
Intl Bus / Lang						1

According to the *CAS Undergraduate Enrollment and Graduation Information* sheet, the figures for FTE Students served in Fall 2006 were as follows: French - 6.5; German - 2.8; and Spanish – 60.1.

The lists of advisees issued by the Office of the Registrar in Spring 2007 indicate that there are 24 declared Spanish majors, 2 French majors, and 1 German major. Data show that the majority of language majors do not declare their major immediately upon entering the university, but rather make this decision after taking courses in the program.

Our majors exemplify the university's mission of lifelong learning: 83% of our alumni respondents continued with their education after attaining the B.A., with 64% of those students pursuing an advanced degree in a graduate program at institutions such as Cornell, UCLA, USD, Cal State Northridge, Cal Poly Pomona, ULV, Biola, Metropolitan College of Denver, and Miami University. Likewise, all of the Senior Survey respondents indicated that they would be attending graduate school.

With respect to demographics, the Alumni Survey revealed that 58% of respondents identified themselves as Latino or of Hispanic heritage. In Spring 2007, 80% of graduating seniors identified themselves as such. 75% of respondents were female, 25 male. Furthermore, 75% of alumni and 100% of senior respondents identified themselves as first generation college students.

As previously noted, approximately 82% of *current* language majors and minors are Hispanic, evidencing a notable growth as compared to our alumni respondents; that figure rises to 89% when we consider the Spanish Program alone. The gender profile of our current major and minor population (76% female; 24% male) is nearly identical to that of our alumni.

We can compare these percentages to the university's most recently recorded general demographics (2006), according to which 67% of students identified themselves as female and 33% as male. Ethnically, ULV students identified themselves as follows: 40.0% Caucasian, 33.6% Latino/Hispanic, 10.9% African American, 6.4% Asian American/Pacific Islander, 0.9% American Indian/Alaska Native, 3.2% International, and 5.0% other.⁵

E. Course enrollments

SPAN 100 and 101 (*Elementary Spanish I and II*) and FREN 100 and 101 (*Elementary French I and II*) are the only language program courses offered every semester. These two Spanish courses have multiple sections (~six or seven) and consistently show strong enrollment. At the time of this writing (Fall 2007), first-year French classes have experienced a significant boom, with twenty students currently enrolled in French 100 and seven in French 101. French Program faculty members at neighboring institutions have anecdotally reported a similar growth in numbers. Continuing to be reviewed by university faculty and administrators is the issue of whether language competency should be a requirement for on- and off-campus undergraduate student populations. A change or an elimination of this requirement would have a significant impact upon our first-year language programs and, potentially, on some of our major and minor programs, albeit to a much lesser degree.

Several Literature in Translation courses are cross-listed with a designation of LIT; these typically draw high enrollments because they satisfy the General Education Humanities Area Requirement without requiring that students be fluent in a foreign language. Given that all of these courses were approved as Literature under the G.E. program slated to be implemented in Fall 2008, we would expect their respective enrollments to remain strong in the future.

Appendix D details the current rotation schedule for language courses, while *Appendix E* shows the 2006-2007 schedule of classes for Fall, January and Spring semesters, with corresponding assigned faculty and enrollments, as per the online Class Schedule. The mean enrollment for all forty-six classes is 12.7 (range: 1–30). The mean enrollment for cross-listed courses (n = 5) is 19.8 (range: 9–30), whereas the mean for non-cross-listed courses (n = 41) is 11.9 (range: 1–24). Seventeen of the classes, or 37%, have enrollments of less than 10 students, a figure that we are continuing to reduce through changes in the course rotation schedule and the cancellation of under-enrolled classes that are not immediately essential to the language majors in a given semester.

F. Advising

Only full-time faculty members are responsible for academic advising within the language programs. For the 2006-2007 academic year, four faculty members had advisees assigned to them. *Appendix F* provides a list of faculty advisors and their corresponding advisees, as per data supplied by the Student Advisement Office. The list shows nine language minors who appear on the official advisee sheets, but we are aware of several more minors who have been or are currently being advised by language faculty and who are not represented on these documents.

⁵ Source: University of La Verne Fact Book 2002– 2006, pg. 13.

IV. Assessment Procedures

Learning outcomes were assessed through the following procedures:

A. Senior Exit Survey

A survey was distributed in Spring 2007 to senior French, German and Spanish majors and minors (See *Appendix G* for a copy of the survey). The survey queried seniors as to their experiences in and level of satisfaction with various aspects of their language program, as well as to their future educational, professional, and personal plans. Students were also encouraged to identify the best and worst aspects of the program and to make recommendations for program improvement. Five of the eight surveys distributed were returned. Because of the small sample size, a quantitative assessment of a sample was not performed; nevertheless, the ratings and comments from all five surveys are noted in the present program review.

B. Alumni Survey

Approximately twenty-five surveys were mailed and/or e-mailed to alumni who graduated from ULV within the last ten years with a major or minor in French, German and Spanish (See *Appendix H* for a copy of the Alumni Survey, as well as corresponding statistical reports). Twelve completed surveys were returned. As with the Senior Exit Survey, alumni were asked to assess various aspects of their language program in terms of overall quality and preparation for further study or a career. They were also asked about their personal and professional accomplishments since graduation and the applicability of their program to their current endeavors. Finally, alumni were encouraged to make recommendations for program improvement.

C. Language Student Survey

Surveys were distributed to students in all language courses toward the close of the Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 semesters. *Appendix I* includes a copy of the Language Student Survey and tables that detail the statistical analysis of the same. The survey asked students to rate the success of their course(s) in terms of promoting linguistic competency and fluency in the target language, improving general linguistic and critical thinking skills, and disseminating knowledge about and fostering appreciation of different cultures. Students were asked to make brief recommendations for improvement of course content and the program in general.

D. Course Evaluations

A content analysis was performed based on the course evaluations from ninety-five courses offered by our language programs between Fall 2004 and Spring 2006. See *Appendix J* for the complete analysis.

E. Syllabi Review

Syllabi corresponding to all language program courses were reviewed. *Appendix C* indicates principle areas of knowledge and competency and the degree to which these areas were covered according to the goals and learning outcomes articulated in each syllabus. Table 1 of Appendix C addresses program goals; Table 2, General Education goals.

F. Senior Project Review

Seven senior projects, completed during the period of 2001 to 2006, were assessed using the department's senior project rubric (*Appendix K*).

G. Faculty Interviews

Faculty members—part-time and full-time alike—were interviewed and asked to identify what they perceived to be the strengths and weaknesses of the language programs and to make suggestions for improvement.

H. Writing Sample Review

A writing assessment rubric (*Appendix M*, Rubric #1) was applied to a writing sample from upper-level students. The sample was made up of twenty compositions (short essays) taken from three 300+ level Spanish courses offered in the 2006-07 academic year.

V. Findings

Learning Outcome 1: Majors will participate actively in target language conversations in most informal and some formal settings on topics of personal and general interest, using appropriate structures that would be easily comprehensible to a native speaker.

Senior Exit Surveys:

All Senior Exit Survey respondents indicated that they had “some basic” or “good” knowledge of the language upon entering ULV, but that they saw “much improvement” in their skills as a result of the courses they took in their respective language program. One student commented: “I felt that each class, each day served a purpose and helped me acquire the language.” Additionally, all respondents noted that they expect to use their foreign language skills in their future professions “on a daily or weekly basis,” or, at a minimum, “occasionally.”

Alumni Surveys:

The majority of alumni continue to use their foreign language skills. 58% of respondents indicated that they use the foreign language at work on a daily or weekly basis; 17%, on an occasional basis; and 25%, rarely. 50% of respondents use their foreign language skills outside of work on a daily or weekly basis; 42%, on an occasional basis; and 8%, rarely. 100% of respondents rated their program as “good” or “excellent” at fostering oral communication skills.

Language Student Survey:

On a 4-point Likert scale (with 4 = strongly agree), the mean rating for improvement that students experienced with regard to their speaking skills in the target language was 3.28, with oral comprehension ranked at 3.33. The mean rating for overall fluency was 3.25. Students recognized as program strengths the fact that they were made to feel comfortable using the target language, and that courses were conducted primarily in that language. We asked students to identify the areas in which they would like to see more emphasis placed; with a mean rating of 3.10, students indicated that they would favor more oral practice.

Course Evaluations Analysis:

Responses from course evaluations corresponding to 95 courses offered in the period from Fall 2004 to Spring 2006 were overwhelmingly positive. Of the 643 thematic comments identified by researchers, 77% of them were positive. It should be noted that the vast majority of these courses (77%) are required (General Education) first-year language courses. It is also important to keep in mind that majors (and minors), although included in the data from course evaluations, would make up the minority of these respondents, given the number of students and sections of first-year language courses.

In terms of course improvements, 45% of respondents stated that no change was necessary. Among the themes for suggested improvement was a desire for increased oral practice and assignments; however, it constituted a relatively small percentage (2%), one that also includes comments relating to the quality of the language lab.

Themes	# of Responses	%	% of Grand Total
Increase oral work including vocabulary, grammar, tests, and presentations. Improve quality of labs	14	9	2

Unfortunately, it is difficult to ascertain students' responses to specific questions relating to oral comprehension and speaking skills, as well as overall fluency, as these data were combined and then sorted into the most statistically significant themes.

18% of respondents felt that they had "learned a great deal" and that their language skills in general had improved as a result of the language course they had taken. Students appear to be satisfied with the amount of emphasis placed on oral production and communication. With regard to themes related to improving teaching effectiveness, only 1% of respondents suggested that we "increase verbal, oral and grammatical practice/exercises;" similarly, only 1% suggested that the professor use or increase his/her use of English in the classroom.

Course Syllabi Review:

All language courses taught in the target language were rated "Superior" in their coverage of foreign language oral communication skills, as articulated in course syllabi and/or outlines.

Faculty Interviews:

Students' oral comprehension and speaking skills are assessed in a variety of ways throughout the semester in all foreign language classes. Students' comprehension and production are evaluated in each class session through individual, pair, and group communicative activities. In first- and second-year courses, students are required to attend the language lab outside of class for approximately 45 minutes per week, and an oral comprehension and/or production section is generally included on all quizzes and exams. Oral interviews are conducted as a part of the final exam and, in some cases, the mid-term exam. Students in intermediate-level courses are expected to present an oral report; students in advanced courses are generally required to present a more extensive and formal oral report, and are called upon on a daily basis to speak at length on a wide variety of topics, both formal and informal in nature. *Appendix L* provides some samples of commonly used rubrics for assessing oral production of both the holistic and analytical type; however, we would like to standardize the use of such rubrics in the future.

In summary, feedback and self-report indicators suggest that there is a good amount of emphasis placed on the development and refinement of oral communication skills. Faculty members believe that there is a need to create a standardized rubric for oral assessment, preferably one informed by the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages' six domains of oral performance (i.e., comprehensibility, comprehension, language control, vocabulary usage, communicative strategies, and cultural awareness). We would also like to investigate alternative oral assessment modes, such as software or Internet-based tools that would provide instructors with an efficient way to measure oral comprehension and production outside of the classroom (e.g., as a component of quizzes or homework assignments).

Learning Outcome 2: Majors will write routine informal and some formal correspondence in the target language, including narratives, descriptions, and summaries of a factual nature, all of which would be easily comprehensible to a native speaker.

Given the nature of our majors, all of our upper division courses are writing intensive and generally include a plethora of writing activities/projects, such as research and response papers, essay exams, literary and commercial translations, creative works, and many other texts. For majors, the culminating project is a research paper of approximately thirty pages that explores some aspect of Hispanic, Francophone, or Germanic culture in a critical and detailed way; most students opt to analyze a literary work or works of the respective culture. Spanish students also have the opportunity to contribute in a variety of ways to *La Vernácula*, our bilingual journal—as poets, essayists, translators, editors, etc.,—thus encouraging them to produce sophisticated texts and engage in related linguistic activities.

Senior Exit Surveys:

As noted above, seniors indicated that they experienced great improvement in their linguistic skills as a result of their coursework. Four of the five respondents rated the program as “Excellent” at fostering competency in written communication; one as “Fair.”

Alumni Surveys:

As previously noted, the vast majority of alumni continue to use their foreign language skills (we did not ask them to differentiate between oral and written skills). 83% of respondents rated their major program as “Good” or “Excellent” at fostering written communication skills.

Language Survey:

The mean rating for improvements that students experienced with regard to their writing skills in the target language was 3.21.

Course Evaluations Analysis:

Data pertaining to written language skills were not disaggregated from that pertaining to oral skills. Students neither singled out writing assignments as an area that needed improvement nor as one that particularly contributed to their satisfaction with the course.

Course Syllabi Review:

All language courses taught in the target language were rated “Superior” in their coverage of foreign language written communication skills, as articulated in course syllabi and/or outlines.

Faculty Interviews:

Over the past few years, there has been a concerted effort on the part of language faculty to increase and improve written production in beginning and intermediate level language classes. To this end, we have met with adjunct language faculty and consulted with our departmental colleagues in the Writing Program in an effort to generate and share ideas and strategies with regard to the creation, incorporation and assessment of writing activities and assignments. These activities range from the more pragmatic, task-based types of written communication (e-mails, business letters, instructions) to more elaborate types of expository and creative writing (travel brochures, descriptive essays, newsletters, short stories, poems). We will continue to make writing an important focus in all of our courses and investigate innovative ways to incorporate diverse writing assignments into the classroom, with a view to improving students’ writing skills across disciplines.

Writing Sample Review:

We applied a writing assessment rubric (*Appendix M*, Rubric #1) to a sample of twenty essays produced by upper-level students from three 300+ level Spanish courses. The sample revealed that, from a linguistic standpoint, students are writing at levels that are appropriate to their respective year in the program and/or background in and experience with the target language. In terms of mechanics (orthography, accentuation, punctuation), student compositions averaged 2.4 on a 5-point scale. Vocabulary and grammar were considerably higher and both ranked in the “Good” range (averaging 15.6/20 points and 17.5/20 points, respectively). Most students appear to struggle somewhat with issues of thesis (20.1/30 pts.) and organization (12.6/20 pts.). Writing tasks in the intermediate- and upper-level language courses always include a revision process; typically, students’ writing performance greatly improves with each subsequent draft. Among majors in upper-division courses, we do not perceive there to be a great divide between the writing level of non-heritage speakers and heritage speakers, although the types of problems and errors between the two populations are certainly discrete.

WRT 111 (formerly ENG 111) is a pre-requisite for our 200-level courses and above; however, most students take our most writing-intensive courses one or more years after completing the freshmen composition sequence. The adoption of a university-required writing course in the junior year would likely assist many of our students as they take on more challenging writing assignments in upper-division coursework.

In summary, self-report indicators and direct performance measures reveal that students are acquiring a good foundation in written communication skills in the target language, creating a variety of texts, and effectively employing a variety of rhetorical modes and strategies.

Learning Outcome 3: Majors will demonstrate, both orally and in written form, an understanding of and ability to analyze various literary genres in the target language and cultures.

Senior Exit Surveys:

Four of the five respondents rated the program as “Excellent” at fostering competency in literary and cultural analysis; one as “Good.”

Alumni Surveys:

100% of alumni respondents rated their program as “Good” or “Excellent” at promoting competency in literary and cultural analysis. 60% are pursuing or have pursued a Master’s Degree.

Course Syllabi Review:

All literature courses—both those taught in the target language and those taught in translation—were rated “Superior” in their incorporation of literature and presentation of literary and cultural analysis skills, as articulated in course syllabi and/or outlines.

Senior Project Review:

See *Senior Project Review* and Table 3 under Learning Outcome 5 (below) for a detailed description of the results of the senior project assessment.

Faculty Interviews (Spanish Program):

With the exception of SPAN 430-433 (Hispanic Readings I-IV), which have as a prerequisite SPAN 320 or 321 (Hispanic Civilization and Culture I and II), language majors are not required to take upper-division literature and culture classes in any particular sequence. Although the content of each of these upper division courses certainly relates to and builds upon that of other courses in the major, it is possible to view them as autonomous units. In addition to this, an imposed sequence inevitably would be a hardship for some majors, given the study abroad requirement and current course rotation schedule.

Nevertheless, faculty members in the Spanish Program have discussed the possibility of creating a new course (*Introduction to Literary Studies*) that would serve as a gateway (and therefore, be a prerequisite) to subsequent literature courses. As it now stands, literature instructors are often obliged to dedicate a great amount of time to the introduction (or for some students, review) of

essential aspects and tools of literary analysis, including research methods; a course of the nature of the one proposed would allow instructors to attain more depth and breadth in the coverage of the literary texts themselves in subsequent literature courses.

In summary, majors rate their acquisition of skills relative to literary and cultural analysis as good or excellent; similarly, syllabi and faculty attest to the fact that these analytical skills are being well covered in our literature courses. Spanish Program faculty would like to examine the feasibility of creating an Introduction to Literary Studies class as a prerequisite to literature courses for majors and perhaps minors as well.

Learning Outcome #4: Majors will demonstrate, both orally and in written form, an understanding and appreciation of significant aspects of the target cultures, including, but not limited to: social conventions, folklore and belief systems, history, fine arts, literature, etc.

Senior Exit Surveys:

In the Senior Exit Survey, students rated the program as “Good” or “Excellent” with respect to its presentation of cultural diversity. When we inquired as to the program’s strengths, one senior wrote: “The incorporation of culture was particularly strong. We learned not only about language but also the people who speak it. In this way I believe culture was a primary focus of this program.” Several seniors chose the Civilization and Culture classes as among those that they found to be the most rewarding courses in the program.

Alumni Surveys:

100% of respondents rated their language program as “Good” or “Excellent” in terms of cultural enrichment; 83% described their program’s ability to foment cultural and historical knowledge as “Good” or “Excellent,” while 92% ranked their program as “Good” or “Excellent” in its efforts to make them more aware of issues of cultural diversity.

Alumni and seniors alike were unanimously positive about their study abroad experiences and the invaluable cultural lessons they took away from their time abroad.

Language Survey:

Students were asked whether their language course(s) had increased their knowledge and appreciation of the cultures where the foreign language is spoken. Students responded positively, with a mean rating of 3.28 on the 4-point Likert scale.

Course Evaluations Analysis:

21% of the total responses in the course evaluation sample attributed course content—specifically its extensiveness, applicability, and cultural content—as related to course satisfaction.

Course Syllabi Review:

A review of course syllabi reveals “Superior” coverage of culture across the board, with a mean rating of 3.96 on a 4-point scale.

Faculty Interviews:

Full-time and adjunct faculty members meet on a yearly basis to discuss common issues and share diverse methodologies and resources, including creative and innovative strategies for incorporating culture into the language classroom and assessing students' knowledge and appreciation of the same. In the Spanish Program, we have established a bank of cultural materials and realia to be shared among all instructors.

In summary, self-report indicators, syllabi, surveys and course evaluations attest to excellent coverage of cultural information and issues of cultural diversity throughout the language programs. Students overwhelmingly indicate that they value the emphasis placed on culture within their language classes, and study abroad participants are extremely positive in their evaluation of this component of the major. Cultural knowledge is often assessed through exams, oral presentations and other assignments; however, there is no standardized assessment measure at this time.

Learning Outcome #5: Majors will produce an original research paper in the target language, using appropriate vocabulary, syntax, grammar, register, and documentation.

Senior Project Review:

The language programs' Senior Project Rubric (*Appendix K*) was used to assess a sample of seven senior projects (See Table 3 below). The rubric was adopted in 2006; therefore, it was applied retroactively to those senior projects that had been submitted prior to that time, with completion dates ranging from 2001 to 2006.

The four main areas of assessment were content, organization, language use, and academic integrity. With relation to content, we see that students' senior theses dealt with noteworthy topics in a creative manner (86% ranked as Excellent or Good). 71% were able to recognize the complexity of factors involved in their project and draw appropriate inferences and conclusions. 57% of these theses were ranked as Excellent or Good at presenting a clear and well-defined thesis, using appropriate scholarly sources and research methodology, and thoroughly analyzing and integrating information. Some improvement also appears to be needed in overall organization and effective transitions, areas in which only 43% were ranked as Excellent or Good. For the most part, ideas remained clear and vivid despite organizational difficulties; with one exception, students appear to have mastered the MLA format and produced a presentable academic paper (88% Excellent/Good). Students excelled in their use of the target language: 100% used a sophisticated lexicon and demonstrated consistent facility with the target language.

In terms of research methods, students are able to successfully use bibliographic resources, but tend to experience difficulties with the incorporation of outside sources (be they primary or secondary) into their own texts. This would seem to be supported by the Alumni Survey, in which only 67% of respondents ranked the ability of their program at fostering competency in research as "Good" or "Excellent." With the newly created Senior Project class, majors will be provided with more detailed instruction in research methods.

Table 3: Results from Senior Project Assessment				
Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	CONTENT:
1	3	2	1	1. Clear and well-defined thesis
3	3	1	0	2. Creative perspective on noteworthy topic
2	3	1	1	3. Recognizes complexity of factors
3	1	3	0	4. Uses scholarly sources/research methodology
1	3	3	0	5. Thoroughly analyzes, evaluates & integrates information
1	4	1	1	6. Concludes and infers appropriately
				ORGANIZATION:
3	0	2	2	7. Well organized
2	2	3	0	8. Clear and vivid ideas
2	1	4	0	9. Smooth and effective sequences/transitions
2	4	0	1	10. Clean, presentable, MLA format
				LANGUAGE USE:
6	1	0	0	11. Consistent facility with target language
6	1	0	0	12. Uses a variety of sentence structures
4	3	0	0	13. Uses sophisticated and precise lexicon
4	3	0	0	14. Free from grammatical or mechanical errors
				BIBLIOGRAPHY:
4	2	1	0	15. Appropriately current sources
4	2	0	1	16. Sources from scholarly journals, books
4	0	3	0	17. Appropriate number of references
4	1	2	0	18. Reference list corresponds with citations
				ACADEMIC INTEGRITY:
3	1	3	0	19. Uses appropriate citations/endnotes
3	3	1	0	20. Paraphrases correctly
6	0	0	1	21. No indication of plagiarism

Faculty Interviews:

There are currently eight students in the Spanish Program who are finishing or have finished coursework for the major and need to complete the senior project in order to graduate. In the past, seniors and alumni have spoken to faculty members about the difficulties inherent to writing their senior project; several expressed a desire for a group class that would provide detailed instruction prior to embarking upon the process, divide the project into a series of stages, and oblige them to meet more short-term deadlines. As a result of these conversations, Spanish Program faculty decided to offer SPAN 499 *Senior Project* as a pilot class (rather than several individual directed studies) in Fall 2007. In the coming years, we will evaluate the success of this course delivery option and attempt to determine whether it was of benefit to the seniors enrolled.

In summary, the senior project review indicates that students are successful in producing creative and often complex monographs on noteworthy topics, but that more attention needs to be paid to certain organizational aspects and the integration of bibliographic sources. Students could benefit

from, and are desirous of, a senior project class with direct instruction to assist them in the preparation of their senior projects.

Other findings:

What follows are findings that we deem important to note, yet do not fall under the heading of our five principal learning outcomes.

Strengths and Weaknesses:

All of the Senior Survey respondents indicated that they would choose the same major, were they to attend college all over again, and that the program had been extremely helpful to them in both their personal and professional lives. 100% of alumni ranked their program as “Good or Excellent” at providing personal and cultural enrichment.

Senior Survey and Alumni Survey respondents identified the following as strengths of their major program: small class size; good communication between students and professors/advisors; the opportunity to voice their opinions; professors’ knowledge, accessibility, support, and choice of course topics. Course curriculum was described as “challenging and relevant.”

Respondents to the Language Student Survey most appreciated that classes were conducted primarily in the target language; that they felt comfortable using the language; and that a variety of learning styles were addressed.

Below are a few comments from the Senior Exit Survey:

“This major is incredibly practical and the program at ULV is very supportive and manageable. The faculty is incredibly approachable and invested in student success. With foreign language acquisition especially, it is important for students to feel comfortable. My success in the program was due to the encouragement and positive feedback I received from faculty.”

“The program was a major consideration in my decision to attend ULV. Although Spanish was not at first my primary course of study, it was something I cared to pursue further throughout my higher education. I would not have attended a university without a foreign language program...I was thrilled with my experience in this program and it comes highly recommended.”

There were no common themes that emerged from the Senior Surveys with regard to their program’s least valuable elements. Among the issues that individual students viewed as weaknesses were the small number of classes offered each semester; the requirement of the Second Language Teaching course; and the inclusion of two research papers in 300-level courses.

Some of the weaknesses as described by individual Alumni Survey respondents included a lack of variety in the available Spanish Program course offerings; a low number of students in classes; and a lack of preparation for senior projects. Two respondents suggested a need/desire for more intercultural exchanges (e.g., with international exchange students), particularly for French and German; one proposed mandatory sessions with a tutor.

On the Language Student Survey, the lowest ranked elements of the program were the ability of their language courses to stimulate interest in majoring or minoring in the program (2.15), and to relate course content to other disciplines (2.74). Language laboratory facilities were also ranked somewhat low (2.73).

Study Abroad:

Both seniors and alumni were unanimous in their praise for the study abroad requirement and their experience abroad. All ranked it as “extremely valuable:” indeed, respondents singled it out as one of the most positive elements in the program, when not in their entire undergraduate academic career, calling it “priceless” and a “rewarding life experience.” Currently enrolled students—82% of whom were taking the course as a General Education requirement—professed that their language courses have increased their interest in study and travel abroad (with a mean rating of 3 on a 4-point scale).

Academic and Career Preparation:

The great majority of seniors and alumni were quite pleased with the preparation they received in the program. Of alumni, 91% ranked their academic preparation and 92% ranked their career preparation as “Good or Excellent.” Twelve of the thirteen Alumni Survey respondents are currently employed outside of the home: exactly half of these are working in the field of education, and nearly half are using their language skills at work or at leisure. As noted previously, 83% of our alumni respondents pursued some kind of post-B.A. education, with 64% of those students pursuing an advanced degree in a graduate program. 100% of seniors similarly indicated that they would be attending graduate school.

VI. Recommendations for Action

1. Create standardized rubrics for oral and written assessment.
2. Investigate alternative oral assessment modes, such as software or Internet-based tools.
3. Consider adding an oral assessment component to graduation requirements for language majors, such as an oral presentation/defense of the senior project before a committee and/or fellow majors.
4. Address the needs of majors in the process of preparing their senior project; to this end, evaluate the success of the newly introduced Spanish 499, Senior Project class (Fall 2007).
5. Create an *Introduction to Literary Studies* course as a core requirement for the Spanish major and a prerequisite for the following literature courses: SPAN 430, 431, 432, and 433.
6. Revise course outlines to reflect the current syllabi, course objectives and learning outcomes, and ensure that course goals, expectations, and policies are clearly communicated to students.
7. Investigate alternate study abroad options.

8. Incorporate innovative multi-media resources into the language classroom and the language laboratory; assess the ways in which the lab is currently used, materials, resources, etc.

Appendix A – Course Instructors (Language Programs)

INSTRUCTOR	RANK	PROGRAM	YRS. W/ DEPT.
Full-time faculty			
Dr. Roswitha Brooks	Professor	German	34
Dr. Gabriela CapraroIU	Assistant Professor	Spanish	01
Dr. Ann Hills	Associate Professor	Spanish	06
Dr. Andrea Labinger	Professor	Spanish	26
Dr. Gerard Lavatori	Professor	French	16
Part-time faculty			
Karen Brunschwig	Part-time Instructor	Spanish	04
Dr. Irene Daniel	Part-time Instructor	German	03
Rafael Fernández	Part-time Instructor	Spanish	01
Dr. Sung-Won Ko	Senior Adjunct	Japanese/ESL	15
Stella Manley	Part-time Instructor	Spanish	04
Ghada Mouawad	Part-time Instructor	French	04
Dr. Jack Swift	Senior Adjunct	Spanish	10

Appendix B – Major Requirements

French – B.A.

Program Chairperson: Gerard Lavatori

Core Requirements:

ANTH 340 Language and Culture, <i>or</i>	
ENG 270 The Foundations of Linguistics	(4)
FREN 210, 211 Intermediate French I, II	(4,4)
FREN 320, 321 French Civilization and Culture I, II	(4,4)
FREN 330 Second Language Teaching	(4)
FREN 430, 431 French Literature I, II	(4,4)
FREN 499 Senior Project	(1-4)

Electives: Additional upper-division French courses to complete 40 semester hours in French. Many of these may be taken abroad.

Study Abroad Requirements: French majors must complete a minimum of one semester in France and select a curriculum that includes at least one course in French Phonetics, Linguistics, or Advanced Syntax.

Comprehensive Examination: The senior comprehensive examination tests language proficiency and reading skills.

German – B.A.

Program Chairperson: Roswitha Brooks

Prerequisites: A minimum of three years of high school German or the following:
GERM 100, 101 Elementary German I, II (4,4)

Core Requirements:

ANTH 340 Language and Culture, <i>or</i>	
ENG 270 The Foundations of Linguistics	(4)
GERM 210, 211 Intermediate German I, II	(4,4)
GERM 320, 321 Advanced German I, II	(4,4)
GERM 330 Second Language Teaching	(4)
GERM 430, 431 German Literature I, II	(4,4)
GERM 499 Senior Project	(1-4)

Electives: Additional upper-division German courses to complete 40 semester hours in German. Many of these may be taken abroad.

Study Abroad Requirements: German majors must complete a year of study in Germany at the university level.

Comprehensive Examination: The senior comprehensive examination tests language proficiency and reading skills.

Spanish – B.A.

Program Chairperson: Ann Hills

Core Requirements:

ANTH 340 Language and Culture, <i>or</i>	
ENG 270 The Foundations of Linguistics	(4)
SPAN 210, 211 Intermediate Spanish I, II	(4,4)
SPAN 320, 321 Hispanic Civilization and Culture I, II	(4,4)
SPAN 330 Second Language Teaching	(4)
<i>Two of the following four:</i>	
SPAN 430, 431, 432, 433 Hispanic Readings	(4,4)
SPAN 499 Senior Project	(1-4)

Electives: Additional upper-division Spanish courses to complete 40 semester hours in Spanish. Many of these may be taken abroad.

Study Abroad Requirements: Spanish majors must supplement their ULV language courses with study in a Spanish-speaking country.

Appendix C – Review of Course Syllabi

TABLE 1: Departmental Goals and Learning Outcomes Covered in Course Syllabi					
Course # Title	F.L. Oral Skills	F.L. Written Skills	Literature	Culture	Research
FREN 100 Elementary French I	4	4	1	4	1
FREN 101 Elementary French II	4	4	1	4	1
FREN 210 Intermediate French I	4	4	3	4	1
FREN 211 Intermediate French II	4	4	3	4	1
FREN 320 French Civilization and Culture I	4	4	4	4	4
FREN 321 French Civilization and Culture II	4	4	4	4	4
FREN/GERM/SPAN 330 Second Language Teaching	2	2	1	2	4
FREN 365 French Literature in Translation	1	2	4	4	4
FREN 420 Commercial French	4	4	1	4	1
FREN 430 French Literature I	4	4	4	4	4
FREN 431 French Literature II	4	4	4	4	4
AVERAGE	3.54	3.64	2.73	3.82	2.64
GERM 100 Elementary German I	4	4	1	4	1
GERM 101 Elementary German II	4	4	1	4	1
GERM 210 Intermediate German I	4	4	3	4	1
GERM 211 Intermediate German II	4	4	3	4	1
GERM 320 Advanced German I	4	4	4	4	4
GERM 321 Advanced German II	4	4	4	4	4
GERM 363 Contemporary German Literature in Translation	1	2	4	4	4
GERM 430 German Literature I	4	4	4	4	4
GERM 431 German Literature II	4	4	4	4	4
AVERAGE	3.67	3.78	3.1	4.0	2.6
JAPN 100 Beginning Japanese I	4	4	1	4	1
JAPN 101 Beginning Japanese II	4	4	1	4	1
JAPN 210 Intermediate Japanese I	4	4	2	4	1
JAPN 211 Intermediate Japanese II	4	4	2	4	1
JAPN 320 Advanced Japanese Grammar and Conversation I	4	4	2	4	3
JAPN 321 Advanced Japanese Grammar and Conversation II	4	4	2	4	3
LIT 375 Modern Asian Literature in Translation	1	1	4	4	4
AVERAGE	3.57	3.57	2.0	4.0	2.0

SPAN 100 Elementary Spanish I	4	4	1	4	1
SPAN 101 Elementary Spanish II	4	4	1	4	1
SPAN 210 Intermediate Spanish I	4	4	3	4	1
SPAN 211 Intermediate Spanish II	4	4	3	4	1
SPAN 314 Spanish Composition & Adv. Grammar	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 320 Hispanic Civilization and Culture I	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 321 Hispanic Civilization and Culture II	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 350 Spanish Translation Workshop	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 361 Mexican Literature in Translation	1	2	4	4	4
SPAN 362 Latin American Literature in Translation	1	2	4	4	4
SPAN 386 Chicano Literature	1	2	4	4	4
SPAN 420 Commercial Spanish	4	4	1	4	1
SPAN 430 Hispanic Readings I	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 431 Hispanic Readings II	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 432 Hispanic Readings III	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 433 Hispanic Readings IV	4	4	4	4	4
AVERAGE	3.44	3.63	3.31	4.00	3.06
MEAN AVERAGES	3.56	3.66	2.78	3.96	2.58

LEGEND		
Score	% Covered	Comments

4	85-100%	Superior
3	70-85%	Good
2	50-70%	Adequate
1	Below 50%	Poor

DESCRIPTION OF GOALS/LEARNING OUTCOMES
For. Lang. Oral Skills: Participate actively in target language conversations in most informal and some formal settings on topics of personal and general interest, using appropriate structures that would be easily comprehensible to a native speaker.
For. Lang. Written Skills: Write routine informal and some formal correspondence in the target language, including narratives, descriptions, and summaries of a factual nature, all of which would be easily comprehensible to a native speaker.
Literature: Demonstrate, both orally and in written form, an understanding of and ability to analyze various literary genres in the target language and cultures.
Culture: Demonstrate, both orally and in written form, an understanding and appreciation of significant aspects of the target cultures, including, but not limited to: social conventions, folklore and belief systems, history, fine arts, literature, etc.
Research: Produce an original research paper in the target language, using appropriate vocabulary, syntax, grammar, register, and documentation.

TABLE 2: General Education Goals* Covered in Course Syllabi

Course # Title	Awareness of Diversity	Critical Thinking	Writing	Information Literacy	Values Orientation
FREN 100 Elementary French I	4	4	4	2	4
FREN 101 Elementary French II	4	4	4	2	4
FREN 210 Intermediate French I	4	4	4	4	4
FREN 211 Intermediate French II	4	4	4	4	4
FREN 320 French Civilization and Culture I	4	4	4	4	4
FREN 321 French Civilization and Culture II	4	4	4	4	4
FREN/GERM/SPAN 330 Second Language Teaching	4	4	4	4	4
FREN 365 French Literature in Translation	4	4	4	4	4
FREN 420 Commercial French	4	4	4	4	4
FREN 430 French Literature I	4	4	4	4	4
FREN 431 French Literature II	4	4	4	4	4
AVERAGE	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.60	4.00
GERM 100 Elementary German I	4	4	4	2	4
GERM 101 Elementary German II	4	4	4	2	4
GERM 210 Intermediate German I	4	4	4	4	4
GERM 211 Intermediate German II	4	4	4	4	4
GERM 320 Advanced German I	4	4	4	4	4
GERM 321 Advanced German II	4	4	4	4	4
GERM 363 Contemporary German Literature in Translation	4	4	4	4	4
GERM 430 German Literature I	4	4	4	4	4
GERM 431 German Literature II	4	4	4	4	4
AVERAGE	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.64	4.00
JAPN 100 Beginning Japanese I	4	4	4	3	4
JAPN 101 Beginning Japanese II	4	4	4	3	4
JAPN 210 Intermediate Japanese I	4	4	4	4	4
JAPN 211 Intermediate Japanese II	4	4	4	4	4
JAPN 320 Advanced Japanese Grammar and Conversation I	4	4	4	4	4
JAPN 321 Advanced Japanese Grammar and Conversation II	4	4	4	4	4
LIT 375 Modern Asian Literature in Translation	4	4	4	4	4
AVERAGE	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.71	4.0
SPAN 100 Elementary Spanish I	4	4	4	2	4
SPAN 101 Elementary Spanish II	4	4	4	2	4
SPAN 210 Intermediate Spanish I	4	4	4	4	4

SPAN 211 Intermediate Spanish II	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 314 Spanish Composition & Adv. Grammar	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 320 Hispanic Civilization and Culture I	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 321 Hispanic Civilization and Culture II	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 350 Spanish Translation Workshop	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 361 Mexican Literature in Translation	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 362 Latin American Literature in Translation	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 386 Chicano Literature	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 420 Commercial Spanish	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 430 Hispanic Readings I	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 431 Hispanic Readings II	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 432 Hispanic Readings III	4	4	4	4	4
SPAN 433 Hispanic Readings IV	4	4	4	4	4
AVERAGE	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.75	4.0
MEAN AVERAGES					
	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.68	4.0

*General Education Goals are classified into two categories: Mission Elements (*Personal Growth, Values Orientation, Community Orientation, Awareness of Diversity, and Sustainability*), and General Competencies (*Writing, Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, and Interdisciplinary Perspective*). The G.E. goals chosen above are those most quantifiable within our programs based on a review of course syllabi; nevertheless, it should be noted that course evaluations reveal that students often make positive remarks regarding other mission elements, such as their sense of personal growth and sense of community as fostered within their language classes.

LEGEND		
Score	% Covered	Comments

4	85-100%	Superior
3	70-85%	Good
2	50-70%	Adequate
1	Below 50%	Poor

DESCRIPTION OF GENERAL EDUCATION GOALS/LEARNING OUTCOMES
Source: Institutional Research & Assessment's General Assessment Reports
Awareness of Diversity: Students will develop an understanding of cultural diversity. (Here, to include the former G.E. goal: <i>International/Intercultural Consciousness</i> : Students will develop an international/intercultural consciousness in which they can appreciate the contributions, the diversity, and the interdependence of the various cultures of the nation and the world.)
Critical Thinking: Students will learn how to think critically and evaluate their own values and the value systems of other persons, groups, and nations.
Writing: Students will learn to write well in the areas of development, organization, and language use.
Information Literacy: Students are competent to search effectively and efficiently for information using library and technical resources.
Values Orientation: Students will question, explore, and nurture their personal values, philosophy, and spiritual beliefs.

Appendix D – Course Rotation Schedule

Courses offered every semester:

SPAN 100 Elementary Spanish I
SPAN 101 Elementary Spanish II
FREN 100 Elementary French I
FREN 101 Elementary French II

Courses offered once per year:

FREN/LIT 365 French Literature in Translation
GERM 100 Elementary German I
GERM 101 Elementary German II
GERM/LIT 363 Contemporary German Literature in Translation
GERM/ESL/FREN/SPAN 330 Second Language Teaching
JAPN 100 Beginning Japanese I
JAPN 101 Beginning Japanese II
LIT 375 Modern Asian Literature
FREN 210 Intermediate French I
FREN 211 Intermediate French II
SPAN 210 Intermediate Spanish I
SPAN 211 Intermediate Spanish II
SPAN 314 Spanish Composition & Advanced Grammar
SPAN 320 Hispanic Civilization and Culture I
SPAN 321 Hispanic Civilization and Culture II
SPAN 430-433 Hispanic Readings I-IV

Courses offered every 2-3 years:

FREN 320 French Civilization and Culture I
FREN 321 French Civilization and Culture II
FREN 420 Commercial French
FREN 430 French Literature I
SPAN 350 Spanish Translation Workshop
SPAN/LIT 361 Mexican Literature in Translation
SPAN/LIT 362 Contemporary Latin American Literature in Translation
SPAN/LIT 386 Chicano Literature
SPAN 420 Commercial Spanish

Courses offered as needed (often as Directed Studies)

FREN 431 French Literature II
GERM 210 Intermediate German I
GERM 211 Intermediate German II
GERM 320, 321, 400, 401, 430, 431
JAPN 210 Intermediate Japanese I
JAPN 211 Intermediate Japanese II

Appendix E – Schedule of Classes, 2006-2007 Academic Year

Course	Instructor	Enrollment
FALL 2006		
FREN 100 Elementary French I (CRN 1664)	Gerard Lavatori	11
FREN 101 Elementary French II (CRN 1665)	Ghada Mouawad	04
FREN 210 Elementary French I (CRN 1666)	Gerard Lavatori	02
FREN 320 French Civilization and Culture (CRN 1667)	Gerard Lavatori	02
FREN 430 French Literature I (CRN 2647) <i>Directed Study</i>	Gerard Lavatori	01
GERM 100 Elementary German I (CRN 1838)	Roswitha Brooks	09
GERM/LIT 363 Contemporary German Lit. in Trans. (CRN 1839)	Roswitha Brooks	11
JAPN 100 Beginning Japanese I (CRN 1830)	Sung-Won Ko	10
JAPN 210 Intermediate Japanese I (CRN 2773) <i>Directed Study</i>	Sung-Won Ko	01
SPAN 100 Elementary Spanish I (CRN 1840)	Gabriela Capraroiu	18
SPAN 100 Elementary Spanish I (CRN 1841)	Ann Hills	21
SPAN 100 Elementary Spanish I (CRN 1842)	Karen Brunschwig	23
SPAN 100 Elementary Spanish I (CRN 1843)	Jack Swift	23
SPAN 100 Elementary Spanish I (CRN 1844)	Rafael Fernandez	19
SPAN 100 Elementary Spanish I (CRN 1845)	Rafael Fernandez	17
SPAN 101 Elementary Spanish II (CRN 1846)	Stella Manley	23
SPAN 101 Elementary Spanish II (CRN 1847)	Jack Swift	20
SPAN 101 Elementary Spanish II (CRN 1848)	Stella Manley	17
SPAN 210 Intermediate Spanish I (CRN 1849)	Karen Brunschwig	08
SPAN 314 Spanish Composition & Adv. Grammar (CRN 1850)	Ann Hills	17
SPAN 320 Hispanic Civilization and Culture (CRN 1851)	Gabriela Capraroiu	10
SPAN/LIT 362 Contemporary Latin American Lit (CRN 1852)	Andrea Labinger	26
SPAN 430 Hispanic Readings I (CRN 1855)	Gabriela Capraroiu	04
JANUARY 2007		
FREN/LIT 365 French Literature in Translation	Gerard Lavatori	30
SPRING 2007		
FREN 100 Elementary French I (CRN 1657)	Ghada Mouawad	08
FREN 101 Elementary French II (CRN 1658)	Gerard Lavatori	10
FREN 321 French Civilization and Culture (CRN 1660)	Gerard Lavatori	03
ESL/FREN/GERM/SPAN 330 2nd Lang. Teaching (CRN 1563)	Gerard Lavatori	09
GERM 101 Elementary German II (CRN 1644)	Irene Daniel	10
SPAN 100 Elementary Spanish I (CRN 1627)	Gabriela Capraroiu	09
SPAN 100 Elementary Spanish I (CRN 1628)	Gabriela Capraroiu	06
SPAN 100 Elementary Spanish I (CRN 1629)	Jack Swift	07
SPAN 100 Elementary Spanish I (CRN 1630)	Gabriela Capraroiu	11
SPAN 101 Elementary Spanish II (CRN 1632)	Stella Manley	18
SPAN 101 Elementary Spanish II (CRN 1634)	Stella Manley	08
SPAN 101 Elementary Spanish II (CRN 1635)	Karen Brunschwig	20
SPAN 101 Elementary Spanish II (CRN 1636)	Jack Swift	24
SPAN 101 Elementary Spanish II (CRN 1637)	Rafael Fernandez	23
SPAN 101 Elementary Spanish II (CRN 1639)	Rafael Fernandez	15

SPAN 101 Elementary Spanish II (CRN 1638)	Ann Hills	23
SPAN 211 Intermediate Spanish II (CRN 1640)	Karen Brunschwig	09
SPAN 321 Hispanic Civilization and Culture (CRN 1641)	Ann Hills	10
SPAN/LIT 361 Mexican Literature in Translation (CRN 1643)	Andrea Labinger	23
SPAN 420 Commercial Spanish (CRN 2004)	Stella Manley	10
SPAN 433 Hispanic Readings IV (CRN 1642)	Andrea Labinger	05

Appendix F – List of Advisees, 2006-2007 Academic Year

Student	ID	Major	Advisor
Robert Gutierrez	10881624	French (CAPA)	Gerard Lavatori/CAPA
Lauren Kimball	10844934	Bus. Admin. (French minor)	Unknown
Whitney Wickham	10275051	French	Gerard Lavatori
Tiffanie Sigal	10855993	Speech Comm. (French minor)	Jeanne Flora
Dustin Sciarotta	10826975	German	Roswitha Brooks
Justine Aguirre-Chavez	10884514	Spanish	Ann Hills
Maria Anguiano	10915216	Spanish (CAPA)	Andrea Labinger
Jazmin Barragan	10968209	Spanish	Unassigned
Irene Beltran	10265239	Spanish	Ann Hills
Nicole Bravo	10887562	Intl Studies (Span minor)	Ann Hills
Seilka Carrazco	10901428	Spanish	Ann Hills
Sara Eazell	10849394	Spanish	Ann Hills
Mariana Gallardo	10843186	Spanish	Ann Hills
Janell Ginter	10884838	Spanish, Speech Comm.	Ann Hills
Eric Gomez	10827983	Spanish	Ann Hills
Gloria Gomez	10822647	Spanish	Andrea Labinger
Karina Guerrero	10256548	Spanish	Ann Hills
Carolina Guillen	10258919	Spanish, Anthropology	Andrea Labinger
Adan Jaime	10884534	Spanish	Ann Hills
Sarah Keagy	10927416	Spanish, Communications	Andrea Labinger
Anthony Lewis	10946888	Communications (Span minor)	Ann Hills
Jazmyne Lewis	10927204	Psychology (Span minor)	Ann Hills
Mariela Manriquez	10286777	Spanish, Intl Bus & Lang	Ann Hills
Krystle Martinez	10887584	Political Science (Span minor)	Ann Hills
Guadalupe Medina-Felix	10915212	Spanish (CAPA)	Ann Hills
Sarah Miller	10257399	English	Ann Hills
Lauren Moon	10824740	Spanish, Political Science	Ann Hills, G. Amini
Sabrina Mora	10843260	Intl Bus & Lang (Span minor)	Ann Hills
Karina Ortiz	10850671	Communications (Span minor)	Ann Hills
Joshua Pells	10976298	Spanish	Ann Hills
Rocio Rodriguez	10845772	Spanish, Psychology	Ann Hills
Daisy Serrano	10887645	Criminology (Span minor)	Ann Hills
Norma Serrano	10850460	Spanish	Andrea Labinger
Tracy Spicer	10272842	Spanish	Ann Hills
Maricela Tapia	10106075	Spanish, Psychology	Ann Hills, L. Arellano
Hugo Toledo	10901674	Spanish	Andrea Labinger
Ruben Trujillo	10822751	Spanish	Ann Hills
Fernando Vallin	10850485	Spanish	Ann Hills

Appendix G – Senior Exit Survey

COVER LETTER:

May 20, 2007

Dear Seniors,

We hope this letter finds you well. The Department of Modern Languages of the University of La Verne is currently conducting a review of our French, German, and Spanish language programs. We consider input from our exiting seniors to be an important part of this review, and therefore would greatly value your opinions and comments regarding the language program in which you majored or minored.

Your responses to this survey will help us to determine how to improve our programs and services. All responses are *confidential* and will be used for internal research purposes only.

We would appreciate receiving your survey responses by Friday, June 22, 2007. You may return a hard copy of the survey to your language professor or to the mailbox of Dr. Ann Hills (Humanities Office). All respondents will be automatically entered into a raffle for a \$25 gift certificate for *Chili's Restaurant & Bar* (see below).

If you have any questions or concerns with regard to this survey or the program review process, please contact Dr. Ann Hills at (909) 593-3511, extension 4367, or hillsa@ulv.edu.

We thank you in advance for your time!

Best regards,

Ann K. Hills
Chair, Department of Modern Languages
Associate Professor of Spanish

Please detach below dotted line and return with survey

Yes, I have completed the Modern Languages Alumni Survey and would like to be entered in the raffle for a Chili's \$25 Gift Certificate!

Name _____

If I win, please contact me by phone e-mail at: _____

DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES
SENIOR EXIT SURVEY

1. In what year will/did you graduate from ULV? _____
2. From which program will/did you receive your major or minor?
 - French (major minor International Business and Language)
 - German Program (major minor International Business and Language)
 - Spanish Program (major minor International Business and Language)
3. If you were a language major, did you have a double major?
 - Yes (If so, please specify second major: _____)
 - No
4. If you were a language major, did you have a minor?
 - Yes (If so, please specify minor: _____)
 - No
5. What were your language skills upon entering ULV?
 - No previous knowledge of the language studied
 - Some basic knowledge of the language studied
 - Good knowledge of the language studied with some room for improvement
 - Already perfectly fluent and literate in the language studied
6. How did your courses in your major at ULV help you improve your language skills in the language studied?
 - No improvement
 - Some improvement
 - Much improvement
7. At what point did you decide to major/minor in a language?
 - Prior to entering ULV
 - After entering ULV but prior to taking a language course
 - After taking a language course
8. Were you a first generation college student?
 - Yes
 - No
9. What is/are your ethnicity/ethnicities? _____

10. What is your gender? _____

Academic and Professional Experiences After ULV

11. Will you pursue further education after receiving your Bachelor's degree? (If YES, please continue to question #11. If NO, go to question #13.)

- Yes
- No

12. Which type of institution will you attend?

- Graduate School
- Professional School
- Community College
- Other: _____

13. If you will be attending graduate school,

what degree will you be pursuing? _____
 within what program? _____
 at which university? _____

For the following questions, "program" refers to the ULV language program in which you majored or minored.

14. How would you rate your program in terms of providing you with personal and cultural enrichment?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

15. How would you rate your program in terms of its presentation of cultural diversity?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

16. Are you currently employed or will you be employed after graduation?

- Yes If so, please specify profession(s): _____
- No

17. Are you currently or will you be working in a field in some way related to your program?

- Yes

- No

18. With what frequency do you use or will you expect to use your foreign language skills at work?

- On a daily or weekly basis
- Occasionally
- Rarely
- Never
- N/A (not employed)

19. With what frequency do you use your foreign language skills outside of work (e.g., at home, volunteer or recreational activities, etc.)?

- On a daily or weekly basis
- Occasionally
- Rarely
- Never

20. Would you recommend your program to a friend or family member?

- Yes
- No If not, why not? _____

21. If you had to attend college all over again, would you major/minor in the same language program?

- Yes
- No If not, why not? _____

22. Overall, have the knowledge you acquired and experiences you had as a result of your involvement in the program been helpful to you, directly or indirectly, in your personal and/or professional life?

- Yes
- No

Please comment: _____

Academic Experiences at ULV

23. Please rate your program's ability to foster competency in the following skill or content areas.

Skill/Content Area	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A
Second Language Acquisition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Oral Communication	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Written Communication	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reading Comprehension	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Literary and Cultural Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public Speaking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Critical Thinking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Creative Thinking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cultural/Historical Knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Awareness of Issues of Cultural Diversity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

24. If you studied abroad, how would you describe your experience?

- Extremely valuable
- Somewhat valuable
- Not very valuable
- Not at all valuable
- N/A (Did not study abroad)

25. If you studied abroad, in which country did you study? _____

26. Please indicate what you consider to have been the strengths and/or most valuable elements of your program:

27. Please indicate what you consider to have been the weaknesses and/or least valuable elements of your program:

28. Which course(s) did you find to be the most valuable?

Academic Advising

29. Was your primary advisor your foreign language professor? Yes No.

30. How often did you consult with your language advisor?

- Every semester
- Once a year
- Only occasionally
- Never If never, why not? _____

31. How would you rate the advice and guidance you received from your language advisor?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- N/A (e.g., Didn't work with an advisor)

32. Please provide us with any general comments you would like to make (e.g., positive or negative remarks, suggestions for improving the program, etc.):

Thank you! ¡Gracias! Merci! Danke!

Appendix H – Alumni Survey

COVER LETTER:

May 14, 2007

Dear Alumni,

We hope this letter finds you well. The Department of Modern Languages of the University of La Verne is currently conducting a review of our French, German, and Spanish language programs. We consider input from our alumni to be an important part of this review, and therefore would greatly value your opinions and comments regarding the language program in which you majored or minored, as well as your experiences since leaving ULV.

Your responses to this survey will help us to determine how to improve our programs and services. All responses are *confidential* and will be used for internal research purposes only.

We would appreciate receiving your survey responses by Friday, May 25, 2007. Please return the survey in the pre-addressed envelope that we have provided for you. All respondents will be automatically entered into a raffle for a \$25 gift certificate for Chili's Restaurant & Bar.

If you have any questions or concerns with regard to this survey or the program review process, please contact Dr. Ann Hills at (909) 593-3511, extension 4367, or hillsa@ulv.edu.

We thank you in advance for your time!

Best regards,

Ann K. Hills
Chair, Department of Modern Languages
Associate Professor of Spanish

Please detach below dotted line and return with survey

Yes, I have completed the Modern Languages Alumni Survey and would like to be entered in the raffle for a Chili's \$25 Gift Certificate!

Name _____

If I win, please contact me by phone e-mail at: _____

DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES
ALUMNI SURVEY

1. In what year did you graduate from ULV? _____
2. From which program did you receive your major or minor?
 - French Program (major minor)
 - German Program (major minor)
 - Spanish Program (major minor)
3. If you were a language major, did you have a double major?
 - Yes (If so, please specify second major: _____)
 - No
4. If you were a language major, did you have a minor?
 - Yes (If so, please specify minor: _____)
 - No
5. What was your status upon entering ULV?
 - Freshman
 - Transfer Student
6. Were you a CAPA student?
 - Yes
 - No
7. Were you a first generation college student?
 - Yes
 - No
8. What is/are your ethnicity/ethnicities? _____
9. What is your gender? _____

Academic and Professional Experiences After ULV

10. Did you pursue further education after receiving your B.A.? (If YES, please continue to question #11. If NO, go to question #14.)
 - Yes

- No

11. Which type of institution did you attend or are you currently attending?

- Graduate School
- Professional School
- Community College
- Other: _____

12. If you attended or are currently attending graduate school,

what degree did you receive/are you pursuing? _____
within what program? _____
at which university? _____

For the following questions, "program" refers to the ULV language program in which you majored or minored.

13. How would you rate your program in terms of preparation for further education?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

14. How would you rate your program in terms of preparation for a career?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

15. How would you rate your program in terms of providing you with personal and cultural enrichment?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

16. Are you are currently employed or have you been employed since graduation?

- Yes If so, please specify profession(s): _____
- No

17. Have you worked or are you currently working in a field in some way related to your program?

- Yes
- No

18. With what frequency do you use your foreign language skills at work?

- On a daily or weekly basis
- Occasionally
- Rarely
- Never
- N/A (not employed)

19. With what frequency do you use your foreign language skills outside of work (e.g., at home, volunteer or recreational activities, etc.)?

- On a daily or weekly basis
- Occasionally
- Rarely
- Never

20. Would you recommend your program to a friend or family member?

- Yes
- No If not, why not? _____

21. If you had to attend college all over again, would you major/minor in the same language program?

- Yes
- No If not, why not? _____

22. Overall, have the knowledge you acquired and experiences you had as a result of your involvement in the program been helpful to you, directly or indirectly, in your personal and/or professional life?

- Yes
- No

Please comment: _____

Academic Experiences at ULV

23. Please rate your program's ability to foster competency in the following skill or content areas.

Skill/Content Area	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A
Second Language Acquisition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Oral Communication	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Written Communication	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reading Comprehension	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Literary and Cultural Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public Speaking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Critical Thinking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Creative Thinking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cultural/Historical Knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Awareness of Issues of Cultural Diversity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

24. If you studied abroad, how would you describe your experience?

- Extremely valuable
- Somewhat valuable
- Not very valuable
- Not at all valuable
- N/A (Did not study abroad)

25. If you studied abroad, in which country did you study? _____

26. Please indicate what you consider to have been the strengths and/or most valuable elements of your program:

27. Please indicate what you consider to have been the weaknesses and/or least valuable elements of your program:

28. If you can recall, which course(s) did you find to be the most valuable?

Academic Advising

29. With what frequency did you consult your language advisor?

- Every semester
- Once a year
- Only occasionally
- Never If never, why not? _____

30. How would you rate the advice and guidance you received from your language advisor?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- N/A (e.g., Didn't work with a language advisor)

31. Please provide us with any general comments you would like to make (e.g., positive or negative remarks, suggestions for improving the program, etc.):

Thank you! ¡Gracias! Merci! Danke!

Data from Alumni Surveys

Table 5: Department of Modern Languages alumni survey background information.

Background Information	n	%
Year of graduation		
1992-1999	6	50
2000-2007	6	50
Total	12	100
Major		
French	3	25
Spanish	9	75
Total	12	100
Were you a double major?		
No	11	92
Yes (Business Admin.)	1	8
Total	12	100
If major, did you have a minor?		
No	10	83
Yes (CIS, Education)	2	17
Total	12	100
Entry Status		
Freshman	9	75
Transfer (CAPA)	3	25
Total	12	100
First generation college student		
No	3	25
Yes	9	75
Total	12	100
Ethnic Background		
Asian American	1	8
Caucasian	4	34
Latino/Hispanic American	7	58
Total	12	100
Gender		
Woman	9	75
Man	3	25
Total	12	100
Further education after B.A.		
No	2	17
Yes	10	83
Total	12	100
Type of current school attending		
Graduate school	7	64
Professional school	1	9
Other	3	27
Total	11	100
Further degree pursuing/obtained		
MA	6	60

Teaching Credential	3	30
MBA	1	10
Total	10	100

(List of Universities: USD, Cal State Northridge, Cal Poly Pomona. ULV, Cornell, Biola, UCLA, Metropolitan College of Denver, Miami University)

Table 6: Department of Modern Languages alumni survey responses to questions related to employment, use of skills, and general satisfaction.

Items	n	%
1. Are you currently employed or have been employed since graduation?		
Yes	12	100
2. Have you worked or are you currently working in a field in some way related to your program?		
No	2	17
Yes	10	83
Total	12	100
3. With what frequency do you use your foreign language skills at work?		
Rarely	3	25
Occasionally	2	17
On a daily or weekly basis	7	58
Total	12	100
4. With what frequency do you use your foreign language skills outside of work?		
Rarely	1	8
Occasionally	5	42
On a daily or weekly basis	6	50
Total	12	100
5. Would you recommend your program to a friend or family member?		
No	1	8
Yes	11	92
Total	12	100
6. If you had to attend college all over again would you major/minor in the same language?		
Yes	12	100
7. Has the knowledge you acquired been helpful		

directly/indirectly in your personal/professional life?

Yes

12

100

Notes:

- Most of the responding alumni appear to be satisfied with their preparation, about half are using their language skills at work or at leisure, and are working in related areas

Table 7: Department of Modern Languages alumni survey responses to questions of learning outcomes (rated on a 4-point scale: 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=excellent).

Learning Outcome	total number responding	% good/excellent
1. Preparation for further education	11	91
2. Preparation for career	12	92
3. Provided personal and cultural enrichment	12	100
4. Second language acquisition	10	90
5. Oral communication	12	100
6. Written communication	12	83
7. Reading comprehension	12	92
8. Literary and cultural analysis	12	100
9. Public speaking	12	67
10. Critical thinking	12	83
11. Creative thinking	12	83
12. Research	12	67
13. Cultural/Historical Knowledge	12	83
14. Awareness of issues of cultural diversity	12	92

Notes:

- More alumni who responded indicate that they had good or excellent preparation in oral communication, literary and cultural analysis, awareness of cultural diversity, and preparation for career and further education
- Areas that need attention are public speaking, research, creative and critical thinking

Appendix I – Language Student Survey

Department of Modern Languages Survey No Names, Please!

Today's Date _____ Language Studied _____

Please mark the response that most closely reflects your opinion.

I. Personal Information:

Year in college: FR SO JR SR

This class fulfills a requirement for my:

Major ___ Minor ___ G.E. ___ Electives ___ Certificate ___ Other (specify) _____

II. Previous Foreign Language Study (indicate how long):

High school _____ Community College/Other University _____ ULV _____

I speak this language at home: Yes _____ No _____

I have lived in a country where this language is spoken: Yes _____ No _____

III. Language Study at ULV: The following questions refer to your foreign language studies *at ULV only*.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Courses in this language have:				
1. helped improve my overall fluency.	1	2	3	4
2. increased my knowledge of the culture(s) where it is spoken.	1	2	3	4
3. helped me see relationships between my own culture and others.	1	2	3	4
4. increased my interest in study/travel abroad.	1	2	3	4
5. increased my interest in majoring or minoring in the language.	1	2	3	4
6. been primarily conducted in the foreign language.	1	2	3	4
7. helped me improve my oral comprehension.	1	2	3	4
8. helped me improve my speaking skills.	1	2	3	4
9. helped me improve my reading skills.	1	2	3	4

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
10. helped me improve my writing skills.	1	2	3	4
11. addressed different learning styles.	1	2	3	4
12. made me feel comfortable using the language.	1	2	3	4
13. The language lab at ULV is adequately equipped for my study needs.	1	2	3	4
14. There are enough language classes to meet my needs and schedule.	1	2	3	4
15. Content covered in foreign language classes has related to other disciplines I study.	1	2	3	4
16. Studying a foreign language has improved my knowledge of English grammar and vocabulary.	1	2	3	4

Comments: _____

IV. Recommendations

In my language classes, I would like more emphasis on:

15. Grammar	1	2	3	4
16. Oral practice	1	2	3	4
17. Writing	1	2	3	4
18. Culture	1	2	3	4
19. Literature	1	2	3	4
20. Extra-curricular cultural activities	1	2	3	4

21. Please comment on those aspects of your experience in the foreign language program at ULV that have been least satisfactory to you, mentioning any improvements you would suggest.

22. Please comment on those aspects of the foreign language program at ULV that have been most satisfactory to you. _____

Results from Language Student Survey

Table 1: Language Studies student information.

Student Information	n	%
Language Studies		
Spanish	121	94
French	8	6
Total	129	100
Year in College		
Freshman	59	45
Sophomore	29	22
Junior	30	23
Senior	12	9
Total	130	99
Class fulfills which requirement		
Major	9	7
Minor	8	6
G.E.	106	82
Elective	6	5
Other	1	1
Total	130	101
Previous foreign language in years in high school		
0.0	10	9
1.0	3	3
2.0	38	33
3.0	53	46
4.0	11	10
Total	115	100
Previous foreign language in years at another college		
0.0	100	94
1.0	5	5
2.0	1	1
Total	106	100
Previous foreign languages at ULV		
0.0	63	58
1.0	35	32
2.0	7	7
3.0	3	2
Total	108	99
Speak/study language at home		
Yes	18	15
No	105	85
Total	123	100
Lived in country where study language is spoken		
Yes	10	8
No	116	91
Total	126	99

Table 2: Department of Modern Languages student survey responses to learning outcomes (4-point Likert scale with 4 = strongly agree).

Learning Outcome	n	Mean	SD
1. Helped improve my overall <i>fluency</i>	130	3.25	.56
2. Increased my knowledge of the culture where it is spoken	130	3.28	.56
3. Helped me see relationships between my own culture and others	130	2.97	.74
4. Helped me improve my oral comprehension	130	3.33	.63
5. Helped me improve my speaking skills	130	3.28	.63
6. Helped me improve my reading skills	130	3.29	.63
7. Helped me improve my writing skills	130	3.21	.70
8. Studying a foreign language has improved my knowledge of English grammar and vocabulary	130	2.58	.82

Notes:

- Strengths are improvements in oral, speaking and reading skills, and overall fluency.
- Areas that need attention are improving knowledge of English grammar and vocabulary, and seeing relationships between own and other cultures

Table 3: Department of Modern Languages student survey responses to program issues (4-point Likert scale with 4 = strongly agree).

Program Issues	n	Mean	SD
1. Increased my interest in study/travel abroad	129	3.06	.83
2. Increased my interest in majoring or minoring in the language	130	2.15	.92
3. Been primarily conducted in the foreign language	130	3.10	.72
4. Addressed different learning styles	130	2.96	.65
5. Made me feel comfortable using the language	129	2.97	.73
6. Language lab at ULV is adequately equipped for my study needs	128	2.73	.83
7. There are enough language classes to meet my needs	129	2.82	.75
8. Content covered in foreign language classes relate to other disciplines	129	2.74	.73

Notes:

- Areas of program strengths are in conducting classes primarily in the foreign language, increased interest in study and travel abroad, feeling comfortable using the language, and addressing different learning styles
- Areas of the program that need attention are in increasing interest in majoring or minoring in the languages, the need for better lab equipment, and content relating to other disciplines

Table 4: Department of Modern Languages student survey responses to the question, “In my language classes, I would like more emphasis on ...” (4-point Likert scale with 4 = strongly agree).

Area of More Emphasis	n	Mean	SD
1. Grammar	129	2.85	.75
2. Oral Practice	129	3.11	.79
3. Writing	129	2.98	.74
4. Culture	128	2.67	.90
5. Literature	129	2.52	.86
6. Extra-curricular cultural activities	128	2.88	.86

Notes:

- Students appear to be asking for more emphasis in oral practice, writing and grammar, and not as much emphasis on literature and culture

Appendix J – Course Evaluation Content Analysis

Modern Languages Department
Course Evaluations Content Analysis

Cindy Rollins, M.S. and Shanna Treworgy
Psy.D. Research Assistants

University of La Verne

February 27, 2007

Method and Procedure

The open-ended responses of student evaluations of 95 courses in the Department of Modern Languages between Fall 2004 and Spring 2006 were content analyzed. The numbers of courses from each language area were as follows:

53 Spanish lower division courses
16 Spanish upper division courses

9 French lower division courses
4 French upper division courses

7 Japanese lower division courses
1 Japanese upper division course

4 German lower division courses
1 German upper division course

The number of respondents in each course varied from 1 to 17. Depending on the number of respondents, 1 or 3 responses were randomly selected from each of the open-ended questions from each course. Altogether 643 separate thematic comments and observations were identified, which were then grouped into positive and negative categories about the course itself and about the attributes of the instructor. The content analysis did not disaggregate the different language areas. The frequencies and percentages of the different themes are summarized in accompanying tables. The information in each table includes percentages within the category.

Summary of Findings

Overall, 77% of the 643 thematic comments and observations expressed positive experiences with the courses and professor, and 23% expressed negative experiences (Table 1). In addition, 28% of the total responses attributed the professor's personality traits such as passionate, helpful, positive, caring, clear, organized, and knowledgeable to course satisfaction. The most positive characteristics regarding the course content and atmosphere (21% of total responses) included extensiveness, applicability, and cultural content as well as "a comfortable, fun, and interactive" learning environment in which a wide variety of teaching techniques were used.

When asked how the course or teaching attributes could be improved, one fifth of the responses indicated, "Change nothing". Also, 11% of the responses suggested increase professor clarity and professor expectations regarding the understanding of course assignments, tests, deadlines as well as slow down teaching pace.

Table 1

Percentage of **positive** and **negative** themes in the evaluation of courses in the Modern Language Department program at the University of La Verne.

	<i>n</i>	Total %
Negative	145	23
Positive	498	77
Total	643	100

Note. Of the total responses, more than three quarters were positive.

Table 2

Percentage of **positive** themes related to the **satisfactory aspects of the course** in the evaluations of the Modern Languages Department at the University of La Verne

Themes	# of Responses	%	% of Grand Total
Course content was extensive, built on previous material, applicable, and cultural	56	21	9
Comfortable, fun, and interactive learning environment, teacher engaged students and encouraged participation	49	19	8
Learned a great deal, increased language skills	47	18	7
Varied teaching techniques: lecture, oral activities, films, group work, readings, presentations	27	10	4
Professor's teaching style was effective, clear, and understandable and well organized	22	9	3
Professor was available, approachable, caring, encouraging, helpful	18	7	3
Workload and course pace was manageable, assignments were appropriate	15	6	2
Professor was fun and patient and possessed positive and pleasant attitude	14	5	2
Professor was knowledgeable and passionate about course material	14	5	2

Total	262	100	41
-------	-----	-----	----

Note. The main themes (39 % of responses) attributed course content, specifically its extensiveness, applicability, and cultural content, as related to course satisfaction. Themes related to learning environment (37% of responses) included a comfortable, fun, and interactive learning environment in which a wide variety of teaching techniques were used. Themes related to professor qualities (25%) included the professor maintaining a positive, caring, and helpful attitude while being clear, organized, and knowledgeable of course content.

Table 3

Percentage of themes related to the **suggested course improvement** in the evaluations of the Modern Languages Department at the University of La Verne

Themes	# of Responses	%	% of Grand Total
Change nothing, course was fun, helpful, and clear	75	45	12
Improve course structure: clarify exam schedule, homework assignments, due dates, and expectations. Increase quizzes and homework	19	11	3
Slower pace, increase review and explanation of material, increase use of English	18	11	3
Increase variety of teaching methods including: increase use of videos, PowerPoint, group activities, and decrease presentations	15	9	2
Increase oral work including vocabulary, grammar, tests, and presentations. Improve quality of labs	14	9	2
Improve assignments: use better texts and workbooks, decrease reading and workbook work, increase writing assignments, decrease busy work	12	7	2
Professor should increase support, encouragement, personal attention, and availability to students	7	4	1
Professor needs to increase student attention, participation, and make course more enjoyable	6	4	1
Total	166	100	26

Note. Nearly 45% of responses stated “change nothing,” indicating satisfaction with the course. The second major theme (25% of responses) indicated a desire for an increase in variety of teaching methods, increase in oral practice, and improvement in assignments. Another 19% of responses suggested professors slow their teaching pace, increase their use of English during class, and increase student participation and student support.

Table 4

Percentage of **positive** themes related to the **satisfactory teaching attributes** in the evaluations of courses in the Modern Languages Department at the University of La Verne.

Themes	# of Responses	%	% of Grand Total
Professor was friendly, nice, kind and cared about the students	22	19	3
Professor was very approachable, available and helpful	18	16	3
Professor was enthusiastic, energetic, and passionate about course material	17	15	3
Professor created a positive learning Environment and motivated students	14	12	2
Professor was knowledgeable including possessing cultural knowledge	12	11	2
Professor used various teaching techniques (games, videos, texts, oral presentations, discussions, visual aids, stories, lectures)	12	11	2
Professor thoroughly covered and explained course material	10	9	2
Professor promoted class interaction and participation	8	7	1
Total	113	100	18

Note. The main themes (61% of responses) attributed professor personality traits such as friendly, passionate, helpful and knowledgeable as related to teaching satisfaction. Additionally, themes related to instructor teaching style (30% of responses) included using various teaching techniques and creating an atmosphere that fosters class interaction and motivates students.

Table 5

Percentage themes related to **improving teaching effectiveness** in the evaluations of courses in the Modern Language Department at the University of La Verne.

Themes	# of Responses	%	% of Grand Total
Change nothing, very satisfied with current teaching/course	48	47	7
Increase communication with students regarding test expectations, assignments, deadlines and individual student progress	20	20	3

Professor should talk slower, speak more clearly and slow down teaching pace	14	14	2
Increase verbal, oral and grammatical practice/exercises during class	8	8	1
Professor should be more patient and understanding of students	7	7	1
Professor should use English or increase use of English during class	5	5	1
Total	102	100	16

Note. Almost 50% of the responses stated “change nothing,” indicating satisfaction with the current teaching of the course. The second major theme was for increased professor clarity regarding the understanding of course assignments, tests, and deadlines as well as increased personal communication regarding student progress. Additionally, two themes (19 % of the responses) suggested professors slow their speech and teaching pace but increase their use of English during class.

Appendix K – Senior Project Rubric

DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES SENIOR PROJECT RUBRIC

Student:	Semester:
Senior Project Title:	Committee members:
Advisor:	
Date:	

RATING SCALE:

1= Excellent	2= Good	3= Fair	4= Poor
--------------	---------	---------	---------

The evaluated senior project . . .

A. Content

1	2	3	4	1. Has a clear and well-defined thesis
1	2	3	4	2. Represents a creative perspective on a noteworthy topic
1	2	3	4	3. Recognizes the complexity of the factors involved
1	2	3	4	4. Uses scholarly sources and appropriate research methodology
1	2	3	4	5. Thoroughly analyzes, evaluates and integrates information
1	2	3	4	6. Concludes and infers appropriately

B. Organization

1	2	3	4	7. Is well-organized
1	2	3	4	8. Presents clear and vivid ideas
1	2	3	4	9. Has smooth and effective sequences/transitions
1	2	3	4	10. Is clean, presentable, and formatted according to the <i>MLA Guidelines</i>

C. Language Use

1	2	3	4	11. Displays consistent facility with the target language
1	2	3	4	12. Uses a variety of sentence structures, from simple to complex
1	2	3	4	13. Uses sophisticated and precise lexicon
1	2	3	4	14. Is free from grammatical or mechanical errors

D. Bibliography

1	2	3	4	15. Uses sources that are, in the majority, appropriately current
1	2	3	4	16. Uses sources from scholarly journals, books, or appropriate exceptions
1	2	3	4	17. Has a reasonable and appropriate number of references
1	2	3	4	18. Has a reference list that corresponds with citations

E. Academic Integrity

1	2	3	4	19. Uses appropriate citations and/or endnotes
1	2	3	4	20. Paraphrases correctly
1	2	3	4	21. Demonstrates no indication of plagiarism

Appendix L – Oral Assessment Rubrics

	4	3	2	1
Content:	Complete	Generally Complete	Somewhat Complete	Incomplete
	Speaker consistently uses the appropriate functions and vocabulary necessary to communicate.	Speaker usually uses the appropriate functions and vocabulary necessary to communicate.	Speaker sometimes uses the appropriate functions and vocabulary necessary to communicate.	Speaker uses few of the appropriate functions and vocabulary necessary to communicate.
Comprehension:	Total Comprehension	Generally Comprehension	Moderate Comprehension	Little Comprehension
	Speaker understands all of what is said to him or her.	Speaker understands most of what is said to him or her.	Speaker understands some of what is said to him or her.	Speaker understands little of what is said to him or her.
Comprehensibility:	Comprehensible	Usually Comprehensible	Sometimes Comprehensible	Seldom Comprehensible
	Listener always understands what the speaker is trying to communicate.	Listener understands most of what the speaker is trying to communicate.	Listener understands less than half of what the speaker is trying to communicate.	Listener understands little of what the speaker is trying to communicate.
Accuracy:	Accurate	Good Effort	Moderate Effort	Minimal Effort
	Speaker uses grammar, vocabulary, and functions correctly.	Speaker usually uses grammar, vocabulary, and functions correctly.	Speaker has some problems with language usage.	Speaker makes many errors in language usage.
Fluency:	Excellent Effort	Good Effort	Moderate Effort	Minimal Effort
	Speaker speaks clearly without hesitation. Pronunciation and intonation sound natural.	Speaker has few problems with hesitation, pronunciation and/or intonation.	Speaker has some problems with hesitation, pronunciation, and/or intonation.	Speaker hesitates frequently and struggles with pronunciation and intonation.

Analytic Rubric for Oral Performance

Task Completion

1. Minimal completion of the task and/or responses frequently inappropriate
2. Partial completion of the task, responses mostly appropriate yet undeveloped
3. Completion of the task, responses appropriate and adequately developed
4. Superior completion of the task, responses appropriate and with elaboration

Comprehensibility

1. Responses barely comprehensible
2. Responses mostly comprehensible, requiring some interpretation on the part of the listener
3. Responses comprehensible, requiring minimal interpretation on the part of the listener
4. Responses readily comprehensible, requiring no interpretation on the part of the listener

Fluency

1. Speech halting and uneven with long pauses and/or incomplete thoughts
2. Speech choppy and/or slow with frequent pauses, few or no incomplete thoughts
3. Some hesitation, but manages to continue and complete thoughts
4. Speech continuous with few pauses and stumbling

Pronunciation

1. Frequently interferes with communication
2. Occasionally interferes with communication
3. Does not interfere with communication
4. Enhances communication

Vocabulary

1. Inadequate and/or inaccurate use of vocabulary
2. Somewhat inadequate and/or inaccurate use of vocabulary
3. Adequate and accurate use of vocabulary
4. Rich use of vocabulary

Grammar

1. Inadequate and/or inaccurate use of basic language structures
2. Emerging use of basic language structures
3. Emerging control of basic language structures
4. Control of basic language structures

Fairfax County Public Schools - PALS Performance Assessment for Language Students, 1999

Holistic Rubric for Oral Assessment

An "A" student:

- o Makes minimal errors.
- o Uses rich and varied vocabulary.
- o Speaks with excellent pronunciation.

- o Speaks smoothly without stopping.
- o Uses a variety of sentence structures.

A "B" student:

- o Demonstrates competence, but makes some errors.
- o Makes only minor errors that do not interfere seriously with communication.
- o Uses a broad range of vocabulary.
- o Has good pronunciation.

A "C" student:

- o Demonstrates competence, but makes frequent errors.
- o Probably would not be entirely understood by a native speaker.
- o Speaks with mediocre pronunciation.
- o Hesitates when speaking, but shows an awareness of correct usage by self-correcting.

A "D" student:

- o Makes so many errors that he/she cannot be understood.
- o Hesitates often.
- o Pronounces the language poorly.
- o Uses English occasionally.
- o Has major weaknesses in grammar and pronunciation.

An "F" student:

- o Makes no attempt to speak or is completely incomprehensible.
- o Has weak vocabulary and/or uses primarily English to respond.
- o Did not respond appropriately for the task assigned.

Michael Blaz. {mdblaz@juno.com} "Oral Assessment." {FLTEACH@LISTSERV.ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU} August 8, 2000.

Appendix M – Writing Rubric Samples

RÚBRICA PARA LA EVALUACIÓN DE COMPOSICIONES (de Proceso y síntesis, 20 edición)

Ideas	
30-27 Excelente B Muy bien	Tesis interesante y clara. Un ensayo bien pensado con una tesis clara y bien desarrollada. Incluye detalles específicos y bien seleccionados que apoyan la tesis.
26-22 Bueno B Adecuado	Ideas interesantes, en general, pero podría explorar más profundamente el tema. Desarrollo adecuado, aunque algunas ideas pueden estar mal apoyadas o no tienen una relación clara con la tesis.
21-17 Más o menos B Le falta	Tesis poco clara, o que no presenta una opinión o idea debatible. El tema ha sido explorado sólo superficialmente y desarrollado a medias, con muchas ideas sin apoyo o irrelevantes.
16-13 Necesita mucho trabajo	Ideas superficiales y/o no interesantes, con poco desarrollo. O no hay suficiente material para poder evaluar el texto.
Organización	
20-18 Excelente B Muy bien	La información se presenta de manera lógica y clara. Todos los párrafos están bien estructurados, con una oración temática que introduce una idea y que se desarrolla dentro del párrafo. Todas las ideas están vinculadas a la tesis.
17-14 Buena -- Adecuada	Los párrafos están bien estructurados y en general presentan ideas que están vinculadas a la tesis. La secuencia de ideas no queda clara a veces y puede parecer desconectada. Las transiciones son a veces bruscas. El lector puede tener algunas dificultades en seguir la corriente de ideas.
13-10 Más o menos B Le falta	Ideas confusas o incongruentes. Algunos párrafos mal estructurados, sin oraciones temáticas o con varias ideas mezcladas. Con frecuencia, es difícil comprender la conexión con la tesis y el mensaje que se trata de comunicar.
9-7 Necesita mucho trabajo	Organización lógica inexistente. Una Aensalada@ de ideas. O no hay suficiente material para poder evaluar el texto.

Gramática	
25-22 Excelente B Muy bien	Una amplia variedad de estructuras, con pocos errores que no dificultan la comprensión.
21-18 Buena -- Adecuada	Buen uso de estructuras, pero con poca variedad; tiende a usar construcciones simples, con algunos errores graves y otros menores, pero todavía se entiende.
17-11 Más o menos B Le falta	Uso limitado de estructuras, con un control inconsistente, errores frecuentes, especialmente con construcciones complejas donde emplea estructuras del inglés. El significado es, con frecuencia, difícil de comprender.
10-5 Necesita mucho trabajo	Frecuentes y persistentes errores de la gramática básica y formación de oraciones. La comprensión se dificulta debido a errores. O no hay suficiente material para evaluar.
Vocabulario	
20-18 Excelente B Muy bien	La selección del lenguaje es apropiada para el tema. Excelente uso de cadenas léxicas y vocabulario preciso. Poca o ninguna evidencia de interferencia del inglés.
17-14 Bueno -- Adecuado	La selección del lenguaje casi siempre es apropiada para el tema, pero es un tanto limitado. Hay algunas repeticiones de vocabulario y algunos errores que indican la interferencia del inglés. Pero todavía se comprende.
13-10 Más o menos B Le falta	La selección del lenguaje es a veces inapropiada para el tema. Uso de un vocabulario limitado y repetitivo, y/o de términos vagos e imprecisos. La interferencia del inglés es evidente en los anglicismos. El significado es, con frecuencia, difícil de captar.
9-7 Necesita mucho trabajo	La selección del lenguaje no es apropiada para el tema. Vocabulario sumamente limitado, con mucha interferencia del inglés. O no hay suficiente material para evaluar.
Mecánica	
5 Excelente B Muy bien	Muy pocos o ningún error de ortografía, acentuación y puntuación.
4 Buena -- Adecuada	Algunos pequeños errores de ortografía, acentuación y puntuación.
3 Más o menos B Le falta	Frecuentes errores de ortografía, acentuación y puntuación.
2-1 Necesita mucho trabajo	Persistentes errores de ortografía, acentuación y puntuación.

Upper Level Writing Tasks – Analytical Rubric

Task Completion

1	Minimal completion of the task; content is extremely superficial; ideas are repetitive and/or irrelevant; paragraphing is haphazard
2-3	Partial completion of the task; content is superficial; ideas are sometimes repetitive and/or irrelevant; paragraphing is generally inappropriate
4-5	Completion of the task; content is adequate; ideas are relevant; paragraphing is appropriate
6	Completion of the task; content is adequate; ideas are relevant; paragraphing is appropriate

Comprehensibility

1	Text barely comprehensible, requiring frequent interpretation on the part of the reader
2	Text mostly comprehensible, requiring some interpretation on the part of the reader
3	Text comprehensible, requiring minimal interpretation on the part of the reader
4	Text readily comprehensible, requiring no interpretation on the part of the reader

Level of Discourse

1	Predominant use of single-clause sentences with a few multi-clause sentences, little or no linkage between sentences
2	Blend of single-clause and multi-clause sentences with mostly coordinating clauses and an occasional subordinating clause, limited use of cohesive devices
3	Adequate blend of single-clause and multi-clause sentences with some coordinating clauses and a few subordinating clauses, appropriate use and range of cohesive devices
4	Variety of single-clause and frequent multi-clause sentences with some coordinating and several subordinating clauses, appropriate use and wide range of cohesive devices

Vocabulary

1	Inadequate range and use of vocabulary
---	--

2-3	Limited range of vocabulary, use sometimes inaccurate and/or inappropriate
4-5	Varied range of vocabulary, use generally accurate and appropriate, a few idiomatic expressions
6	Wide range of vocabulary; use mainly accurate and appropriate, including some idiomatic expressions

Grammar

1	Emerging use of basic language structures and minimal or no use of advanced language structures
2-3	Emerging control of basic language structures with some advanced language structures
4-5	Control of basic language structures and emerging use of advanced language structures
6	Control of basic language structures and emerging control of advanced language structures

Source: PALS – Performance Assessment for Language Students