Educational Program Learning Outcome Assessment Plan  
B.A. in Modern Foreign Languages

These are Learner Outcomes identified for the current year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Data Collection and Analysis</th>
<th>Results of Evaluation</th>
<th>Use of Evaluation Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What should a graduate in this major know, value, or be able to do at graduation and beyond?</td>
<td>What assessment tools and/or methods will you use to determine achievement of the learning outcome? Describe how the data from these tools and/or methods will be collected. Explain the procedure to analyze the data.</td>
<td>What were the findings of the Analysis Team? List any specific recommendations.</td>
<td>What changes in curriculum, courses, or procedures were made as a result of the program learning outcome assessment process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand the contributions of major French, German, or Spanish writers and their works as well as the historical context in which they wrote</td>
<td>Foreign Language faculty used rubric to score and evaluate oral and written work by students. The rubric not only evaluated oral and written work in the target language, but also content. The Foreign Language faculty adapted the rubrics created by Dr. Marilyn Schultz and followed common goals in scoring and evaluating. (Appendix Q)</td>
<td>Students were clearer in the expectations of individual assignments and the courses through the use of rubrics. As a result of this, their work was more consistent. Since faculty used rubrics their grading was also more consistent and allowed for more consistency in department goals. Rubrics need to be continually evaluated and reworked for appropriateness and changing assessment</td>
<td>The Analysis Team decided to weight some elements such as target language proficiency slightly higher than historical context. Rubric will be subject of committee discussion to determine needed modifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate proficiency in oral comprehension and expository writing in the target language, and in the ability to determine such necessary considerations as thesis, purpose, audience, and organization relate to major.</td>
<td>The Foreign Language faculty used rubric <em>(Appendix Q)</em> to score and evaluate oral and written work by students. This rubric not only evaluated oral and written work in the target language, but also content and process. The Foreign Language faculty adapted the rubrics created by Dr. Marilyn Schultz for English composition and followed common goals in scoring and evaluating. The rubric was also used for the language laboratory element. Language laboratory work is required, but is out-of-class time.</td>
<td>Students were clearer in the expectations of individual assignments and the courses through the use of rubrics. As a result of this, their work was more consistent. Since faculty used rubrics their grading was also more consistent and allowed for more consistency in department goals. Rubrics need to be continually evaluated and reworked for appropriateness and changing assessment needs.</td>
<td>The Analysis Team decided to weight some elements such as target language proficiency slightly higher than organization. Rubric will be subject of committee discussion to determine needed modifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate familiarity with research procedures in their target language and will have experience in using other critical perspectives or arguments in defining</td>
<td>The Foreign Language faculty used rubrics <em>(Appendix Q)</em> to score and evaluate oral and written work by students. The rubric not only evaluated oral and written work in the</td>
<td>Students were clearer in the expectations of individual assignments and the courses through the use of rubrics. As a result of this, their work was</td>
<td>Since these are foreign language classes the Analysis Team decided to weight target language proficiency slightly higher than research procedures. Rubric will be subject of committee discussion to determine needed modifications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their own.  target language, but also research procedures, process, and content. The Foreign Language faculty adapted the rubrics created by Dr. Marilyn Schultz and followed common goals in scoring and evaluating more consistent.

Since faculty used rubrics their grading was also more consistent and allowed for more consistency in department goals.

Rubrics need to be continually evaluated and reworked for appropriateness and changing assessment needs
APPENDIX Q
Foreign Languages

GRADING RUBRIC
(Adapted from a rubric created by Dr. Marilyn Schultz according to NCTE requirements)
The bulleted elements of each grade may not be represented with each assessment within the course. However, when all coursework assessments are considered, each grade would represent the bulleted qualities, although the list is not exhaustive. Most qualities are intended to apply to each grade.

A  This grade represents excellent to distinguished work for the course.
- Writing and logic flow smoothly in the target language.
- The work contains few, if any, errors in the target language.
- The work exceeds what is ordinarily expected in scope and depth.
- The work shows originality and creativity and/or demonstrates sound critical thinking.
- The work may demonstrate application of concepts studied to new situations; there is willingness for risk-taking to tackle challenging problems.
- The work demonstrates mastery of the material; it is organized and complete.
- The argument, analysis, or problem-solving is complex.

B  This grade represents work that exceeds the basic expectations for the course.
- The work contains few errors in the target language.
- The work demonstrates insight and critical thinking.
- The work is organized, clear, and generally correct in analysis and/or facts; it is complete and reasonably thorough.
- The work demonstrates a solid understanding of the material covered by the assignment.
- The work demonstrates sound problem-solving skills; there is evidence of some risk-taking.
- The structure is sound and logical but the work may lack depth in some parts of the argument.

C  The work is competent, generally satisfying expectations, but reveals some gaps in student understanding, mastery or presentation for the course.
- The work may be weakened by grammar or punctuation errors in the target language.
- The work satisfies the major requirements for the assignment.
- The work demonstrates competent problem-solving skills; it may manage straightforward problems well but have problems making connections and/or applying concepts to new situations.
- The work may leave some questions about understanding of parts of the course material because it is not quite complete or because there are noticeable oversights. It is less thorough and lacks details.
- The work is generally correct but contains some organizational or structural problems.
- The ideas have merit, but they may not be clearly presented or fully developed.
- The ideas may be obvious or somewhat superficial.

D  The work is of a poor quality; it is substandard in several areas for the course.
- The work may be disrupted with grammar or mechanical errors in the target language.
- The work may not satisfy all requirements for the assignment.
- The work contains serious flaws in logic or omissions of information.
- The work reflects noticeable gaps in mastering the material and concepts studied.
- The work reflects oversight or incomplete analysis.
- The thinking is flawed except for that on the most basic of problems.
- The work may be unclear and poorly organized.

F  The work is not acceptable; it is substandard in many areas for the course.
- The work may be disrupted with serious errors in grammar and mechanics in the target language.
- The work does not achieve the goals of the assignment.
- The work reflects little understanding of the material and concepts studied.
- The work contains serious errors, oversights, incomplete analysis, or carelessness. There is little evidence of the ability to recall information and relate it to the concepts studied.
- The work is incomplete and/or provides evidence of little thought.
- The work may not address the assignment.