

Cleveland State University
Assessment Report 2007
[Spring/Summer/Fall2006]

Department of Modern Languages
M.A. Spanish Program

Introduction

The Spanish graduate program consists of approx. 20 students [5 graduate assistants], and other students who seek their M.A., or school teachers who take graduate courses for their licensure.

Since 2004, all full-time Spanish faculty have been increasingly engaged in an ongoing discussion about the assessment process. Such engagement, along with the feedback that the Spanish program has been receiving over the past two years from the Assessment Office, helped faculty to reflect further about the Spanish program goals and outcomes.

Last year, faculty re-articulated the program goals. They however were still struggling with the Outcomes and Methods. An insightful feedback that the program got from the Assessment Office was that we “may be confused about the narrow focus of assessment of student learning as [our] report includes information relevant to program review (e.g. syllabus review) but this information is not associated with student learning.”

Our ability to refine our thinking was helped considerably by an assessment mini-grant which brought us a full-day workshop in August of 2006 on incorporating ACTFL [American Council for Teaching Foreign Languages] speaking and writing standards in our coursework. This year, the Spanish section took one step further in improving the Assessment process. On the one hand, four of the Spanish faculty attended a four days workshop organized by ACTFL which was aimed not only at preparing them to become certified Oral Proficiency Testers but also at training them in Language/Culture program Assessment. Moreover, two of our Spanish faculty attended another four days workshop organized by US Department of Education during the ISA convention [International Studies Association], and which aimed at training them particularly in multicultural and language program assessment.

Goals and Outcomes:

Thus this year, the Spanish faculty conceptualized, and consequently outlined with more specificity the M.A. program goals, and students’ learning outcomes, and clearly distinguished them from the ones designed for the B.A.

M.A. goals:

1. Demonstrated sophisticated ability to use critical theory and write creatively in at least one particular field of Hispanic Studies [literature/culture/linguistics]
2. Advanced Mid-High proficiency [according to ACTFL¹ guidelines] in written and spoken Spanish
3. Sophisticated performance of knowledge of Hispanic language and culture

Methods:

More importantly, the Spanish Section started to improve the Assessment Methods by creating a systematic assessment process [See Appendix 1&2]. The process consists of taking randomly 3 samples from each of the 500+ classes offered during the period of Spring/Summer/Fall 2006. The samples were distributed by the ML department main office among the Spanish faculty. No faculty was to review his/her own classes. The assessment consisted of three steps:

¹ American Council for Teaching Foreign Languages

1st. To review whether students' learning outcomes are clearly stated in the class syllabus and whether clear guidelines about grading and research were given to the students. The purpose of this section was not to make a program review, but rather to ensure that the evaluation of students performance is not dissociated from clear and well structured statements that correlate with the program and level standards they should receive from the instructors.

2nd. To review goal # 1 [knowledge] according to a questionnaire which reflects the program learning outcomes and expectations.

3rd. To review goal #2 [skills] according to a questionnaire which reflects the program learning outcomes and expectations.

4th. Evaluation of sample according to the first and second questionnaire should result into placing each of the paper and/or exam reviewed under one of these categories: Totally Satisfactory/ Partially Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory

P.S. The wording of these categories equal what some other programs refer to as: Exceeds Expectations/Meets Expectations/Unsatisfactory

Findings:

The Spanish faculty found that students learning outcomes are communicated with 60% of clarity to students. Also, in spite that the majority use the same rubrics, some expressed a concern about the efficiency of these rubrics and whether they really measure the learning outcomes expected by the Spanish graduate program. Furthermore, some expressed concern for using the same rubrics at the Undergraduate and Graduate levels to measure students' learning outcomes and performance.

The faculty found that more effort needs to be done to ensure students' application of theory and rigorous documentation. Also, faculty members agree that more effort needs to be done to ensure that students' linguistic performance meets the level of sophistication expected at the graduate level.

Actions:

Effective fall 2007, the 501 Research Method course will introduce new elements. These new implementations aim at improving the shortage detected in some aspects of students' learning outcomes. Also, the section will cooperate further with the department Curriculum Committee in order to review all criteria, syllabi and courses content at the graduate level. Furthermore, some of the rubrics have been modified as to better meet the learning outcomes expectations for the M.A. level.

In the following the Appendix 1 & 2



Program: Spanish M.A.	Completed By: Heba El Attar
Department: Modern Languages	Date: 05-21-2007

Goal 1: Demonstrated sophisticated ability to use critical theory and write creatively in at least one particular field of Hispanic Studies [literature/cultural studies/or linguistics]

Outcomes	Research Methods	Findings	Review	Actions
<p>- Literature Students will demonstrate effective ability to discuss different literary genres, and write scholarly and critically about these literary works. Students will demonstrate ability to identify a problem/thesis and defend it by drawing on relevant literary scholarship.</p> <p>- Culture Students will demonstrate potential ability to discuss Hispanic culture by drawing on basic major cultural theories. Students will demonstrate potential ability to synthesize an approach to one of these cultural topics, and position their argument within current scholarly debate on this topic.</p>	<p>I. Direct</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Exams [tests, quizzes, Praxis II, etc.] Research papers <p>II. Indirect</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Study Abroad Survey Alumni Survey Interviews with Alumni Discussions with faculty 	<p>- 3 samples of exams and/or papers were taken from each graduate class offered during Spring/ Summer/Fall 2006.</p> <p>- Samples were all reviewed according to questionnaires prepared previously, and which reflect the overall criteria that we have for each aspect of knowledge [literature/ culture/ linguistics] expected at the graduate level. Each of the samples was to be classified to be either: completely satisfactory /partially satisfactory /unsatisfactory</p> <p>- Compared to the expected outcomes, the samples showed that overall students' performance for the knowledge goal/area is</p>	<p>- Faculty were potentially involved in the assessment process throughout the year, whether through their direct input in the Spanish section official meetings, or in each of their graduate classes by trying to develop and apply different methods to continuously assess students performance.</p> <p>- Through alumni survey, and interviews, students were also contributing to the assessment data collection. We however are still working on making such contribution more criteria based.</p> <p>- The Study Abroad surveys were not informative for they are currently structured as to poll students level of satisfaction with</p>	<p>- To address the partially satisfactory performance of sophistication in research and application of theory, the MA program will be incorporating new elements to the 501 course of Research Method. New implementations will be effective fall 2007.</p> <p>- Faculty will develop a more thorough survey for the Study Abroad programs.</p>



Cleveland State University

<p>- Linguistics Students will demonstrate sophisticated ability in discussing different linguistic topics based on major linguistic theories introduced in the courses.</p> <p>In all the above mentioned areas, students will produce researches of quality that allows their work to be presented in conferences and/or be developed into publishable articles.</p>		<p>about: 60% completely satisfactory, and 40% partially satisfactory, while none was identified as unsatisfactory.</p> <p>- M.A. program at the ML department expects 70% of students to meet the overall outcomes, in this sense the numbers above mentioned show that all graduate students do, though the level of sophistication and thorough application of theory varies among these students, and still needs to be seriously addressed by faculty.</p>	<p>the organization of the Study Abroad program, however the survey does not measure accurately how the immersion experience contributed into the student growth in the target culture.</p>	
---	--	---	---	--



Goal 2: Advanced Mid-High [according to ACTFL guidelines] proficiency in written and spoken Spanish language

Outcomes	Research Methods	Findings	Review	Actions
<p>- Students will demonstrate sophisticated level of proficiency in written and spoken Spanish.</p> <p>- Students will demonstrate efficient ability to write creatively in Spanish language, constructing paragraphs of advanced complexity, accurately alternating the use of different tenses, using idiomatic expressions of advanced complexity, and a rich repertoire of abstract terminology.</p>	<p>1. Direct</p> <p>a. Exams [tests, quizzes, Praxis II, etc.]</p> <p>b. Research papers</p> <p>c. Oral Exams (OPI)</p> <p>d. Oral Comprehensive Exams</p>	<p>- The same 3 samples of exams and/or papers taken from each class offered at the graduate level during Spring/Summer/Fall 2006, served for this section as well.</p> <p>- Samples were all reviewed according to questionnaires prepared previously according to criteria that reflect the M.A. program learning outcomes. Each of the samples was to be classified to be either: completely satisfactory /partially satisfactory /unsatisfactory</p> <p>- Unlike the scores in the knowledge area [goal #1] of the MA program, the skill area [goal #2] showed that only 33.5% of research papers and/or exams are completely satisfactory, while 66.5% are partially satisfactory. None is unsatisfactory though.</p> <p>- 75%of the students improved at least ½ ACTFL level. on the OPI 100% of students meet OPI exit standard levels.</p> <p>- The MA program at the ML department expects 70% of students to meet the overall outcomes, and the above numbers show that the students actually do. However, the program needs to especially focus on improving students' scholarly writing and oral proficiencies.</p>	<p>- Faculty were continuously involved in the review process</p> <p>- Four of the faculty received ACTFL workshop and are expected to apply more rigorously the ACTFL standards to excel oral and written proficiencies at the graduate level.</p> <p>- The OPI should be applied more widely in the MA program. There is still no rigorous assessment process for the oral comprehensive exams.</p>	<p>To ensure MA students' performance at least at the Mid or high advanced levels according to ACTFL guidelines, the MA program is reviewing its course content, activities, and assessment process as to increase the number of graduate students writing and discussing at the scholarly level. To achieve that, the MA program is cooperating with the Program Committee to change the focus of the colloquium series organized in conjunction with the 501 class. Starting next Fall2007, this series will all be based around one major theme, and related theories will be introduced gradually and discussed critically in the graduate classes. Students will be prepared to attend, interact with scholars [before, during and after each lecture] in professional conversations. Students will be expected to reflect the results of such practice in their writings, research and overall participation in the graduate classes. Faculty will develop a thorough assessment process for the oral exams.</p>



Goal 3: Sophisticated performance of knowledge of Hispanic language and culture

Outcomes	Research Methods	Findings	Review	Actions
<p>1- Professional level Students will demonstrate ability to perform efficiently in conferences; join good PhD programs; and get some of their research articles prepared and accepted for publication.</p> <p>2- Social level Students will perform leadership in events and activities pertinent to the Hispanic world.</p>	<p>1. Direct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Acceptance in PhD programs b. Conference presentations c. Job offers <p>2. Indirect</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Alumni survey 	<p>50% of our graduate students present papers at least once in one of the conferences.</p> <p>30% of our graduate students are accepted in PhD programs</p> <p>20% of our graduate students are working on one of their research papers in order to publish it.</p> <p>20% of our graduate students were able to get jobs as lecturers in colleges or as teachers in schools.</p> <p>30% of our graduate students perform leadership in cultural activities and/or events related to the Hispanic culture</p>	<p>- Spanish faculty need to invest even more effort in informing students about the assets of participating in local and regional conferences.</p> <p>- Faculty need to start very early in the MA program orienting students to the different PhD programs available for them once they are done with their M.A.</p> <p>- Faculty need to encourage students more in working on at least one of their research papers to render it publishable.</p>	<p>- Three of the Spanish faculty are organizing three panels for the graduate students in the “Crossing Over” conference organized by CSU in fall2007.</p> <p>- Two of the Spanish faculty are working with at least three graduate students to publish jointly research papers in refereed journals.</p>

Appendix I

First Questionnaire

1. Number of the class you are reviewing: _____

2. After reviewing the syllabus:

a. Are students' learning outcomes clearly stated? Yes No

b. Are there clear guidelines for grading? Yes No

c. Does the syllabus include clear guidelines for exams and papers? Yes No

3. Before proceeding to reviewing papers, are there any rubrics enclosed? Yes No

Field One: Knowledge

1. Literature

300+ 1. Does the student show an understanding of Peninsular and/or Latin American literary movements across history?

2. Does the student show understanding of the characteristics of different literary genres?

3. Does the student show ability to provide simple but accurate analysis of simple literary works?

4. Does the student show familiarity with some of the important Hispanic authors?

400+ 1. Does the student show a deep understanding of Peninsular and/or Latin American literary movements across history, and the ability to reflect about them?

2. Does the student show ability to analyze different familiar and non familiar literary genres?

3. Does the student show ability to provide a simple critical analysis of literary work of moderate complexity?

4. Does the student show ability to use critically information about the different Hispanic authors?

- 500+** 1. Does the student show ability to use critically his/her knowledge about the different literary movements and basic literary theories pertinent to Hispanic Lit.?
2. Does the student show ability to analyze critically and creatively familiar and non familiar literary genres?
3. Does the student show ability in associating between different accumulative knowledge of Hispanic Lit. when analyzing critically and creatively literary works of moderately advanced complexity?
4. Does the student show ability to perform a graduate level research [accurate and varied use of resources, accurate citation, critical analysis etc.]?

2. Culture

- 300+** 1. Does the student demonstrate knowledge of ancient and modern civilizations in the Hispanic world?
2. Does the student show familiarity and understanding of past and present socio-political realities of the Hispanic world?
3. In Praxis II (if applicable), does the student show knowledge of Hispanic culture?
4. In Study Abroad survey (if applicable), does the student show understanding of the culture s/he after the immersion?
- 400+** 1. Does the student demonstrate ability to analyze information about Hispanic cultures and civilizations?
2. Does the student demonstrate ability to reflect critically about moderately difficult issues related to socio-political realities in the Hispanic world?
3. In Praxis II (if applicable), does the student show ability to reflect critically about Hispanic culture?
4. In Study Abroad survey (if applicable), does the student show critical reflection about the target culture after the immersion?
- 500+** 1. Does the student demonstrate ability to analyze information about Hispanic culture using basic cultural theories?
2. Does the student demonstrate ability to critically and creatively reflect and analyze moderately advanced issues related to socio-political realities in the Hispanic world?
3. In Study Abroad survey (if applicable), does the student show critical reflection and moderate application of cultural theories regarding the target culture after the immersion?

3. Linguistics

- 300+** 1. Does the student demonstrate knowledge of the History of Spanish language?
2. Does the student demonstrate knowledge of basic phonetic particularities of Spanish?
- 400+** 1. Does the student demonstrate intermediate high to advanced knowledge of grammatical and syntax rules and concepts?
2. Does the student show ability to provide simple and accurate linguistic analysis?
- 500+** 1. Does the student demonstrate advanced knowledge of grammatical and syntax rules and concepts?
2. Does the student demonstrate ability to reflect critically and provide creative linguistic analysis?

Field Two: Skills

1. Grammar

- 300+** 1. Is the student able to construct paragraphs based on simple and accurate sentences?
2. Is the student able to alternate between and accurately use present, preterit and future tenses?
3. Is the student able to use basic idiomatic expressions?
- 400+** 1. Is student able to construct paragraphs based on complex sentences?
2. Is the student showing ability to manage the subjunctive?
3. Is the student showing ability to use moderately complex idiomatic expressions?
- 500+** 1. Is the student showing ability to construct paragraphs of advanced complexity?
2. Is the student showing mastery in alternating and accurately using different tenses?
3. Is the student showing mastery in using idiomatic expressions of advanced complexity?

2. Writing

- 300+** 1. Is the student using the language accurately to produce intelligible and logical sentences and simple paragraphs?
2. Is the student showing a decent repertoire of vocabulary?
- 400+** 1. Is the student demonstrating ability to use the language at an advanced level to write critically, forming paragraphs of moderately advanced complexity?
2. Is the student demonstrating a rich and varied repertoire of vocabulary?
- 500+** 1. Is the student using the language to produce logical, creative and analytical analysis and writing at a moderately abstract level?

2. Is the student demonstrating mastery of a moderately vast repertoire of abstract vocabulary?

3. Listening and Speaking

In oral presentations or exams at the

- 300+** 1. Is the student able to understand utterances of moderate complexity?
2. Is the student able to produce accurate utterances and coherent paragraphs of moderate complexity?
- 400+** 1. Is the student able to understand utterances of moderately advanced complexity?
2. Is the student able to produce accurate, analytical and critical utterances at a moderately advanced level?
- 500+** 1. Is the student able to understand utterances of advanced [abstract] complexity?
2. Is the student able to produce utterances of advanced [abstract] complexity?

**Appendix II
Results of Classes Reviewed**

I. First Questionnaire

Undergraduate

Class N.	Clear Articulation of Outcomes	Clear Guidelines for Grading	Clear Articulation of Guidelines for Exams/Papers	Rubrics
3xx	x	x	x	x
3xx	x	---	x	---
4xx	---	---	---	---
4xx	x	x	---	x

Total n. of classes reviewed xx

1. N. of classes complying with Outcomes statement	x	=	%
2. N. of classes complying with Grading statement	x	=	%
3. N. of classes complying with Paper guidelines statement	x	=	%
4. N. of classes complying with Rubrics	x	=	%

Graduate

Class N.	Clear Articulation of Outcomes	Clear Guidelines for Grading	Clear Articulation of Guidelines for Exams/Papers	Rubrics
5xx	x	x	x	x
5xx	---	---	---	x
5xx	x	---	x	---

Total n. of classes reviewed xx

1. N. of classes complying with Outcomes statement	x	=	%
2. N. of classes complying with Grading statement	x	=	%
3. N. of classes complying with Paper guidelines statement	x	=	%
4. N. of classes complying with Rubrics	x	=	%

II. Second Questionnaire

CS: Completely Satisfactory

PS: Partially Satisfactory

U: Unsatisfactory

Undergraduate

Class Number & title	N. of papers or exams reviewed	Field I Knowledge	Field II Skills
3xx	3	CS: 1 PS: 1 U: 1	CS: 1 PS: 2 U: ----
3xx	3	CS: --- PS: 3 U: ---	CS: 1 PS: 2 U: :
4xx	3	CS: 3 PS: --- U: ---	CS: 2 PS: 1 U: ---
4xx	3	CS: 1 PS: 2 U: ---	CS: 1 PS: 2 U: ---

Total n. of papers reviewed: xx

Field I:

1. Total n. of papers completely satisfactory: x = %
2. Total n. of papers partially satisfactory: x = %
3. Total n. of papers unsatisfactory: x = %

Field II:

1. Total n. of papers completely satisfactory: x = %
2. Total n. of papers partially satisfactory: x = %
3. Total n. of papers unsatisfactory: x = %

Graduate

Class Number & title	N. of papers or exams reviewed	Field I Knowledge	Field II Skills
5xx	3	CS: 1 PS: 2 U: ---	CS: 3 PS: --- U: ---
5xx	3	CS: --- PS: 3 U: ---	CS: --- PS: 3 U: ---
5xx	3	CS: 3 PS: --- U: ---	CS: --- PS: 3 U: ---

Total n. of papers reviewed: xx

Field I:

1. Total n. of papers completely satisfactory:	x	=	%
2. Total n. of papers partially satisfactory:	x	=	%
3. Total n. of papers unsatisfactory:	x	=	%

Field II:

1. Total n. of papers completely satisfactory:	x	=	%
2. Total n. of papers partially satisfactory:	x	=	%
3. Total n. of papers unsatisfactory:	x	=	%

III. Summary of Professors Evaluations

1. Undergraduate Level

- a- -----
- b- -----
- c- -----

2. Graduate level

- a- -----
- b- -----