

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE.....  | 2  |
| A. Enrollments.....   | 2  |
| II. CURRENT ASSESSMENT PLANS: PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATED STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES.....          | 3  |
| A. ADFL Essential Components of Highly Effective language programs.....                         | 3  |
| B. ACTFL STANDARDS.....   | 6  |
| C. NCATE STANDARDS (NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION).....               | 10 |
| III. LANGUAGE SECTION ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES.....  | 12 |
| A. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: <i>GERMAN</i> .....   | 14 |
| B. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: <i>JAPANESE</i> .....   | 18 |
| C. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: <i>FRENCH</i> .....   | 24 |
| D. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: <i>FRENCH EDUCATION</i> (Additional).....                             | 27 |
| E. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: <i>SPANISH</i> .....  | 30 |
| F. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: <i>SPANISH EDUCATION</i> (Additional).....                            | 45 |
| G. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: <i>NCATE</i> (FRENCH AND SPANISH ONLY).....                           | 48 |
| H. LESS COMMONLY TAUGHT LANGUAGES: <i>ARABIC- CHINESE – PORTUGUESE – RUSSIAN- SWAHILI</i> ..... | 56 |
| IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING COMMENTS.....  | 58 |
| V. APPENDICES   |    |
| <i>Portfolio and Spanish Departmental Exam Grading Rubrics</i>                                  |    |
| <i>Capstone Form</i>  |    |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

**I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the assessment progress in Modern Languages based on our currently established assessment plans. Assessment in the Department of Modern Languages is an ongoing process, and continued attention to matters of assessment is essential. This report focuses primarily on assessment of our language majors. Students enrolled in our beginning course sequence are assessed on an ongoing basis according to the expertise of the instructor.

**A. Enrollments**

The Department of Modern Languages Departmental enrollments for the 2007 – 2008 Academic Year were as follows:

**All Students enrolled in MDL Courses**

|                | <b>Fall 2007</b> |                | <b>Spring 2008</b> |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| French:        | 266              | French         | 222                |
| German:        | 144              | German         | 182                |
| Japanese       | 75               | Japanese       | 102                |
| Spanish:       | 735              | Spanish        | 679                |
| Chinese*       | 10               | Chinese*       | 13                 |
| Arabic*        | 29               | Arabic*        | 26                 |
| <b>TOTALS:</b> | <b>1259</b>      | <b>TOTALS:</b> | <b>1224</b>        |

*\* Taught by Adjunct instructors without benefit of a full-time faculty member (See Less Commonly Taught Languages.)*

**Language Majors**

| <b>Academic Year as of beginning of<br/>Fall 2007</b> |           |
|---|-----------|
| French  | 9         |
| French Ed   | 3         |
| German  | 10        |
| Spanish   | 33        |
| Spanish Ed  | 20        |
| Japanese  | 6         |
| <b>TOTAL MDL MAJORS</b>                               | <b>81</b> |

*\*Note: Education majors are currently NOT officially counted as MDL Majors. See notes in Spanish Education Analysis/Planned action for detail.*

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

**II. CURRENT ASSESSMENT PLANS: PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATED STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**

There are no established comparative data that are considered benchmarks in French, German, Japanese and Spanish programs (by any of the professional foreign language associations). In order to establish benchmarks for the Department of Modern Languages, we consulted information provided by several organizations: *ADFL* (Association of Departments of Foreign Languages), *ACTFL* (American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages), and *NCATE* (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education). Through this research, we culled the essential components of an effective, growing language department, and formulated standards for our student outcomes for both our liberal arts and Education majors. The incorporation of ADFL, ACTFL and NCATE Standards allow the Department of Modern Languages to connect to the field of Modern Language Education as a whole, and offer a source of information, which allows us to establish benchmarks appropriate to our department. These Benchmarks are outlined below as “Standards”:

**A. ADFL Essential Components of Highly Effective language programs**

The ADFL periodically reviews what it considers highly effective programs. In reviewing recent articles, several criteria surface that are considered elements of effective, growing language departments. These components are evaluated both directly and indirectly.

| Criteria   | Assessment Measure  |
|--|---|
| <b>a) Enrollments in advanced courses and majors</b> | <p>The Department continues to shift emphasis from the lower level courses to the intermediate and upper level courses wherever possible. Significant success has been achieved in Spanish and Japanese. In keeping with these factors, the Department has implemented a number of new courses, in conjunction with the recently approved (Spring 2007) Master of Arts Program in Spanish. This new program will increase the level of courses our students can take. The first of these courses, SPN433 and SPN436 were taught in Fall 2007, and SPN436 was taught in Spring 2008. Students are assessed in these courses according to the expertise of the instructors, and these courses will be more globally assessed in future years.</p> <p>In the 101 and 102 course in all languages, the recently implemented (Fall 2007) “C or better policy.” Continues to show promise, though it is too soon to have formal data as to the effects of this change. (Students are required to complete 101 and 102 courses with a grade of C</p> |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>or better in order to move up to the 200 level courses). In Spring of 2008, Faculty voted to implement this policy into the 203 courses, with the option of a “challenge” exam at this level only. This new policy will be in effect beginning Spring 2009. It is expected that these measures will increase student learning, and help prepare them for higher level courses, but it is too soon to have concrete data that demonstrates this improvement.</p>  |
| <p><b>b) Effective teaching – Involved faculty</b></p> | <p>All MDL students complete university-wide evaluations in their courses, and evaluate their instructors accordingly. Faculty also complete the university Annual Report, and are involved in a variety of departmental, college and university committees, as well as professional development and scholarship in their areas of expertise. During the fall of 2007 and spring of 2008, faculty collaborated with faculty in other departments to offer <i>Honors 483 Contemporary Spanish Women Literary, Filmic and Historical Perspectives</i>. See Syllabus for details.</p> <p>Assessment Day Events were planned to include students, in order to provide an opportunity for faculty and students to further interact. The Department worked closely with Brian Morgan to reconfigure BERT to provide an updated majors list at any time, and provide training to faculty in how to access those lists.</p> |
| <p><b>c) Study abroad programs</b></p>                 | <p>The study abroad programs provide students to connect with communities abroad and build communication skills in the language. In both programs (Spanish and French), students are given a placement examinations during the Study Abroad Programs. Marshall University students compare favorably with students from other U.S and European colleges and universities in terms of their foreign language skills as evaluated by professors at the Universidad A. de Nebrija in Madrid and at the Université Catholique in Lyon. In their interaction with students from different parts of the world, they succeed regularly in joining the multilingual and multicultural groups of their peers abroad and compare well with them in</p>  |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>terms of their ability to function in the new community.</p> <p>More than <b>425</b> Marshall University students have participated in these programs since 1989 and fewer than 5% of those have experienced severe culture shock and/or academic failure. Most students participating in these two programs are given the Comprehensive Departmental Examination Level I or Level II upon their return to campus.</p>   |
| <b>d) Testing for assessment and placement</b>        | <p>The department administers departmental exams for language placement and as a measure to determine our student's level of language skills. It is recognized that an examination is not the ideal measure of an active skill such as language learning, but detailed assessment of every student in our undergraduate courses for non-majors is beyond the limitations of the Department. Given this, the addition of the portfolio (First data gathered Spring 2007) with samples of student research and writing at various levels of language acquisition will provide us with significant data to assess the language skills of our majors. The Capstone Projects will also be evaluated with greater depth and consistency. See individual language sections for further discussion.</p> |
| <b>e) Support for faculty</b>                         | <p>This is an area where improvement is needed. The Department continues to function in two language areas (German and Japanese) with only one full-time faculty, and French with 2 full-time faculty where at least 3 are required. See Report Summary for details.</p>  |
| <b>f) Opportunities outside the regular classroom</b> | <p>German, Japanese, and Spanish all provided students with opportunities to participate in language activities outside the classroom. See Individual language sections for further details.</p>  |
| <b>g) Programs for secondary teacher candidates.</b>  | <p>By implementing additional program goals using the NCATE standards, and working to improve both the training the teacher candidates receive and the language skills they develop, we can help fill the gap in qualified language teachers in West Virginia. See Spanish</p>  |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | Education Section of the report for further details.   |
| <b>h) An up to date, dynamic departmental webpage, and incorporation of technology</b> | <p>The departmental webpage underwent a complete revamping during the Summer of 2008, bringing it in line with current webpage coding, and finalizing the last issues of consistency and updates to the standards in web pages (CSS Compliancy).</p> <p>The department utilizes the university's e-mail and BERT systems to circulate information and maintain contact with its students.</p> <p>In addition, the department maintains a modern language lab, and strongly encourages faculty to utilize technology. The majority of faculty use some form of technology in their classes. (See Syllabi)</p> |

**B. ACTFL STANDARDS**

The overall program goals of the Department of Modern Languages remain those adopted and recommended by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) for language skills. Additionally, in order to advance our Foreign Language Teacher Education Major, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards for Teacher Education Programs were adopted. There are no other formal benchmarks in the field of Modern Language Education.

**All of our language programs utilized these Standards in their program assessment.**

| <b>ACTFL National Standard (:</b> | <b>Specific Learning Outcomes.<br/><i>Students will be able to:</i></b>  | <b>Specific Learning outcomes, Assessment Methods and Activities:</b>   |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>1. Communication:</b>          | Communicate in a language other than English (listening comprehension, speaking, reading comprehension and writing). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Students are expected to listen, read, write, and speak at an appropriate level in all language courses, and are assessed according to the expertise of the instructor for 101 – 203 courses.</i></li> </ul> <p>Throughout this sequence, these four linguistic skills are frequently and independently assessed in order to provide students with constant feedback concerning their communicative progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Students will take a skills-based departmental exam in 204 courses to demonstrate skill development.</i></li> </ul> |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|                    |  |   |
|--------------------|--|---|
|                    |  | <p>A departmental exam encompassing all but speaking skills is administered at the 204 level and 300 level</p> <p><b>.204 Level:</b> In addition to being the first course that all majors take before moving into more advanced courses, the 204 course completes the first level or cycle of exposure to the particular foreign language and culture studied and it is required of majors, minors and of students who are in colleges that have a foreign language requirement. It is designed to review the language and to use the four linguistic skills presented and tested in the previous three courses. Most activities in the course are based on cultural material. At this level, the classes are conducted entirely in the target language, as are all of the readings. Students write compositions and make oral presentations in class in the target language as well</p> <p><b>300 Level:</b> Foreign Language Proficiency for language majors is assessed in 300 level grammar classes, in two sections of the department (French and Spanish), through a 300 level examination. There are two courses which introduce composition and conversation (FRN, SPN 305/306) and in all three sections there are two advanced composition and two advanced conversation courses at this level (FRN, GER, SPN 315/316; FRN, SPN 323/324). In all 300 level courses, the foreign language is reviewed structurally in order to reinforce the communicative approach employed in the first cycle of language acquisition.</p> <p><b>400 Level:</b> Once the students reach the 400 level literature or culture courses, they have concluded a second cycle (300 level) of language study.<br/>At this level, no examination is administered, as it is more important to take a performance-based assessment. It is understood that an examination demonstrates only a portion of the picture of our students' abilities.<br/>Language majors conclude their program with the Capstone Project, in conjunction with any one of the 400 level courses, and the department also uses a <b>Language Skills Portfolio (French and Spanish)</b>. The Language Skills Portfolio encompasses different types of work from all levels of instruction (100-200, 300 and 400 levels) and demonstrates student progress over time.</p> |
| 2. <b>Culture:</b> | Gain knowledge and understanding of other cultures | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Students in all languages participate in activities (in particular in the 204 courses) that are based on cultural materials of various kinds: artistic, historic, political, literary, folkloric, or a combination of these.</i></li> <li>• <i>Students participate in Study Abroad Experiences</i></li> <li>• <i>Students majoring in a Modern Language will complete a Capstone Project</i></li> </ul>  |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|                               |  |   |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
|                               |  | <p><b>Language and Culture Coursework:</b> This outcome is assessed in the 204 course for all students, and for majors in the 204 course and in the 300/400 culture and civilization and literature courses. The activities in the 204 course</p> <p><b>Coursework in cultural studies:</b><br/>The culture and civilization courses are taught in the target language and can be capstone courses for the French and the German sections of the department. However, in all three sections students learn about and are assessed on the cultures of the people who speak the languages they are learning.</p> <p><b>Study Abroad:</b><br/>For the French and Spanish language programs, this goal is also accomplished through the departmental study abroad programs. In German and Japanese students are also encouraged to pursue study abroad opportunities although Marshall University does not currently sponsor its own programs in those languages.</p> <p><b>Capstone Project:</b><br/>Majors in Spanish designate a 400 level literature course for their capstone experience. Majors in French, German and Japanese choose from a 400 level offering in culture and civilization or literature. They must demonstrate writing skills in literary/cultural analysis, presenting their research to the class in the target language. In order to analyze the culture or the literature they are studying they have to be able to read the foreign language and in order to be critical they have to be familiar with the culture and with the historical circumstances that produced the object of their research and writing.</p> |
| <p>3. <b>Connections:</b></p> | <p>Connect with other disciplines and acquire information.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Students complete projects and coursework that provide opportunities to connect with other disciplines and acquire information.</i></li> <li>• <i>Students majoring in a Modern Language will complete a Capstone Project</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Coursework:</b><br/>At the 204 level, the department does not formally assess what knowledge other than the target language or culture our students have acquired. However, constant examples from other languages and cultures are employed for purposes of instruction, which expose students to other disciplines and to new information. The upper level culture and civilization and literature courses are taught comparatively and deal with a variety of subjects, which place students in contact with other disciplines (art, literature, music, history, geography, etc.)</p> <p><b>Capstone Projects:</b><br/>Majors in each of the 4 language areas complete a Capstone</p>   |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|                               |  |   |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
|                               |  | <p>Project. See Standard 1 for further description.</p> <p><b>Dual Majors:</b><br/>Individuals learn by comparing and contrasting. In the Department of Modern Languages, there are double majors or majors in a language with a minor in another discipline. This demonstrates the natural connection that foreign languages have to other disciplines. Faculty members in our department also collaborate with other faculty members from other departments in the College of Liberal Arts on course development and research, particularly in the Honors program. (See Enrollment figures for further details)</p>   |
| <p>4. <b>Comparison:</b></p>  | <p>Develop insight and learn the nature of linguistic and cultural structures.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Students are expected to make comparisons between language structures and cultural elements of their culture and the target culture.</i></li> <li>• <i>Students complete coursework, class projects, papers, and other activities within courses to demonstrate these comparisons.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Coursework:</b><br/>The Department of Modern Languages has added four 400 level courses in Spanish: SPN 433 Intensive Grammar Review, SPN 444 Bilingual Contrastive Grammar, SPN 435 Culture and Civilization: Contemporary Latin America and SPN 436 Culture and Civilization: Contemporary Spain. This is an additional comprehensive level of language and culture instruction, which will help students learn about linguistic and cultural structures. SPN433 was taught for the first time in Fall 2007; SPN436 in Fall 2007; and SPN435 in Spring of 2008. These courses will be more formally evaluated in future years.</p> <p><b>Study Abroad:</b><br/>The departmental study abroad programs also enable students to connect their language and culture to those of the world at large. The cultural elements present at all levels of courses taught, guest speakers and other academic events help students connect the language and culture they are learning beyond the classroom and relate it to their own lives.</p> <p>The <b>Capstone Projects</b> and <b>Language Skills Portfolio</b> also address these Standards.</p> |
| <p>5. <b>Communities:</b></p> | <p>Participate in multilingual communities at home and around the world.</p>       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Students participate in multilingual communities through Study abroad and participation in student activities on the Marshall Campus.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Study Abroad:</b> This goal is addressed mainly via the study abroad programs.</p> <p><b>Student Activities:</b> Throughout the programs of study, the students are encouraged to attend foreign films, interact with international students, participation in Language Conversation</p>   |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>Groups, and complete internet and research projects. In conjunction with Latin American History, the department participates in Hispanic Heritage Month. These events are usually planned around a series of lectures and presentations about an intellectually significant and usually current concern in the Hispanic world.</p> <p>This goal is not evaluated formally since it exceeds the department's capability to do so. However, in our recent student surveys students have expressed an understanding of the benefits of these kinds of activities. <i>See Individual language sections for further details of student questionnaire responses.</i></p> |
|--|--|---|

**C. NCATE STANDARDS (NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION)**

Our department offers two Education degrees, in French and Spanish Education. The content of these programs is required to conform to the standards of NCATE, and as such, the Department of Modern Languages is responsible for the Program level NCATE Standards that support Unit Standards 1 and 3. These Program level standards are:

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Unit Standard 1:</b><br>This standard is demonstrated through the ACTFL Standards shown above | <b>Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions:</b><br>Candidates know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, and skills. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the standards of the professional organization  | <i>(These are Addressed through the ACTFL Program Standards listed above)</i>  |
| <b>Unit Standard 3:</b>  | <b>Field Experiences and Clinical Practice:</b> The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Students complete experiences in the classroom at early levels through the Level II Clinical Experience and Student teaching.</i></li> </ul> <p>A member of the department of Modern Languages supervises and supports these clinical and field experiences.</p> |
| <b>Unit Standards 2 and 4-6</b>  | These Standards are assessed through the School of Education.  |  |
| <b>PROGRAM STANDARD 1: Language, Linguistics, Comparisons</b>                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard 1.a.</b> Demonstrating Language Proficiency. Candidates demonstrate a high level of proficiency in the target language, and they seek opportunities to strengthen their proficiency.</li> <li>• <b>Standard 1.b.</b> Understanding Linguistics. Candidates know the linguistic elements of the target language system, recognize the changing nature of language, and accommodate for gaps in their own knowledge of the target language system by learning on their own.</li> <li>• <b>Standard 1.c.</b> Identifying Language</li> </ul> | <p><b>See ACTFL Standards above. Assessment measures include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coursework</li> <li>• OPI</li> <li>• Portfolio</li> <li>• Addition of the 400 level grammar classes</li> </ul>  |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p>Comparisons. Candidates know the similarities and differences between the target language and other languages, identify the key differences in varieties of the target language, and seek opportunities to learn about varieties of the target language on their own.</p>   |  |
| <p><b>PROGRAM STANDARD 2: Cultures, Literatures, Cross-Disciplinary Concepts</b></p>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard 2.a. Demonstrating Cultural Understandings.</b> Candidates demonstrate that they understand the connections among the perspectives of a culture and its practices and products, and they integrate the cultural framework for foreign language standards into their instructional practices.</li> <li>• <b>Standard 2.b. Demonstrating Understanding of Literary and Cultural Texts and Traditions.</b> Candidates recognize the value and role of literary and cultural texts and use them to interpret and reflect upon the perspectives of the target cultures over time.</li> <li>• <b>Standard 2.c. Integrating Other Disciplines In Instruction.</b> Candidates integrate knowledge of other disciplines into foreign language instruction and identify distinctive viewpoints accessible only through the target language</li> </ul> | <p style="text-align: center;">(See ACTFL Standards Above)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Coursework</b></li> <li>• <b>Study Abroad.</b></li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>PROGRAM STANDARD 3: Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard 3.a. Understanding Language Acquisition and Creating a Supportive Classroom.</b> Candidates demonstrate an understanding of language acquisition at various developmental levels and use this knowledge to create a supportive classroom learning environment that includes target language input and opportunities for negotiation of meaning and meaningful interaction.</li> <li>• <b>Standard 3.b. Developing Instructional Practices That Reflect Language Outcomes and Learner Diversity.</b> Candidates develop a variety of instructional practices that reflect language outcomes and articulated program models and address the needs of diverse language learners.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Students apply knowledge of language acquisition theories, and instructional practices through practice teaching activities, materials development and similar measures.</i></li> </ul> <p>Addressed through SPN407 and FRN 407: Language Teaching Methodologies. This course is taught by a full-time faculty member with a background in foreign language education. They are aligned with clinical experiences to allow students to make connections between understanding and creating a well-taught foreign language class. See Methods syllabus for further details.</p> |
| <p><b>PROGRAM STANDARD 4: Integration of Standards into Curriculum and</b></p>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard 4.a. Understanding and Integrating Standards In Planning.</b> Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the goal areas and standards of the <i>Standards for Foreign Language Learning</i> and their</li> </ul>  | <p><b>Students plan lessons, and demonstrate knowledge of language standards and the planning process through completion of Unit Plans.</b></p>  |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Instruction</b>  | <p>state standards, and they integrate these frameworks into curricular planning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard 4.b. Integrating Standards in Instruction.</b> Candidates integrate the <i>Standards for Foreign Language Learning</i> and their state standards into language instruction.</li> <li>• <b>Standard 4.c. Selecting and Designing Instructional Materials.</b> Candidates use standards and curricular goals to evaluate, select, design, and adapt instructional resources.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methods</li> <li>• Student Teaching and Clinical Unit plans.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>PROGRAM STANDARD 5: Assessment of Languages and Cultures</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard 5.a. Knowing assessment models and using them appropriately.</b> Candidates believe that assessment is ongoing, and they demonstrate knowledge of multiple ways of assessment that are age- and level-appropriate by implementing purposeful measures.</li> <li>• <b>Standard 5.b. Reflecting on assessment.</b> Candidates reflect on the results of student assessments, adjust instruction accordingly, analyze the results of assessments, and use success and failure to determine the direction of instruction.</li> <li>• <b>Standard 5.c. Reporting assessment results.</b> Candidates interpret and report the results of student performances to all stakeholders and provide opportunity for discussion.</li> </ul> | <p><i>Students demonstrate knowledge of assessment models by developing rubrics, reflection on assessment and reporting assessment results and completion of an assessment evaluation of their teaching units.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methods</li> <li>• Student Teaching and Clinical Unit plans.</li> <li>• School of Ed Capstone</li> </ul> |
| <b>PROGRAM STANDARD 6: Professionalism</b>                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard 6.a. Engaging in Professional Development.</b> Candidates engage in professional development opportunities that strengthen their own linguistic and cultural competence and promote reflection on practice.</li> <li>• <b>Standard 6.b. Knowing the Value of Foreign Language Learning.</b> Candidates know the value of foreign language learning to the overall success of all students and understand that they will need to become advocates with students, colleagues, and members of the community to promote the field.</li> </ul>  | <p><i>Students engage in Professional development and demonstrate knowledge of foreign language learning through journaling, portfolios, and self-assessments.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Methods: Journal;portfolio, self-assessment</b></li> </ul>  |

### III. LANGUAGE SECTION ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

The Department Of Modern Languages consists of 6 distinct language sections. Each language section has different assessment needs and goals, and focuses on different specific student learning outcomes. In support of this diversity, this report is divided by language section. French and Spanish Programs have an Education

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

emphasis, which requires evaluation of the NCATE Standards along with the ACTFL Standards, whereas German, Japanese and the Less Commonly Taught courses focus primarily on the ACTFL Standards.

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

**A. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: *GERMAN***

***1. German Coursework and Examinations***

***a. Assessment Measures (Tools)***

The German section of the Department of Modern Language does not give Departmental Level Examinations for assessment purposes because:

1. The program is very small and the one senior professor in the section instructs all students and knows their competencies.
2. There are not enough upper level courses in German to promote a high degree of proficiency. The typical German major takes at least one course in English, several Independent Studies courses in reading, and an occasional 300/400 level class in literature or civilization. The German conversation and composition courses are offered once every two or three years.

Given these factors, the German department evaluates the language standards as a normal and consistent part of coursework. The results shown below are drawn from the final examinations given in the German 204 course.

***b. Benchmark (Standard):***

ACTFL: Communication: Communicate in a language other than English (listening comprehension, speaking, reading comprehension and writing).

***c. Results/Analysis:***

In the fall semester 2007 22 students in two sections of German 204 took the final examination. The average score was 61% (a low D). Please note that a final examination grade normally counts as only 20% of the total grade-in-course, and comes at the end of a long and arduous semester. Another indicator of student achievement can be seen as the composite test scores of the students during the course of the entire semester which normally count for 40% of the total grade-in-course. This same group of students achieved a test average of 76% (a mid-range C). This grade was also consistent with the average evaluation of student performance and achievement in daily classroom work.

In the spring semester of 2008 19 students in one section of German 204 took the final examination. The average score was 68% (a high D). Again the test average for this group was 75% which mirrored very closely the results of the semester before. Not only were these averages consistent during the two semesters in question, but they also mirrored those of the previous year: "A total of 57 students took the GER 204 final examination and the overall average grade was 57 %." As for the test averages there was "an overall average grade of 77 %." [from the *2006/2007 Assessment Report*].

At the advanced level, 14 student enrolled in German 414 (*Survey of German Literature I*) in the fall semester 2007. With three tests and class participation yielding a composite course grade, the

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

class average was 84% (a mid-range B). There was no comparable upper-division course offered in the spring semester 2008.

a. *Analysis/Planned Action*

As with other basic foreign language courses attrition also occurs at the 204 level in German. Students unprepared, or unwilling to complete such a course successfully are a much smaller percentage of students failing or withdrawing from the course. In the fall semester 2007 5 students withdrew from German 204 and 2 grades of F were reported. In the spring semester 2008 5 students withdrew from German 204 and 2 grades of F were reported.

Repeatedly over the past seven years requests have been submitted to the university administration to restore a second full-time permanent faculty position in German. These requests have been based on enrollment statistics which continuously support the need for a minimum of eight sections of German being taught (four sections being the normal course-load per full-time faculty member) and the difficulty the program has had in obtaining suitable temporary instructors. The consistent denial of these requests means that there is still only one full-time permanent and properly credentialed faculty member in the program.

Hence any ability to expand and revise the current German program has been severely curtailed by this serious limitation. Any true growth potential for this program may never be realized under the current structure.

## 2. *German Capstones*

a. *Assessment Measures (Tools):*

The German program at Marshall University has interpreted the capstone project as being a tool to allow the student to demonstrate linguistic and cultural competencies while, at the same time, allowing great latitude for individual interests and for practical utilization of the language. As a result, students have been encouraged to propose a project which may have personally beneficial applications. Language skills are not always an end in themselves, but rather often a means by which a great many other things can be accomplished.

b. *Benchmark (Standard)*

ACTFL: Communications; Culture; Connections

c. *Results/Analysis*

Three students completed Capstone Projects in German. (describe projects, how do they demonstrate communications, culture or connections. The projects were entitled:

***Café Cimino Introductory Webpage in German (currently available at [http://webpages.marshall.edu/~dickers2/capstone/de\\_index.htm](http://webpages.marshall.edu/~dickers2/capstone/de_index.htm)). This is a project that combines an interest in web design with a knowledge of German to the benefit of an area business which seeks to attract foreign visitors to its facilities.***

***Advice for students who are considering studying abroad in Germany or Austria.*** This was a brochure created for use by the Marshall University Center for International Studies to acquaint students considering foreign study with

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

some of the important issues they may encounter during travel and residency. The student who constructed this based the information on her own recent experience studying abroad in Germany and Austria and it arose from a presentation she gave at a special meeting held for students considering studying abroad.

***German Beer Compared to Japanese Beer.*** The student who presented this was completing a dual major in German and Japanese. He had already completed a capstone project in Japanese on the subject of Japanese beer and it was decided that a detailed power point presentation comparing and contrasting the role of beer (and other important beverages such as tea in Japan) in the context of a special topics class on *German Beer* would reveal insights into the two cultures and languages this student was mastering.

***d. Analysis/Planned Action***

The variety and practicality of such capstone projects as those completed in German recently demonstrate the flexibility as well as the breadth and scope of the applicability of German in professional and personal use. Naturally this is not the only possible route to the demonstration of linguistic proficiency and cultural competencies. Owing to the small size of the program, however, students will continue to be encouraged to consider capstone projects which reflect their own interests, and curiosities and not only those which arise from a specific course or subject.

**3. Student Surveys (Indirect Measure)**

***a. Assessment Measures (Tools)***

Small group meetings with continuing German Majors (4/11/2008 and 4/15/2008).

***b. Benchmark (Standard) ADFL:*** Involved Faculty

***c. Results/Analysis:***

- Students want more study abroad opportunities and financial support for those opportunities.
- Students want more regularly scheduled upper division courses in order to reduce how many independent study courses they are forced to take.
- Confirmation of the gaps in our small German Programs. (See other analyses in this section.

***d. Analysis/Planned Action***

These student surveys clearly show that our German program is seriously lacking in a number of areas – and more importantly that these gaps **ARE** affecting our students.

Given our program limitations, and the importance of our students completing the international experience, we have attempted to seek support from outside our institution in for Study abroad.

However, a recent discussion with one such program in the hopes of promoting greater opportunities for students to study abroad made the issues glaringly apparent.

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

In May of 2008 the program head of German met with the directors of the University of Vienna's European Summer Programs. The problem, as pointed out by the Viennese directors, is that with American higher education continually placing athletics as a higher priority than academics in the face of declining financial resources in American universities.

In this regard there is little room for optimism that students will get to have the life-changing experience of foreign study without a greater financial commitment from this institution. German students at Marshall University will continue to be short-changed in their quest for affordable overseas study opportunities.

***GERMAN: Assistance needed with Assessment***

The German program at Marshall University is unlikely to be able to produce greater levels of competence and proficiency in its students without additional full-time permanent faculty members. The current program head must oversee all instructors (both full-time and part-time), handle all program administration, teach independent study classes on a regular basis as uncompensated overloads and deal with all student-related issues. This severely limits the time available for the development of new strategies and mechanisms for assessing student achievement and for promoting growth within the program itself.

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

**B. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: JAPANESE**

*1. Japanese Coursework and Examinations*

*a. Assessment Measures (Tools)*

The Japanese section of the Department of Modern Language does not give Departmental Level Examinations for assessment purposes at this time. Since the Japanese program is small, the results were taken from the final examinations of JPN204 and JPN315, spring 2008.

*b. Benchmark (Standard): ACTFL: Communication*

*c. Results/Analysis:*

The four skills are evaluated throughout all courses through the expertise of the instructor. Since the Japanese program is small, the results were taken from the final examination of JPN204 and JPN 315 for spring of 2008. No formal departmental assessment measures were conducted in fall of 2007, as JPN204 was taught by an adjunct instructor and the program was being re-configured under the direction of a full-time faculty member.

**204 Level:**

In spring 2008, one class took the JPN204 final examination.

JPN204 Final exam. The results were:

| ALL STUDENTS (23)                     |              |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Average Grammar Exam Grade            | 77%          |
| Average Reading Comprehension Grade   | 74%          |
| Average Listening Comprehension Grade | 73%          |
| Average Writing Grade                 | 75%          |
| Average Speaking Grade                | 85%          |
| <b>Average Overall Exam Grade</b>     | <b>76.8%</b> |

Individual speaking exam was conducted in the instructor's office. Speaking shows the highest percentage, and listening shows the lowest percentage.

**300 Level:**

In spring 2008, one class took the JPN315 Intermediate Japanese.

JPN315 Final exam. The results were:

| ALL STUDENTS (6)                      |               |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| Average Grammar Exam Grade            | 66.49%        |
| Average Reading Comprehension Grade   | 53.33%        |
| Average Listening Comprehension Grade | 68.33%        |
| Average Writing Grade                 | 74.66%        |
| Average Speaking Grade                | 81.08%        |
| <b>Average Overall Exam Grade</b>     | <b>73.06%</b> |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

Individual speaking exam was conducted in the instructor's office. Speaking shows the highest percentage, and reading comprehension shows the lowest percentage

In JPN315, there was a wide gap between individual student's skills because some of the students experienced study abroad and some did not. It is difficult for instructors to keep a balance to make the course challenging but not too demanding for students. Students have problems to retain their vocabulary and kanji (Chinese characters) that they learned in the previous lessons.

**d. Analysis/Planned Action**

Based on the results of these exams, we need to include more dictation and listening practice as classroom practice to improve students' listening skills. We also noticed that there is a need for constant review for kanji (Chinese character) writing. Instructors noticed that the students had difficulty to retain kanji they learned in the previous lessons.

For the next year, we are planning to use a standardized exam called Japanese Language Proficiency Test (JLPT) as department exams. Students in JPN204 will take the level 4 JLPT, and students in JPN315 will take the level 3 JLPT. Japanese majors are expected to be able to pass the level 3 JLPT by the time they complete JPN402. Therefore, these exams will be a good indication to assess students' Japanese skills.

Additionally, we will be considering including cultural questions on future exams.

## **2. Japanese Capstones**

- a. Assessment Measures (Tools) – Capstone Projects:** In fall 2007, 9 Japanese majors successfully completed the capstone project. The capstone project for Japanese major requires: a 10-15 page research paper in English on Japanese related topics, a 15 minute presentation in Japanese, Q&A in Japanese during the presentation, and handout for presentation in English with abstract. Students wrote the paper in English because writing a research paper in Japanese is considerably difficult for the undergraduate Japanese program. Students presented their Japanese skills by presenting the paper in Japanese which was challenging enough for all the students. The Capstone Projects also demonstrate a comprehension of Japanese culture.
- b. Benchmarks (Standards): ACTFL: Communication, Culture, Connections, Comparisons, Communities**
- c. Results/Analysis** – Nine students completed Capstone Projects in Japanese. All students worked hard and took this project seriously throughout the semester. The research was presented at the end of the semester as a part of MDL 481 Special Topics: Japanese society and culture in translation. We also invited some Japanese guests from a local Japanese company in WV. These extra guests in business suits created a serious, job-interview like atmosphere.

***The projects were entitled:***

- 1) Housewives of the environment: Japanese women's involvement in the Japanese environmental movement
- 2) Render Unto Tennou (Emperor): Christianity in Japanese Society
- 3) Anime invasion: How Japanese animation and film have invaded the U.S.
- 4) The struggle for superiority in Sumo

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

- 5) Life in Shinto and death in Buddhism
- 6) The Japanese aesthetic: Tale of Genji and contemporary Japanese society
- 7) Drinking in Japan
- 8) Japanese education system
- 9) Where did Shinto, Buddhism, and Christianity come from in Japan?

***The student self-evaluations:***

The table below shows the results of the student self-evaluations in fall 2007. All nine students submitted the student self-evaluation form.

|  |   | <i>Definitely</i> | <i>Somewhat</i> | <i>Not at all</i> |
|--|---|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| <b>Standard 1: Communication</b>   |   |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>1.1</b>   | <i>In completing this project, I provided and obtained information in the target language, expressed feelings, emotions and opinions.</i>                     | <b>8</b>          | <b>1</b>        |                   |
| <b>1.2</b>   | <i>I understood and interpreted written and spoken language on a variety of topics</i>  | <b>6</b>          | <b>3</b>        |                   |
| <b>1.3</b>   | <i>I presented information, concepts and ideas to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics.</i>   | <b>7</b>          | <b>2</b>        |                   |
| <p><b>Please explain and provide any details/examples for the above (use additional sheet if necessary):</b><br/>           *My speech was too long for the time, plus some of the students had not taken enough Japanese courses to understand the material.<br/>           *During class I used the readings and my experience in Japan to help discussions.<br/>           *For this project, one of the assignments was to do a 10-12 minutes presentation in Japanese in front of my peers, professors and Japanese guests.<br/>           *For my project, I was able to speak to Japanese people for ideas and opinions on my paper along with presenting my project to my MDL481 class in Japanese.<br/>           *In my project I touched on many different topics about drinking, such as drinking itself and the impact it has on society.</p> |   |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>Standard 2. Cultures</b>  |   |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>2.1</b>   | <i>Through this project, I developed an understanding of the relationship between the practices and perspectives of the culture and literature I studied.</i> | <b>9</b>          |                 |                   |
| <b>2.2</b>   | <i>I developed an understanding of the relationship between the products and perspectives of the culture and literature studied.</i>                          | <b>9</b>          |                 |                   |
| <p><b>Please explain and provide any details/examples for the above (use additional sheet if necessary):</b><br/>           *The text was very informative in this course.<br/>           *The secondary books we read in this class, along with our own research have given me further insight on my understanding of Japan, its society and culture.<br/>           *In my research I was able to learn about many problems in the Japanese industry and how and why shoes problems arose.<br/>           *I loved to drink in Japan with my Japanese friends. Doing this project allowed me to understand the culture and concepts around drinking.</p>   |   |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>Standard 3: Connections</b>   |   |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>3.1</b>   | <i>I reinforced and furthered my knowledge of other disciplines and the research process through the foreign language.</i>                                    | <b>8</b>          | <b>1</b>        |                   |
| <b>3.2</b>   | <i>I acquired information and recognized the distinctive</i>  | <b>9</b>          |                 |                   |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|  |   |          |          |  |
|--|---|----------|----------|--|
|  | <i>viewpoints that are only available through the foreign language and its cultures.</i>  |          |          |  |
|  | <i>I have increased my knowledge of conducting research and investigation techniques through this project.</i>  | <b>9</b> |          |  |
| <p><b>Please explain and provide any details/examples for the above (use additional sheet if necessary):</b><br/>         *By studying the religions, I found that the Japanese are very dedicated to their culture.<br/>         *Completing this research project has certainly improved my research skills and incorporated my writing skills in both English and Japanese. I have also learned to present formally in Japanese.<br/>         *I was able to learn about certain problems unique to Japanese culture through specifically reading books and articles written from the Japanese perspective. Also I was able to use research techniques which I have not used recently.<br/>         *By knowing Japanese, it allowed me to discuss my topic among fellow Japanese and understand their viewpoints.</p>  |   |          |          |  |
| <b>Standard 4: Comparisons</b>   |   |          |          |  |
| <b>4.1</b>   | <i>I developed an understanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the language studied and my own.</i>   | <b>7</b> | <b>2</b> |  |
| <b>4.2:</b>  | <i>I developed understanding of the concept of culture and literature through comparisons of the cultures and literatures studied as compared to my own culture and literature.</i> | <b>9</b> |          |  |
| <p><b>Please explain and provide any details/examples for the above (use additional sheet if necessary):</b><br/>         *The differences between America and Japan's religious background furthered my understanding of culture in Japan.<br/>         *The books we read and the discussion we had in class offered me a distinct and cultural relative as well as universal approach in understanding and connecting Japan to my own culture.<br/>         *I was able to make connections to the US society in the problems I examined and compare both cultures based on these problems. The literature I used provided several interesting facts about how the US culture is causing these problems in Japan.<br/>         *I have done a lot of independent study and translation while I was in Japan. It allowed me to see the differences between English and Japanese.</p> |   |          |          |  |
| <b>Standard 5: Communities</b>   |   |          |          |  |
| <b>5.1:</b>  | <i>I used the language both within and beyond the school setting.</i>   | <b>8</b> | <b>1</b> |  |
| <b>5.2:</b>  | <i>I developed an understanding of how the foreign language connects to my life as a whole, both for personal enjoyment and enrichment.</i>   | <b>9</b> |          |  |

**Please explain and provide any details/examples for the above (use additional sheet if necessary):**

- \*At my job, I was able to help Japanese customers with my use of the language.
- \*Learning and practicing Japanese has allowed me to make Japanese friends, gain an interest in living and working in Japanese society and most of all, to form a lifelong bond with Japan and its people.
- \*Overall I enjoyed learning about my topic greatly and was able to use my Japanese outside the classroom frequently. Also I was able to realize that the US culture can affect other cultures in many ways, both good and bad.
- \*I use my language to talk to my Japanese friends online and keep in touch with my Japanese family.

---

In reviewing the table above, students expressed an understanding of how the ACTFL Standards applied to their projects. Especially, students learned about Japanese culture as well as their own culture by comparing and analyzing multiple aspects of culture and society. All

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

the students were able to present a research paper in Japanese, and some of them expressed that they need more practice in doing so.

*e. Analysis/Planned Action*

1. A short English presentation needs to be added to the existing Japanese presentation for the capstone projects. All students who took MDL481 had previous Japanese knowledge, but their Japanese levels varied. Therefore, some students had hard time understanding presenters' Japanese presentations. Students' self-evaluation suggested including English presentation as well as the Japanese one.
2. Another student shared his struggle with preparing Japanese presentation since we did not practice how to present a research paper in Japanese in previous Japanese language courses. Japanese requires different type of speech for different purposes such as polite speech, plain speech, and expository speech. We need to include some practice for expository speech in previous Japanese courses.
3. We need to establish a course exclusively for the Japanese capstone course. Students did not have a chance to learn how to research, how to present their research paper in Japanese in previous Japanese courses. With limited Japanese courses, it is difficult to do so. Therefore we need to establish the Japanese capstone course in the future.

In conclusion, the assessment of our capstone projects for Japanese should be reviewed and further developed incorporating with previous Japanese languages courses. Overall, students found this project a great learning experience.

### **3. Japanese Student Surveys (Indirect Measure)**

- a. *Assessment Measures (Tools)* – Small group meetings with continuing Japanese Majors
- b. *Benchmark (Standard) ADFL:* Involved Faculty; Opportunities outside classroom, Study Abroad; *ACTFL:* Connections

*c. Results/Analysis:*

In conjunction with Assessment Day 2008, 20 students returned the student survey. Small group discussions were also held on Assessment Day. The results showed some positive reactions to the program, and some areas for improvement.

**Positives:**

- Interactive activities are helpful
- Overall satisfied with the program
- Students feel they have developed some skills
- Students feel they have gained confidence in their language skills
- Student have made good connections to other Japanese language learners and teachers
- A large number of Japanese majors for a first year program (35, and still increasing)
- Availability of assistance from native speakers in the classroom, during review sessions, conversation partners and program events

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

**Areas for improvement:**

- Clarify student course expectations and program goals – students have a somewhat false idea of what they will be able to accomplish in 4 semesters of Japanese
- Additional faculty
- Additional culture and upper level courses
- Writing specific course
- Students feel their weakest skills are listening and speaking which appears accurate by faculty assessment.
- Classroom and technology availability remain an issue. Currently classrooms used for Japanese are at various locations on campus and technology is not always easily accessible.
- Students want more study abroad opportunities and financial support for those opportunities.
- Students want more regularly scheduled upper division courses in order to reduce how many independent study courses they are forced to take.
- Confirmation of the gaps in our small Japanese Programs.

***d. Analysis/Planned Action***

The Japanese section is a new program in its first year with Japanese majors enrolled in courses in the Fall of 2007. The program requires significant support and continued analysis in moving forward. See Assistance Needed for further details.

**JAPANESE: Assistance Needed with Assessment:**

The Japanese program at Marshall University remains seriously understaffed, and the program will lose its effectiveness quickly without additional full-time permanent faculty members.

The program had only one full-time tenure track faculty member in 2007-2008. She is supported only with a single grad student who taught 2 course sections per semester, and helped with administrative tasks.

However, only the full-time faculty member can teach upper level courses. She also must mentor all instructors (both full-time and part-time) (including local Japanese high school teachers in programs which feed into Marshall's Japanese program), handle all program administration, teach independent study classes on a regular basis as uncompensated overloads and deal with all student-related issues and advising. This severely limits the time available for the development of new strategies and mechanisms for assessing student achievement and maintaining the momentum that the Japanese program is currently showing.

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

**C. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: *FRENCH***

***1. French Coursework and Examinations***

Note: *During the past year, there have been some challenges in the French Section due to (a) the reduction in faculty personnel following a retirement in which the retiring faculty was not replaced, (b) a sabbatical for one of the remaining two full-time faculty members, and (c) the disruption caused by the remodeling of offices and the hasty storage of critical documents and material which now appear to have been misplaced. This has affected the data for the French Section. See Analysis/Planning for further comments.*

***a. Assessment Measures (Tools)***

In French, the four skills are regularly assessed in all classes as well as on the departmental examinations. The departmental examinations were given at the end of the spring semester in 2008 but the results obtained from the first level (given during the last week of the 204 class) were unfortunately lost during the transference of office files and furniture made necessary by the summer renovation of the seventh floor of Smith Hall. The assessment of student proficiency at Level I was therefore based this year upon grades earned on the final exam.

***b. Benchmark (Standard)***

*ACTFL:* Communications, *NCATE:* Program Standard #1

***c. Results/Analysis:***

***Fall 2007:***

**204 Level:**

27 students took the 204 level final exam in Fall of 2007, and the overall average grade was 86.1%. While it is not possible to make comparisons between last years and this year's assessments (as they were not the same assessment), it is interesting to note that the Fall 2007 exam given in a course is significantly higher than the 70.75% average on last year's exams.

**300 Level:** No 300 level assessment was completed this academic semester. See Analysis/Planning.

***Spring 2008:***

**204 Level:**

Twenty-five students took the 204 level final exam and the overall average grade was 84.04%. This result is 14% higher than the results obtained from the departmental exam given last year, but the professor administering the exam stated that the spring 2008 class was the best-prepared class she had taught in the last 10 years.

**300 Level:**

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

The results obtained from the departmental exam at the 300 level were as follows: (Is this fall of 2007 or Spring of 2008)

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Majors only [5]            |     |
| Average grammar exam grade | 84% |
| Average writing grade      | 88% |
| Average overall exam grade | 86% |

|                            |       |
|----------------------------|-------|
| All students [11]          |       |
| Average grammar exam grade | 72%   |
| Average writing grade      | 85%   |
| Average overall exam grade | 78.5% |

It is interesting to note that both the highest grade earned on the exam (95%) and the lowest grade earned on the exam (27%) were made by non-majors. This 27% affected the overall averages. The average overall exam grade was 10% lower this year when compared to all students last year and 2% lower when compared to majors only. In addition, the results were obtained from final exam scores last year and the actual departmental exam this year. The final exams tested additional areas such as literature, which the departmental exam doesn't assess. When compared to the results obtained from the actual departmental exam administered in 2006-2007 there was a 2% decrease this year in the average overall exam grade for all students and a 6.4% decrease for the average exam grade. The average written grade increased by 10%, however. The average reading comprehension grade was not assessed on the exam this year due to time constraints; the inclusion of this area on the test would have probably increased the average overall exam grade since the average reading comprehension grade had shown the highest percentage last year. ;

***d. Analysis/Planned Action:***

The data for assessment will need to be reviewed and records more carefully monitored in future semesters.

***4. French Capstones***

No Assessment completed for the capstones completed during the Academic Year 2007-2008

***5. Study Abroad in French.***

No Assessment completed for Study Abroad in French for the Academic Year 2007-2008

***6. Student Surveys (Indirect Measure).***

During Assessment Day 2008, Student surveys were planned, however, there were no French students in attendance during that event. This is an area for improvement in future years, though it clearly tells

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

us that the issues in the French Section *ARE* affecting our students experience and interest in the program.

**FRENCH: Assistance needed with Assessment:**

The French Department currently remains woefully understaffed, with only 2 full-time, tenured professors in the department. This severely limits the time available for the development of new strategies and mechanisms for assessing student achievement and promoting growth within the department. Hiring of additional faculty is essential for the survival of the French Program.

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

**D. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: *FRENCH EDUCATION* (Additional)**

**1. *Portfolios***

**a. *Assessment Tools:***

All French majors are required to complete a language skills portfolio. Three French Education Majors completed the portfolio in fall of 2007 in FRN 312 (Teaching Methods). Two Liberal Arts majors were scheduled to complete the portfolio in spring of 2008 but did not do so.

This portfolio will provide qualitative evaluations of our students' language skills in the semester prior to their graduation.

Students are required to reach an "Advanced-Low" level on the ACTFL Speaking Proficiency Scale prior to graduation, and this same level was adopted for reading, writing, and listening rubrics developed using these ACTFL Proficiency Scales.

The portfolio project was graded based on those rubrics. The results above demonstrate that the student was able to achieve a level of language either approaching or meeting the "Advanced Low" proficiency level in all areas.

b. **Benchmark (Standard) ACTFL:** All 5 Cs; NCATE: Program Standard #1

**c. *Results/Analysis***

The results of the French Portfolio Assessment are shown in the table below:

|                                       | <b>Listening</b>                            | <b>Reading</b>       | <b>Speaking</b>                         | <b>Spontaneous Writing</b>            | <b>Writing Samples</b>                   |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>French</b>                         |   |                      |   |                                       |  |
| 1                                     | Meets                                       | Meets                | Meets                                   | Approaches                            | Meets                                    |
| 2                                     | Approaches                                  | Meets                | Not completed                           | Meets                                 | Not Completed                            |
| 7                                     | Meets                                       | Meets                | Meets                                   | Meets                                 | Meets                                    |
| <b>Totals:</b>                        | <b>2 Meets (67%)<br/>1 Approaches (33%)</b> | <b>3 Meets(100%)</b> | <b>2 Meets (67%)<br/>1 Not complete</b> | <b>2 Meets (67%)<br/>1 Approaches</b> | <b>2 Meets (67%),<br/>1 Not Complete</b> |
| <b>Approaches or Meets Standards:</b> | <b>100%</b>                                 | <b>100%</b>          | <b>67%</b>                              | <b>100%</b>                           | <b>67%</b>                               |

**a. *Oral Proficiency Interviews***

**a. *Assessment Tools:***

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

All French Education are required to complete a language skills portfolio. Three French Education Majors completed the portfolio in Fall of 2007. Two French Liberal Arts majors were scheduled to complete the portfolio in Spring of 2008 but did not do so.

This portfolio will provide qualitative evaluations of our students' language skills in the semester prior to their graduation.

Students are required to reach an "Advanced-Low" level on the ACTFL Speaking Proficiency Scale prior to graduation, and this same level was adopted for reading, writing, and listening rubrics developed using these ACTFL Proficiency Scales.

The portfolio project was graded based on those rubrics. The results above demonstrate that the student was able to achieve a level of language either approaching or meeting the "Advanced Low" proficiency level in all areas.

b. **Benchmark (Standard) ACTFL:** All 5 Cs; **NCATE:** Program Standard #1

c. **Results/Analysis**

One French Education Major completed the Oral Proficiency Interview in Spring of 2008. No Candidates took the exam during Fall of 2007. The results are shown in the table below.

| <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Language</u>                  | <u>Test Type</u> | <u>Name</u> | Status    | Rating | Note |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------|--------|------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | FRENCH<br>Marshall<br>University | OPI-<br>DIAG     | 1           | Completed | IM     |      |

Unfortunately, none of our French Education Majors have met the NCATE Established level of "Advanced-Low". This is likely due to a lack of study abroad experiences, and the fact that the interview occurs by telephone, which eliminates the interpersonal element of language. Additional measures should be discussed that allow for additional faculty trained in giving these Oral Proficiency Students, though it should be noted that there are a number of limitations to doing so including the time to become a tester, and the limitations placed by ACTFL and NCATE on which students a professor is allowed to examine (they cannot examine their own students).

d. **Analysis/Planned Action:**

Although this is only one student, the Advanced-Low Level required by NCATE is a high standard, and one that is very difficult to meet without a significant study abroad experience, which this student did not have. Students need to continue to be strongly encouraged to participate in Study Abroad. Future plans for French Education majors may include incorporation of a Dual major, which will provide students additional opportunities for improvement in their language skills.

Additionally, the current Oral Proficiency Interview requirement allows the option of a simple "level check" – meaning the tester ONLY tests for the advanced Low level. While this student

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

received a full rating, without further students as a point of comparison it is difficult to analyze this data in any way that provides us information that we can use to improve our students skills.

***FRENCH EDUCATION: Assistance Needed with Assessment***

See Spanish Education and French sections of this report.

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

**E. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: *SPANISH***

***1.Spanish Coursework and Departmental exams:***

***a. Assessment Measures (Tools)***

The Spanish departmental examinations continue to undergo revision, and are given in an online format, in a WebCT Environment. WebCT is password protected. Exams are proctored and are given ONLY in the Foreign Language Laboratory. NCATE requires an “advanced low” level of language proficiency for speaking, and this same level has been adopted as the standard for all rubrics developed for the Spanish Departmental Examination.

In our continuing efforts to assess all four language skills, the current exam assesses Listening, reading, Writing and grammar.. As an interpersonal skill, speaking continues to be assessed in the classroom and via the Oral Proficiency Interview requirement for teacher candidates.

Assessments include a multiple choice grammar exam and listening exam, a translation based reading comprehension exam, and a spontaneous writing prompt (2 prompts for 300 level). All exams are based on the ACTFL Proficiency Standards (which NCATE also uses), and graded based on rubrics developed based on those ACTFL Standards.

Exams are graded based rubrics developed from the ACTFL proficiency standards. Using these as Benchmark (Standard)s, all Education Majors are expected to reach Advanced Low level of proficiency for speaking, so that level was adopted for writing as well.

Current grading rubric assumes Advanced Low as the Standard to meet (100%). No student has yet to exceed the standard at the 204 or 300 levels.

A score of 70% would be approximately “Intermediate Low” in skill level. This would be an appropriate goal for SPN 204 students to reach in their writing skills, but for our 300 level courses, they should be aiming slightly higher.

Listening exam is a multiple choice exam, and Reading comprehension is translation to English, and graded using a rubric based on comprehension – ACTFL provides no standards for reading or listening proficiency.

***b. Benchmark/Standard***

ACTFL: Communication; NCATE: Program Standard #1

***c. Results/Analysis:***

**204 level:**

In Spanish: 90 students took the Departmental Examination Level I in fall of 2007, either after completing the 204 course or as a placement measure. The results are shown below:

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|                                      |               |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| ALL STUDENTS (90)                    |               |
| Average Grammar Exam Grade:          | 57.19 %       |
| Average Listening Exam Grade:        | 52.61%        |
| Average Reading Comprehension Grade: | 62.11%        |
| Average Writing Grade:               | 56.55%        |
| <b>Average Overall Exam Grade:</b>   | <b>57.12%</b> |

|                                      |            |
|--------------------------------------|------------|
| MAJORS ONLY (3)                      |            |
| Average Grammar Exam Grade:          | 73%        |
| Average Listening Exam Grade:        | 60%        |
| Average Reading Comprehension Grade: | 83%        |
| Average Writing Grade:               | 70%        |
| <b>Average Overall Exam Grade:</b>   | <b>71%</b> |

These scores show that there is still room for improvement in our students' language skills at Level I. However, our majors show notable improvement on our Grammar exam, our reading comprehension activity, and have upheld the same score in writing. It is very possible that there were technical difficulties with the listening portion of the exam, which resulted in reduced scores.

One noticeable change is a 10% increase in reading comprehension. This is the same, culturally based paragraph as last year, but these students performed higher – both majors and non-majors. This shows that our majors are completing SPN 204 with a higher level of reading comprehension skills. Writing skills dropped in non-majors (but it should be noted, that there were a number of students who simply did not reply or typed in "I don't know", etc. as their response.

This class of 204 students has not necessarily received the benefits of the measures implemented in recent years : the C or better requirement, placement test options, disallowing of credit for courses not taken, etc.

**300 level:**

**In Spanish:** 17 students took the Departmental Exam II in fall 2007, either at the end of a 300 level course or as a placement measure. The results are shown below:

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|                                      |            |
|--------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>ALL STUDENTS (17)</b>             |            |
| Average Grammar Exam Grade:          | 65%        |
| Average Listening Exam Grade:        | 71%        |
| Average Reading Comprehension Grade: | 71%        |
| Average Writing Grade:               | 77%        |
| <b>Average Overall Exam Grade:</b>   | <b>71%</b> |

|                                      |            |
|--------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>MAJORS ONLY (7)</b>               |            |
| Average Grammar Exam Grade:          | 85%        |
| Average Listening Exam Grade:        | 67%        |
| Average Reading Comprehension Grade: | 77%        |
| Average Writing Grade:               | <b>75%</b> |
| <b>Average Overall Exam Grade:</b>   | <b>75%</b> |

While our average overall for all students is down slightly, it should be noted that there has been a 10% increase in Writing skills. While an exam does not always provide ideal sources of data for active skills, this tells us that our students are beginning to better grasp writing at the 300 level.

In comparing these scores to last year's scores for our Majors, we can see an overall increase in our students' skill. This shows that our students are demonstrating some measure of improvement in exam scores over last year. This will no doubt require further investigation to determine if this is a complete trend change.

**Spring 2008:**

**204 Level**

In Spanish: 88 students took the Departmental Examination Level I in fall of 2007, either after completing the 204 course or as a placement measure. The results are shown below:

|                                      |                    |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| <b>ALL STUDENTS (88)</b>             | <b>Spring 2008</b> |
| Average Grammar Exam Grade:          | 62%                |
| Average Listening Exam Grade:        | 57%                |
| Average Reading Comprehension Grade: | 67%                |
| Average Writing Grade:               | 59%                |
| <b>Average Overall Exam Grade:</b>   | <b>61%</b>         |
|                                      |                    |

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| <b>MAJORS (2): (1 major Spring 07)</b> | <b>Spring 2008</b> |
| Average Grammar Exam Grade:            | 82%                |
| Average Listening Exam Grade:          | 65%                |
| Average Reading Comprehension Grade:   | 80%                |
| Average Writing Grade:                 | 70%                |
| <b>Average Overall Exam Grade:</b>     | <b>74%</b>         |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

**300 Level:**

15 students took the Departmental Exam in Spring of 2008.

| <b>ALL STUDENTS (15)</b>             | <b>Spring 08</b> |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| Average Grammar Exam Grade:          | 86%              |
| Average Listening Exam Grade:        | 79%              |
| Average Reading Comprehension Grade: | 81%              |
| Average Writing Grade:               | 74%              |
| <b>Average Overall Exam Grade:</b>   | <b>80%</b>       |

| <b>Majors (7)</b>                    | <b>Spring 08</b> |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| Average Grammar Exam Grade:          | 90%              |
| Average Listening Exam Grade:        | 84%              |
| Average Reading Comprehension Grade: | 87%              |
| Average Writing Grade:               | 76%              |
| <b>Average Overall Exam Grade:</b>   | <b>84%</b>       |

This data shows that our majors are meeting the Communications standards higher than non-majors – though it is notable that our non-majors (likely language minors) are able to achieve well over 70% on these advanced exams.

As the exam given in Spring of 2007 was a different exam, I is not possible to compare Spring 2007 to Spring 2008 results. However, a comparison of the 300 level scores for fall 2007 and spring 2008 semesters demonstrates a slight increase in our student performance in spring 2007, with the exception of writing:

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|                                       |            |
|---------------------------------------|------------|
| MAJORS ONLY (11)                      |            |
| Average Grammar Exam Grade:           | 80%        |
| Average Listening Exam Grade:         | 67%        |
| Average Reading Comprehension Grade:  | 71%        |
| Average Writing Grade (10 students)*: | 65%        |
| <b>Average Overall Exam Grade:</b>    | <b>71%</b> |

| MAJORS ONLY                          | Fall 2006  | Fall 2007  | Spring 2008 |
|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Average Grammar Exam Grade:          | 80%        | 85%        | 90%         |
| Average Listening Exam Grade:        | 67%        | 67%        | 84%         |
| Average Reading Comprehension Grade: | 71%        | 77%        | 87%         |
| Average Writing Grade:               | 65%        | <b>75%</b> | 76%         |
| <b>Average Overall Exam Grade:</b>   | <b>71%</b> | <b>75%</b> | <b>84%</b>  |

This comparison shows a notable improvement between Fall of 2007 and Spring of 2008, and a 13% improvement over Fall of 2006 when these exams were first placed in an online environment. This demonstrates an increase in the language skills of our majors – and provides evidence that our students can communicate in the target language, at least in a predictable environment. This upward trend shows promise that our various measures implemented (C or better requirements, stricter pre-requisites, etc.) are having some benefits.

*d. Analysis/Planned Action*

The Spanish Section of the Department of Modern languages is continually monitoring these exams. For Fall 2008, a number of minor modifications will be made to the exam itself, including revision of culture questions, and expansion of the exam instructions, as well as correcting a problem with the listening portion of the exam, and piloting a speaking component of the exam.

Additionally, the section is discussing further implementation of placement exam measures at earlier course levels, and will be discussing the use of standardized and normed testing measures including WebCAPE, STAMP and others as valid measures of our student performance.

Additional, ongoing planned activities (as time and faculty availability allow) include:

- i. Creation of an exam specifically for Native Speakers of Spanish.
- ii. Activation of Listening and Speaking Assessments.
- iii. Wider administration of these exams to encompass the 100 – 203 courses \*.
- iv. Ongoing review of effectiveness of exam questions.

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

*\*See Summary and Conclusion for comments on this intention*

**2. Spanish Capstones (Direct and Indirect Measures)**

**a. Assessment Measures (Tools)**

The 300 and 400 level culture and literature courses address these standards within the courses, and are taught according to the expertise of the faculty. The Capstone Projects also demonstrate a comprehension of culture.

This year an expanded capstone evaluation form has been implemented, in order to further assess our students cultural and literature knowledge. This form was originally pilot tested in **Spring of 2007**. The expanded form required the inclusion of the capstone project abstract in the target language, and a student self- evaluation of his/her language skills.

**b. Benchmark (Standard)**

**ACTFL:** Communications, Culture, Connections, Communities; **ADFL:** Enrollment in upper level courses and majors

**c. Results/Analysis:**

The 300 and 400 level culture and literature courses address this standard within the courses, and are taught according to the expertise of the faculty. The Capstone Projects also demonstrate a comprehension of culture.

The expanded capstone form requires the capstone project abstract in the target language, and a student self- evaluation of his/her language skills. 11 of the 12 capstone projects included a student self- evaluation. *Seven* students included the abstract.

The table below shows the results of the student self-evaluations from Fall 2007 to Spring 2008.

|  |   | <i>Definitely</i> | <i>Somewhat</i> | <i>Not at all</i> |
|--|---|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| <b>Standard 1: Communication</b>   |   |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>1.1</b>   | <i>In completing this project, I provided and obtained information in the target language, expressed feelings, emotions and opinions.</i> | <b>9</b>          |                 |                   |
| <b>1.2</b>   | <i>I understood and interpreted written and spoken language on a variety of topics</i>  | <b>7</b>          | <b>4</b>        |                   |
| <b>1.3</b>   | <i>I presented information, concepts and ideas to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics.</i>                         | <b>7</b>          | <b>4</b>        |                   |
| <b>Please explain and provide any details/examples for the above (use additional sheet if necessary):</b><br>*I don't feel I presented the information on a "variety" of topics. It was really just on one topic expressed |   |                   |                 |                   |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|   |   |    |        |
|---|---|----|--------|
| <p>extensively.<br/>           *By translating the script, I gained a wealth of knowledge and vocabulary.<br/>           *I completed a 25-minute presentation in Spanish summarizing the results of research in El Salvador.<br/>           *I believe I need to improve my communication.</p>   |   |    |        |
| <b>Standard 2: Cultures</b>   |   |    |        |
| 2<br>.<br>1   | <i>Through this project, I developed an understanding of the relationship between the practices and perspectives of the culture and literature I studied.</i>                       | 9  | 2      |
| 2<br>.<br>2   | <i>I developed an understanding of the relationship between the products and perspectives of the culture and literature studied.</i>  | 6  | 5      |
| <p><b>Please explain and provide any details/examples for the above (use additional sheet if necessary):</b><br/>           *Trough this project, I was further motivated to study Spanish Literature more in depth.<br/>           *This project presented a distinct challenge in keeping w/the Spanish culture, but wasn't impossible.<br/>           *I compared/contrasted cultural texts with the political, economic, and social discourses to examine the status of women in El Salvador.</p>   |   |    |        |
| <b>Standard 3: Connections</b>  |   |    |        |
| 3<br>.<br>1   | <i>I reinforced and furthered my knowledge of other disciplines and the research process through the foreign language.</i>  | 11 |        |
| 3<br>.<br>2   | <i>I acquired information and recognized the distinctive viewpoints that are only available through the foreign language and its cultures.</i>                                      | 8  | 3      |
|   | <i>I have increased my knowledge of conducting research and investigation techniques through this project.</i>  | 7  | 3<br>1 |
| <p><b>Please explain and provide any details/examples for the above (use additional sheet if necessary):</b><br/>           *I feel that my knowledge of how to conduct a research and investigation was already well established and practiced before this.<br/>           *Because I didn't do a research paper, most of my research was done in areas appertaining with the script, the author, and vocabulary.<br/>           *I examined and analyzed cultural texts which I have never done before, in order to uncover the changes in the status of women in El Salvador.<br/>           *I have never made connections so deep &amp; abstract before. It was a challenge.</p> |   |    |        |
| <b>Standard 4: Comparisons</b>  |   |    |        |
| 4<br>.<br>1   | <i>I developed an understanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the language studied and my own.</i>   | 8  | 3      |
| 4<br>.<br>2<br>:  | <i>I developed understanding of the concept of culture and literature through comparisons of the cultures and literatures studied as compared to my own culture and literature.</i> | 7  | 4      |
| <p><b>Please explain and provide any details/examples for the above (use additional sheet if necessary):</b><br/>           *This experience was different than learning about American Literature in English. Very different.<br/>           *I now have a much better understanding of Spanish history and culture because I tried to stay as true to what the author wrote as possible.<br/>           *Specifically, I have a better understanding of the epistemological implications of approaching a subject in a different language.</p>  |   |    |        |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
| *When studying another culture it was difficult to omit my own culture and look at their culture from their point of view. |   |   |   |
| <b>Standard 5: Communities</b>   |   |   |   |
| 5<br>.<br>1<br>:   | <i>I used the language both within and beyond the school setting.</i>   | 7 | 4 |
| 5<br>.<br>2<br>:   | <i>I developed an understanding of how the foreign language connects to my life as a whole, both for personal enjoyment and enrichment.</i> | 9 | 2 |

**Please explain and provide any details/examples for the above (use additional sheet if necessary):**

\*I am still working on developing a solid connection between this foreign language and my life as a whole.

\*I have a lot of fun with this project, but it was a TON of work. I know now how difficult translating it.

\*I conducted a week of research in El Salvador, conducting five personal interviews & conversing with locals in the villages through which I passed.

\*For me, this major is for personal enjoyment only, however, I believe it has made me more rounded.

**c. Results/Analysis:**

In reviewing the table above, students expressed an understanding of how the ACTFL Standards applied to their work. The topics chosen demonstrate that the students have connected with the culture, and with Spanish Speaking communities (in particular the El Salvador projects), and have made interdisciplinary connections (in particular the theatre project.)

However, it should be noted that there are areas where further development of Assessments for the Capstone Projects are needed.

**d. Analysis/Planned Action**

The Capstone project in the Department of Modern Languages is currently completed within a 400 level literature or culture course. While the student self-evaluation provides some data, a more objective evaluation is needed. The current Capstone Form is a limited assessment of our students work, and no formal rubrics that align with ACTFL or NCATE Standards currently exist. The need to re-evaluate this assessment increases with the potential addition of Education Majors as Dual majors. (See Report Conclusion for additional notes)

Below are a few measures that are essential to Capstone Projects in Spanish.

1. With the addition of 400 level grammar classes, and upper level linguistics classes, the Capstone Project for some students may be a more applied project in linguistics as well as a literature or culture based project.

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

2. It is essential that we require students in Spanish to complete ALL Capstone work in the target language. In the results of the student surveys, students expressed a desire to be required to write in Spanish – and they are aware of the benefits of doing so. Allowing them to complete the capstone forms in English is counter-productive to this goal.
3. Prior to the capstone project, students should have completed all other coursework, and ideally study abroad. It is also important that we hold the students accountable for what they should know by the time they reach the 400 level: including language skills, research skills, proper research paper writing, etc. This is particularly essential for Spanish Education Majors.
4. Intervention with students who lack appropriate skills for the Capstone Projects should occur as early as possible, and students encouraged to take additional coursework or a Study Abroad experience prior to the Capstone Project.
5. As many Liberal arts majors will go on to graduate study, the Capstone paper should be an academic project, whether research based or application based. If the project chosen is an applied project (i.e. translations or linguistic projects), the same rigor must be applied.
6. Our students lack knowledge of how to complete academic research. Some possible solutions to this problem include:
  - creation of a 3 credit capstone course, taught by a qualified full-time faculty member. This course may include assessment measures to verify students have achieved sufficient language knowledge to complete the Capstone project, and the course should include a significant work in how to conduct research in a foreign language, and allow for more direct contact with the project and the faculty member in that area of expertise.
  - Requiring additional coursework in Research Based Composition (English 302), CJ 302: Criminal Justice Research Methods, or a similar course.
  - Increased recommendation and utilization of the services of our Writing Center to help our students with the paper research and organization.
  - Periodic workshops on relevant topics.

In conclusion, the assessment of our capstone projects for Spanish should be reviewed and further developed using the goals and standards that the department has defined as benchmarks: *The ADFL, ACTFL and NCATE Standards*. This need will increase with the potential incorporation of Education majors as Dual majors.

***b. Student surveys – indirect measure:***

***a. Assessment Measures (Tools)***

Administration of Student Surveys (Assessment Day 2008)

***b. Benchmark (Standard)***

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

*ADFL:* Involved Faculty; *ACTFL:* Communities

**c. Results/Analysis:**

According to the comments the two students provided, each of them felt they had received a good education in the first four of the *ACTFL Content Area Standards (Communication, Culture, Connections, Comparison)*. However, a suggestion for future questionnaires is to provide questions that more specifically address ACTFL's "5 C's."

The two students felt "positive" about the program in terms of what they had learned in their classes. They were both highly complimentary of the culture content they received in their courses.

The questionnaires that students filled out relate specifically to one ACTFL area: that of *Communities* ("participate in multilingual communities at home and around the world"). Their responses as to whether or not we should encourage our majors to study abroad were in the affirmative. One of the two students felt that study-abroad should be mandatory. Both students insisted, however, that there needs to be more financial aid available to them because, otherwise, they would not be able to afford such a requirement. One student recommended that we offer study-abroad opportunities for shorter periods (a duration of 2-3 weeks abroad, for example) because many students would not be able to request leave from their jobs. Both students suggested we offer various locales for study-abroad, rather than offering a program in only a few countries.

**d. Analysis/Planned Action**

Due to the fact that we only received three questionnaires (and only two of them were complete), the information here is limited, if not insufficient. Our understanding of our majors' experiences and concerns are limited by the fact that we received only two complete questionnaires. We will need to address this problem for the next Assessment Day and corresponding report.

We will have to set the goal of fostering a better and on-going interaction with our majors so that we can, as a result, procure a clearer picture and better data from our students in order to more accurately assess their experience as majors in the Spanish section of the department. Dr. Shannon Butler and Dr. María Rosario Quintana have been assigned the organization of Assessment Day 2009 and this will undoubtedly be one of their primary areas of focus.

**c. Spanish: Other Activities**

**a. Assessment Measures (Tools).**

The Spanish Department believes that language learning must extend beyond the classroom, and in order to facilitate this, organizes a number of extra programs each year. In Fall 2007 the Department sponsored a Hispanic Heritage Month Celebration, and a Flamenco Program.

**b. Benchmark (Standard):**

*ADFL* Involved Faculty; *ACTFL:* Communities, Culture, Communications, Connections.

**c. Results/Analysis:**

Not all of these events of a nature lend themselves to formal assessment. However, for the Flamenco Program, a participant survey was completed. The results of this survey show overwhelmingly that students appreciate these kinds of programs, and hope for additional programs like them.

Flamenco: Lecture and Performance: October 22, 2007

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

52 students, 13 faculty, 4 staff, 27 local community members and 5 High School students returned the survey. Approximately 300 evaluations were distributed and 101 were completed and returned: 34%. Respondents rated the program on a Scale of 1 to 5: 1 being a poor rating – 5 being an excellent rating

|  | <b>Score</b> | <b>Percentage</b> |
|--|--------------|-------------------|
| The program was well organized                   | 4.76         | 95%               |
| The program provided new information             | 4.71         | 94%               |
| The speaker/presenter was well prepared          | 4.63         | 93%               |
| Lecture was understandable and well organized.   | 4.51         | 90%               |
| The performers were well prepared.               | 4.83         | 97%               |
| Quality of location, sound system, etc.          | 4.48         | 90%               |
| Overall quality of program.                      | 4.74         | 95%               |
| Program increased awareness of Hispanic culture. | 4.6          | 92%               |
| <b>Average:</b>                                  | <b>4.66</b>  | <b>93%</b>        |

Additionally, many respondents offered comments on the program. These comments will help in planning future events and choosing the venue, but many of the comments also demonstrate that our students (and community members) have made connections with the culture of Spain and the community of language learners, as well as the community at large.

- *Very great! More other performances.*
- *Thank you very much. We really enjoyed it. Good luck!*
- *I enjoyed it! Especially the youngest dancer. She was beautiful and talented. Bring them back, but put the show in a better space.*
- *Thank you so very much.*
- *Fantástico!*
- *More, more, more. How about a flamenco class – some dance, some song, some music, some history!*
- *Very well prepared and a very special evening. Gracias!*
- *One of the best events Maria Carmen Riddel has prepared to date!!!*
- *This program was very interesting. I came because I was offered extra credit, but I have enjoyed it regardless.*
- *MU should offer more events of this quality.*
- *Excellent, very unexpected event for Huntington. Far exceeded my expectations. Please bring more presentation of this high quality and advertise heavily.*
- *I would like to see a Salsa or Tango show. I think it would be great to share some Latin American culture.*
- *This was an amazing performance of a style of dance that is rarely seen in West Virginia. DO IT AGAIN NEXT YEAR!*
- *I really enjoyed this program. I did not think I did, but it made want to get up and dance along.*
- *Excellent, fantastic, educational, enjoyable. Wonderful.*
- *Excellent presentation! Dr. Riddel has brought a wonderful multicultural experience to Marshall University*
- *Olé! Fantástico!*

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

- *This program was an excellent and entertaining way of providing MU students with new cultures, It was better than lecturers because they tend to drag to people that are not interested in what they are talking about. However, flamenco is very entertaining in its own right! **DO IT AGAIN SOON!***
- *Music, dance and guitarist were excellent. The lecture was excellent. I think every aspect of this event has contributed to a greater knowledge of the Spanish culture and music.*
- *I would like to see some Latin American culture/dances presented as well.*

**d. Analysis/Planned Action:**

The department should continue to plan these types of events, including cultural, musical and other events from both Spanish and Latin American Culture. Collaboration with other departments such as Latin American Studies would also benefit the department.

**d. Study Abroad in Spanish**

**a. Assessment Measures (Tools).**

ACTFL's Advanced level standard states: "students use the language both within and beyond the school setting." and "students show evidence of becoming life long learners by using the language for personal enjoyment and enrichment."

This standard is not formally assessed in detail since it exceeds the capabilities of our foreign language program. However, the department does provide ample opportunities for the students to participate in activities that help them make this connection, both in class and at a departmental level.

The department's **Summer Spanish Language and Culture Program in Madrid, Spain** in cooperation with the Universidad Antonio de Nebrija enables Marshall University students to interact with students from different parts of the world, that is to say, with multilingual communities abroad. Spanish is the only language the participating students have in common.

**b. Benchmark (Standard)s:**

**ADFL** Study Abroad Programs; **ACTFL:** Communities, Culture, Communications, Connections.

**c. Results/Analysis:**

**In Spanish:** 14 Marshall University students participated in the summer 2007 Spanish Language and Culture Program in Madrid. 4 students took the Departmental Examination Level I and 8 students took the Departmental Examination Level II. (2 students did not take the Departmental Exam). 2 majors fully completed the departmental exam.

The results are shown below:

**204 level**

4 students took the 204 level study abroad exam. The results are shown in the table below.

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| 204 (Average<br>Scores) |  |
|-------------------------|--|

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
|           |     |
| Grammar   | 54% |
| Listening | 73% |
| Reading   | 53% |
| Writing   | 53% |
| AVG       | 58% |

**300 level:**

8 students took the 300 level exam

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| 300       |     |
| Grammar   | 89% |
| Listening | 73% |
| Reading   | 71% |
| Writing   | 75% |
| (6)*      |     |
| AVG       | 77% |

(\* Note: 1 person did not respond; 1 person misread instructions and translated the question)

|            |     |
|------------|-----|
| Majors (2) |     |
|            |     |
| Grammar    | 71% |
| Listening  | 70% |
| Reading    | 60% |
| Writing    | 75% |
| AVG        | 69% |

When compared to last years exam scores, the following trend can be seen:

| 204 (Average Scores) | Summer 07  | Summer 08  |
|----------------------|------------|------------|
|                      |            |            |
| Grammar              | 53%        | 54%        |
| Listening            | 54%        | 73%        |
| Reading              | 58%        | 53%        |
| Writing              | 64%        | 53%        |
| <b>AVG</b>           | <b>57%</b> | <b>58%</b> |

A significant increase in Listening skills is noted in this years data, however, Writing and Reading skills have decreased significantly. It should be noted however, that this is the 204 level, and these students

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

have not yet had opportunity to have the same amount of detailed written language instruction that students at the 300 level would have.

| 300          | Summer 07  | Summer 08  |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Grammar      | 80%        | 89%        |
| Listening    | 68%        | 73%        |
| Reading      | 76%        | 71%        |
| Writing (6)* | 74%        | 75%        |
| <b>AVG</b>   | <b>75%</b> | <b>77%</b> |

A slight increase overall was noted at this level for study abroad students at this more advanced level. Writing skills have not increased dramatically, but this may be due to a variation in the average score given that 2 people did not complete the writing assessment portion of the exam.

|            | Majors (2)              |                         |
|------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|            | Summer 07<br>(5 majors) | Summer 08<br>(2 majors) |
| Grammar    | 79%                     | 71%                     |
| Listening  | 65%                     | 70%                     |
| Reading    | 78%                     | 60%                     |
| Writing    | 82%                     | 75%                     |
| <b>AVG</b> | <b>76%</b>              | <b>69%</b>              |

The exam averages for this year have declined significantly, but this may be due in part to the fact that the data only includes 2 Majors studying abroad for this year.

**d. Analysis/Planned Action:**

The Study Abroad data gathered for this report, while it does show some notable increases, give us a picture of one of the major issues in the Department of Modern Languages: the low participation in Study abroad – including in Spanish, which is the largest language section in the department. As noted earlier in this report, there are 53 (33 COLA and 20 COEHS) Spanish or Spanish Education majors in the department. However, only 2 majors took advantage of our summer Study Abroad program. The reasons given by students for lack of participation in Study abroad include money, work, and family obligations.

With the increased costs for overseas travel, participation in the Summer program in Spain was lower this year. Future plans include working to develop a short term program to provide teachers with a language intensive study abroad experience, and continued cooperation with the Center for International programs to expand both our offerings and the number of our majors who participate in Study Abroad experiences. The department should also investigate grant opportunities to help support this essential part of our program.

**SPANISH: Assistance Needed With Assessment**

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

*See Spanish Education and Summary and Conclusion sections of this report.*

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

**F. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: *SPANISH EDUCATION* (Additional)**

**1. *Spanish Portfolios:***

**a. *Assessment Tools:***

All Spanish majors are required to complete a language skills portfolio, however, not all Spanish majors do so. Spanish Education Majors complete this assessment in SPN 407 in the Fall Semester. This portfolio will provide qualitative evaluations of our students' language skills in the semester prior to their graduation.

Students are required to reach an "Advanced-Low" level on the ACTFL Speaking Proficiency Scale prior to graduation, and this same level was adopted for reading, writing, and listening rubrics developed using these ACTFL Proficiency Scales.

The portfolio project was graded based on those rubrics. The results above demonstrate that the student was able to achieve a level of language either approaching or meeting the "Advanced Low" proficiency level in all areas.

**b. *Benchmark (Standard)***

ACTFL: All 5 Cs; NCATE: Program Standard #1

**c. *Results/Analysis***

Fall 2007

|                                      | <b>Listening</b>                              | <b>Reading</b>        | <b>Speaking</b>                             | <b>Spontaneous Writing</b>                                     | <b>Writing Samples</b>                      |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|--|---|
| <b>Spanish</b>                       |   |                       |   |  |   |
| 3                                    | Not Met                                       | Meets                 | Approaches                                  | Approaches   | Meets                                       |
| 4                                    | Approaches                                    | Meets                 | Meets                                       | Meets  | Meets                                       |
| 5                                    | Not Met                                       | Meets                 | Approaches                                  | Approaches   | Approaches                                  |
| 6                                    | Not Met                                       | Meets                 | Meets                                       | Meets  | Meets                                       |
| 8                                    | Not Met                                       | Meets                 | Meets                                       | Not Met  | Meets                                       |
| <b>Totals:</b>                       | <b>1 Approaches (20%)<br/>4 Not Met (80%)</b> | <b>5 Meets (100%)</b> | <b>2 Approaches (40%)<br/>3 Meets (60%)</b> | <b>1 Not Met (20%)<br/>2 Approaches (40%)<br/>2 Meets(40%)</b> | <b>1 Approaches (20%)<br/>4 Meets (80%)</b> |
| <b>Approaches or Meets Standards</b> | <b>20%</b>                                    | <b>100%</b>           | <b>100%</b>                                 | <b>80%</b>   | <b>100%</b>                                 |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

**d. Analysis/Planned Action**

The listening activity for the portfolio may require further evaluation and/or a different type of assessment. The current activity involves a native speaker reading a rather complicated story and may have been difficult to understand without some modifications. Also, one of the participants experienced technical difficulties in completing the listening section, resulting in a lower score. With continued implementation of the Portfolio requirement, it is hoped that we will see improved levels of listening comprehension and less incidence of “Approaches Standard”.

**e. Oral Proficiency Interview:**

**a. Assessment Tools:**

The results of the Oral Proficiency Interview for Spanish in Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 are shown below. Two students took the Oral Proficiency Exam in Fall 2007, and 3 students took the Oral Proficiency exam in Spring of 2008. Most of our students chose the “Advanced Level Check” which provides only minimal feedback to our department.

| <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Language</u>                   | <u>Test Type</u> | <u>Name</u> | Status    | Rating |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------|--------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | SPANISH<br>Marshall<br>University | OPI-<br>ADV LV   | 1           | Completed | NQ     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | SPANISH<br>Marshall<br>University | OPI-<br>ADV LV   | 2           | Completed | NQ     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | SPANISH<br>Marshall<br>University | OPI-<br>ADV LV   | 3           | Completed | NQ     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | SPANISH<br>Marshall<br>University | OPI-<br>ADV LV   | 4           | Completed | NQ     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | SPANISH<br>Marshall<br>University | OPI-<br>ADV LV   | 5           | Completed | NQ     |

Note: *NQ = Not Qualified = “does not demonstrate Advanced-Low Level Speaking Skills.”*

**b. Benchmark (Standard)**

ACTFL: All 5 Cs; NCATE: Program Standard #1

**c. Results/Analysis:**

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

Unfortunately, none of our Spanish Education Majors have met the NCATE Established level of “Advanced-Low”. This is likely due to a lack of study abroad experiences, and the fact that the interview occurs by telephone, which eliminates the interpersonal element of language.

Additional measures should be discussed that allow for additional faculty trained in giving these Oral Proficiency Students, though it should be noted that there are a number of limitations to doing so including the time to become a tester, and the limitations placed by ACTFL and NCATE on which students a professor is allowed to examine (they cannot examine their own students).

*d. Analysis/Planned Action:*

The Advanced-Low Level required by NCATE is a high standard, and one that is very difficult to meet without a significant study abroad experience, which these students did not have. Students need to continue to be strongly encouraged to participate in Study Abroad. Future plans for Spanish Education majors include incorporation of a Dual major, which will provide students additional opportunities for improvement in their language skills.

Additionally, the current Oral Proficiency Interview requirement allows the option of a simple “level check” – meaning the tester ONLY tests for the advanced Low level. While this student received a full rating, without further students as a point of comparison it is difficult to analyze this data in any way that provides us information that we can use to improve our students skills.

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

**G. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: NCATE (FRENCH AND SPANISH ONLY)**

**1. SPN/FRN Foreign Language Teaching Methodology Course.**

*a. Assessment Tools:* Foreign Language Teaching Methodology Course Syllabus and related Data.

*b. Benchmark (Standard)*  
NCATE: Program Standards 3 through 6

*c. Results/Analysis:*

The foreign language teaching methods course continues to include a technology component, to aid our teacher candidates in using technology for teaching foreign languages, but the course now also covers Communicative Language Teaching in both theory and practice, Foreign Language Standards (ACTFL) and West Virginia Content Standards Objectives (CSOs). West Virginia teachers are responsible for these in the classrooms and in their lesson plans. Students also complete projects involving the NCATE Program Standards.

In fall of 2007, 5 students took SPN407 and 3 students took FRN 407 Foreign Language Teaching Methodology. 5 of the students were Spanish Education majors, two were French Education majors, and the third was post-baccalaureate French student. The Foreign Language Teaching Methodology course will be kept small, as it is now offered every fall, and to allow for maximum interaction and practice opportunities. The course involved projects and hands on activities and discussions, rather than final exams. (See syllabus). Course Grades are shown below.

|    | Participation | Portfolio | Micro Teach | Journal | Article Presentation | Final Paper |
|----|---------------|-----------|-------------|---------|----------------------|-------------|
| 1  | 100%          | 93%       | 100%        | 95%     | 100%                 | 80%         |
| 2  | 89%           | 87%       | 98%         | 95%     | 100%                 | 85%         |
| 3  | 89%           | 67%       | 98%         | 75%     | 100%                 | 83%         |
| 4  | 100%          | 98%       | 100%        | 100%    | 100%                 | 85%         |
| 5* | 67%           | 11%       | 83%         | 40%     | 60%                  | 58%         |
| 6  | 100%          | 93%       | 100%        | 100%    | 100%                 | 83%         |
| 7  | 100%          | 96%       | 100%        | 100%    | 100%                 | 75%         |
| 8  | 100%          | 89%       | 100%        | 90%     | 100%                 | 98%         |

\* Note: Student #5 determined during the methods course that she did not wish to pursue a teaching career, and chose to complete a Liberal arts degree in French instead.

**Program Standard 3: Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices**

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

All students in the Foreign Language Methodology course complete a culminating paper on a topic relevant to the specific areas covered in the course. Some paper topics have included relevant theorists, or specific language skills. (See Appendices for Rubrics)

*The table below shows the results of this assignment:*

|  | <b>Does not meet standards (Unacceptable)</b>                       | <b>Approaches Standard (Minimal)</b> | <b>Meets Standard (Good)</b> | <b>Exceeds Standard (Excellent)</b> |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <i>Points</i>  | <b>10</b>   | <b>15</b>                            | <b>20</b>                    | <b>25</b>                           |
| <b>Abstract/Outline:</b>   |   |                                      | 1                            | 7                                   |
| <b>Intermediate Draft:</b>   |   |                                      | 1                            | 7                                   |
| <b>Peer Review:</b>  | Not completed this semester due to illness and schedule limitations |                                      |                              |                                     |
| <b>Sources</b>   |   | 1                                    | 6                            | 1                                   |
| <b>Content</b>   |   | 3                                    | 4                            | 1                                   |
| <b>Professional Development/Value of Foreign Language Learning</b> |   | 2                                    | 5                            | 1                                   |
| <b>Organization</b>  |   | 1                                    | 7                            |                                     |
| <b>Mechanics and Style</b>   |   | 2                                    | 4                            | 2                                   |

While these data show that our candidates do have an understanding of language acquisition theories, the lower grades in organization and Mechanics and Style, as well as Content indicate that further measures to help our students become better researchers is necessary.

**Program Standard 4: Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction**

**Program Standard 5: Assessment of Languages and Cultures**

**Program Standard 6: Professionalism**

Students demonstrate Program Standards 4, 5, and 6 through their Teaching Portfolio completed in the Foreign Language Teaching Methodology course, as well as their Clinical and Student Teaching evaluations. (See Appendix for Rubrics). This portfolio is a culminating project that provides students with a collection of materials they can use in their future classrooms or to show to future employers.

Teaching Portfolio

|                             | <b>Does not Meet Standards (Unsatisfactory)</b> | <b>Approaches Standards (Minimal)</b> | <b>Meets Standards (Good)</b> | <b>Exceeds Standards (Excellent)</b> |
|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <i>Points*</i>              | <b>10</b>                                       | <b>15</b>                             | <b>20</b>                     | <b>25</b>                            |
| <b>Teaching Philosophy</b>  |   | 1                                     | 2                             | 5                                    |
| <b>Unit Plan*</b>           |   |                                       | 1                             | 6                                    |
| <b>Assessments</b>          | 1   | 1                                     | 2                             | 3                                    |
| <b>Resource Collection:</b> |   |                                       | 4                             | 3                                    |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|  | <b>Does not Meet<br/>Standards<br/>(Unsatisfactory)</b> | <b>Approaches<br/>Standards<br/>(Minimal)</b> | <b>Meets<br/>Standards<br/>(Good)</b> | <b>Exceeds<br/>Standards<br/>(Excellent)</b> |
|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| <i>Points*</i>                                   | <b>10</b>   | <b>15</b>                                     | <b>20</b>                             | <b>25</b>                                    |
| <b>Original Game</b>                             |   | 1   | 1                                     | 5  |
| <b>Evaluation of a<br/>textbook</b>              |   | 1   | 1                                     | 4  |
| <b>Observations<br/>of Language<br/>Teachers</b> |   | 1   | 3                                     | 3  |
| <b>Additional<br/>Materials:</b>                 |   | 1   | 2                                     | 3  |
| <b>Organization</b>                              | 1   | 1   | 2                                     | 4  |

*Note: Student #5 completed only select parts of the Portfolio prior to making the decision to not pursue an education degree.*

The scores on this teaching portfolio demonstrate that the teacher candidates in the Foreign Language Methodology course as a whole either meet or exceed the NCATE Program standards for Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction (in Unit Plan), Assessment of Languages and Cultures, and Professionalism.

***d. Analysis/Planned Action:***

The Department of Modern languages will continue these same measures in support of French and Spanish Education majors. The Department is required to file their Program Review report in Fall of 2009.

***2. Clinical Experience and Student Teaching Supervision evaluations and narratives***

***a. Assessment Tools***

Clinical Experience and Student Teaching Supervision evaluations and narratives.

***b. Benchmark (Standard)***

**NCATE:** Program Standards 3 through 6

***c. Results/Analysis:***

The College of Education students must successfully complete clinical experiences at three different levels which provides them with observation and hands on experience in the classroom prior to beginning their student teaching in Level III. Students are placed in a classroom for 8 weeks for Clinical Level II, and 16 weeks for Clinical Level III (Student Teaching), and must teach for approximately 20 days, as well as complete an 8-10 day teaching unit. Students are observed twice during Clinical Level II experience and between two and four times in an 8 week Student Teaching placement, preferably during their teaching unit.

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

Each level has specific admission requirements, established and administered by the College of Education. Level I clinical experiences involve the teacher candidate observing an experienced teacher, and no supervision is required.

All student teacher candidates at Marshall University are assessed using the same Observation rubric, which utilizes the 10 INTASC (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) principles. These principles are the standard measure of teacher candidates. See table below for specific standards.

As mentioned, a faculty member from the Department of Modern Languages supervises student teachers in foreign languages. The faculty member observes the students between two and four times during the placement, providing the student with intermediate evaluations. The classroom teacher then completes a midterm and final exam. The supervising faculty member maintains contact with the student teacher and the classroom teacher, and mediates any issues that may arise.

In fall 2007, an additional content area evaluation form was fully implemented (see appendix) and data was gathered. There were still some missing forms, as the forms were omitted from the student teacher folders distributed to the classroom teachers. This will continue to be reviewed and addressed in future years, but initial anecdotal evidence shows a reduced level of content knowledge for many of our students. This is likely the result of lack of study abroad experiences, which is addressed elsewhere in this report.

In **fall of 2007**, five (5) students completed their ***Clinical Level II*** experience. The scores given by their classroom teachers on the midterm and final exams are shown in the table below.

**Clinical Level II Observations:**

|   |                                | Midterm        |                           |                 |          | Final          |                           |                 |          |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|----------|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|----------|
|   |                                | Mastery<br>(4) | Partial<br>Mastery<br>(3) | Emerging<br>(2) | U<br>(0) | Mastery<br>(4) | Partial<br>Mastery<br>(3) | Emerging<br>(2) | U<br>(0) |
| 1 | Content Knowledge              | 4              | 1                         |                 |          | 4              | 1                         |                 |          |
| 2 | Human Development and Learning | 3              | 2                         |                 |          | 4              | 1                         |                 |          |
| 3 | Diverse Learners               | 3              | 2                         |                 |          | 4              | 1                         |                 |          |
| 4 | Instructional Strategies       | 3              | 2                         |                 |          | 4              | 1                         |                 |          |
| 5 | Learning Environment           | 2              | 3                         |                 |          | 2              | 3                         |                 |          |
| 6 | Communication                  | 3              | 2                         |                 |          | 4              | 1                         |                 |          |
| 7 | Planning                       | 2              | 3                         |                 |          | 4              | 1                         |                 |          |
| 8 | Assessment                     | 2              | 3                         |                 |          | 4              | 1                         |                 |          |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

|    |   |   |   |  |  |   |   |  |  |
|----|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| 9  | Reflective Teaching/<br>Professional Growth | 2 | 3 |  |  | 4 | 1 |  |  |
| 10 | Professional Relationships                  | 3 | 2 |  |  | 4 | 1 |  |  |
|    |   |   |   |  |  |   |   |  |  |

These observation scores demonstrate that the majority of our student teachers develop Mastery or Partial Mastery of all essential skills identified on the INTASC (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) proficiencies. The scores also demonstrates that those who may have lower skills are able to develop them through feedback, continued efforts and practice, as seen in the high level of students with a rating of Mastery in the second observation. The area of “Creating a positive learning environment” is one that is ranked slightly lower and it will be necessary to watch this in the future to determine if there is an area in our program that is affecting this, or if its simply the natural variation between the classroom teachers ratings.

In the **Fall of 2007**, two (2) students completed their ***Clinical Level III*** Experience (Student Teaching). The table below shows the results of their formal midterm and final evaluations, completed by their classroom teachers during their placements.

| Clinical Level III Experience (Student Teaching) |   |                     |                |           |       |                   |                |           |       |
|--|---|---------------------|----------------|-----------|-------|-------------------|----------------|-----------|-------|
|  |   | Mid-term Evaluation |                |           |       | Final Evaluation  |                |           |       |
|  |   | Distinguished (4)   | Proficient (3) | Basic (2) | U (0) | Distinguished (4) | Proficient (3) | Basic (2) | U (0) |
| 1  | Content Knowledge                           | 1                   |                | 1         |       | 1                 | 1              |           |       |
| 2  | Human Development and Learning              | 1                   | 1              |           |       | 1                 | 1              |           |       |
| 3  | Diverse Learners                            | 1                   | 1              |           |       | 1                 | 1              |           |       |
| 4  | Instructional Strategies                    | 1                   | 1              |           |       | 1                 | 1              |           |       |
| 5  | Learning Environment                        | 1                   | 1              |           |       | 1                 | 1              |           |       |
| 6  | Communication                               | 1                   |                | 1         |       | 1                 | 1              |           |       |
| 7  | Planning                                    | 1                   | 1              |           |       | 1                 | 1              |           |       |
| 8  | Assessment                                  | 1                   | 1              |           |       | 1                 | 1              |           |       |
| 9  | Reflective Teaching/<br>Professional Growth | 1                   | 1              |           |       | 1                 | 1              |           |       |
| 10   | Professional Relationships                  | 1                   | 1              |           |       | 1                 | 1              |           |       |
|  |   |                     |                |           |       |                   |                |           |       |

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

*Note: due to a clerical error, one student's midterm form was misplaced and her midterm scores are estimated here based on her final supervisor evaluation. This student was, however, in the 5-9 program, and observed by a member of the Department of Modern Languages— see notes for comments*

Similar to the Level II Clinical experiences, this chart demonstrates that the majority of our student teachers develop proficiency or a distinguished demonstration of essential skills identified on the INTASC (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) proficiencies. It also demonstrates that those who may have lower skills are able to develop them through feedback, continued efforts and practice, as seen in the high level of students with a rating of Mastery in the second observation. It should be noted that one of these students was a 5-9 program major, and while her classroom teacher rated her classroom skills as Proficient, there were a number of language issues that arose during her student teaching. See Analysis/Plan of Action for further discussion.

In **Spring of 2008**, one student completed their ***Clinical Level II*** Experience. The table below displays the ratings given to them by their classroom teachers at the midterm and final points in their placements.

Clinical Level II:

|    |  | Midterm     |                     |              |       | Final       |                     |              |       |
|----|--|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------|
|    |  | Mastery (4) | Partial Mastery (3) | Emerging (2) | U (0) | Mastery (4) | Partial Mastery (3) | Emerging (2) | U (0) |
| 1  | Content Knowledge                        | 1           |                     |              |       | 1           |                     |              |       |
| 2  | Human Development and Learning           |             | 1                   |              |       |             | 1                   |              |       |
| 3  | Diverse Learners                         |             |                     | 1            |       |             | 1                   |              |       |
| 4  | Instructional Strategies                 |             | 1                   |              |       |             | 1                   |              |       |
| 5  | Learning Environment                     |             |                     | 1            |       |             | 1                   |              |       |
| 6  | Communication                            |             |                     | 1            |       |             | 1                   |              |       |
| 7  | Planning                                 |             | 1                   |              |       |             | 1                   |              |       |
| 8  | Assessment                               |             | 1                   |              |       |             | 1                   |              |       |
| 9  | Reflective Teaching/ Professional Growth |             | 1                   |              |       |             | 1                   |              |       |
| 10 | Professional Relationships               | 1           |                     |              |       | 1           |                     |              |       |
|    |  |             |                     |              |       |             |                     |              |       |

Similar to fall 2007, these observation scores demonstrate that the majority of our student teachers develop Mastery or Partial Mastery of all essential skills identified on the INTASC (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) proficiencies. The scores also demonstrates that those who may have lower skills are able to develop them through feedback,

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

continued efforts and practice, as seen in the high level of students with a rating of Mastery in the second observation.

In **Spring of 2008**, four (4) students completed their ***Clinical Level III*** Experience, and. The table below demonstrates the ratings given to them by their classroom teachers at the midterm and final points in their placements.

**Clinical Level III (Student Teaching)**

|    |   | Midterm Observation  |                   |              |          | Final Observation    |                   |              |          |
|----|---|----------------------|-------------------|--------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------|----------|
|    |   | Distinguished<br>(4) | Proficient<br>(3) | Basic<br>(2) | U<br>(0) | Distinguished<br>(4) | Proficient<br>(3) | Basic<br>(2) | U<br>(0) |
| 1  | Content Knowledge                           | 1                    | 3                 |              |          | 4                    |                   |              |          |
| 2  | Human Development and Learning              | 1                    | 3                 |              |          | 2                    | 2                 |              |          |
| 3  | Diverse Learners                            | 1                    | 3                 |              |          | 4                    |                   |              |          |
| 4  | Instructional Strategies                    | 1                    | 3                 |              |          | 4                    |                   |              |          |
| 5  | Learning Environment                        |                      | 4                 |              |          | 2                    | 2                 |              |          |
| 6  | Communication                               | 1                    | 3                 |              |          | 4                    |                   |              |          |
| 7  | Planning                                    | 1                    | 3                 |              |          | 4                    |                   |              |          |
| 8  | Assessment                                  | 1                    | 3                 |              |          | 4                    |                   |              |          |
| 9  | Reflective Teaching/<br>Professional Growth | 1                    | 3                 |              |          | 4                    |                   |              |          |
| 10 | Professional Relationships                  | 2                    | 2                 |              |          | 4                    |                   |              |          |
|    |   |                      |                   |              |          |                      |                   |              |          |

*Due to a clerical error one mid-term evaluation and one final evaluation was misplaced and scores are estimated here based on the midterm student teacher supervisor observation.*

This chart demonstrates that the majority of our student teachers continues to develop proficiency in all essential skills identified on the INTASC proficiencies, and in some cases have demonstrated Distinguished skills. It also demonstrates that those who may have lower skills are able to develop them through feedback, continued efforts and practice, as seen in the high level of students with a rating of Proficient or Distinguished in the second observation. It should also be noted that the student with lower scores had difficulty primarily with Planning, Assessment and Professional issues, rather than content area knowledge.

**d. Analysis/Planned Action:**

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

Having a departmental faculty members involved in this process is a vital connection for our Teacher Education candidates, as their classroom and theory learning now has a direct link to their field experience. It also provides an opportunity for more stringent assessment, and to help avoid problems with under-prepared teachers.

Direct supervision of Foreign Language Teacher candidates during their clinical experiences has been a positive step taken the Department of Modern Languages, and the results indicate that our students are indeed approaching or meeting the appropriate NCATE Program Standards. This involvement should continue.

One area for consideration is that of the 5-9 Specialization option in both French and Spanish. This specialization area provides our student teacher candidates with very limited content area (less than ½ the amount for 5 – 12 certification – and in terms of language learning, the language skills are essential, whether in middle school or high school. The students who complete this program struggle when placed in student teaching and clinical experiences (one student had to repeat their clinical experience prior to the involvement of a Modern Language Supervisor.) This issue will be reconsidered and possible program changes proposes in the 2008-2009 academic year.

Additionally, currently, education majors are not considered official MDL Majors, and as such, the department appears on the surface to support significantly less students than it actually does. Clearly this effects budgets, staffing, etc. In order to partially address this issue – and provide our students with an opportunity to further develop their language skills, especially in speaking, the department will be considering working with the College of Education to implement dual majors for all Spanish and French Education majors. This will be further discussed during the 2008-2009 academic year.

***SPANISH EDUCATION: Assistance needed with Assessment.***

While there are multiple faculty members involved in teaching the Spanish content knowledge for our Education majors, the Spanish Education Section could use significant additional support.

Currently, the same tenure-track faculty member teaches the Foreign Language Teaching Methodologies Course and supervises Clinical Level II and Student Teaching (Level III) courses. This same faculty member also teaches a full course load, including both beginning and advanced courses, administers placement tests for the department, maintains the departmental webpage, monitors off-campus and dual credit courses, and serves as Spanish Liaison to the College of Education. The faculty member is also involved at the State level in the field of Foreign Language Education, as would be expected of a faculty member with a background in Foreign Language Education, and which will benefit the Department in the long term.

In order to maintain and continue to evaluate measures of assessment – and maintain assessment as an ongoing process in the Department of Modern Languages, significant support is needed in the department. See Report summary for areas where support is needed.

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

**H.LESS COMMONLY TAUGHT LANGUAGES: ARABIC- CHINESE –  
PORTUGUESE – RUSSIAN- SWAHILI**

*a. Assessment Measures (Tools).*

No formal assessment of these languages is possible at this time, without a full-time experienced faculty member to administer and coordinate the courses.

*b. Benchmark (Standard)s:*

N/A

*c. Results/Analysis:*

Without the concurrence of the Department of Modern Languages, Marshall University's administration approved the teaching of several "less commonly taught foreign languages" beginning with Japanese in the 1990s. Over the years the number of these languages has grown and until recently all were being taught at the elementary and intermediate levels by unsupervised part-time graduate-level teaching assistants obtained through such means as the Fulbright Student Exchange Program. In 2006 Japanese was transformed into a major degree program with the addition of a full-time, tenure-eligible professorship.

Despite requests by the Department of Modern Languages that some form of oversight and assessment be created for the other languages in question, the university has thus far failed to provide any formal or legitimate mechanism for this and as a result, courses in Arabic, Chinese, Portuguese, Russian and Swahili were offered for academic credit with no means for knowing whether the quality and level of instruction met those objectives normally presumed of such foreign language courses in American higher education.

Due to low enrollments Portuguese, Russian and Swahili were removed from the regular university curriculum in early 2008. The remaining two languages, Arabic and Chinese, while considered *critical languages* by the U.S. Department of State, are still being taught without any oversight or assessment by graduate instructors who will depart after only one year.

Moreover, it was in early fall 2008 that the Department of Modern Languages finally endorsed a prohibition on native speakers enrolling for academic credit in beginning or intermediate classes in their native languages. In the spring of 2008 9 of 22 students enrolled in Arabic 102 were judged to be native speakers. Fall 2008 enrollment in beginning Arabic (101) looks promising with 27 students; none of them now are judged to be native speakers.

Chinese has not attracted as many students as desired. In the spring semester 2008 there were only 13 students enrolled in four different levels of basic Chinese. Fall 2008 also demonstrates decreased enrollment with only 19 students enrolled in two levels, but this may be attributed in part to a failure by the department to list the courses correctly in the university's published *Schedule of Courses*.

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

It was also endorsed by the Department of Modern Languages in 2008 that *only foreign languages taught by full-time permanent faculty members at Marshall are eligible for dual-credit classes in area high schools* and that *special topics courses in Modern Languages can be offered only by permanent full-time faculty*. Such measures preclude advanced courses being taught in Arabic or Chinese at the present time.

***d. Analysis/Planned Action***

The Department of Modern languages will continue to review these issues and monitor all foreign language courses taught in affiliation with Marshall University. It is strongly felt that there still needs to be a mechanism in place for the oversight and assessment of all foreign languages taught for academic credit at Marshall University. The administration should make this a high priority in its planning for the future. Any plan to add foreign languages or to enhance the status of foreign languages currently being taught should be done only in close consultation with the Department of Modern Languages. No formal assessment of the LCTL's is possibly at this time without full-time permanent faculty members to supervise the courses.

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

#### **IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING COMMENTS**

In conclusion, the analyses in this report demonstrate that our students do achieve some level of proficiency, and meet at least some of the chosen benchmarks/standards. The department has established many of the elements that ADFL suggests for inclusion in an effective language programs, through study abroad, faculty involvement and similar measures.

However, the success of the department – and implementation of expanded and deeper assessment of our student performance – and support of student learning – continue to be jeopardized by the financial and personnel limitations of our Department.

From the *2006-2007 Annual Assessment Report*, the Department of Modern Languages identified the following areas for future plans for this academic year. These plans are now revisited in this years report:

- A. Continued assessment of the three main language programs in order to determine program effectiveness and when and what program changes are needed. (*See Individual Language Sections for discussions*)
- B. Ongoing departmental assessment will include: (*See Individual language Sections for improvements*)
  - 1. The full implementation of the portfolio based assessment in fall 2007.
  - 2. A more thorough and consistent evaluation of the Capstone projects.
  - 3. Wider administration of Majors' Questionnaires, and increased student participation in assessment day activities.
- C. Continued WebCT and electronic course development. SPN 204 and SPN 335 are now available on-line and faculty members in the department are preparing SPN 315 Advanced Grammar and Composition and SPN 336 Culture and Civilization: Spain for on-line courses. Additional online courses will be available as part of the upcoming Master's Degree Program in Spanish. (*this Goal remains a work in process – SPN 315 is scheduled to become an online course, focusing heavily on writing and grammar, in spring or fall of 2009*)
- D. Technological training for faculty and students. This has been on going for several years and will continue. Marshall University provides significant resources in this area, and the Department of Modern Languages will continue to make use of them. (**Ongoing**)
- E. Continued supervision of Extended Education program for the basic language courses. (*See Less Commonly Taught Languages for discussion*). *Additionally Dual Credit Courses are now more closely monitored by full-time faculty, department chair, and academic dean.*
- F. Extra-classroom cultural activities. (*See language sections for details*).

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

- G. Possible expansion of Spanish study abroad program to include a full semester in Spain. *(This is an ongoing process.) The addition of a Mexico-based program for our Spanish Education students (and current teachers) is also in the beginning stages.*
- H. Development of German study abroad program *(See German Section for details)*
- I. Continued development of Japanese minor and major. *(See Japanese Section for details)*
- J. Additionally, Feedback from the *Office of Assessment and Program Review* on the 2006-2007 Report suggested modifying the student learning outcomes in a slightly more measurable terms. *While it is not possible to rewrite the ACTFL standards, some modifications were made to the wording to allow them to remain measurable outcomes.*

In Conclusion, assessment in the Department of Modern Languages continues to be jeopardized by departmental limitations. The Department of Modern Languages sorely understaffed and under-funded. *The Association of Departments of Foreign Languages (ADFL)* has established guidelines in some of these areas as well: We need:

- K. **A full time language laboratory and multimedia room director and supervisor** who will manage the daily operations of the lab, and assist students and faculty with foreign language tutorials, DVD and video viewing, power point presentations, etc, take over maintenance of the Department WebPage, placement testing, etc. ADFL recommends that “Departments of foreign languages and literatures, to make the best use of their faculty members' interests and abilities, should adopt flexible workload policies.” With Marshall’s high teaching loads and research requirements, a full-time, experienced, staff member to handle the daily operations of the language lab will allow faculty members to make better use of their time.
- L. **Smaller language classes at all levels.** This is vital for the “communicative approach to foreign language instruction.” For best results with this approach, the ADFL reaffirms its position that the maximum class size for foreign language instruction in classes where all four skills are equally stressed should not exceed 20, and adds that the optimum class size is 15. In any case, particularly at the elementary and intermediate levels, class size must be small enough to enable--rather than to inhibit--the kind of effective interaction between teacher and students necessary to developing proficiency in the language. We are at a disadvantage in this, and it will continue to affect student performance, as frequently, language classes now have over 30 students enrolled in them.
- M. **Additional faculty.**

The Department of Modern Languages continues to operate without sufficient faculty to meet all department needs.

Specifically (in addition to the lab personnel mentioned above):

- One full time professor is needed in the French program to replace a retired tenured professor.
- One full-time professor is needed in Japanese

**Undergraduate Program Assessment Annual Report  
2007-2008  
Department of Modern Languages  
December 2008**

- One full-time professor is needed in the German program
- Two full time professors are needed in the Spanish program.

The department could also benefit from some competent graduate assistants to assist faculty in positions involving higher levels of service, such as Lab director, and those serving as the only full-time professor in a particular language section.

This faculty shortage severely limits the department both in courses taught and in the likelihood of implementing additional or expanded assessment measures in the 101-203 courses in Spanish, among other things. With the potential inclusion of Spanish and French majors as Dual majors in Education and language content area, these faculty limitations will be even more glaring and faculty in positions without adequate support will feel the crunch of this deficiency.

- N. **Faculty development and travel funds.** ADFL advocates that *“faculty members should be given the maximum opportunity for professional accomplishment sufficient to achieve tenured status. Faculty members should have fair and reasonable teaching loads, appropriate release time and internal grants for research, and modest service assignments, even while being full members of the department and college governance system. Foreign language department chairs, tenured faculty members, and college administrators should encourage their junior colleagues to participate in professional organizations and conferences, to engage in scholarly research and publication, and to travel for professional development, both domestically and abroad, and support them in doing so.”*
- O. **Additional classrooms and office space.** There are very few classrooms and it is difficult to schedule classes at optimal times. There are very few offices and faculty have a difficult time finding a place to work and receive students. Japanese in particular is affected by lack of technology-based classrooms.
- P. **Technological assistance** and computer programs which will enable the department to develop technologically enhanced courses and electronic courses. WebCT training.

**Skills Portfolio: Reading Comprehension Rubric**

Updated 11/4/2007

|                               | <b>Does not meet standard</b>                 |   | <b>Approaches Standard</b>                    |   | <b>Meets Standard</b>                         |   |                               |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
|                               | <b>Intermediate Low</b>                       | <b>Intermediate-Mid</b>                   |   | <b>Intermediate-High</b>                                |   | <b>Advanced- Low</b>                                |                               |
| <b>Level of Comprehension</b> | Response shows complete lack of comprehension | Literally translated reading into English | Lacking comprehension; Appears to be guessing | More than one significant error affecting comprehension | One significant error affecting comprehension | One or two small errors not affecting comprehension | Full comprehension, no errors |
| <b>Numerical Score</b>        | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10                            |

Skills Portfolio: Writing Rubric: Spontaneous Writing

Updated 11/4/2007

Note: highest level writing sample should be considered the students writing level.

|                              | <b>Standard Not Met</b>   |                       |   |   | <b>Approaches Standard (Good)</b>  |  | <b>Meets Standard (Excellent)</b>  |   |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|
|                              | <b>Below Intermediate</b> |                       |   | <b>Intermediate Low</b>                             | <b>Intermediate Mid</b>  | <b>Intermediate High</b>   | <b>Advanced - Low</b>  |   |
| <b>Topics</b>                | No Response               | Isolated words        | Isolated words, but comprehension evident | Comprehension evident, able to formulate a response | Writing sample shows ability to create statements and formulate questions based primarily on familiar material, using vocabulary that is limited to common objects and routine activities. | Writing sample contains texts loosely based on personal preferences, daily routines, common events, and other topics related to personal experience. | Writing sample demonstrate the ability to meet all practical writing needs.  | Writing sample concerns social correspondence, narratives, descriptions, and simple summaries.                          |
| <b>Grammatical Structure</b> | No response               | No sentence structure | Very Basic Structure                      | Basic structure, some grammatical knowledge evident | Writing sample contains short and simple conversational-style sentences with basic subject-verb-object word order, using recombinations of learned vocabulary and structures.              | Writing closely resembles spoken language  | Sentences are linked into paragraphs with limited and repeated cohesive devices. Writer may have difficulty paraphrasing or elaborating on a concept in the composition. | Writing sample consists of sentences linked into logical paragraph structures.  |
| <b>Tense/Time Frame</b>      | No response               | Unable to determine   | Present tense with numerous errors.       | Present tense only, though with minimal errors.     | Writing sample is generally written in the present tense, with incorrect references to past or future tenses.  | Writing sample is framed in present time, with inconsistent references to other time frames.   | Writings take place in multiple time frames though with some inaccuracies and inconsistencies  | Writing sample demonstrates control of simple sentence structures and some control of more complex language structures. |

Skills Portfolio: Writing Rubric: Spontaneous Writing

Updated 11/4/2007

|                         |             |  |                 |   |   |  |  |  |
|-------------------------|-------------|--|-----------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Coherence</b>        | No response | Incoherent, or not enough to determine | Barely coherent | Coherent but remains in present tense or does not respond to the question | Writing is comprehensible to native speakers and those used to non-native writers, but some comprehension gaps may occur. | Writing is comprehensible to native speakers, though some effort may be required.  | Writing is comprehensible to native speakers used to non-native writing.         | Writing is comprehensible to native speakers not used to non-native writing, though some effort may be necessary.  |
| <b>Organization</b>     | No response | Unable to discern                      | No organization | Limited Organization  | Writing tends to be simple sentences with significant repetition, with no attention to the reader of the text.            | Writing sample can be defined as a collection of discrete sentences and/or questions loosely strung together, with little to no evidence of deliberate organization, and little attention to the reader of the text. | Sentences are linked into paragraphs with limited and repeated cohesive devices. | Writing sample consists of sentences linked into logical paragraph structures, but may resort to redundancy and awkwardness when attempting more complex structures. |
| <b>Numerical Score:</b> | 0           | 2                                      | 4               | 6   | 7   | 8  | 9  | 10   |

## Skills Portfolio: Listening Rubric

Updated 11/4/2007

|  | <b>Does not meet standard</b> | <b>Approaches Standard</b> |                          | <b>Meets Standard</b> |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
|  | <b>Intermediate Low</b>       | <b>Intermediate-Mid</b>    | <b>Intermediate-High</b> | <b>Advanced- Low</b>  |
| <b>Completion of Listening Comprehension Questions</b> | 75% or less                   | 76% or better              | 85% or better            | 100%                  |
|  | 7                             | 8                          | 9                        | 10                    |

## Skills Portfolio: Speaking Standard Rubric

Updated 11/4/2007

|                        | <b>Standard Not Met</b>   | <b>Approaches Standard</b>   |  | <b>Meets Standard</b>   |
|------------------------|---|--|--|---|
|                        | <b>Intermediate Low</b>   | <b>Intermediate-Mid</b>  | <b>Intermediate-High</b>   | <b>Advanced- Low</b>  |
| <b>Pronunciation</b>   | Speaker makes major pronunciation errors utilizing English sounds for words   | Speaker makes significant pronunciation errors which affect comprehension                              | Speaker makes pronunciation errors that do not affect comprehension.                   | No pronunciation errors noted in sample.  |
| <b>Tense</b>           | Attempts to complete a narration task in the past tense are halting, and limited in effectiveness.                              | Able to complete a narration task in the past tense, though significant comprehension errors are noted | Able to complete a narration task in the past tense, with minimal comprehension errors | Able to complete a narration task in the past tense   |
| <b>Vocabulary</b>      | Vocabulary is limited to basic personal information and needs   | Vocabulary is both basic personal information and needs and social and physical needs                  | Vocabulary expands to include work, school, recreation and personal interests          | Vocabulary is varied and includes from basic personal information to work personal interests and current events.        |
| <b>Grammar</b>         | Numerous grammar errors affecting comprehension   | Some grammar errors affecting comprehension  | Minor grammar errors affecting comprehension   | Minor grammar errors not affecting comprehension  |
| <b>Coherence</b>       | Speech would be comprehensible to native speakers and those used to non-native speakers, but some comprehension gaps may occur. | Speech would be comprehensible to native speakers, though some effort may be required.                 | Speech would be comprehensible to native speakers used to non-native speakers          | Speech would be comprehensible to native speakers not used to non-native speakers, though some effort may be necessary. |
| <b>NUMERICAL SCORE</b> | 7   | 8  | 9  | 10  |

Note: This sample is not intended to replace the Oral Proficiency Interview during the Clinical Level III (Student Teaching) Experience, but rather as a “pre-check” measure.

## Skills Portfolio: Writing Standard Rubric

Updated 11/4/2007

Note: highest level writing sample should be considered the students writing level.

|                              | <b>Standard Not Met</b>   | <b>Approaches Standard (Good)</b>  |  | <b>Meets Standard (Excellent)</b>   |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
|                              | <b>Intermediate Low</b>   | <b>Intermediate Mid</b>  | <b>Intermediate High</b>   | <b>Advanced - Low</b>   |
| <b>Topics</b>                | Compositions and writing samples show ability to create statements and formulate questions based primarily on familiar material, using vocabulary that is limited to common objects and routine activities. | Compositions and writing samples contain texts loosely based on personal preferences, daily routines, common events, and other topics related to personal experience.  | Compositions and writing samples demonstrate the ability to meet all practical writing needs.  | Compositions and writing samples concern social correspondence, narratives, descriptions, and simple summaries.   |
| <b>Grammatical Structure</b> | Compositions and writing samples contain short and simple conversational-style sentences with basic subject-verb-object word order, using recombinations of learned vocabulary and structures.              | Writing closely resembles spoken language  | Sentences are linked into paragraphs with limited and repeated cohesive devices. Writer may have difficulty paraphrasing or elaborating on a concept in the composition. | Compositions and writing samples consist of sentences linked into logical paragraph structures.   |
| <b>Tense/Time Frame</b>      | Compositions and writing samples are generally written in the present tense, with incorrect references to past or future tenses.  | Compositions and writing samples are framed in present time, with inconsistent references to other time frames.  | Writings take place in multiple time frames though with some inaccuracies and inconsistencies  | Compositions and writing samples demonstrate control of simple sentence structures and some control of more complex language structures.  |
| <b>Coherence</b>             | Writing is comprehensible to native speakers and those used to non-native writers, but some comprehension gaps may occur.   | Writing is comprehensible to native speakers, though some effort may be required.  | Writing is comprehensible to native speakers used to non-native writing.   | Writing is comprehensible to native speakers not used to non-native writing, though some effort may be necessary.   |
| <b>Organization</b>          | Writing tends to be simple sentences with significant repetition, with no attention to the reader of the text.  | Compositions and writing samples can be defined as a collection of discrete sentences and/or questions loosely strung together, with little to no evidence of deliberate organization, and little attention to the reader of the text. | Sentences are linked into paragraphs with limited and repeated cohesive devices.   | Compositions and writing samples consist of sentences linked into logical paragraph structures, but may resort to redundancy and awkwardness when attempting more complex structures. |
| <b>Writing Process</b>       | Samples show little or no progress over time  | Samples show some progress over time, but major errors still exist   | Samples show progress over time, but some errors persists  | Samples show significant progress over time.  |
|                              | 7   | 8  | 9  | 10  |



## DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES

Graduating majors in French, German or Spanish will designate one 400-level literature or culture course in their senior year as their capstone experience. In exceptional cases another advanced course may be so designated with the permission of the Chair. In addition to the normal course requirements the student will integrate as much as possible the various competencies developed throughout his or her foreign language program of study. This project will culminate in a research paper, which will be delivered in a class presentation toward the end of the term. ***Majors must be able to demonstrate at least an Advanced-Low level of proficiency in the target language in order to graduate.***

### CAPSTONE PROJECT PROPOSAL

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Student ID. # \_\_\_\_\_

Permanent Address: \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Expected Date of Graduation: \_\_\_\_\_

Major: 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_

Minor: \_\_\_\_\_

Circle designated capstone course:

French: 401, 402, 403, 404

German: 417, 418, 419, 420

Spanish: 411, 412, 413/414, 415, 416, 417

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Term: \_\_\_\_\_

Brief description of Project:

Approved by:

Supervising Professor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Advisor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## VERIFICATION OF COMPLETION CHECKLIST

Please attach to this document the following information:

1. Project title (*In target Language*)
2. A one page Project Abstract (*In Target Language*)
3. Project Self-assessment (*see following page*)

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |

**Comments:**

**Verified by:**  
Supervising Professor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## PROJECT SELF-ASSESSMENT

|                                  |  | <b>Definitely</b> | <b>Somewhat</b> | <b>Not at all</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| <b>Standard 1: Communication</b> |  |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>1.1</b>                       | <i>In completing this project, I provided and obtained information in the target language, expressed feelings and emotions and exchanged opinions.</i> |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>1.2</b>                       | <i>I understood and interpreted written and spoken language on a variety of topics</i>   |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>1.3</b>                       | <i>I presented information, concepts and ideas to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics.</i>                                      |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>Standard 2. Cultures</b>      |  |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>2.1</b>                       | <i>Through this project, I developed an understanding of the relationship between the practices and perspectives of the culture I studied.</i>         |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>2.2</b>                       | <i>I developed an understanding of the relationship between the products and perspectives of the culture studied.</i>                                  |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>Standard 3: Connections</b>   |  |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>3.1</b>                       | <i>I reinforced and furthered my knowledge of other disciplines through the foreign language</i>   |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>3.2</b>                       | <i>I acquired information and recognize the distinctive viewpoints that are only available through the foreign language and its cultures.</i>          |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>Standard 4: Comparisons</b>   |  |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>4.1</b>                       | <i>I developed an understanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the language studied and my own.</i>                                  |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>4.2:</b>                      | <i>I developed understanding of the concept of culture through comparisons of the cultures studied and my own.</i>                                     |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>Standard 5: Communities</b>   |  |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>5.1:</b>                      | <i>I used the language both within and beyond the school setting.</i>  |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>5.2:</b>                      | <i>I developed an understanding of how the foreign language connects to my life as a whole, both for personal enjoyment and enrichment.</i>            |                   |                 |                   |

**Comments:**

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY  
Foreign Language Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form

Teacher candidate: Mary Stiles  
School: Cabell Midland High School  
University Supervisor: Christina Huhn  
Lesson Title:

Date:  
Class:  
Cooperating Teacher:

This form should be complete by the Cooperating Teacher as often as possible during the placement. The University Supervisor should complete this form with each observation, and include it with the standard observation form. No one lesson will encompass all standards, and it is important that the cooperating teacher complete this form as often as possible to help demonstrate candidate knowledge of the standards.

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| 4          | <b>Distinguished</b> – Teacher Candidate comprehends and can adequately demonstrate the standard.                     |
| 3          | <b>Proficient</b> – Most of the time the teacher candidate demonstrates understanding and competence in the standard. |
| 2          | <b>Basic</b> – Teacher candidate is beginning to understand and demonstrate competence in the standard                |
| 1          | <b>Unsatisfactory</b> – Teacher candidate does not demonstrate understanding and competence in the standard           |
| <b>N/A</b> | This standard is not part of the current lesson (Note: not all lesson plans will meet all standards)                  |

| <b>STANDARD 1: LANGUAGE, LINGUISTICS, COMPARISONS</b>  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----|
| <b>1.a. Demonstrating Language Proficiency.</b> Candidates demonstrate a high level of proficiency in the target language, and they seek opportunities to strengthen their proficiency.  |   |   |   |   |     |
| <b>1.b. Understanding Linguistics.</b> Candidates know the linguistic elements of the target language system, recognize the changing nature of language, and accommodate for gaps in their own knowledge of the target language system by learning on their own.                                       |   |   |   |   |     |
| <b>1.c. Identifying Language Comparisons.</b> Candidates know the similarities and differences between the target language and other languages, identify the key differences in varieties of the target language, and seek opportunities to learn about varieties of the target language on their own. |   |   |   |   |     |

**Comments:**

| <b>STANDARD 2: CULTURES, LITERATURES, CROSS-DISCIPLINARY CONCEPTS</b>   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| <b>2.a. Demonstrating Cultural Understandings.</b> Candidates demonstrate that they understand the connections among the perspectives of a culture and its practices and products, and they integrate the cultural framework for foreign language standards into their instructional practices. |   |   |   |   |     |
| <b>2.b. Demonstrating Understanding of Literary and Cultural Texts and Traditions.</b> Candidates recognize the value and role of literary and cultural texts and use them to interpret and reflect upon the perspectives of the target cultures over time.                                     |   |   |   |   |     |
| <b>2.c. Integrating Other Disciplines in Instruction.</b> Candidates integrate knowledge of other disciplines into foreign language instruction and identify distinctive viewpoints accessible only through the target language.  |   |   |   |   |     |

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY  
Foreign Language Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form

Teacher candidate:

Comments: NA to lesson.

| <b>STANDARD 3: LANGUAGE ACQUISITION THEORIES AND INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES</b>  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| <b>3.a. Understanding Language Acquisition and Creating a Supportive Classroom.</b> Candidates demonstrate an understanding of language acquisition at various developmental levels and use this knowledge to create a supportive classroom learning environment that includes target language input and opportunities for negotiation of meaning and meaningful interaction. |   |   |   |   |     |
| <b>3.b. Developing Instructional Practices That Reflect Language Outcomes and Learner Diversity.</b> Candidates develop a variety of instructional practices that reflect language outcomes and articulated program models and address the needs of diverse language learners.  |   |   |   |   |     |

Comments:

| <b>STANDARD 4: INTEGRATION OF STANDARDS INTO CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION</b>   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| <b>4.a. Understanding and Integrating Standards in Planning.</b> Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the goal areas and standards of the <i>Standards for Foreign Language Learning</i> and their state standards, and they integrate these frameworks into curricular planning. |   |   |   |   |     |
| <b>4.b. Integrating Standards in Instruction.</b> Candidates integrate the <i>Standards for Foreign Language Learning</i> and their state standards into language instruction.  |   |   |   |   |     |
| <b>4.c. Selecting and Designing Instructional Materials.</b> Candidates use standards and curricular goals to evaluate, select, design, and adapt instructional resources.  |   |   |   |   |     |

Comments:

| <b>STANDARD 5: ASSESSMENT OF LANGUAGES AND CULTURES</b>             | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| <b>5.a. Knowing assessment models and using them appropriately.</b> |   |   |   |   |     |

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY  
 Foreign Language Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form

Teacher candidate:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Candidates believe that assessment is ongoing, and they demonstrate knowledge of multiple ways of assessment that are age- and level-appropriate by implementing purposeful measures.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>5.b. Reflecting on assessment.</b> Candidates reflect on the results of student assessments, adjust instruction accordingly, analyze the results of assessments, and use success and failure to determine the direction of instruction. |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>5.c. Reporting assessment results.</b> Candidates interpret and report the results of student performances to all stakeholders and provide opportunity for discussion.  |  |  |  |  |  |

Comments:

| STANDARD 6: PROFESSIONALISM  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----|
| <b>6.a. Engaging in Professional Development.</b> Candidates engage in professional development opportunities that strengthen their own linguistic and cultural competence and promote reflection on practice.   |   |   |   |   |     |
| <b>6.b. Knowing the Value of Foreign Language Learning.</b> Candidates know the value of foreign language learning to the overall success of all students and understand that they will need to become advocates with students, colleagues, and members of the community to promote the field. |   |   |   |   |     |

Comments: