For Academic Programs

Informed by your assessment activities related to student learning, what changes have you made in your degree program in the last three to five years? Describe the changes (e.g., curriculum revision, new courses, faculty development), the general results that prompted the changes (e.g., student performance on an assessment measure), and any impact on student learning that you might attribute to these changes.

1. In response to student performances on MA comprehensive exams, Ph.D. prospectus exams and defenses, and graduate student essays, theses, and dissertations, the department decided that there was too little emphasis on literary theory. We have responded by adding RL 557 (Critical Theory) to the curriculum, and Spanish courses are furthermore expected to incorporate theoretical elements into each course. Faculty have noted a distinct improvement in the sophistication and quality of student literary analysis during the past two years.

2. During the 8-Year-Review and also in student exit questionnaires, students complained about a lack of linguistic professors and courses. During the past 4 years we have added one professor of linguistics in French and one in Spanish and we have hired an additional Spanish linguist for fall 2014. We have also added the following courses to the curriculum: FR 513 (Research Methods in French Applied Linguistics); RL 513 (Research Methods in Applied Linguistics); SP 523 (Quantitative Methods in Hispanic Linguistics Research); SP 580 (Seminar in Spanish Linguistics). According to exit surveys, student satisfaction with the program has increased and our placement rate, which has averaged close to 90% in the past four years, attests to the quality of our graduates.

3. We have changed two of the assessment categories for evaluating our graduate teaching assistants. Formerly we asked undergraduate students to rate their course using departmental evaluations. However, we discontinued the use of these evaluations in cycle 2012-13. Another criterion was the observation and evaluation of graduate student teachers by a tenure track faculty member, the Language Program Director. Despite the use of a rubric, the results seemed too subjective and difficult to compare across French, German, and Spanish. The problem was exacerbated by the fact that Spanish has not had an applied linguist as Language Program Director for three years. We replaced these two measures with A&S computerized ratings of courses by students. These allow for better, more objective comparisons of teacher performance across our various disciplines and also allow for comparison throughout A&S. Results have been encouraging and we have not seen any reasons as yet to alter the mechanics of our training of graduate student teaching assistants.

Mission / Purpose

Our mission is to provide our students with the linguistic and intercultural competence necessary for the global society of the 21st century. We intend to promote language proficiency and instill in our students informed and critical perspectives regarding other cultures and also our own. We are committed to providing this training to our students within a department equipped with the best facilities and technology available, staffed by teachers and scholars with international experience and expertise. Specifically, our mission is: To offer majors a program aimed at advanced language proficiency and significant exposure to the literature and culture of the countries studied. In part this objective is fulfilled by fostering double majors, e.g., language/business; To offer in-depth training in language, literature, linguistics, cultural studies, and faculty to graduate students at the MA and Ph.D. levels; To offer instruction in modern and classical languages to all students in fulfillment of core curriculum requirements; To train minors in the use of modern and classical languages by offering a minimum of three years of classes in the language(s); To offer reading proficiency courses in various languages for graduate students in other programs; To participate with other departments within and outside of the College of Arts and Sciences in offering interdisciplinary studies programs, especially in (a) area studies and period studies, (b) world literature and comparative literature, (c) language pedagogy, (d) linguistics, (e) film studies, and (f) international honors programs; To contribute to increased internationalization by sponsoring appropriate campus events, helping students study abroad, and attracting international students. To advance the academic goals of students by fostering new and challenging contexts: e.g., creating the opportunity for students to study abroad (in summer, semester-long, and year-long programs), offering accelerated and honors sections, incorporating advanced writing components in designated courses, and offering students courses dealing with content as well as language proficiency. To provide services to the community, including sponsoring and organizing a wide variety of educational and social events related to languages and culture, for example: foreign films, conferences and symposia, state-wide language club conventions, etc.; To serve the community and the state as the principal institution offering expert training in modern and classical languages; To train students to teach modern and classical languages in schools, colleges and universities throughout the state; To promote research in literature, linguistics, cultural and interdisciplinary studies, and to offer the greatest pool of expertise in modern language studies and classical studies in the state of Alabama. In this regard, the Department of Modern Languages and Classics affirms its special commitment to the promotion of scholarly research leading to the development of new knowledge and to the enhanced standing of the University.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge

Students completing the track in French or Spanish literature, with or without thesis, will demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of French or Spanish literature and culture from the beginnings until today. Students completing the linguistics track will develop expertise in applied, general, and historical linguistics. Students will demonstrate their expertise in written and oral form.
Related Measures

M 1: Evaluation of essays
In their last semester of study, students will write a series of essays based on their coursework and a reading list. These essays are not given a letter grade but are assessed by a team of faculty members. Faculty use a rubric and assign an evaluation. 80% will write satisfactory essays.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
80% of Romance Languages students will write satisfactory essays on their comprehensive examinations.

M 2: Oral presentation
During the final semester of study, students will make an oral presentation, either during their comprehensive exams or in a class, that demonstrates mastery of their discipline. The oral presentation is rated with a rubric. 80% will make satisfactory presentations.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
80% of French and Spanish MA students will make satisfactory oral presentations.

M 3: Comparison of results from last year
Comparison of results from 2011-12 with 2010-11 to gauge improvement.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of French and Spanish MA students will write satisfactory essays and will make satisfactory presentations, as evidenced by the rating of pass or better.

SLO 2: Demonstrate mastery of teaching

MA students who teach demonstrate mastery of teaching techniques and methods.

Related Measures

M 4: A&S student evaluations
A&S online student evaluations of teachers. The majority will be average or better, based on the center of the A&S rating scale (3).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
The majority of French and Spanish MA students will receive an evaluation of instructor that is average or better.

M 6: Comparison of results from last year-O2
Comparison of results from 2011-12 with 2010-11 to gauge improvement.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
The majority of French and Spanish MA students will receive an evaluation of instructor that is average or better.

M 21: Student Evaluation of Course
Student evaluation of the course will achieve a rating of 3.5 or better on the A&S rating scale (1-5) for the question: How would you rate this course?

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
Student evaluation of the course will achieve a rating of 3.5 or better on the A&S rating scale (1-5) for the question: How would you rate this course?

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 3: Program Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality. The department has developed a long-range Action Plan based on the results of the 8-Year-Review of 2009-2010.

Related Measures

M 7: List of strengths from accreditation review
List of strengths from most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 8: list of opportunities from accreditation review
List of opportunities from most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 9: List of actions taken based on review
List of actions taken based on most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
M 10: Summary of impacts
Summary of impacts as a result of actions taken (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 4: Optimal Program Enrollments and Degree Completion
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Related Measures

M 11: Number of Students in the Program
Number of students in the graduate major for the last three fall semesters.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
The numbers will permit graduate classes of 7 students.

M 12: Number of Degrees Awarded to ACHE
Number of degrees in the graduate major for last five August+December+May commencements. Comparison of these numbers with ACHE viability standards.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
The number of graduates will meet or exceed the target supplied by ACHE of 3.75 graduate per year over a five year period.

OthOtcm 5: Highly Valued by Program Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures

M 13: Exit Survey Results-quality of curriculum
In an exit survey, graduates will be asked to rate the quality of their curriculum. The average rating will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
60% or higher of graduates will rate their curriculum as satisfactory or better.

M 14: Exit Survey Results-quality of teaching
In an exit survey, graduates will be asked to rate the quality of the teaching in their program. The average rating will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program
Target:
60% or higher of graduates will report that they are satisfied or better with the quality of teaching.

OthOtcm 6: Department Outcome: Faculty teach at superior level
Faculty will teach at a superior level

Related Measures

M 15: A&S student evaluations
A&S student evaluations: At least 60% of faculty will receive above average ratings on the A&S scale for the question: How would you rate your teacher?
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

M 16: Departmental student evaluations
Departmental student evaluations: Results will substantiate A&S evaluations.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

OthOtcm 7: Department Outcome: Faculty Contribute to the Production of knowledge
Faculty members will contribute actively to the production of knowledge in the fields of literature, culture, linguistics, and theory.

Related Measures

M 17: Faculty Activity Reports-scholarly publication
Faculty Activity Reports: Faculty should average at least one refereed scholarly publication each academic year.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 18: Faculty Activity Reports-conference presentation
Faculty Activity Reports: Faculty should average at least one scholarly conference presentation each academic year.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 8: Department Outcome: Faculty Services
Faculty members will provide service and outreach with their expertise to the community and profession.

Related Measures

M 19: Faculty engagement in community
Faculty Activity Reports: At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in community and/or professional service at the local or state level.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 20: Faculty engagement in professional service
Faculty Activity Reports: At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in professional service at the regional, national or
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in professional service at the regional, national or international level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission / Purpose

Our mission is to provide our students with the linguistic and intercultural competence necessary for the global society of the 21st century. We intend to promote language proficiency and instill in our students informed and critical perspectives regarding other cultures and also our own. We are committed to providing this training to our students within a department equipped with the best facilities and technology available, staffed by teachers and scholars with international experience and expertise. Specifically, our mission is: To offer majors a program aimed at advanced language proficiency and significant exposure to the literature and culture of the country(ies) studied. In part this objective is fulfilled by fostering double majors, e.g., language/business; To offer in-depth training in language, literature, linguistics, cultural studies, and theory to graduate students at the MA and Ph.D. levels; To offer basic instruction in modern and classical languages to all students in fulfillment of core curriculum requirements; To train minors in the use of modern and classical languages by offering a minimum of three years of classes in the language(s); To offer reading proficiency courses in various languages for graduate students in other programs; To participate with other departments within and outside of the College of Arts and Sciences in offering interdisciplinary studies programs, especially in (a) area studies and period studies, (b) world literature and comparative literature, (c) language pedagogy, (d) linguistics, (e) film studies, and (f) international honors programs; To contribute to increased internationalization by sponsoring appropriate campus events, helping students study abroad, and attracting international students; To advance the academic goals of students by fostering new and challenging contexts: e.g., creating the opportunity for students to study abroad (in summer, semester-long, and year-long programs), offering accelerated and honors sections, incorporating advanced writing components in designated courses, and offering students courses dealing with content as well as language proficiency. To provide services to the community, including sponsoring and organizing a wide variety of educational and social events related to languages and culture, for example: foreign films, conferences and symposia, state-wide language club conventions, etc.; To serve the community and the state as the principal institution offering expert training in modern and classical languages; To train students to teach modern and classical languages in schools, colleges and universities throughout the state; To promote research in literature, linguistics, cultural and interdisciplinary studies, and to offer the greatest pool of expertise in modern language studies and classical studies in the state of Alabama. In this regard, the Department of Modern Languages and Classics affirms its special commitment to the promotion of scholarly research leading to the development of new knowledge and to the enhanced standing of the University.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge

Students completing the track in French or Spanish literature, with or without thesis, will demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of French or Spanish literature and culture from the beginnings until today. Students completing the track in French or Spanish literature, with or without thesis, will demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of expertise in modern language studies and classical studies in the state of Alabama. In this regard, the Department of Modern Languages and Classics affirms its special commitment to the promotion of scholarly research leading to the development of new knowledge and to the enhanced standing of the University.

Connected Documents

Curriculum Map I-Romance Language M.A.(FR)
Curriculum Map I-Romance Language M.A.(SP)
Curriculum Map II-Romance Language M.A.(FR)
Curriculum Maps I-Romance Language M.A.(FR)

Related Measures

M 1: Evaluation of essays

In their last semester of study, students will write a series of essays based on their coursework and a reading list. These essays are not given a letter grade but are assessed by a team of faculty members. Faculty use a rubric and assign an evaluation. 80% will write satisfactory essays.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target: 80% of Romance Languages students will write satisfactory essays on their comprehensive examinations.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met

In fall 2012 three students took comprehensive written exams (1 FR, 2 SP). Two received Pass and one Pass with Distinction. In spring 2013 three additional students (2 SP, 1 FR) wrote examinations: 1 Pass with Reservations, 1 Pass, and 1 Pass with Distinction. 83% of students tested wrote satisfactory examinations.

M 2: Oral presentation

During the final semester of study, students will make an oral presentation, either during their comprehensive exams or in a class, that demonstrates mastery of their discipline. The oral presentation is rated with a rubric. 80% will make satisfactory presentations.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target: 80% of French and Spanish MA students will make satisfactory oral presentations.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met

In fall and spring 2012-12 six students (4 Spanish, 2 French) made oral presentations judged by a rubric. 4 received ratings of pass with Distinction and 2 received Pass. Thus 100% of students made satisfactory oral presentations.

M 3: Comparison of results from last year

Comparison of results from 2011-12 with 2010-11 to gauge improvement.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of French and Spanish MA students will write satisfactory essays and will make satisfactory presentations, as evidenced by the rating of pass or better.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
In 2011-12 88% of French and Spanish MA students made oral presentations that were satisfactory or better. In 2012-13 100% did. In 2011-12 100% of French and Spanish MA students wrote satisfactory essays; in 2012-13 83% did.

SLO 2: Demonstrate mastery of teaching
MA students who teach demonstrate mastery of teaching techniques and methods.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map II-Romance language M.A.(SP)
Curriculum Map I-Romance Language M.A.(SP)
Curriculum Map II-Romance Language M.A.(FR)
Curriculum Maps I-Romance Language M.A.(FR)

Related Measures

M 4: A&S student evaluations
A&S online student evaluations of teachers. The majority will be average or better., based on the center of the A&S rating scale (3).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
The majority of French and Spanish MA students will receive an evaluation of instructor that is average or better.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
For SP MA in fall 2012: 100% (4 out of 4) of the sections taught by MA students had teacher evaluations average or better; in fact, 100% (4 out of 4) of the sections had teacher evaluations rated excellent (meaning at least a 4 rating). For FR MA: 100% (or 1 out of 1) of students had evaluations average or better; the ratings were excellent (all above 4). For SP MA in spring 2013: 100% (4 out of 4) of the sections taught by MA students had teacher evaluations average or better; in fact, 100% (4 out of 4) of the sections had teacher evaluations rated excellent (meaning at least a 4 rating). For FR MA: 100% (or 1 out of 1) of students had evaluations average or better; the ratings were excellent (all above 4). Hence 100% of FR and SP GTAs teaching at the MA level in fall and spring 2012-13 received instructor ratings that were excellent.

M 6: Comparison of results from last year-O2
Comparison of results from 2011-12 with 2010-11 to gauge improvement.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
The majority of French and Spanish MA students will receive an evaluation of instructor that is average or better.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
In 2011-2012, 99% of MA Romance Languages GTA teaching evaluations were average or better over the course of the academic year. In 2012-2013, 100% of MA Romance Languages GTA teaching evaluations were average or better over the course of the academic year. We have discontinued teacher observation as a measure and replaced it with A&S student evaluation of course.

M 21: Student Evaluation of Course
Student evaluation of the course will achieve a rating of 3.5 or better on the A&S rating scale (1-5) for the question: How would you rate this course?

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
Student evaluation of the course will achieve a rating of 3.5 or better on the A&S rating scale (1-5) for the question: How would you rate this course?

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
For SP MA in fall 2012: 100% (4 out of 4) of the sections taught by MA students had course ratings average or better; 75% (3 out of 4) of the sections had course ratings of excellent (meaning at least a 4 rating). For FR MA: 100% (or 1 out of 1) of sections had evaluations average or better. For SP MA in spring 2013: 100% (4 out of 4) of the sections taught by MA students had course ratings average or better; 50% (2 out of 4) of the sections had course ratings of excellent (meaning at least a 4 rating). For FR MA: 100% (or 1 out of 1) of sections had evaluations average or better. Hence 100% of French and Spanish MA student teachers had evaluations of average or above during academic year 2012-13.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OtOtcm 3: Program Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Related Measures

M 7: List of strengths from accreditation review
List of strengths from most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 8: list of opportunities from accreditation review
List of opportunities from most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence:  Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 9:** List of actions taken based on review
List of actions taken based on most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence:  Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 10:** Summary of impacts
Summary of impacts as a result of actions taken (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence:  Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 22:** Placement as Quality Indicator
Students will obtain placement in their field or continue with further education.
Source of Evidence:  Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

**Target:**
60% of students will find employment in their field or continue with their education within 6 months of graduation.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Of 6 graduates, 2 are now in PhD programs, 2 are teaching at high schools, one is teaching at a college in Florida, and one is teaching in China.

**OthOtcm 4:** Optimal Program Enrollments and Degree Completion
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

**Related Measures**

**M 11:** Number of Students in the Program
Number of students in the graduate major for the last three fall semesters.
Source of Evidence:  Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
The numbers will permit graduate classes of 7 students.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Enrollments for the past 3 years in fall semester have been 21, 21, and 17, thus permitting optimal class sizes.

**M 12:** Number of Degrees Awarded to ACHE
Number of degrees in the graduate major for last five August+December+May commencements. Comparison of these numbers with ACHE viability standards.
Source of Evidence:  Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
The number of graduates will meet or exceed the target supplied by ACHE of 3.75 graduate per year over a five year period.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
During the past five years the Romance languages MA program has graduated 41 students for an average of 8.2 per year.

**OthOtcm 5:** Highly Valued by Program Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

**Related Measures**

**M 13:** Exit Survey Results-quality of curriculum
In an exit survey, graduates will be asked to rate the quality of their curriculum. The average rating will be reported.
Source of Evidence:  Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
60% or higher of graduates will rate their curriculum as satisfactory or better.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The survey was not administered during the past year but will be administered in 2013-14.

**M 14:** Exit Survey Results-quality of teaching
In an exit survey, graduates will be asked to rate the quality of the teaching in their program. The average rating will be reported.
Source of Evidence:  Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

**Target:**
60% or higher of graduates will report that they are satisfied or better with the quality of teaching.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The survey was not administered this year but will be administered in 2013-14.

**OthOtcm 6:** Department Outcome: Faculty teach at superior level
Faculty will teach at a superior level

**Related Measures**

**M 15:** A&S student evaluations
A&S student evaluations: At least 60% of faculty will receive above average ratings on the A&S scale for the question: How would you rate your teacher?
Source of Evidence:  Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**M 16:** Departmental student evaluations
Departmental student evaluations: Results will substantiate A&S evaluations.
Source of Evidence:  Student course evaluations on learning gains made
**OthOtcm 7: Department Outcome: Faculty Contribute to the Production of knowledge**
Faculty members will contribute actively to the production of knowledge in the fields of literature, culture, linguistics, and theory.

**Related Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 17: Faculty Activity Reports-scholarly publication</td>
<td>Faculty Activity Reports: Faculty should average at least one refereed scholarly publication each academic year. Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 18: Faculty Activity Reports-conference presentation</td>
<td>Faculty Activity Reports: Faculty should average at least one scholarly conference presentation each academic year. Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OthOtcm 8: Department Outcome: Faculty Services**
Faculty members will provide service and outreach with their expertise to the community and profession.

**Related Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 19: Faculty engagement in community</td>
<td>Faculty Activity Reports: At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in community and/or professional service at the local or state level. Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 20: Faculty engagement in professional service</td>
<td>Faculty Activity Reports: At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in professional service at the regional, national or international level. Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target:**
At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in professional service at the regional, national or international level.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
In 2011-2012 12 of 26 faculty members, or 46%, were involved in professional service at the regional, national, or international level.
The mission of Modern Languages and Classics is to provide our students with the linguistic and intercultural competence necessary for the global society of the 21st century. We intend to promote language proficiency and instill in our students informed and critical perspectives regarding other cultures and also our own. We are committed to providing this training to our students within a department equipped with the best facilities and technology available, staffed by teachers and scholars with international experience and expertise. Specifically, our mission is: To offer majors a program aimed at advanced language proficiency and significant exposure to the literature and culture of the country/ies studied. In part this objective is fulfilled by fostering double majors, e.g., language/business; To offer in-depth training in language, literature, linguistics, cultural studies, and theory to graduate students at the MA and Ph.D. levels; To offer basic instruction in modern and classical languages to all students in fulfillment of core curriculum requirements; To train minors in the use of modern and classical languages by offering a minimum of three years of classes in the language(s); To offer reading proficiency courses in various languages for graduate students in other programs; To participate with other departments within and outside of the College of Arts and Sciences in offering interdisciplinary studies programs, especially in (a) area studies and period studies, (b) world literature and comparative literature, (c) language pedagogy, (d) linguistics, (e) film studies, and (f) international honors programs; To contribute to increased internationalization by sponsoring appropriate campus events, helping students study abroad, and attracting international students; To advance the academic goals of students by fostering new and challenging contexts: e.g., creating the opportunity for students to study abroad (in summer, semester-long, and year-long programs), offering accelerated and honors sections, incorporating advanced writing components in designated courses, and offering students courses dealing with content as well as language proficiency. To provide services to the community, including sponsoring and organizing a wide variety of educational and social events related to languages and culture, for example: foreign films, conferences and symposia, state-wide language club conventions, etc.; To serve the community and the state as the principal institution offering expert training in modern and classical languages; To train students to teach modern and classical languages in schools, colleges and universities throughout the state; To promote research in literature, linguistics, cultural and interdisciplinary studies, and to offer the greatest pool of expertise in modern language studies and classical studies in the state of Alabama. In this regard, the Department of Modern Languages and Classics affirms its special commitment to the promotion of scholarly research leading to the development of new knowledge and to the enhanced standing of the University.

### Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

**SLO 1: Demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge**

Students completing the track in French or Spanish literature, with or without thesis, will demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of French or Spanish literature and culture from the beginnings until today. Students completing the linguistics track will develop expertise in applied, general, and historical linguistics. Students will demonstrate their expertise in written and oral form.

**Connected Documents**

- Curriculum Map II-Romance Language M.A.(SP)
- Curriculum Map I-Romance Language M.A.(SP)
- Curriculum Map II-Romance Language M.A.(FR)
- Curriculum Maps I-Romance Language M.A.(FR)

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Evaluation of essays**

In their last semester of study, students will write a series of essays based on their coursework and a reading list. These essays are not given a letter grade but are assessed by a team of faculty members. Faculty use a rubric and assign an evaluation. 80% will write satisfactory essays.

**Target:**

80% of Romance Languages students will write satisfactory essays on their comprehensive examinations.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**

In fall 2011 no French or Spanish students took MA comprehensive examinations. In spring 2012 5 Spanish MA students took comprehensive examinations. 3 received superior ratings and 2 received average ratings on the written component. 3 French MA students took written examinations. Two received average ratings and one received superior ratings on the written examinations.

Conclusion: 100% of French and Spanish MA students received ratings of average or better on the written part of their MA comprehensive examinations.

**M 2: Oral presentation**

During the final semester of study, students will make an oral presentation, either during their comprehensive exams or in a class, that demonstrates mastery of their discipline. The oral presentation is rated with a rubric. 80% will make satisfactory presentations.

**Target:**

80% of French and Spanish MA students will make satisfactory oral presentations.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**

In fall 2011 no French or Spanish MA student made an oral presentation judged by our rubric. In spring 2012 3 Spanish students received average ratings on their oral presentations and 2 received superior ratings. Among French students, one received below average ratings, one received average rating, and one received superior
Conclusions: 88% of Romance Language MA students received rating of average or better on their MA presentations.

M 3: Comparison of results from last year
Comparison of results from 2011-12 with 2010-11 to gauge improvement.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
During the last academic year we did not differentiate between French and Spanish student or fall and spring semesters. The overall results were similar to this year, though in reverse order: 88% of Romance Languages students wrote comprehensive examinations that were average or better in quality (this year it was 100%). Last year 100% of French and Spanish students of literature and linguistics made oral presentations that were rated average or better; this year it was 88%.

Conclusions: Targets were met. We will continue to monitor to see if improvements are necessary.

SLO 2: Demonstrate mastery of teaching
MA students who teach demonstrate mastery of teaching techniques and methods.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map II-Romance language M.A.(SP)
Curriculum Map I-Romance Language M.A.(SP)
Curriculum Map II-Romance Language M.A.(FR)
Curriculum Maps I-Romance Language M.A.(FR)

Related Measures

M 4: A&S student evaluations
A&S online student evaluations of teachers. The majority will be average or better., based on the center of the A&S rating scale (3).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
The majority of French and Spanish MA students will receive an evaluation of instructor that is average or better.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
In fall 2011 67% (2 out of 3) French GTAs had evaluations average or better. 100% of Spanish 4 GTAs had evaluations of average or better. 75% were excellent and 25% good. In spring 2012, 100% of 7 French and Spanish MA student teachers received excellent ratings (better than 4).

Conclusion: 99% of MA Romance Languages GTA teaching evaluations were average or better over the course of the academic year.

M 5: Observation by Faculty
Observation and evaluation by a faculty member. MA student teachers are rated on their use of the target language, their delivery of the lesson plan, and their application of pedagogical technique. Student teachers will achieve a rating of average or above in each category.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
Student teachers will receive a rating of average or better in application of pedagogical technique, delivery of lesson plan, and use of target language.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
In fall 2011 67% of French students were above average and one student or 33% was below average. 75% of Spanish students were above average and 25% or one student was below average.

In spring 2012 for French MA students the application of pedagogical technique: 67% (2 out of 3) students were rated above average and one was rated average. Use of language and delivery of lesson plan: 100% above average. In Spanish, 75% were rated exceptional and 25% rated good in all categories.

Conclusion: Over the course of the year, 72% of students received ratings that were average or better. 100% of French and Spanish MA students were rated average or better in the three categories examined in spring 2012.

M 6: Comparison of results from last year-O2
Comparison of results from 2011-12 with 2010-11 to gauge improvement.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
For French MA students (3) in fall 2010 (Measure 2.1) for 4 students were: 75% excellent, 33% good. For Measure 2.2: 33% had exceptional ratings and 77% were below average. In spring 2011 for French, the results for Measure 2.1 were: 40% excellent, 20% good, 40% below average. For Measure 2.2: 33% had exceptional ratings, and 66% had below average ratings.

For Spanish MA students in fall 2010 for Measure 2.1, 3 students were excellent and one was below average. In spring 2011 for Measure 2.1, 3 Spanish MA students received excellent ratings. There is no way to compare Measure 2.2 inasmuch as Spanish had no tenure-track faculty member observing teachers last academic year.

Conclusion: over the course of the academic year 2010-11, 87% of Romance Languages student teachers received Instructor ratings of average or better. These already high ratings improved in academic year 2011-2012. Regarding teacher observations: in 2010-2011 28% of observed students in French received ratings of above average or better. In the past year these numbers improved, and the majority of French students were above average in every category over the course of the year. No comparison is possible with Spanish, inasmuch as there was no tenure-track professor to observe student teachers in academic year 2010-11.
OthOtcm 3: Program Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality. The department has developed a long-range Action Plan based on the results of the 8-Year-Review of 2009-2010.

Related Measures

M 7: List of strengths from accreditation review
List of strengths from most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 8: List of opportunities from accreditation review
List of opportunities from most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 9: List of actions taken based on review
List of actions taken based on most recent accreditation review (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 10: Summary of impacts
Summary of impacts as a result of actions taken (specific to the degree program).
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 4: Optimal Program Enrollments and Degree Completion
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Related Measures

M 11: Number of Students in the Program
Number of students in the graduate major for the last three fall semesters.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 12: Number of Degrees Awarded to ACHE
Number of degrees in the graduate major for last three August+December+May commencements. Comparison of these numbers with ACHE viability standards.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 5: Highly Valued by Program Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures

M 13: Exit Survey Results-quality of curriculum
In an exit survey, graduates will be asked to rate the quality of their curriculum. The average rating will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 14: Exit Survey Results-quality of teaching
In an exit survey, graduates will be asked to rate the quality of the teaching in their program. The average rating will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

OthOtcm 6: Department Outcome: Faculty teach at superior level
Faculty will teach at a superior level.

Related Measures

M 15: A&S student evaluations
A&S student evaluations: At least 60% of faculty will receive above average ratings on the A&S scale for the question: How would you rate your teacher?
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

M 16: Departmental student evaluations
Departmental student evaluations: Results will substantiate A&S evaluations.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

OthOtcm 7: Department Outcome: Faculty Contribute to the Production of knowledge
Faculty members will contribute actively to the production of knowledge in the fields of literature, culture, linguistics, and theory.

Related Measures

M 17: Faculty Activity Reports-scholarly publication
Faculty Activity Reports: Faculty should average at least one refereed scholarly publication each academic year.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 18: Faculty Activity Reports-conference presentation
Faculty Activity Reports: Faculty should average at least one scholarly conference presentation each academic year.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 8: Department Outcome: Faculty Services
Faculty members will provide service and outreach with their expertise to the community and profession.

Related Measures
**M 19: Faculty engagement in community**
Faculty Activity Reports: At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in community and/or professional service at the local or state level.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 20: Faculty engagement in professional service**
Faculty Activity Reports: At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in professional service at the regional, national or international level.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FR 512</td>
<td>Mastery FR Lit and Culture</td>
<td>Mastery FR Linguistics</td>
<td>Teaching Mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation by Language Program Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required Task Exit Exams</td>
<td>Measure 1.1</td>
<td>Measure 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required Task Oral Interview</td>
<td>Measure 1.2</td>
<td>Measure 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required Task A&amp;S Teaching Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>Course 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 533</td>
<td>FR 545/546</td>
<td>FR 547</td>
<td>FR 552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Required Task**

**Common Assignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Course 3</th>
<th>Course 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FR 512</td>
<td>FR 515</td>
<td>FR 521</td>
<td>FR 561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Curriculum Map 1 (Student Learning Outcomes, SP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Course 3</th>
<th>Course 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP 515</td>
<td>SP 516/517</td>
<td>SP 518</td>
<td>SP 541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SP 581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SP 584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning Outcome 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student Learning Outcome 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student Learning Outcome 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student Learning Outcome 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Lit. and Culture</td>
<td>SP Linguistics</td>
<td>Teaching Mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reinforce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reinforce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reinforce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>SP 502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Experience</strong></td>
<td>Observation by Language Program Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Task</strong></td>
<td>Exit Exams</td>
<td>Measure 1.1</td>
<td>Measure 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Task</strong></td>
<td>Oral Interview</td>
<td>Measure 1.1</td>
<td>Measure 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Task</strong></td>
<td>A&amp;S Teaching Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure 2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Curriculum Map II (Assessment Measures, FR and SP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Experience</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation by Language</td>
<td>Mastery Lit and Culture</td>
<td>Mastery Linguistics</td>
<td>Teaching Mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure 2.2 Fall 2011/Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Task</th>
<th>Measure 1.1. Fall/Spring 2011/2012</th>
<th>Measure 1.2. Fall/Spring 2011/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Propectus Written Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S Teaching Evaluations</td>
<td>Measure 2.1. Fall/Spring 2011/2012</td>
<td>Measure 2.1. Fall/Spring 2011/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Curriculum Maps (Student Learning Outcomes, FR) #1 (In which courses or in what activities or assignments are Student Learning Outcomes Addressed)

Use “Introduce” when outcome is first addressed; “Reinforce” when outcome is reinforced; and “Master” when outcome is expected to be mastered. Note that you do not need to obtain a measure from every course in which an outcome is addressed (see Map #2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR Lit. and Culture</td>
<td>FR Linguistics</td>
<td>Teaching Mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>FR 533</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>FR 545/546</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>FR 547</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>FR 552</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR 554</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>FR 670</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>FR 699</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td>FR 512</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 8</td>
<td>FR 515</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 9</td>
<td>FR 521</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 10</td>
<td>FR 561</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Curriculum Map 1 (Student Learning Outcomes, SP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP Lit. and Culture</td>
<td>SP Linguistics</td>
<td>Teaching Mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>SP 515</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>SP 516/517</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>SP 518</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>SP 541</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP 591</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>SP 690</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td>SP 699</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>SP 502</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>SP 556</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>SP 581</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>SP 584</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>