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 futhermore 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 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 of French or Spanish literature demonstrate broad knowledge of the literature, culture, and history of the country, countries, or area studied. Students of French or Spanish linguistics demonstrate expertise in applied, and general linguistics.

Connected Documents

Curriculum Map I-Romance Languages Ph.D.(SP)
Curriculum Map II-Romance Languages Ph.D. (FR and SP)
Curriculum Maps I-Romance Languages Ph.D. (FR)
Related Measures

M 1: Evaluation of essays
In their fourth semester of study, students write a series of pre-prospectus essays in order to demonstrate their mastery of the subject matter. The essays are evaluated by a faculty committee. 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 students will write satisfactory essays as part of their Ph.D. qualifying examination.

M 2: Pre-prospectus essays defense
In their fourth semester of study, students orally defend the pre-prospectus essays in front of a committee of faculty members, who will evaluate the defense based on a rubric. 80% of students will complete a satisfactory defense.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target: 80% of students will complete a satisfactory oral defense of the Ph.D. prospectus.

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 PhD students in French and Spanish will pass written PhD qualifying examinations and an oral prospectus defense.

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

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map I-Romance Languages Ph.D. (SP)
Curriculum Map II-Romance Languages Ph.D. (FR and SP)
Curriculum Maps I-Romance Languages Ph.D. (FR)

Related Measures

M 4: A&S teaching evaluations
The majority of A&S teaching evaluations will be at 3.5 or better, based on the A&S rating scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent), for the question: How would you rate the teacher of this course? This is an increase in the target from 3.0 to 3.5 for the academic year 2013-2014.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target: The majority of A&S teaching evaluations will be at 3.5 or better, based on the A&S rating scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent), for the question: How would you rate the teacher of this course? This is an increase in the target to 3.5 over 3.0 in previous years.

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 student teachers will receive evaluations that are average of better.

M 21: Student Evaluation of Course
The majority of graduate student teachers 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: The majority of graduate student teachers 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.

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 find employment in their field.

- **Target:**
  - 60% of graduates will find employment within their field within 6 months of graduation.

**OthOtm 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 graduate major
Number of students in the graduate major for the last three fall semesters.

- **Source of Evidence:** Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
- **Target:**
  - Enrollments will be sufficient for graduate seminars with enrollments 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:**
  - Average graduation rates over five years will meet or exceed targets established by ACHE of ___ graduates per year.

**OthOtm 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:** Student satisfaction survey at end of the program
- **Target:**
  - 60% or more of graduates will rate their curriculum 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:** Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
- **Target:**
  - 60% or better of graduates will rate their teaching as satisfactory or better.

**OthOtm 6: 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:** Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**OthOtm 7: 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

**OthOtm 8: Faculty Provide 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 20: Faculty engagement in professional service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Activity Reports: At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in professional service at the regional, national or international level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</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 courses 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. 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. 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. 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. 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 of French or Spanish literature demonstrate broad knowledge of the literature, culture, and history of the country, countries, or area studied. Students of French or Spanish linguistics demonstrate expertise in applied, 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.

Related Measures

M 1: Evaluation of essays

In their fourth semester of study, students write a series of pre-prospectus essays in order to demonstrate their mastery of the subject matter. The essays are evaluated by a faculty committee. 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 students will write satisfactory essays as part of their Ph.D. qualifying examination.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met

In 2011-12 no French students wrote a PhD qualifying examination. In Fall 2012, 4 Spanish PhD students wrote qualifying examinations. 2 received pass with distinction, one received a pass, and one received a fail. In spring 2013 one Spanish PhD student received a pass. Hence 80% of students completed a satisfactory PhD qualifying examination.

M 2: Pre-prospectus essays defense

In their fourth semester of study, students orally defend the pre-prospectus essays in front of a committee of faculty members, who will evaluate the defense based on a rubric. 80% of students will complete a satisfactory defense.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:

80% of students will complete a satisfactory oral defense of the Ph.D. prospectus.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met

In 2012-13 no French PhD student defended a prospectus. In fall 2012 2 Spanish students defended with ratings of pass. In spring 2013 2 students defended, one with ratings of pass and one with ratings of pass with reservations. Thus 75% of PhD students presented satisfactory oral presentations. This is close to the target.

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 PhD students in French and Spanish will pass written PhD qualifying examinations and an oral prospectus defense.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
In 2011-12 80% of students wrote satisfactory or better PhD qualifying examinations. In 2012-13, 80% also did. In 2011-12, 88% of students presented a satisfactory or better oral prospectus defense; in 2012-13 75% did.

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

Connected Documents
- Curriculum Map I-Romance Languages Ph.D. (SP)
- Curriculum Map II-Romance Languages Ph.D. (FR and SP)
- Curriculum Maps I-Romance Languages Ph.D. (FR)

Related Measures

M 4: A&S teaching evaluations
The majority of A&S teaching evaluations will be average or better, based on the center of the A&S rating scale (3).
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target: The majority of student teachers will receive evaluations that are average or better.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
For SP PhD in fall 2012: 95% (40 out of 42) of the sections taught by PhD students had teacher evaluations average or better; 5% (2 out of 42) of the sections had teacher evaluations rated excellent (meaning at least a 4 rating). For FR PhD students: 100% (or 3 out of 3) of students had evaluations average or better. For spring 2013 for SP PhD: 91% (31 out of 34) of the sections taught by PhD students had teacher evaluations average or better; 9% (3 out of 34) of the sections taught by PhD students had teacher evaluations between 2.4 and 3; 56% (19 out of 34) of the sections had teacher evaluations rated excellent (meaning at least a 4 rating). For FR PhD students: 100% (or 3 out of 3) of students had evaluations average or better. Hence, out of 80 sections in fall and spring, 5 sections (6%) were below average. 94% were average or above, and a large percentage 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 student teachers will receive evaluations that are average or better.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
IN 2011-2012 an impressive 94% of graduate student teachers on the PhD level received teaching evaluations that were average or better. In 2012-2013 the results were identical.

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 PhD in fall 2012: 69% (29 out of 42) of the sections taught by PhD students had course ratings average or better; 31% (13 out of 42) of the sections taught by PhD students had course ratings between 2.4 and 3.5; 31% (13 out of 42) of the sections had course ratings of excellent (meaning at least a 4 rating). For FR PhD in fall and spring: 86% (or 4 out of 6) of sections had evaluations average or better. 44% (or 2 out of 6) sections had evaluations slightly below 3.5 (between 3.2 and 3.4). For SP PhD in spring 2012: 50% (17 out of 34) of the sections taught by PhD students had course ratings average or better; 50% (17 out of 34) of the sections taught by PhD students had course ratings of excellent (meaning at least a 4 rating). Hence for 2011-2012, 61% of FR and SP PhD sections received ratings for course of 3.5 or above, on the A&S scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent).

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.

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 find employment in their field.
Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas
  **Target:**
  60% of graduates will find employment within their field within 6 months of graduation.
  **Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
  Of 6 graduates, 1 has a tenure-track position at the University of Idaho, 1 has a tenure-track position at Tennessee Wesleyan College, 1 has a tenure-track position at Samford University, 1 is a full-time Instructor at the University of Alabama, 1 is working as a poet in Nicaragua, and one is looking for employment in the field.

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 graduate major
Number of students in the graduate major for the last three fall semesters.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
  **Target:**
  Enrollments will be sufficient for graduate seminars with enrollments of 7 students.
  **Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
  Graduate enrollments in Romance Languages PhD courses for the past three years have been 18, 17 and 15 in the fall semester.

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:**
  Average graduation rates over five years will meet or exceed targets established by ACHE of ___ graduates per year.
  **Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
  21 students received Romance language PhDs during the past 5 years, for an average of 4.2 graduates 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: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

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: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 6: 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: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 7: 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

Other Otm 8: Faculty Provide 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
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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; 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 of French or Spanish literature demonstrate broad knowledge of the literature, culture, and history of the country, countries, or area studied. Students of French or Spanish linguistics demonstrate expertise in applied, and general linguistics.

Related Measures

M 1: Evaluation of essays
In their fourth semester of study, students write a series of pre-prospectus essays in order to demonstrate their mastery of the subject matter. The essays are evaluated by a faculty committee. 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 students will write satisfactory essays as part of their pre-prospectus.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**
In fall 2011, 1 of 2 French PhD students wrote satisfactory essays. Two Spanish students wrote satisfactory essays, one with above average ratings and one with average ratings. In spring 2012 two French students passed written examinations, two with average ratings and one with superior ratings. In Spanish, three students passed with below average ratings and one with superior ratings. Conclusion: Over the course of the year, 78% of French and Spanish PhD students wrote satisfactory essay. This is close to the 80% target.

M 2: Pre-prospectus essays defense
In their fourth semester of study, students orally defend the pre-prospectus essays in front of a committee of faculty members, who will evaluate the defense based on a rubric. 80% of students will complete a satisfactory defense.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% of students will complete a satisfactory oral defense.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**
In fall one French student completed a defense with above average ratings. Two Spanish students completed defenses, one with average ratings and one with above average. In spring two French students completed oral defenses, one with below average ratings and one with superior ratings. Two Spanish students passed their defenses, two with average ratings and one with superior ratings. Conclusion: Over the course of the year, 88% of French and Spanish PhD students defended their pre-prospectus with ratings of satisfactory or better.
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
In academic year 2010-11, 100% of 6 Romance Languages PhD students (literature and linguistics) completed satisfactory written examinations and defended their examinations successfully orally. One student needed two attempts to achieve a satisfactory result in the written exams.
Conclusions: The results from academic year 2011-12 were less impressive but still more or less within the high standards of our target range.

SLO 2: Demonstrate mastery of teaching
PhD students who teach demonstrate mastery of teaching techniques and methods.
Connected Documents
Curriculum Map I-Romance Languages Ph.D.(SP)
Curriculum Map II-Romance Languages Ph.D. (FR and SP)
Curriculum Maps I-Romance Languages Ph.D. (FR)

Related Measures
M 4: A&S teaching evaluations
The majority of A&S teaching evaluations will be average or better, based on the center of the A&S rating scale (3).
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made
Target: The majority of student teachers will receive evaluations that are average of better.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
In fall 2011, 100% of French PhD students (7) had teaching evaluations that were average or better: 57% excellent and 43% good. In spring 2012 71% of 7 students had excellent evaluations, while 2 students had good evaluations. In fall 67% of 15 Spanish PhD students had excellent evaluations and 33% had good ones. In spring 2012, of 15 Spanish students, 80% had excellent evaluations, 13% had good evaluations, and 7% below average.
Conclusions: Over the course of the academic year, 94% of French and Spanish student teachers received teaching evaluations that were average or above.

M 5: Observation by Faculty
Observation and evaluation by a faculty member. Student teachers will be rated on their use of the target language, their delivery of the lesson plan, and their application of pedagogical technique. Teachers will achieve an average of average or better for each category.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: Student teachers will be rated average or better in three categories.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
In fall 2011, of 7 French PhD students, 43% were rated superior, 29% average, and 28% as below average in every category. In spring 2012, 100% of 7 French PhD students were average or above in use of target language and delivery of lesson plan. 43% were above average in application of pedagogical techniques, and 29% were below average. For Spanish in fall 2011 53% of students were rated superior and 47% satisfactory. In spring 93% were rated superior and 7% were rated below average.
Conclusions: The great majority of French and Spanish PhD students received ratings of average or better for application of pedagogical technique, delivery of lesson plan, and use of target language.

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
French PhD student evaluations from fall 2010 for 6 students for Measure 2.1 were: 83% superior, 17% good. For Measure 2.2 in fall 2010 they were: 33% superior, 33% satisfactory, 33% below average. French PhD evaluations for 5 students for Measure 2.1 in spring 2011 were: 42% superior, 14% good, 14% average, 28% below average. For Measure 2.2 in spring 2011: application of pedagogical technique: 33% above average, 33% average, and 33% below average; use of target language: 66% above average, 17% average, and 17% below average; delivery of lesson plan: 67% above average, 33% average.
For 16 Spanish PhD students in fall 2010, teaching evaluations (Measure 2.1) were 94% excellent and 6% good. In spring 2011 for 12 students the ratings were 84% excellent, 8% good, and 8% below average. There is no way to compare measure 2.2 as Spanish had no tenure-track faculty member observing GTAs in 2010-2011.
Conclusions: Regarding teaching evaluations, 95% of student teacher evaluations were average or better over the course of the year. In academic year 2011-12 the number is 94%.

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 graduate major
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: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

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: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 6: 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: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 7: 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: Faculty Provide 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Activity Reports: At least 40% of faculty should be engaged in professional service at the regional, national or international level.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</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 address; “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>Course 1</td>
<td>FR 533 Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>FR 545/546 Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>FR 547 Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>FR 552 Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>FR 554 Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>FR 670 Master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td>FR 699 Master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>FR 512 Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>FR 515 Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>FR 521 Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>FR 561 Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td>Mastery Lit and Culture</td>
<td>Mastery Linguistics</td>
<td>Teaching Mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation by Language Program Director</td>
<td>Measure 1.1. Fall/Spring 2011/2012</td>
<td>Measure 1.2. Fall/Spring 2011/2012</td>
<td>Measure 2.2 Fall 2011/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Task</td>
<td>Pre-Prospectus Written Exams</td>
<td>Measure 1.1. Fall/Spring 2011/2012</td>
<td>Measure 1.1. Fall/Spring 2011/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Task</td>
<td>Pre-Prospectus Oral</td>
<td>Measure 1.2. Fall/Spring 2011/2012</td>
<td>Measure 1.2. Fall/Spring 2011/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Task</td>
<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>