Introduction

The 2007-2009 academic years were a time of transition and change. In 2007-2008 the Department of Modern Languages carried out a search, which resulted in the hire of Dr. Dinora Cardoso as a faculty member. Before Cardoso’s hire, several visiting professors and adjuncts taught the courses not covered by the full-time faculty. This was especially the case in the past two years since one of our faculty members was on sabbatical in the fall of 2007 and abroad in the fall of 2008. While it was an enriching experience for our students to have professors with different gifts and backgrounds, we also realized that some of the courses lacked continuity and needed firmer established goals. For example, in the past eight years no tenure-track department member has taught Spanish 100.

Last year, Westmont College went through two traumatic events that had an impact on learning. In the fall of 2008, the Tea fire traumatized students and burned six buildings including student residencies. Two weeks of classes were cancelled at this time. In the spring of 2009, fires in Montecito also affected campus functions and caused students to once again evacuate, this time, during final exam week. In addition, capital improvements have caused disruption in terms of noise and changes in classroom venue. Although a welcome disruption, construction on campus has had an impact on teaching and learning.

Despite the transition and change our department has continued to assess student learning. As part of our continual process of self-assessment, our department met twice with Westmont’s assessment coordinator, Marianne Robins; we also sought out interdisciplinary input and worked closely with anthropology professor Laura Montgomery.

In 2007-2008, we worked with the new department member and re-examined our course goals. We continued to administer the mini-finals in our lower-division courses to assess grammar acquisition in Spanish and French. In 2008-2009, we shifted our focus from the written grammar production to assessing oral production in Spanish lower-division courses. Additionally, we assessed students’ intercultural sensitivity and awareness over a three-year cycle in SP 150, a required major course. Finally, our department determined assessment goal strategies for the following academic year.

Results for 2007-2009

Goal 1: Language Fluency

A) Written
From the fall of 2007 to the fall of 2009, we continued to administer the “mini-final” to all French and Spanish language classes. As we have in the past, we administered these the first week of each semester for all language courses. The tool consists of samples of key grammatical structures that are part of the final exam at the end of the semester. The idea is to compare the first week sample with the end of term results. We now realize that the mini-final is an effective instrument to assess grammar production in lower-division courses. The have shown us that our benchmarks for the
language classes are realistic and that students are meeting them. On the recommendation of our
director of assessment, we will suspend its use in order to focus on other goals. However, we will
continue to use the tool as an additional calibration device for placement.

B) Oral
To continue to assess the area of language fluency, we decided to examine student oral production
of lower-division language courses. Our prior assessment instrument, the mini-finals, only assessed
written language fluency. One additional assessment for language fluency is to administer oral
exams/interviews to students at the end of the semester. In the fall of 2008, Cardoso and Elías met
to create an oral proficiency rubric based on the ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of
Foreign Languages) guidelines. They made modifications to the one-to-one interview between
the student and the instructor, to include role-playing among a small group of students. Cardoso is
trained in oral proficiency assessment by ACFTL. One of our goals is for the rest of the faculty to
be trained as well. The oral proficiency training will allow us to evaluate student oral production in a
uniform manner within the department as well as against national standards. In the spring of 2009,
Elías tested for oral proficiency in SP 5. Our goal is to include a modified oral proficiency interview
for SP 2 next fall and eventually institute one for every language level course. We are in the process
of assessing the results of these interviews as a whole.

Goal 2: Critical Thinking

The department determined the course objectives for Advanced Spanish (SP 100), an
intensive course designed to reinforce students’ reading, oral, and written skills in Spanish.
In order to smooth the transition between lower and upper division courses, we decided to be
more purposeful in defining the objectives and outcomes of the course. Focusing the course on
literary analysis will teach students skills that will be implemented in more advanced courses, in
particular SP/FR 101-104 and other upper division literature courses. Grammar and vocabulary
acquisition are studied as a function of writing and research skills.

The course objectives are twofold. The first are based on the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines.

A) The students will:
1. Read at an advanced plus level. According to the guidelines, the advanced plus means that
students will:
   a) follow essential points of written discourse at the Superior level in areas of special interest
      or knowledge
   b) understand parts of texts which are conceptually abstract and linguistically complex,
      and/or texts which treat unfamiliar topics and situations, as well as some texts which
      involve aspects of target-language culture.
   c) comprehend the facts to make appropriate inferences. An emerging awareness of the
      aesthetic properties of language and of its literary styles permits comprehension of a
      wider variety of texts, including literary. Misunderstandings may occur.
2. Speak at an advanced plus level, which is characterized by the speaker’s ability to:
   a) converse in a clearly participatory fashion
   b) initiate, sustain, and bring to closure a wide variety of communicative tasks, including
      those that require an increased ability to convey meaning with diverse language strategies
      due to a complication or an unforeseen turn of events
   c) satisfy the requirements of school and work situations, and
d) narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.

3. Write at the **advanced plus** level for a passing grade at the **superior level** for an A.

* Advanced plus is characterized by and ability to:
  a) write about a variety of topics with significant precision and in detail. Can write most social and informal business correspondence.
  b) describe and narrate personal experiences fully but has difficulty supporting points of view in written discourse.
  c) write about the concrete aspects of topics relating to particular interests and special fields of competence.
  d) show remarkable fluency and ease of expression, but under time constraints and pressure writing may be inaccurate. Generally strong in either grammar or vocabulary, but not in both. Weakness and unevenness in one of the foregoing or in spelling or character writing formation may result in occasional miscommunication. Some misuse of vocabulary may still be evident. Style may still be obviously foreign.

* Superior is characterized by an ability to:
  a) express self effectively in most formal and informal writing on practical, social and professional topics.
  b) write most types of correspondence, such as memos as well as social and business letters, and short research papers and statements of position in areas of special interest or in special fields.
  c) control a full range of structures, spelling, and a wide general vocabulary allow the writer to hypothesize and present arguments or points of view accurately and effectively.
  d) show an underlying organization, such as chronological ordering, logical ordering, cause and effect, comparison, and thematic development is strongly evident, although not thoroughly executed and/or not totally reflecting target language patterns.
  e) show sensitivity to differences in formal and informal style, but may not tailor writing precisely to a variety of purposes and/or readers.
  d) eliminate errors in writing, which disturb natives or cause miscommunication.

B. In addition to these language proficiency standards, students will:

1. Acquire a working knowledge of databases and library resources for research on literary topics. Conduct research beyond Internet search engines and have an increased awareness of evaluation of sources.
2. Use MLA style to document, research and format papers. Be familiar with the MLA Style Handbook for Writers.
3. Implement computer resources to improve their writing.
   a) Use Word’s language spell checker, dictionary and thesaurus in the target language
   b) Be able to access the specific symbols for the target language and incorporate them into their papers.
Goal #3: World Christians

During this review cycle, we also worked on assessing our third goal, World Christians. Specifically, we focused on the following aspect of Goal #3:

[Students with a degree in Modern Languages] are sensitive to those from other cultural and ethnic backgrounds, respect alternative viewpoints, and understand and appreciate the diversity of God’s rich creation.  *(cf. College-wide Standard 3: Diversity)*

Essentially, we believe that “world Christians” must first develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to build relationships of mutual respect across cultural boundaries. In particular this requires training in how to gather information, to recognize the role of culture in human experience, and to cope constructively with the challenges of cultural adjustment. Without this set of skills, students would have limited ability to “incarnate” the Gospel, appreciate the diversity of God’s creation or participate in the worldwide church from a position of discernment, openness, and understanding rather than one of prejudice, fear, and ignorance. This outcome, however, results from a process of increasingly sophisticated conceptions of themselves, other cultures, the church, and their understanding and practice of the Christian faith in relationship to culture.

To help students get there, the Modern Language Department developed the Cross Cultural Studies (SP/FR 150) course, a requirement for our majors. It should be noted that this course came about as a result of data collected from our senior exit interviews and our work on program review (see our 2006 Five-Year Report for more details on its history). This course, then, became the natural place to assess this particular learning goal.

Assessment Strategies: Cross-Cultural Studies (SP/FR 150)

We implemented two strategies to assess student growth:

- **IDI**: Students took the Intercultural Developmental Inventory (IDI) the first day of class (our baseline) and again during finals week to assess growth in the area of intercultural sensitivity. A group profile was generated for each set to determine if the information received in SP/FR 150 helped students move farther along the scale from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism.

- **Student Portfolios & Self-Assessments**: At the end of the course, students turned in a portfolio demonstrating a range of writing (including a mix of critical analysis and personal reflection). Two self-assessment essays were assigned: one the first week of class and one turned in the last day, in students’ final portfolios. The former serves as a baseline, and students were asked specifically to respond to questions related to the goals stated above. In the latter, students did the same, but were also asked to reread and reflect upon what they wrote the first week, and assess their own growth, specifically related to the goals mentioned above.
Data & Interpretation

Much data has been collected thus far, including the following:

- All Day 1 and Final Self Assessment essays: 2005-2009
- Selected student portfolios: 2005-2009

The IDI:

The IDI, based upon Milton J. Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), is a measurement of an individual’s fundamental worldview orientation to cultural difference, and thus the individual’s capacity for intercultural competence.1 Scores are generated on the following scales that move from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism:

- **Denial/Defense (DD)**: indicates a worldview that simplifies and/or polarizes cultural differences2
- **Reversal (R)**: indicates a worldview that reverses “we” and “they” polarization, where “they” are superior
- **Minimization (M)**: indicates a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal issues3
- **Acceptance/Adaptation (AA)**: indicates a worldview that can comprehend and accommodate to complex differences
- **Encapsulated Marginality (EM)**: Indicates a worldview that incorporates a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives (which thereby need to be resolved)

The instrument assesses the respondent’s location on each of the scales in terms of whether they are **unresolved** (1.0-2.33), **in transition** (2.33-3.66) or **resolved** (3.66-5.0).

The **Overall Developmental Profile (DS)** moves on a point scale from 55-145 (with the mean set at 100) and is broken into three major categories:

- defense/denial (DD): 55-84
- minimization (M): 85-114
- acceptance/adaptation (AA): 115-145

---

1 Intercultural sensitivity refers to “the way people construe cultural difference.” Moreover, as Bennett states, “it is assumed that such sensitivity can be described in developmental terms better than as a collection of specific behaviors. In other words, *it is the construction of reality as increasingly capable of accommodating cultural difference that constitutes development.*”

An individual’s capacity to communicate and function effectively in a cross-cultural setting, then, is a function of the level at which he or she conceptualizes and reacts to cultural difference.

2 In “defense,” individuals tend to see the world in terms of “we” and “they,” where “we” are superior and differences are threatening.

3 In “minimization”—a transitional stage between ethnocentrism and ethnorelativism—individuals are no longer threatened by difference; rather they “minimize” it and emphasize similarity. In the process, however, they tend to assume people from other cultures are basically “like us,” and thereby see and judge others in a manner that is heavily distorted by their own cultural assumptions.
Benchmarks were (tentatively) set for our students:

- All students will experience growth in their overall developmental profile (DS) and at least 80% will move up at least 10-15 points on the overall scale.
- Group average will increase by at least 10-15 points along same DS scale
- All students will have resolved issues in denial/defense (DD)
- No student will remain “unresolved” in minimization and all will be at least in transition

The hope is that when students go abroad—with the information gained in the Cross-Cultural Studies class—they would experience even greater growth, moving through minimization and into acceptance/adaptation before they graduate.

Summary Analysis:

Both individual and group profiles were generated for three semesters. Once a year Professor Docter met with a faculty member outside the department, Anthropology Professor Laura Montgomery, to discuss and analyze the IDI results. Overall, both professors were encouraged by the classes’ movement toward ethnorelativism, even in the short period of one semester. All students experienced growth, and the group profiles moved up between 12-25 points, depending upon the semester. All students were resolved in the denial/defense scale and all were at least in transition in minimization. We therefore met our initial benchmarks.

Detailed Analysis:

Unfortunately, at the time of this writing, only the Spring 2009 results were available for analysis. What follows is a more detailed analysis of the results, though I would preface this by saying this was an atypical year in that the results, though positive, were less dramatic than in other semesters. This could be because (1) the pool was smaller (only 7); and (2) one student who scored very highly on the post-test did not take the pretest, so her scores were not used in the final analysis.

Group profile highlights are as follows (see charts following):

- Overall Developmental Profile (DS): increased from 89.74 to 101.45, almost 12 points
- Denial/Defense (DD): Resolved, moved from 4.19 (resolved) to 4.46 (resolved)
- Reversal (R):Moved closer to resolution, though remained in transition, from 3.24 to 3.57
- Minimization (M): Moved closer to resolution, though remained in transition, from 2.96 to 3.22
- Acceptance/Adaptation (AA): Resolved, moved from in transition (3.38) to resolved (3.80)
- Encapsulated Marginality (EM): Resolved, moved from 4.3 (resolved) to 4.6 (resolved)

Note on the charts below that it is the Overall Developmental Intercultural Sensitivity (DS) which determines growth. The Overall Perceived Intercultural Sensitivity (PS), second bar graph, only indicates where students think they are, not where they actually are.
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Because this year was so unusual, we did gain some valuable information which came about as a surprise. In any given year, there are typically 1-3 students (between 10-18% of the class) who take the course out of sequence—following, and not prior to, their semester abroad. Though not ideal, their input into class discussions is invaluable as they have first-hand stories to share that add new insights and generally confirm the information in the reading. This year, however, exactly 50% of the class (4 of 8 students) had already studied abroad.

The most important thing we learned from this unique group is that the study abroad experience alone does not necessarily increase one’s intercultural sensitivity. In fact, it is quite probable that without the benefit of the Cross-Cultural Studies preparatory class, students actually regress in this area. Of the four students who had already studied abroad at the start of the course, we have data for three (one did not take the pre-test). These three, despite their time abroad and their more senior class standing, entered the class with the lowest scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Final Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>77.55</td>
<td>117.13</td>
<td>40 points</td>
<td>all areas resolved except M in transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>76.10</td>
<td>98.45</td>
<td>22 points</td>
<td>all areas resolved except M in transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>113.20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>all areas resolved except M in transition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, two of these students demonstrated the greatest growth in the class, and the fourth student also scored high on the post-test; we assume she also began low and grew a great deal, though we have no pre-test data to confirm this. One student, a male (Student C), demonstrated only minimal growth on the IDI scale.

To illustrate Student A’s progress, see the charts below. Note that, unlike the group profile results, the Overall Developmental Profile (DS) is the second graph on each test:
### I&D Profile

**Developmental Model of Interpersonal Sensitivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Introspection</th>
<th>Exterposure</th>
<th>Responsiveness</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Acceptant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Acceptant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Acceptant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Acceptant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Social Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Intellectual Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Psychological Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Emotional Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Profile (FL)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Profile (DS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Worldview Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Self-Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Other-Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Social-Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Environmental-Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Profile (FL)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reflection</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Intervention</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Sensitivity</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental-Sensitivity</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Profile (DS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reflection</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Intervention</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Sensitivity</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental-Sensitivity</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Portfolios:

Student writing in SP/FR 150 reveals a tremendous amount of growth in the area of intercultural sensitivity. All self-assessments (first and last day of class) from 2005-2009 are archived electronically in the Modern Language Assessment Portfolio. Below are excerpts from Student A’s final paper (May 2009). Recall that this student (a female junior) had already studied abroad, and had expressed prior to the course that she did not see the need to take it. Her IDI revealed that she scored in Denial/Defense at the start, and moved two categories by the end of the class, to Acceptance/Adaptation. Here is how she begins her final essay, which she titles, “The Rebirth of Cross-Cultural Understanding” (bold font is mine):

As I have previously noted, I entered into the sphere of cross-cultural communication this semester rejecting the fact that there might be many more concepts of global thinking classification with which I need to become acquainted. Finding myself relatively occupied with practical and previously gained knowledge regarding countries in which I have traveled, I was also convinced of the sources of any injustices I had faced in my recent time in Sevilla, Spain. Having reached these conclusions by my own internal speculation, I eventually felt ready to move on from my time abroad (and as far away from some of the more disheartening memories as possible). As my passport could testify, I had used my time abroad to successfully become “well-traveled;” however, even after my five months abroad and an additional seven upon my return to the United States, I did not realize that well-traveled in no way signifies the understanding of being communicatively well-cultured…

The very danger of misunderstanding another culture lies in the fact that we often do not notice our own misinterpretations in the midst of processing our experience. Because of this, many of us, considering ourselves “educated” or “well-traveled” (or at least well-vacationed) will find it most shocking and discomfiting to experience surprising miscommunications while abroad. These experiences can even take place in our own towns, as our familiar and stationary locations may blind us from realizing cultural miscommunications can occur in our own native land, resulting from a lack of global thinking and cross-cultural context. In a similar way, as I reflect on the course of this semester, I see that although conceptualization of many ideas began in January, true understanding of many cross-cultural themes did not develop until much later…. Through recognizing, reconstructing, and finally becoming more truly educated about my experiences in Spain and elsewhere, I have come closer to moving from ethnocentrism to global thinking.

Next she documents how she misinterpreted several actions and events in Spain and Europe, e.g. “I remember concluding my Spanish señora never truly desired to open up her home or life to me because she showed little interest in … being involved in my time in Spain.” As she now recalls attempting to “decipher cultural context,” she slowly becomes aware that in Spain she “continuously made the mistake of assessing these situations using only my own (and very limited) knowledge of cultures. Looking back, I can see how this was obviously not an effective manner of assessment, though I then was sure I was keeping myself aware of the need to be culturally sensitive.”

As the semester progresses, she states that the “various readings and assignments challenged me to go back and relive much of my experience abroad” and in the process discovers it “surprising”
that her “previous conclusions about their outcomes were not as evident.” She continues (and concludes) her essay as follows:

Instead, I was impressed with the bombardment of perspectives offered to me from our readings. Instead of assignments simply reminding me of that which I already knew, as I naively believed would occur, I was amazed that by applying these newly acquired perspectives on my past experiences, new- and even possibly better, or more appropriate- outcomes might be discovered. Though this was just the beginning of a slow process of re-evaluation of my semester, I began to allow myself to more freely access my negative memories and impressions of Spain, and recognize that perhaps these events were just that: personal impressions and interpretations, not cultural facts.

Though this step of the process was beneficial, it was in no way simple or easy. Reliving my past frustrations and slowly realizing more and more that many mistakes and misinterpretations may have been made on my part cross-culturally was jarring and often embarrassing. My built-up pride regarding my own cultural understanding suffered, and I began to learn (as I am still learning today) that in the future, humility should be my best weapon against cultural insensitivity abroad.

The recognition and reconstruction of these events was challenging and informative, but even these eventually could not satisfy my final need to understand specific cultural interactions. Just as the last two steps of Hess’s action-reflection-response learning model require an active gathering of further information and reinterpretation of the same events, the final step to my appreciation of the need for cultural awareness came through my own personal research into my experiences in Spain. Through assignments given in class to research aspects of specific cultures and my own investigations outside of assignments, it took me until the last half of the semester to truly accept the importance of returning to the discomfort, frustration, and pain of past experiences to learn from them and understand from where the pain took root.

As I finally applied not only general cultural building blocks but specific knowledge pertaining to certain cultures to my experiences, I found that my slowly proposed hypothesis was correct: **I indeed had misjudged the cause for many of my frustrations while abroad, and even was able to directly re-interpret some memories in light of my education.** Realizing that Spaniards do not carry as many collectivist cultural traits as those in Latin American countries, as I thought they would, for example, made me re-evaluate my original conclusion that my Spanish señora did not want me in her home simply because she was not especially welcoming, inclusive, and emotionally involved in my life. [...] In the end and through the discomfort, these specific opportunities for research have allowed me to broaden my scope of global thinking.

Cross-cultural study, in effect, has allowed me to transfer through the last steps of cultural sensitivity, those of which I was lacking most at the beginning of the semester. Though it has often been humbling and embarrassing, the gleaned fruit of a greater global perspective has allowed me to reconcile many of my frustrations and disappointments I carried home from my time abroad. I now know, as well, not only the importance of specific cultural details, but of the overall process of cross-cultural growth. **Experiencing cultural diversity is not enough; this is why the “well-traveled” individual may still not necessarily have any idea of their own denial of the significance of these differences.** However, to evaluate and comprehend that
which has passed, whether reminiscent of joy or embarrassment, and to equip oneself to identify the true variations in global values in the future allows for true maturation.

I have chosen to highlight this one student’s journey because it is representative of the vast majority of students who take 150. Another student (2008), for example, begins her final essay similarly:

I have always valued “thinking globally” and prided myself on being a person who had an open mind and a global perspective. But until I took Cross-Cultural Studies, I did not know what it meant to have a global perspective and be open to other cultures. In fact, I did not even understand what culture is and how deeply it affects all people. Through this course, I have come to a deeper knowledge of myself and the cultures in the world around me.

Students routinely report on how surprising it is to learn about their own culture, for it is something they never even considered. One 2007 student, for example, begins his essay this way:

When I was asked “what is culture?” during the first week of my cross-cultural studies class, I recall being unable to give an answer. As the semester progressed, I learned to recognize many nuances of different cultures that I never before thought of, such as … the myriad of characteristics that I was ignorant of in regards to my own culture. By studying cultural differences and similarities, one can certainly acquire a lot of knowledge concerning global issues and customs. Not only has my appreciation of cultural issues increased throughout this semester, but also I feel more adequately prepared for my future experiences abroad. […]

… I was very surprised to see that my cultural awareness increased the most in my knowledge towards American culture.

Another echoes, “when I first began the course, I did not know how to define American culture and its influences on me.”

All students learn the importance of refraining from judging another culture before understanding it, one of the most important characteristics of intercultural sensitivity. As one student states:

Upon reflection, I’ve learned not to be judgmental while assessing foreigners and their behaviors before truly understanding them. In an effort to do this, I’ve attempted to drop my ethnocentric lenses through which I am used to seeing others cultures. By doing so, I am able to understand cultures from a global perspective while not assuming that my own culture’s values and behaviors are the absolute best.

Another describes her increased awareness in this way:

I never knew how deeply one’s culture permeated into the choices one makes and the lifestyle one lives, mainly because I was unaware of how many of my own decisions have been dictated by the world around me. … What saddens me is that I never thought of most of these things [e.g. my goals in school, family relations,
friendships] as cultural because I assumed that, for the most part, this is how things were done all over the world.

A common theme in students’ final essays involves great personal growth and the ability to see the world differently, with “newly opened eyes”: “All I can say to summarize what I have learned this semester is that my eyes have been opened… to the culture of my … neighbors, and my eyes have been opened to who the person God created me to be truly is.” Many also come to recognize their own, earlier ethnocentrism, and appreciate their growing understanding:

All the abstract labels and terms have come to life as I have begun to train myself to recognize these cultural differences for what they really are—simply different ways of doing things or thinking of things. There is always a reason behind them, and they are not necessarily better or worse than our methods. Before I often saw these differences as haphazard and sometimes even offensive. Now I can understand the logic behind them, though without always having to embrace them indiscriminately as my own.

As we have seen, by the end of this course students realize that their previous “myopic outlook on the world [was] stretched and broadened” and that they are progressing toward becoming more culturally sensitive individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-term Goals 2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LOWER DIVISION**

a) continue to use “mini finals for placement purposes
b) continue to use and expand the oral proficiency testing in the language courses.
c) Spanish 1 will be using an online workbook for the first time. We will evaluate its effectiveness at the end of the semester.
d) Review textbooks for future use in Sp 4
e) One of the writing assignments in Sp 4 will be writing an informal letter to family or friends in order to increase students’ awareness of register. This will enable them to distinguish between formal and informal written discourse.
f) Oral proficiency training for faculty.
g) In all French literature courses (FR 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 195), we are formulating and refining an assessment instrument for oral participation.

**UPPER DIVISION**

a) In Sp 100 we will assess the skills learned in the course, such as having to write a bibliography, by the student’ production of a five page research paper on a literary topic as their final project; the paper will incorporate the skills learned in the course. The faculty will implement a common rating rubric that will be used to assess writing projects in upper-division courses. We intend to partner with the English Department to examine their rubrics and share strategies.
b) As we continue to think about assessing the leaning goal of World Christians in SP/FR 150, we propose to do the following in the next review cycle:

- Analyze and discuss in more detail the IDI results from 2007 & 2008, especially checking to see if the pattern noticed in 2009 continues (in which students who have already gone abroad begin the class with low, not high, scores).
- Discuss the benchmarks with Dr. Laura Montgomery to see if they are adequate or if they need modification.
- Share our information with a member of the Off Campus Programs Committee and the Global Initiatives Task Force.
- Determine if we will continue to administer the IDI in future SP/FR 150 courses or focus on another strategy.

c) We intend to work on designing a 2-unit capstone course for all graduating Modern Language majors in the following review cycle.

Long-term goals

To help keep us focused and accountable, we have proposed to accomplish the following during the next review cycle, understanding that the ongoing nature of assessment will undoubtedly necessitate modifications to our plan and/or its timeline for implementation:

1) To schedule meetings to continue to develop our learning and assessment strategies, which can include the following
   a) To solicit feedback from external sources
   b) To record minutes to make us accountable
2) To assess if we have met our goal of creating life-long learners we may use any data from college-wide sources such as the
   a) Senior Interview
   b) Senior Survey
   c) Alumni Survey,
   d) NSEE
   e) GE Annual Report
3) To conduct annual oral interviews with a sample of graduating Modern Language seniors and discuss our findings at a department meeting each fall. We will modify the instrument in order to obtain more information specific to our learning goals.
4) We will discuss our results with any faculty that might derive benefit from them.
5) When some of the assessment strategies yield “success stories,” we will be more intentional about using them in departmental recruiting materials, alumni mailings, and on our webpage.
6) To continue to create a sense of Christian community among French and Spanish students and to integrate more closely the extracurricular with the curricular, with activities such as
   b. Re-enacting a posada
   c. Dessert for returning students from off-campus program in Spain and Latin America
   d. Mesa-hispánica—‘temas de hoy’
c. German dinner with film

7) To continue to assess students’ oral performance in the target language we propose to:
   a. use the modified oral proficiency interviews, based on ACTFL guidelines. Given the results in Sp 1 we have decided to expand the testing to other lower-division language courses.
   b. Film (on digital video) students giving a brief oral presentation during the first week of the semester and again at the end. The members of the department will establish the performance indicators. Ideally, both video clips will be viewed and discussed by the professor and student. One departmental meeting each year would be devoted to viewing representative samples, discussing the strategy itself, evaluating the results, and determining if curricular or pedagogical changes are necessary. (To be discussed: maybe we could do this with students going to off-campus programs to monitor their progress and the off-campus program.)
   c. To become more cognizant of the national standards faculty in our department will endeavor to be trained in oral proficiency testing at the ACTFL workshop.

8) Our previous report stated that we would implement a writing portfolio for lower-division courses. In order to serve our majors better, we have decided to shift our focus to upper-division courses starting with Sp 100. From this pivotal course all other final writing projects in other courses will expand the students’ writing portfolio. We will use the rubric for evaluating grammar on essays (presented by Docter) in all Spanish classes by the 2007-08 academic year and evaluate its effectiveness in terms of student learning (i.e. giving students an opportunity to do multiple rewrites) in our Summer 2008 assessment meetings.

9) Continue to use the “mini-finals” as a calibration device for placement.