Graduate Program Outcome Data

In 2017, the co-directors of MSLT program at the time had implemented an assessment plan that required each professor teaching an MSLT course to complete a rubric that was based on the objectives of the program at that time. That is, after teaching an MSLT course and/or serving on an MSLT student's committee and participating in his/her oral defense of their Portfolio project, each professor would evaluate whether or not the student's work (either via a course's final project or after having read a student's Portfolio project) was either meeting one or more of the five objectives that were determined to be essential at the time or indicate that there was no evidence of meeting the learning objective. The following table indicates the summary of those results at the conclusion of the Spring 2017 semester:

Summary results

Spring 2017	Objective 1		Objective 2		Objective 3		Objective 4		Objective 5	
	Met Objective	No Evidence	Met Objective	No Evidence	Met Objective	No Evidence	Met Objective	No Evidence	Met Objective	No Evidence
Number of students who have been assessed in each category (The numbers vary because students take different courses, not all students are assessed for each category)	8	0	8	0	8	0	15	0	11	0

All students assessed in the spring, 2017 are currently meeting the program objectives they have been evaluated on.

Assessment continued in this fashion for another year, until the former co-directors stepped down. Beginning in Summer 2018, the new co-directors incorporated feedback from current and former student survey data along with information from discussions from MSLT faculty and implemented various programmatic and curricular changes during the 2018-2019 academic year (see the 'Data-based decisions' document for more information on these changes). Given the various programmatic/curricular changes that were fully introduced with the incoming cohort of MSLT students in Fall 2019, coupled with some minor changes to the learning objectives which were again based on student survey data and faculty input (see the 'MSLT Assessment Plan' document for more information), outcome data that reflect these aforementioned changes will be collected starting in Spring 2021. That is, the MSLT cohort defending in Spring 2021 will have Portfolio projects that fully reflect the curricular changes implemented in Spring 2019. Below is the assessment rubric that each committee member will complete upon reading an MSLT student's Portfolio and after having participated in the oral defense of the student's project. This data will then be submitted to the co-directors who will maintain an assessment file for each MSLT student upon completion of the degree. Data will be collated and used as a basis for any discussions with MSLT faculty regarding any future curricular or programmatic changes. The data will also be posted on the new Department of World Languages and Cultures's website.

Below we list the updated MSLT program objectives and also provide a sample rubric to be used to assess whether or not each student met or has not met each learning objective via the Portfolio/capstone project.

MSLT Program Objectives: Students who complete the MSLT degree successfully will be able to:

1. Articulate their understanding of language learning by children, adolescents, or adults, depending on the age group they intend to teach after completing the degree.

2. Describe an approach to second language (L2) teaching and discuss its relative merits in contrast with other approaches.

3. Reference the importance of the standards and criteria for proficiency set by professional organizations such as the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) or the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).

4. Demonstrate awareness of the role of culture and/or pragmatics in L2 teaching and learning.

5. Demonstrate in-depth knowledge of current literature on topics relevant to their current and/or future teaching interests and contexts (e.g., the use of technology/digital tools in L2 learning and teaching, how to meaningfully incorporate literature in a variety of L2 learning and teaching contexts, understanding current issues and approaches to teaching in dual language immersion environments).

The assessment rubric listed below will be kept in a folder in USU's Box system. All rubrics will be reviewed at the end of each academic year to help program director(s) and MSLT faculty determine whether adjustments in course content and/or course offerings should be made. The assessment rubrics serve program purposes; they do not determine whether a particular student does or does not meet the requirements for the degree. Again, the rubric below will be completed by each faculty member who is either Chairing or serving as a member of a student's Portfolio committee after having read the Portfolio and participated in the student's oral defense.

MSLT Assessment Rubric

Faculty Member's Name:
Student's Name:
Date of Defense:

_____

Based on your thorough reading of the student's Portfolio, please assess whether or not the student's Portfolio meets the each of the MSLT's five following learning objectives:

1. Articulate their understanding of language learning by children, adolescents, or adults, depending on the age group they intend to teach after completing the degree.

2. Describe an approach to second language (L2) teaching and discuss its relative merits in contrast with other approaches.

3. Reference the importance of the standards and criteria for proficiency set by professional organizations such as the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) or the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).

4. Demonstrate awareness of the role of culture and/or pragmatics in L2 teaching and learning.

5. Demonstrate in-depth knowledge of current literature on topics relevant to their current and/or future teaching interests and contexts (e.g., the use of technology/digital tools in L2 learning and teaching, how to meaningfully incorporate literature in a variety of L2 learning and teaching contexts, understanding current issues and approaches to teaching in dual language immersion environments).

	Objective 1		Objective 2		Objective 3		Objective 4		Objective 5	
	Met Objective	No Evidence	Met Objective	No Evidence	Met Objective	No Evidence	Met Objective	No Evidence	Met Objective	No Evidence
Additional comments:										