



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

Program Review Self-Study Template

Academic unit: Modern & Classical Languages & Literatures

College: LAS

Date of last review 2010-2011

Date of last accreditation report (if relevant) N/A

List all degrees described in this report (add lines as necessary)

Degree: BA, Modern & Classical Languages → specializations: French, Latin, Spanish CIP code: 16.0101

Degree: MA, Spanish CIP code: 16.0908

Faculty of the academic unit (add lines as necessary)

Name _____ Signature _____

Terilyn Abbott _____

Wilson Baldrige _____

Gail Burkett _____

Cuitláhuac Chávez _____

Francisco Flores-Cuautle _____

Yumi Foster _____

Eunice Doman Myers _____

Enrique Navarro _____

Brigitte Roussel _____

Rachel Showstack _____

Deborah Wadman _____

Kerry Wilks _____

Submitted by: Wilson Baldrige, Chair, MCLL x6645 Date April 1, 2014

wilson.baldrige@wichita.edu

In yellow highlighted areas,
data will be provided

1. Departmental purpose and relationship to the University mission (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

a. University Mission:

The mission of Wichita State University is to be an essential educational, cultural, and economic driver for Kansas and the greater public good.

b. Program Mission (if more than one program, list each mission):

The four types of degrees offered by MCLL form an integral component of the stated teaching, research, and service missions of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences within the comprehensive mission of Wichita State University:

- The BA in Modern & Classical Languages & Literatures (specializations in French and Spanish¹);
- The teaching major (Spanish, French, and/or Latin);
- The Bilingual Option (French, German, Latin, Russian, or Spanish);
- The MA in Spanish.

From the viewpoint of general education in a traditional sense, foreign languages are strictly speaking inseparable from other humanities disciplines, especially religion, philosophy, history, and of course literature. The deepest significance of the above areas is revealed through the configurations of natural language as taught, analyzed, and practiced in language departments. The status of language in the humanities is not that of an object distinct from the thinking subject, but language in every respect constitutes the subject as human. Thus, when the Greek said “to think and to be are one and the same,” or when the Frenchman said “I think, therefore I am,” *thinking* and *being* were understood as *one* with the speech acts performed by Parmenides and Descartes. If the humanities are “the branches of learning that investigate human constructs and concerns” (Webster), then the languages in their diversity that construct lasting value at the heart of the humanities have a clear relation to WSU’s overall general education mission.

Of course our mission exceeds the traditional humanistic role outlined above. Foreign language programs make a significant contribution to institutional priorities by equipping students with the cultural tools necessary to achieve effective citizenship in the global community. Accordingly, the BA and MA programs in Modern and Classical Languages contribute to fulfillment of the institutional mission by offering not only *skills* courses (e.g. grammar, conversation, phonetics), but also *content* courses in the civilization of countries from north and south. Basic language courses and advanced to superior-level content courses are supplemented by task-oriented offerings in translation and foreign languages for business. Courses such as these equip students with tools of technical and commercial communication and develop cross-cultural understanding.

¹ Since the retirement of our one tenured faculty member in Classics, the Latin specialization (BA) has been suspended; Classics courses are currently being offered by an Academic Lecturer with a PhD.

The National Foreign Language Center (www.nflc.org) has long recognized these interwoven aspects of language competence as a national priority: since its inception, the Center's position has been that the global success of local export industries is dependent to a great extent on their ability to understand and communicate accurately with overseas markets. In some sectors, success in global competition requires residence in foreign countries for extended periods and interaction with a broad socioeconomic cross-section of society — not just with “gatekeepers” who may have some command of English. See www.wichita.edu/mcll → About → Mission.

- c. The role of the program (s) and relationship to the University mission: Explain in 1-2 concise paragraphs.

MCLL thus embraces at once a humanistic, GenEd mission and a technical/professional, applied mission. Our programs enable students to understand the nature and structure of foreign languages, their interplay with other disciplines, and the significance of transnational works of the imagination. Our programs increase cultural awareness and openness to diversity, basic components of WSU's Mission *and* Strategic Plan (Values + Goal #6). Furthermore, the Department of Modern & Classical Languages prepares majors to enter Masters programs and reaffirms its commitment to guiding MA students (Spanish) and MALS students (Classics/French/German/Russian) toward careers in the field or doctoral research.² We also participate in the delivery of WSU's expertise mission through pre-K-12 teacher education.

An essential correlation between our mission and that of the University is to continue to support a clearly articulated requirement for degree-bound students to pursue a course of study toward achieving basic intermediate proficiency in at least one language other than their native tongue, as a necessary complement to courses in other areas of Liberal Arts and Fine Arts or in conjunction with Business, Aerospace, Criminal Justice or Pre-Law. Through published research whose quality and diversity enhance the fulfillment of our teaching mission, MCLL faculty likewise advance the institutional goal of making original contributions to knowledge and human understanding.

- d. Has the mission of the Program (s) changed since last review? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 i. If yes, describe in 1-2 concise paragraphs. If no, is there a need to change?

Without changing MCLL's basic mission, our departmental Strategic Plan singles out the development of online offerings: intermediate language courses and languages for the professions, particularly *translation*. Greater emphasis in these areas and a change in delivery systems could have a significant impact on our programs: one might refer to this initiative as the future for world language majors and minors at WSU. MCLL will request authorization to conduct searches for tenure-stream faculty with demonstrated expertise in the delivery of online courses involving languages for business together with translation-&-interpreting.

² “The Master of Arts in Liberal Studies (MALS) program is designed for people who wish to pursue a particular topic or interdisciplinary interest at the graduate level. The liberal studies program offers students an opportunity to design a program of study to answer their particular needs and interests in a focused, coherent manner” (*Graduate Bulletin*).

- e. Provide an overall description of your program (s) including a list of the measurable goals and objectives of the program (s) (programmatic). Have they changed since the last review?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, describe the changes in a concise manner.

MCLL constitutes a single undergraduate degree program, as reflected in the data received from OPA as well as the *Catalog*: “The department grants the Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree in modern and classical languages and literatures. Students can specialize in French, Latin, or Spanish.” Consistent with practice at other Regents institutions, our single degree program reinforces departmental unity and encourages students to work toward multiple language acquisition (Bilingual Option).

MCLL’s current course offerings are designed to enable students to achieve, within three semesters or the equivalent, at least basic intermediate listening, speaking, reading, and writing proficiency in French & Spanish or reading and writing proficiency in Latin. Successful completion of 111-112-210 fulfills the LAS Foreign Language Graduation Requirement, though students having taken foreign language previously may meet the requirement by demonstrating proficiency at a level equivalent to 5 hours beyond the 112 course.

111-112 (elementary) and 210 (intermediate) language classes are structured as 5-hour courses since at least 65 contact hours per semester are needed for novices to progress toward intermediate proficiency in a foreign language. Our 5-hour course structure is not unique in LAS: Math 112, Biology 223, Chemistry 103/211, and Physics 213/214 are 5-hour courses; science labs are equivalent to the integral verbal *practicum* in foreign languages: oral proficiency again being the number one student goal.

Proficiency is the motto of approaches to foreign language teaching that foster the production of language understandable to native speakers not used to dealing with foreigners. In line with the methodology of our elementary textbooks, MCLL language courses are based upon the criteria for assessment of oral proficiency established by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). The proficiency-based approach is clearly the most appropriate way to fulfill our mission; it also offers a consistent metric by which to assess outcomes and overall program effectiveness. Following is a concise statement of the Assessment Plan for Measuring the Goals of the undergraduate major in Modern & Classical Languages:

Goals of the Undergraduate Major:

Students of modern languages will be able to function in a culturally appropriate way in the skill areas of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Students of Classics will be able to function in reading and translation. Students of modern languages will have acquired appropriate sociolinguistic skills; all majors will display basic knowledge of history, politics, systems of belief, literature, art and daily life; and tolerant attitudes regarding other cultures and peoples. Students will be conversant with a body of literature. Majors in education will acquire instructional competencies for the teaching of reading, writing, speaking, listening, cultural knowledge & awareness, and literature.

Assessment Plans for Measuring the Goals of the Undergraduate Major:

Modern language majors submit a substantive writing sample in the target language on a cultural, historical, or literary subject. Classical language majors submit a translation into English or a substantive essay. All writing samples are evaluated for mechanical accuracy and for knowledge of literature and methods of literary analysis. Modern language majors demonstrate spoken-language proficiency, sociolinguistic ability, cultural knowledge, insight, and values through the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview. Students are interviewed several times. This prerequisite for Teaching Certification is arranged through Advanced Conversation classes.

The Bachelor of Arts degree program consists of highly articulated coursework built on an incremental system of prerequisites, ranging from the above-mentioned introductory courses to advanced undergraduate work in composition, grammar, translation, business language, literature, civilization, and linguistics. Since language acquisition is incremental, coursework is completed in a well-defined order to ensure success at the next level. In general, students achieve language competence, cultural knowledge, and awareness through coursework in three series:

An INTRODUCTORY series as defined above with regard to the LAS Graduation Requirement;

An INTERMEDIATE series targeting each of the four language skills detailed in the assessment plan. In all areas (speaking-listening, writing, and reading), majors typically score in the range defined as *intermediate-high-to-advanced*;

An ADVANCED series in which students continue skill-specific coursework in speaking, writing, reading, and culture/civilization. Literature, civilization, business, and translation courses serve to integrate advanced language and *critical thinking* skills, cultural knowledge and awareness, or professional skills in the target language.

Additionally, majors preparing for high school teaching certification are required to complete one course in the methodology of foreign language teaching (MCLL 454F), as well as to fulfill College of Education requirements for teacher certification including supervised student teaching in an area high school. Teaching majors are also expected to score in the *advanced* range for writing and oral proficiency, and maintain a 3.00 GPA in the language(s) they plan to teach.

The assessment metrics outlined above are used as evaluative tools in all upper division courses to verify student progress toward the advanced level. Inasmuch as intermediate and advanced language study is most often useful to students in combination with other areas (technical or professional, as noted above), the guidelines established for assessment of outcomes enable us to verify that all majors are making appropriate progress toward advanced proficiency.

The mission of the MA program in Spanish is to give students the opportunity to pursue advanced study in Hispanic language, literature, and civilization. Through analysis and interpretation, MA candidates gain a superior understanding of the language and its related cultural contexts as well as expertise in the literary masterworks of Spain and Latin America. Students receive preparation which, upon graduation, allows them to enter PhD programs at highly ranked institutions nationwide. Former graduates have placed at the University of Arizona, the University of Colorado, Texas Tech University, and the University of Kansas, among others.

During the previous review cycle the MA in Spanish received favorable comments and was evaluated as exceeding expectations in every category. We plan to increase the number of applicants for admission to the MA in Spanish by continuously updating information on the recently reconstructed MCLL Web site. The Graduate Studies link offers a comprehensive overview of the program and includes detailed descriptions and information regarding admission and degree requirements, exam formats and content, GTA appointments, and graduate course offerings each semester. All undergraduate Spanish majors receive a copy of the informational brochure for the MA program. This recruitment endeavor is a joint effort between our Graduate and Undergraduate Coordinators. In cooperation with the Registrar's Office, MCLL is prepared to track all majors using the CAPP degree audit system. Of course the department continues to maintain an appropriate response rate to any and all inquiries coming in via the Graduate School. In view of the recruitment efforts outlined above together with University-wide initiatives in the area of retention, we expect to exceed the Regents' minima and remain above the threshold in terms of majors as well as graduates.

Objectives:

1. To recruit and admit well-qualified graduate students to our MA program.
2. To provide our students with the advanced communication skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) and cultural understanding needed for career and vocational activities and for effective citizenship in the global community.
3. To enhance the abilities and knowledge of Spanish teachers by providing them with an advanced level of expertise in language and culture as well as the instructional skills to convey their knowledge.
4. To prepare effective language teachers through appropriate training, evaluation, and advisement of teaching assistants. This includes the university workshop for GTAs, the Spanish 750 course (Contextualized Language Teaching) or an equivalent, observation of GTAs at least twice per semester, and meetings of GTAs once per month.
5. To provide practical courses for MA candidates who work as translators, bilingual professionals, or who otherwise work in international business; e.g., Spanish 557 (Literary and Technical Translating); Spanish 515 (Commercial Spanish) or Spanish 552 (Business Spanish).
6. To hire and maintain a highly qualified faculty to teach, advise, and train our Masters candidates.
7. To make certain at least 70 percent of students selected to enter the MA program successfully graduate with the degree; five per year on average. OPA data indicate the goal for degree conferral has been met.
8. To achieve an 80 percent placement rate for our students in their major field (or in PhD programs) within the first year after graduation.
9. To engage in ongoing assessment of outcomes and to assess the program's effectiveness in preparing graduates to enter their individual professions.

Assessment:

1. The outcomes of Objective 1 above, i.e. the quality of students who are admitted to our MA program are addressed through their GPA which must be 2.75 in their last 60 hours of undergraduate work and 3.0 in Spanish, and their background of preparation in the field. For international students, the minimum Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) score for admission is 550.
2. The outcomes of Objectives 2-5 above are assessed by a combination of the following: the MA students' GPA in the program (a minimum 3.0 average); performance on their written and oral examinations; performance on the Oral Proficiency Interview (Advanced level), and alumni questionnaires.

3. The outcomes of Objective 4 above are measured by Spanish graduate faculty visits to the classrooms of all teaching assistants. These classes are evaluated twice each semester. A follow-up interview of the observing faculty member with the teaching assistant includes suggestions for improvement. Teaching assistants also receive careful mentoring on a continuing basis by the Spanish Language Coordinator. In addition, the Graduate Coordinator regularly meets with teaching assistants.

4. The outcomes of Objective 6 above are assessed through the annual review process of non-tenured faculty. Each faculty member is expected to be evaluated in every class through norm-referenced student evaluations (Student Perception of Teaching Effectiveness or IDEA). Other indicators of success would be nomination for or receiving teaching awards.

5. The outcomes of Objectives 7 and 8 above are assessed by monitoring the number of students who successfully complete course work and successfully pass the three Master's degree written examinations and one comprehensive oral examination. Program effectiveness is assessed through surveys of graduating MA students and/or interviews with them by the Graduate Coordinator.

6. The outcomes of Objective 8 above are assessed by a questionnaire rating student satisfaction with the preparation received during their Master's degree program relative to their post-graduation livelihood and position.

7. The outcomes of Objective 9 above: program effectiveness is assessed through surveys of employers or of graduate faculty from institutions enrolling our former students or through telephone interviews with the latter by the Graduate Coordinator.

2. Describe the quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty in terms of SCH, majors, graduates, and scholarly/creative activity (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Complete the table below and utilize data tables 1-7 provided by the Office of Planning Analysis (covering SCH by FY and fall census day, instructional faculty; instructional FTE employed; program majors; and degree production).

Scholarly Productivity	Number Journal Articles		Number Presentations		Number Conference Proceedings		Performances			Number of Exhibits		Creative Work		No. Books	No. Book Chaps.	No. Grants Awarded or Submitted	\$ Grant Value
	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	*	**	***	Juried	****	Juried	Non-Juried				
Year 1	3	3	8		1										1	1	\$4,000
Year 2	3	2	8		1											1	\$4,000
Year 3	5	3	6		1										1		

* Winning by competitive audition. **Professional attainment (e.g., commercial recording). ***Principal role in a performance. ****Commissioned or included in a collection.

- Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the faculty/staff using the data from the table above and tables 1-7 from the Office of Planning Analysis as well as any additional relevant data. Programs should comment on details in regard to productivity of the faculty (i.e., some departments may have a few faculty producing the majority of the scholarship), efforts to recruit/retain faculty, departmental succession plans, course evaluation data, etc.

Provide assessment here:

Of the twelve full-time faculty members currently employed in our department, ten are assigned (or contribute in specific ways) to the BA and MA programs in Modern & Classical Languages. Of these latter, seven have academic rank (= four tenured & three probationary); one is an Instructor/Language Lab Director with a PhD; two more are Fairmount Lecturers (= Regular Unclassified Professionals), one of whom is the MCLL Undergraduate Coordinator and the other the Spanish Language Coordinator who mentors GTAs (see Assessment #3, p. 7 above).

In view of the departmental mission, our initial task is to produce readers and writers of Latin or speakers, readers, and writers of French / Spanish (+ German / Russian for the Bilingual Option) who consistently perform at the intermediate level. If, within the global institutional mission, foreign languages traditionally aim to fulfill an essential role in terms of general education, most students set as their primary goal to achieve oral proficiency in their chosen language as a skill to be applied in the workplace. All MCLL faculty are native or near-native speakers of the languages they teach, which translates as superior-level in terms of the rating system developed by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Additionally, five faculty members have received training in the ACTFL oral proficiency rating system: as a result, criteria and techniques developed by the foremost national organization for foreign language instruction are employed at Wichita State in classroom evaluation of student performance as well as in assessment activities.

The eight professors with PhDs assume responsibility for teaching the majority of courses in their respective programs numbered above 210, through the 800 level. Of the tenured faculty, three have been promoted to associate professor; one to the rank of full professor; all are members of the Graduate Faculty: these professors teach every course above 500.

Colleagues in MCLL are regularly nominated for university awards recognizing excellence in teaching. Two former Barrier Award recipients are thus members of that particular Award Committee. All faculty participate in or advise for study abroad programs. As a measure of the strength of MCLL's commitment to its programs and to WSU students, faculty often teach course loads at or above the College standard during the regular academic year, then devote a substantial portion of their summer either to directing, supervising, or teaching in a study abroad program.

Significant achievements in research and publication further underscore the strengths and productivity of MCLL faculty who, during the present review cycle, published refereed journal articles or book chapters, book reviews, and translations; presented papers at regional, national, and international conferences; and received internal ARCS awards. An assessment of the strengths and qualifications of the MCLL faculty would not be complete without mention of the contributions made to administration and governance through service in positions such as Associate Dean (LAS; Graduate School), service on the College Tenure & Promotion Committee, and as Faculty Senate President. MCLL colleagues also contribute to University governance through service on major committees including the Graduate Council, the General Education Committee, and the advisory board for the Master of Arts in Liberal Studies program.

Historically the ratio between our share of WSU's total instructional expense and the average number of credit hours produced as a percentage of overall institutional SCH has been quite favorable. The combined share of a relatively

high percentage of generated credit hours as compared to a relatively low percentage of instructional expense demonstrates cost effectiveness in terms of teaching expenditures.

The OPA data show that MCLL generated, for example as a five-year rolling average between 2009-13, annual credit hour totals comparable to those produced during the previous KBOR Review: 10,918 SCH (2009-13) vs. 11,070 (2007-11). Equivalent annual credit hour levels have been sustained, however, with substantially fewer faculty members. As a result, the department has become more cost effective with respect to the ratio of overall SCH to professorial faculty with terminal degrees: greater numbers of credit hours are being generated, at relatively low cost to the institution, by GTAs and adjuncts. From 2007-2013, MCLL conferred an average of 21.14 undergraduate and 5.42 graduate degrees annually. Inasmuch as the KBOR minima are 10 and 5 respectively, MCLL's programs have met or surpassed the Board's criteria.

3. Academic Program: Analyze the quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students for each program (if more than one). Attach updated program assessment plan (s) as an appendix (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information).

- a. For undergraduate programs, compare ACT scores of the majors with the University as a whole. (Evaluate table 8 [ACT data] from the Office of Planning and Analysis).
The rolling 5-year average (2008-2012) shows that MCLL majors attained a mean ACT score of 24.4 in comparison with the University mean of 22.7.
- b. For graduate programs, compare graduate GPAs of the majors with University graduate GPAs. (Evaluate table 9 [GPA data] from the Office of Planning and Analysis)
The rolling 5-year average (2009-2013) shows that our candidates for the MA in Spanish attained a mean GPA of 3.6 in comparison with the University mean of 3.5.
- c. Identify the principal learning outcomes (i.e., what skills does your Program expect students to graduate with). Provide aggregate data on how students are meeting those outcomes in the table below. Data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e. Provide an analysis and evaluation of the data by learner outcome with proposed actions based on the results.

In the following table provide program level information. You may add an appendix to provide more explanation/details. Definitions:

Learning Outcomes: Learning outcomes are statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation. These relate to the skills, knowledge, and behaviors that students acquire in their matriculation through the program (e.g., graduates will demonstrate advanced writing ability).

Assessment Tool: One or more tools to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., a writing project evaluated by a rubric).

Criterion/Target: Percentage of program students expected to achieve the desired outcome for demonstrating program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of the students will demonstrate satisfactory performance on a writing project).

Result: Actual achievement on each learning outcome measurement (e.g., 95%).

Analysis: Determines the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved and leads to decisions and actions to improve the program. The analysis and evaluation should align with specific learning outcome and consider whether the measurement and/or criteria/target remain a valid indicator of the learning outcome as well as whether the learning outcomes need to be revised.

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
Language majors will demonstrate functional proficiency in the skill areas of:	ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interviews & Evaluation of Writing Samples following the ACTFL Rubric	Intermediate-High-to-Advanced Proficiency in all skill areas	<u>See Appendix #1</u>	Avg. ratings: Interm. High (speaking) and Adv. Mid (writing): MCLL majors currently meet stated goals. Increased emphasis on Adv. Conversation and Study Abroad proposed.
Listening/Speaking				
Reading/Writing				
Cultural knowledge				
Critical thinking				

- d. Provide aggregate data on student majors satisfaction (e.g., exit surveys), capstone results, licensing or certification examination results (if applicable), employer surveys or other such data that indicate student satisfaction with the program and whether students are learning the curriculum (for learner outcomes, data should relate to the outcomes of the program as listed in 3c).

Evaluate table 10 from the Office of Planning and Analysis regarding student satisfaction data.

The OPA data show the percentage of satisfied or very satisfied undergraduate MCLL majors as 66.7% in 2012 (below the University level) and 90.9% in 2013 (above the University level). The data also show fewer graduates in 2012 than in 2013; in our view, however, no single (or simple) explanation accounts for the 24-point difference in satisfaction rates. Based on anecdotal evidence, the department chair reports fewer student complaints over the past two semesters than in 2012. Two faculty members who received low scores on normed evaluations for rapport with students are no longer at WSU.

Learner Outcomes (e.g., capstone, licensing/certification exam pass-rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year		Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
1,2,3		OPI samples taken from 525 Advanced Conversation courses;		
1,2,3		Writing samples taken from 526 Advanced Grammar & Composition courses;		

1,2,3	Writing samples collected in Advanced literature & civilization courses.		
-------	--	--	--

- e. Provide aggregate data on how the goals of the *WSU General Education Program* and *KBOR 2020 Foundation Skills* are assessed in undergraduate programs (optional for graduate programs).

Outcomes:	Results	
	Majors	Non-Majors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Have acquired knowledge in the arts, humanities, and natural and social sciences o Think critically and independently o Write and speak effectively o Employ analytical reasoning and problem solving techniques 		
See below (i)		

Note: Not all programs evaluate every goal/skill. Programs may choose to use assessment rubrics for this purpose. Sample forms available at: <http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/>

- f. For programs/departments with concurrent enrollment courses (per KBOR policy), provide the assessment of such courses over the last three years (disaggregated by each year) that assures grading standards (e.g., papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) course management, instructional delivery, and content meet or exceed those in regular on-campus sections.

Provide information here: N/A

- g. Indicate whether the program is accredited by a specialty accrediting body including the next review date and concerns from the last review.

Provide information here: N/A

- h. Provide the process the department uses to assure assignment of credit hours (per WSU policy 2.18) to all courses has been reviewed over the last three years.

Provide information here:

During the review period, two substantial sets of Curriculum Changes for MCLL were approved at all levels. The Chair and the departmental committee review course syllabi submitted with the curriculum change proposals in order to verify the appropriate assignment and definition of credit hours; delivery of requisite contact hours is closely monitored.

- i. Provide a brief assessment of the overall quality of the academic program using the data from 3a – 3e and other information you may collect, including outstanding student work (e.g., outstanding scholarship, inductions into honor organizations, publications, special awards, academic scholarships, student recruitment and retention).


Provide assessment here:

ACT scores received by MCLL majors place them in the top 25% of recent HS graduates nationwide; their GPAs place them at or above the norm. Language majors are smart achievers: we consider ourselves fortunate to be able to teach and mentor approximately one hundred (100) outstanding young scholars and to graduate approximately twenty (20) in

a given year with the BA in Modern & Classical Languages. Inasmuch as our program assessment measures effectiveness and proficiency in both speaking and writing as well as cultural knowledge, critical thinking and analytic skills, positive assessment results indicate by the same token that General Education and Foresight 2020 outcomes are accomplished by our majors.

4. Analyze the student need and employer demand for the program. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

- a. Evaluate tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning Analysis for number of applicants, admits, and enrollments and percent URM students by student level and degrees conferred.
- b. Utilize the table below to provide data that demonstrates student need and demand for the program. *For subsequent reviews, MCLL will collect employment data for the below categories. Numbers included herewith are from the Occupational Outlook for Interpreters & Translators (Bureau of Labor Statistics).*

Employment of Majors*							
	Average Salary	Employment % In state	Employment % in the field	Employment: % related to the field	Employment: % outside the field	No. pursuing graduate or professional education	Projected growth from BLS** Current year only.
Year 1							
Year 2	\$45,430 Translators						
Year 3	\$50,930 Media & Comm.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	
For Interpreters & Translators: + 46% (2012-2022). See appendix for documentation.							

* May not be collected every year

** Go to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Website: <http://www.bls.gov/oco/> and view job outlook data and salary information (if the Program has information available from professional associations or alumni surveys, enter that data)

- Provide a brief assessment of student need and demand using the data from tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning and Analysis and from the table above. Include the most common types of positions, in terms of employment graduates can expect to find.

Provide assessment here:

MCLL graduates participate successfully in the civic, business, and educational community. Many continue their careers in Masters and Doctoral programs at prestigious institutions across the country. Some recent graduates are now teaching French and Spanish in area high schools; still others are employed as bilingual professionals in local industry.

Several are in law school; one has gone on to do advanced study in translation; others are pursuing MBA degrees with an international focus or MALS degrees involving areas such as Philosophy, Anthropology, and Political Science.

MCLL programs provide practical courses for MA candidates and members of the business community who are translators or work in other sectors of the international arena. We also provide intellectual, cultural, and motivational activities for teachers and students of local and regional middle schools, secondary schools, and colleges, many of which employ our graduates. A growing need exists within governmental agencies such as the CIA or the Defense Language Institute for graduates with a strong foundation in foreign languages. Additionally, the Francophone and Hispanic heritage communities in the United States rely upon programs such as ours to prevent erosion of first language competence among their young people. The tremendous head start enjoyed by heritage speakers in turn becomes a resource essential to the national interest, given the need for cross-cultural communications at home, with our neighbors north and south of the border, as well as with friends, partners, and allies around the world. In this instance our teaching focuses upon documenting, assessing, and accrediting heritage speakers for proficiency, while some require focused work in the written form of the language spoken at home. WSU certainly has the strongest foreign language program in South Central Kansas together with technological advantages — delivery systems such as classrooms equipped for Inter Distance Learning, video conferencing, and computer-supported course objects in our state-of-the-art Language Lab — which should allow us to meet future student needs better than most of our regional competitors. Additionally, MCLL's participation in the Cooperative Education program benefits both our students and the community.

The increasing need for language expertise in combination with other disciplines was mentioned above. The general effectiveness of instruction in MCLL is demonstrated by the fact that our graduates, BA and MA alike, who seek to go on for further study, exceed the targeted 80 % rate of acceptance to other institutions.

- 5. Analyze the service the Program provides to the discipline, other programs at the University, and beyond. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).**

Evaluate table 16 from the Office of Planning Analysis for SCH by student department affiliation on fall census day.

- a. Provide a brief assessment of the service the Program provides. Comment on percentage of SCH taken by majors and non-majors, nature of Program in terms of the service it provides to other University programs, faculty service to the institution, and beyond.

Provide assessment here:

A concise cost analysis was presented in § 2, pp. 8-9 above. The data set forth in table #16 complete and confirm said analysis: 8.2% of our SCH are MCLL majors while 91.8% are non-program majors (2007-2012). These percentages

reflect the fact that elementary and intermediate language courses used by LAS majors to satisfy the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement account for most of our credit hours. An overwhelming proportion of those SCH (as mentioned in § 2) are generated by GTAs & adjuncts at relatively low cost to the institution. At the same time, of course, MCLL thus provides a necessary service to LAS and programs in other Colleges where world language proficiency is a necessary component of the major.

Colleagues in MCLL are active in the foremost professional associations of our discipline and provide a variety of services to the Kansas World Language Association, the American Association of Teachers of French, the American Association of Teachers of Spanish, the Modern Language Association, and PEN International. As mentioned above, we provide service to the discipline through work on editorial boards or as guest editors of scholarly publications, or as referees for paper submissions to colloquia. MCLL faculty often serve as T&P reviewers for colleagues at other institutions, and have been called upon to evaluate exams for the Educational Testing Service.

With regard to other programs at WSU, our department provides intermediate language and literature courses that enable students to fulfill College graduation requirements (as detailed above), as well as University General Education requirements (French & Spanish 210, 223, & 300 are often selected for this purpose). MCLL delivers an important service to programs such as International Business, Art History, or other Humanities disciplines for which a specific level of foreign language competence is recommended or required. Examples — besides French, Latin, & Spanish — would be: Russian language in support of notable offerings in Russian History (*Early & Imperial Russian*; *Soviet History*); or Arabic, in support of dynamic offerings consistent with faculty research: Political Science (*Middle East Politics*), Anthropology (*Anthropology of Islam*), and Women's Studies (*Women in the Middle East*). MCLL also offers courses for graduate students seeking to fulfill foreign language reading exam requirements; as a service to other departments, we administer and evaluate these translation exams, most often for History, Chemistry, and Mathematics.

On a regular basis, MCLL faculty serve as translators or interpreters for the local business community. We are actively involved with Sister Cities and other exchange programs; for instance, MCLL majors or advanced students have been selected for Rotary Scholarships: this reflects one of our cooperative efforts with Foundation CEO Elizabeth King, another of which resulted in the Buck scholarship for WSU students enrolled at the University of Orléans for an intensive summer, semester, or year-long program of language study. Finally, MCLL faculty organize a host of additional community activities through the Sister Cities Diplomatic Corps, and often serve in an advisory capacity for groups such as the foreign film committee of the Wichita Center for the Arts.

MCLL has developed the following long-range goal: to convert our Language Lab Classroom and Master Classroom, components of the MALIC, into multimedia centers allowing learners to develop maximum proficiency. This project for a large, profitable distance-learning and webcast curriculum interfaces with WSU's general emphasis on global technology and will further engage today's undergraduates with the latest interactive software to assist in second language acquisition. Online or blended courses in languages for the professions will operate in parallel with our traditional

classroom instruction delivering advanced content courses toward fulfillment of our Gen Ed, applied, and teacher training missions.

6. Report on the Program's goal (s) from the last review. List the goal (s), data that may have been collected to support the goal, and the outcome. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

(For Last 3 FYs)	Goal (s)	Assessment Data Analyzed	Outcome
	MCLL Language Lab Renovation (details below).		Completed.
	New faculty hires (Spanish) in support of undergraduate & graduate programs.		Achieved: two Probationary; one Instructor; one Academic Lecturer w/PhD.

7. Summary and Recommendations

- a. Set forth a summary of the report including an overview evaluating the strengths and concerns. List recommendations for improvement of each Program (for departments with multiple programs) that have resulted from this report (relate recommendations back to information provided in any of the categories and to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e). Identify three year goal (s) for the Program to be accomplished in time for the next review.

Provide assessment here:

Our most important goals coming out of the 2010-2011 KBOR review were: 1) bring to completion the major renovation called MALIC, i.e. the transformation of our former Language Lab (313 Jardine) into a collaborative space with University Libraries and the School of Music (= the Music and Languages Innovation Center), including the conversion of 306 JH into a state-of-the-art Master Classroom assigned to MCLL; and 2) hire new faculty in Spanish to support the MA program detailed herewith: these objectives have been achieved.

RE applied learning: in the coming semesters, we plan to adopt elementary and intermediate textbooks that incorporate vocabulary for the professions. At the same time, MCLL will develop and expand existing upper-division offerings in translation, interpreting, and foreign languages for business. The Certificate Program in Spanish for the Professions was recently approved: applied learning outcomes will be enhanced by combining this Certificate with specific Co-Op & Internship programs through contacts in the Latino community.

In keeping with the fundamentally cross-disciplinary nature of world language programs, MCLL plans to submit a proposal for a Certificate Program in Latin American Studies. As mentioned above, we're fortunate to have made several recent hires: these new colleagues, through their research expertise, represent the various regions of Latin America necessary to offer a comprehensive program: northern and southern Mexico, the "Southern Cone" (including Argentina

and Chile), and the Andean territory. MCLL plans to join forces with colleagues in Political Science and Anthropology whose specializations involve Guatemala and Mexico.

In addition to study abroad opportunities already successfully in place, MCLL plans to develop online or blended offerings: intermediate language courses and languages for the professions, particularly *translation*. Experimental courses in these latter areas offered recently in traditional format had high enrollments, with waiting lists. This area stands to make the greatest impact on our programs in terms of revenue generation: one might refer to this initiative as the future for world language majors and minors at WSU. Specifically, MCLL will request authorization to conduct searches for tenure-stream faculty in French and Spanish with demonstrated expertise in the delivery of online courses involving languages for business and translation-&-interpreting.

We are pleased to have among new faculty a PhD in Spanish with expertise in Heritage Learners and Second Language Acquisition: the Spanish section is currently studying the possibility of offering free-standing sections exclusively for heritage speakers. In departments such as ours, *global learning* and *diversity* have never been mere watchwords: rather, they define who we are and what we do necessarily. MCLL shall continue to explore ways to address all the stated goals that bring these core values into play.

MCLL also seeks to revitalize its German program (minor & major) through a cooperative venture with Anthropology. As a complement to our current study abroad programs in France and Mexico, MCLL & Anthropology plan to sponsor a study abroad program in Heidelberg, Germany. The goal is to develop skills of intermediate and advanced students from both departments with a view to functional proficiency in German together with knowledge in the content area determined by the Anthropology professor. At the same time, we envision cooperative course development and advisement regarding Linguistics 351 [linguistics & foreign languages] & 352 [anthropological linguistics], encouraging students of languages and cultures to gain knowledge of the subject from multiple perspectives.

The MCLL Assessment Plan currently in place shall be adjusted as a function of the three-year template and to verify the success of the above initiatives (we went through a successful KBOR review three years ago, based on the former reporting cycle). These assessment activities will be carried out on a semester-by-semester basis to ensure the quality of each component of the program. As always in the context of Program Review, majors must meet the stipulated levels of proficiency: should our elaborate and effective quality control measures reveal limitations within the program, a data review will be performed by our resident experts in foreign language pedagogy. Teaching methods then would be adjusted to ensure all goals for oral and written proficiency, including appropriate content in each of the designated areas, are met prior to the subsequent review period.

Appendix 1

Assessment of the Major in Modern & Classical Languages and Literatures: Goals, Objectives, and Current Data

GOAL #1 *Language Proficiency*. Students of French and Spanish will be able to function in a culturally appropriate way in the four skill areas (speaking, listening, writing, reading). Students of Latin will fulfill Objectives #4 and #5 only.

Objective #1. *Speaking*. The speaker will be able to converse in a clearly participatory fashion, initiate and sustain a variety of communicative tasks including those most frequently encountered in the workplace, narrate, and describe with some detail.

Objective #2. *Listening*. The student will be able to understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect.

Objective #3. *Writing*. The student will be able to write routine social and professional correspondence, take notes, write cohesive summaries, narratives, and translate standard commercial and technical documents.

Objective #4. *Reading*. The student will be able to follow the essential points of written discourse, to comprehend facts and make reasonable inferences. The student should have some awareness of the properties specific to commercial, technical, and literary language.

Objective #5 (Latin majors only). Latin majors will be able to translate Latin prose into English.

GOAL #2. *Culture*. Students of the modern languages will have acquired appropriate sociolinguistic skills; all majors will display basic knowledge of history, politics, systems of belief, literature, art, and daily life; and tolerant attitudes regarding other cultures and peoples.

Objective #1. Students shall demonstrate the ability to interpret cultural artifacts; to cite common proverbs; to meet demands for survival as a traveler; to describe major public issues, the educational system, and the cultural values ascribed to education; to discuss the present significance of past events, historic periods, prominent personalities and cultural achievements; to handle common social and professional situations.

GOAL #3: *Literature*. Students will be conversant with a body of literature.

Objective #1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the facts of literary history.

Objective #2: Students will be able to use a variety of critical approaches and demonstrate an awareness of levels of meaning within a text.

GOAL #4: *Teaching majors*. In addition to the above goals, majors in the teacher education program will acquire instructional competencies for teaching all of the language skills plus literature and cultural knowledge and awareness.

Objective #1: Students will be eligible for certification as high school teachers.

The corresponding departmental assessment strategy is as follows:

Assessment of language proficiency, culture, and literature (GOALS #1, #2, #3): modern language majors submit substantive writing samples in the target language on cultural, historical, literary, or technical subjects; classical language majors submit translations into English, or substantive essays. Using a holistic evaluation model, these samples are evaluated for mechanical accuracy consistent with the norms of the ACTFL Writing Proficiency Guidelines (MCLL GOAL #1), for appropriate cultural or professional knowledge, insight, and values (MCLL GOAL #2), and for knowledge of literature and methods of literary analysis (MCLL GOAL #3).

Assessment of language proficiency and culture (GOALS #1, #2): by means of the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI), modern language majors are rated for spoken-language proficiency (MCLL GOAL #1), professional and sociolinguistic ability, cultural knowledge, insight, and values (GOAL #2). Faculty members in each modern language are trained in ACTFL oral proficiency testing and interviewing techniques.

The following analysis provides evidence of the quality of students pursuing the academic major in MCLL. The data were collected and evaluated in conformity with the Assessment Plan detailed above.

There are two main aspects to the assessment strategy within this Plan: assessment of written language proficiency in conjunction with cultural and literary knowledge based on a writing sample, and assessment of verbal language proficiency in conjunction with cultural awareness based on the Oral Proficiency Interview (French & Spanish only).

The writing samples used for the present evaluation were collected in Advanced Composition and Grammar courses. The Oral Proficiency Interviews were conducted by full-time faculty trained in the ACTFL methodology. The following list includes majors (2011-2013) identified by the Office of Planning & Analysis with corresponding MCLL assessment data.

These criteria-referenced ratings must be clearly distinguished from regular course grades. The latter indicate the average of a variety of performances in the context of a group of students at a given level of the curriculum. ***The above ratings, which indicate points in a progression, were obtained using scales of which the upper end denotes native or near-native proficiency.***

Student	OPI date	525	MCLL Maj	OPI Rating	Writing	Date
#1	FL 11	✓	✓	INTERM HIGH	8.2	SP 11
#2	FL 11	✓	✓	INTERM MID	7.2	SP 11
#3	FL 11	✓	✓	INTERM HIGH	8.0	SP 11
#4	FL 11	✓	✓	ADVANCED MID	9.4	SP 11
#5	FL 11	✓	✓	INTERM MID	7.6	SP 11
#6	FL 11	✓	✓	ADVANCED MID	9.6	SP 11
#7	FL 11	✓	✓	ADV LOW	9.2	SP 11
#8	FL 11	✓	✓	ADVANCED MID	9.4	SP 11
#9	FL 11	✓	✓	INTERM HIGH	8.8	SP 11
#10	FL 11	✓	✓	ADV HIGH	9.8	SP 11
#11	FL 12	✓	✓	INTERM HIGH	8.2	SP 12
#12	FL 12	✓	✓	INTERM MID	8.4	SP 12
#13	FL 12	✓	✓	INTERM HIGH	8.8	SP 12
#14	FL 12	✓	✓	INTERM LOW	6.8	SP 12
#15	FL 12	✓	✓	INTERM HIGH	8.4	SP 12
#16	FL 12	✓	✓	SUPERIOR	9.6	SP 12
#17	FL 12	✓	✓	INTERM HIGH	8.0	SP 12
#18	FL 12	✓	✓	INTERM MID	7.4	SP 12
#19	FL 12	✓	✓	NOVICE MID	4.6	SP 12
#20	FL 12	✓	✓	ADV LOW	8.4	SP 12
#21	FL 12	✓	✓	NOVICE HIGH	6.2	SP 12
#22	FL 13	✓	✓	INTERM HIGH	8.2	SP 13
#23	FL 13	✓	✓	NOVICE HIGH	5.8	SP 13
#24	FL 13	✓	✓	INTERM MID	6.4	SP 13
#25	FL 13	✓	✓	INTERM HIGH	7.2	SP 13
#26	FL 13	✓	✓	ADV LOW	8.6	SP 13
#27	FL 13	✓	✓	ADV LOW	8.6	SP 13
#28	FL 13	✓	✓	INTERM LOW	8.0	SP 13
#29	FL 13	✓	✓	NOVICE HIGH	7.8	SP 13
#30	FL 13	✓	✓	INTERM HIGH	7.2	SP 13
#31	FL 13	✓	✓	INTERM HIGH	7.6	SP 13
#32	FL 13	✓	✓	ADV LOW	8.2	SP 13

MCLL ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

<u>Levels:</u>	<u>Novice</u>	<u>Intermediate</u>	<u>Advanced</u>	<u>Superior</u>
<u>Categories:</u> /	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9	10
<u>Central Idea</u>	Basic information; simple messages	Practical writing needs; topics of current, general interest	Features of academic research paper with emphasis on concrete aspects	Topic treated abstractly as well as concretely; involves hypotheses
<u>Organization</u>	Lists and notes	Simple facts, ideas; little evidence of deliberate organization	Describes, narrates in major time frames; connected discourse in paragraph form	Well-developed ideas, arguments through extended discourse
<u>Style / Voice</u>	Reproduces formulaic information in simple document	Creates with language in loosely connected series	Ability to paraphrase and elaborate to provide clarity	Effective expression throughout
<u>Usage</u>	Reproduces basic structures with some accuracy, but grammar generally inadequate	Expresses meaning through vocabulary and structures comprehensible to readers accustomed to non-natives	Expresses meaning comprehensible to readers unaccustomed to non-natives; good control of frequently used structures	Control of all structures
<u>Mechanics</u>	Errors frequent	Contains basic spelling / punctuation errors	Weaknesses in spelling / punctuation may distract reader	No patterns of error

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities

Department: Mod Cla Lang

Program: Mod Cla Lang

Tables 1 through 7 provide data for Section 2 of the Program Review Self Study Template.

(excludes GR Spanish)

Table 1: Fiscal Year Summation of Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production

Course level	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)							Rolling 5 FY average		
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013
Total	11,005	11,618	11,202	10,959	10,568	11,188	10,671	11,070	11,107	10,918
100-299	9,720	10,254	9,965	9,548	9,293	9,748	9,189	9,756	9,762	9,549
300-499	435	529	383	415	577	676	672	468	516	545
500-699	618	702	604	830	540	619	649	659	659	648
700-799	110	15	154	12	44	15	21	67	48	49
800-899	122	118	96	154	114	130	140	121	122	127
900-999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: SCH of all enrolled department offerings summated by FY for each census day. In some cases department level SCH includes entire department offerings.

Table 2: Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production at Fall Census Day

Course level:	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average	
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012		
Total	5,540	5,715	5,312	5,034	5,157	5,336	5,399	5,352	5,311	5,248		
100-299	4,946	5,085	4,779	4,475	4,584	4,717	4,686	4,774	4,728	4,648		
300-499	197	272	176	144	279	331	337	214	240	253		
500-699	311	290	244	325	216	213	300	277	258	260		
700-799	14	12	83	12	33	6	15	31	29	30		
800-899	72	56	30	78	45	69	61	56	56	57		
900-999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
note: SCH of all enrolled department offerings at Fall census day.												

note: SCH of all enrolled department offerings at Fall census day.

Table 3: Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production among Department Instructional Faculty on November Employee Census Day (entire term SCH)

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day										Rolling 5 year average	
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012		
Program total	n/a	n/a	5,770	5,391	5,132	5,298	4,253	n/a	n/a	5,169		
Tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	1,072	1,076	530	705	786	n/a	n/a	834		
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	2,338	1,810	1,839	1,211	1,003	n/a	n/a	1,640		
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	1,590	1,070	1,513	2,088	1,424	n/a	n/a	1,537		
GTA	n/a	n/a	770	1,435	1,250	1,294	1,040	n/a	n/a	1,158		
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	0		
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	0		
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0		

note: faculty/staff with active class assignments and employment at November freeze.; employee type based on ecis and egrip matrix.

Table 4: Instructional FTE Employed on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
Program total	n/a	n/a	35.0	36.0	33.0	36.0	32.0	n/a	n/a	34			
Tenure-eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	8.0	8.0	4.0	6.0	6.0	n/a	n/a	6			
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	8.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	4.0	n/a	n/a	6			
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	14.0	12.0	13.0	15.0	14.0	n/a	n/a	14			
GTA	n/a	n/a	5.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	8.0	n/a	n/a	8			
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0			
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0			
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0			

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze; employee type based on ecis and egrip matrix.; fle of 1 based on 80 hour bi-week appointment; employee type based on ecis and egrip matrix; KBOR minima for faculty (TTF) 3 for UG, plus 3 for masters, plus 2 for doctoral.

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities

Department: Mod Cla Lang

Program: Mod Cla Lang

Table 5a: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for University Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
Year of November Census Day										
(University level) Total	n/a	n/a	225	247	236	231	222	n/a	n/a	232
Tenure-eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	214	240	228	216	194	n/a	n/a	219
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	298	330	301	286	290	n/a	n/a	301
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	280	287	274	269	295	n/a	n/a	281
GTA	n/a	n/a	190	201	214	210	204	n/a	n/a	204
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	116	121	106	149	121	n/a	n/a	123
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	14	n/a	n/a	3
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on eds and egpr matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

Table 5b: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for College Division Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
Year of November Census Day										
(College Division level) Total	n/a	n/a	238	253	253	243	237	n/a	n/a	245
Tenure-eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	211	226	230	207	199	n/a	n/a	215
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	293	280	280	278	323	n/a	n/a	293
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	227	256	256	284	252	n/a	n/a	255
GTA	n/a	n/a	271	292	271	259	261	n/a	n/a	271
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on eds and egpr matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

Table 5c: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for Program Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
Year of November Census Day										
(Program level) Total	n/a	n/a	165	150	156	147	133	n/a	n/a	150
Tenure-eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	134	135	133	118	131	n/a	n/a	130
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	292	259	263	242	261	n/a	n/a	261
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	114	89	116	139	102	n/a	n/a	112
GTA	n/a	n/a	154	159	139	129	130	n/a	n/a	142
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on eds and egpr matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities

Department: Mod Cla Lang

Program: Mod Cla Lang

Table 6: Program Majors (Including double majors) on Fall Census Day

Student Class	Year of Fall Census Day					Rolling 5 year average				
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
Total	93	103	100	107	100	97	84	101	101	98
freshmen	13	14	13	10	9	12	7	12	12	10
sophomore	15	21	21	17	22	17	13	19	20	18
junior	15	27	23	27	21	30	18	23	26	24
senior	50	41	43	53	48	38	46	47	45	46
masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
post masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: majors include all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; other includes guest or non degree students; KBOR minima 25 UG, 20 GR masters and 5 GR doctoral.

Table 7: Degree Production by Fiscal Year

Degree level:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)										Rolling 5 FY average		
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013			
Total	26	26	17	24	21	12	22	23	20	19			
Doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Bachelor	26	26	17	24	21	12	22	23	20	19			
Associate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; KBOR minima 10 UG, 5 GR masters & 2 GR doctoral.

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities

Department: Mod Cia Lang

Program: Mod Cia Lang

Table 8 provides data for Section 3a of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 8: Mean ACT score of Juniors and Seniors Enrolled on Fall Census Day (source=Fall Census Day)

Statistic:	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
University level	22.1	22.3	22.5	22.5	22.7	22.8	23.0	22.4	22.6	22.7			
Program majors	24.3	23.7	24.0	25.0	24.9	23.7	24.2	24.4	24.3	24.4			
Program majors count	65	68	66	80	69	68	64	70	70	69			
Percent reporting ACT	46	47	42	47	43	42	37	45	44	42			
Percent reporting	70.8%	69.1%	63.6%	58.8%	62.3%	61.8%	57.8%	64.7%	63.0%	60.8%			

note: if ACT missing and SAT available, SAT is used converted to ACT metric; KBOR captures ACT data for enrolled Juniors & seniors only; KBOR minima >=20.

Table 9 provides data for Section 3b of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 9: Mean Application GPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications)

Statistic:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)										Rolling 5 FY weighted average		
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013			
University level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
Program majors	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
Program majors count	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	0			
Percent reporting GR gpa	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	0			
Percent reporting	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			

note: graduate student application gpa based on last 60 hours of course work earned.

Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 10: Satisfaction with Program among Undergraduate and Graduate Students at End of Program Exit

Student level:	Academic Year (fall-spring-summer sequence)										Rolling 5 AY average		
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013			
University Undergraduate level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
College Division Undergraduate level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	79.5%	82.9%	n/a	n/a	n/a			
Program Undergraduate majors:						84.2%	86.0%						
Percent satisfied or very satisfied	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	66.7%	90.9%	n/a	n/a	n/a			
mean	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.8	4.1	n/a	n/a	n/a			
median	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4	4	n/a	n/a	n/a			
count	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	6	22	n/a	n/a	n/a			
University Graduate level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	80.0%	82.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a			
College Division Graduate level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	69.6%	73.3%	n/a	n/a	n/a			
Program Graduate majors:													
Percent satisfied or very satisfied	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
mean	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
median	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
count	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			

note: primary majors only; data from the Application For Degree Exit Survey; scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being high (very satisfied).

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities

Department: Mod Cla Lang

Program: Mod Cla Lang

Tables 11 through Table 15 provide data for Section 4 of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 11: Applications, Admits and Enrollment for Undergraduate and Graduate Applicants

Student level:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)										Rolling 5 FY average		
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013			
Undergraduates:													
Applicants	12	23	22	12	10	13	20	16	16	15			
Admitted	12	23	22	11	10	12	19	16	16	15			
Census day	10	16	15	10	7	11	9	12	12	10			
Graduates:													
Applicants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Admitted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Census day	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

note: unduplicated count as last record of FY; applicants exclude incomplete or cancelled applications.

note: unduplicated count as last record of FY; applicants exclude incomplete or cancelled applications.

Table 12: Percent Under-represented Minorities (URM) on Fall Census Day

Student level:	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
University level:													
Freshmen & Sophomores	15.3%	14.5%	15.0%	15.7%	17.0%	18.0%	18.5%	15.5%	16.0%	16.8%			
Juniors & Seniors	12.3%	12.0%	12.3%	13.0%	14.0%	14.9%	15.4%	12.7%	13.2%	13.9%			
Masters	5.8%	6.6%	6.8%	7.8%	8.2%	9.7%	11.3%	7.1%	7.8%	8.8%			
Doctoral	5.0%	6.9%	6.8%	5.6%	6.6%	5.4%	6.7%	6.2%	6.2%	6.2%			
College division level:													
Freshmen & Sophomores	10.7%	10.5%	15.3%	12.1%	16.4%	17.4%	16.4%	13.0%	14.3%	15.5%			
Juniors & Seniors	17.2%	15.8%	13.5%	14.6%	19.4%	18.2%	15.4%	16.1%	16.3%	16.2%			
Masters	12.1%	15.5%	12.8%	9.9%	10.7%	7.6%	7.9%	12.2%	11.3%	9.8%			
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Program level:													
Freshmen & Sophomores	21.4%	8.6%	23.5%	18.5%	16.1%	27.6%	30.0%	17.6%	18.9%	23.2%			
Juniors & Seniors	30.8%	29.4%	19.7%	20.0%	30.4%	32.4%	26.6%	26.1%	26.4%	25.8%			
Masters	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; URM includes black non-hispanic, hispanic, american indian/alaskan native & hawaiian.

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities

Department: Mod Cla Lang

Program: Mod Cla Lang

Table 13: Race/Ethnicity on Fall Census Day

Student level:	Year of Fall Census Day												Rolling 5 year average		
	Total	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012				
Freshmen & Sophomores	Total	93	103	100	107	100	97	84	101	101	98				
	Total URM	26	23	21	21	26	30	23	23	24	24				
white non-hispanic	28	35	34	27	31	29	20	31	31	28					
black non-hispanic	21	29	21	19	22	14	11	22	21	17					
hispanic	0	0	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2					
asian non-hispanic	6	3	6	3	3	6	5	4	4	5					
american indian/alaskan native	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	1					
foreign	0	2	0	1	0	3	1	1	0	1					
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
multiple race	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	1					
unknown	1	0	3	1	1	4	0	0	1	2					
Juniors & Seniors	Total	65	68	66	80	69	68	64	70	70					
white non-hispanic	37	39	47	55	43	41	39	44	44	45					
black non-hispanic	3	3	3	5	8	7	5	5	4	6					
hispanic	16	15	10	11	12	15	12	1	13	12					
asian non-hispanic	1	2	0	3	2	2	0	1	2	2					
american indian/alaskan native	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1					
foreign	2	3	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	1					
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
multiple race	1	1	0	1	0	2	1	2	1	1					
unknown	4	3	3	4	3	1	4	3	3	3					
Master	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Doctoral	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities

Department: Mod Cia Lang

Program: Mod Cia Lang

Table 14: Percent Under-represented Minorities (URM) of Degreed Conferred Students by Fiscal Year

Degree level:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Rolling 5 year average	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
University level:											
Doctoral	8.7%	1.5%	7.2%	6.1%	6.3%	6.5%	6.5%	6.0%	6.0%	5.5%	6.5%
Masters	4.9%	6.0%	6.4%	6.1%	6.4%	8.7%	10.5%	6.0%	6.0%	6.7%	7.6%
Bachelor	10.2%	10.7%	11.3%	11.1%	12.0%	12.7%	12.7%	11.1%	11.1%	11.5%	11.9%
Associate	21.4%	13.8%	11.8%	16.0%	18.8%	18.4%	23.1%	16.4%	16.4%	15.8%	17.6%
College division level:											
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Masters	8.6%	23.1%	11.1%	12.8%	10.7%	8.6%	16.7%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	12.0%
Bachelor	14.4%	17.6%	13.7%	6.9%	15.0%	12.8%	15.5%	13.5%	13.5%	13.2%	12.8%
Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Program level:											
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Masters	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bachelor	23.1%	46.2%	47.1%	12.5%	19.0%	41.7%	18.2%	29.6%	33.3%	27.7%	0.0%
Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

note: Includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; URM includes black non-hispanic, hispanic, american indian/alaskan native & hawaiian.

Table 15: Race/Ethnicity of Degreed Conferred Students by Fiscal Year

Degree level:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Rolling 5 year average	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
Year of Fall Census Day											
Total	26	26	17	24	21	12	22	23	20	19	5
Total URM	6	12	8	3	4	5	4	7	6	5	5
Year of Fall Census Day											
Rolling 5 year average											
Doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters											
white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bachelor											
white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

(Table continued on next page)

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities Department: Mod Cia Lang Program: Mod Cia Lang

(Table 15 continued)

Degree level:

Year of Fall Census Day

Rolling 5 year average

Bachelor Total	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
white non-hispanic	26	26	17	24	21	12	22	23	20	19
black non-hispanic	18	11	8	20	16	7	14	15	12	13
hispanic	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
asian non-hispanic	6	9	7	3	3	5	3	6	5	4
american indian/alaskan native	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
foreign	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hawaiian	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
multiple race	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
unknown	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
Associate Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

Tables 16 provides data for Section 5 of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 16: Department Student Credit Hour (SCH) by Student Department Affiliation on Fall Census Day

Major & student level:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
Total	5,540	5,715	5,312	5,034	5,157	5,336	5,399	5,352	5,311	5,248
Program UG majors	346	424	388	482	445	434	403	417	435	430
Program GR majors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-program majors	5,185	5,291	4,921	4,552	4,712	4,902	4,996	4,932	4,876	4,817
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Program UG major	6.2%	7.4%	7.3%	9.6%	8.6%	8.1%	7.5%	7.8%	8.2%	8.2%
Program GR major	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Non-program majors	93.8%	92.6%	92.6%	90.4%	91.4%	91.9%	92.5%	92.2%	91.8%	91.8%

note: program majors includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities

Department: Mod Cla Lang

Program: GR Spanish

Tables 1 through 7 provide data for Section 2 of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 1: Fiscal Year Summation of Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production

Course level:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)												Rolling 5 FY average
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013			
Total	11,005	11,618	11,202	10,959	10,568	11,188	10,671	11,070	11,107	10,918			
100-299	9,720	10,254	9,965	9,548	9,293	9,748	9,189	9,756	9,762	9,549			
300-499	435	529	383	415	577	676	672	468	516	545			
500-699	618	702	604	830	540	619	649	659	659	648			
700-799	110	15	154	12	44	15	21	67	48	49			
800-899	122	118	96	154	114	130	140	121	122	127			
900-999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

note: SCH of all enrolled department offerings summated by FY for each census day. In some cases department level SCH includes entire department offerings.

Table 2: Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production at Fall Census Day

Course level:	Year of Fall Census Day												Rolling 5 year average
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
Total	5,540	5,715	5,312	5,034	5,157	5,336	5,399	5,362	5,311	5,248			
100-299	4,946	5,085	4,779	4,475	4,584	4,717	4,686	4,774	4,728	4,648			
300-499	197	272	176	144	279	331	337	214	240	253			
500-699	311	290	244	325	216	213	300	277	1258	260			
700-799	14	12	83	12	33	6	15	31	29	30			
800-899	72	56	30	78	45	69	61	56	56	57			
900-999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

note: SCH of all enrolled department offerings at Fall census day.

Table 3: Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production among Department Instructional Faculty on November Employee Census Day (entire term SCH)

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day												Rolling 5 year average
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
Program total	n/a	n/a	5,770	5,391	5,132	5,298	4,253	n/a	n/a	5,169			
Tenure-eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	1,072	1,076	530	705	786	n/a	n/a	834			
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	2,338	1,810	1,839	1,211	1,003	n/a	n/a	1,640			
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	1,590	1,070	1,513	2,088	1,424	n/a	n/a	1,537			
GTA	n/a	n/a	770	1,435	1,250	1,294	1,040	n/a	n/a	1,158			
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	0			
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	0			
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0			

note: faculty/staff with active class assignments and employment at November freeze.; employee type based on ecis and egrp matrix.

Table 4: Instructional FTE Employed on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day												Rolling 5 year average
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
Program total	n/a	n/a	35.0	36.0	33.0	36.0	32.0	n/a	n/a	34			
Tenure-eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	8.0	8.0	4.0	6.0	6.0	n/a	n/a	6			
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	8.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	4.0	n/a	n/a	6			
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	14.0	12.0	13.0	15.0	14.0	n/a	n/a	14			
GTA	n/a	n/a	5.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	8.0	n/a	n/a	8			
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0			
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0			
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0			

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze; employee type based on ecis and egrp matrix.; fle of 1 based on 80 hour bi-week appointment; employee type based on ecis and egrp matrix; KBOR minima for faculty (TTF) 3 for UG, plus 3 for masters, plus 2 for doctoral.

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities

Department: Mod Cia Lang

Program: GR Spanish

Table 5a: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for University Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day								Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012	
(University level) Total	n/a	n/a	225	247	236	231	222	n/a	n/a	232	
Tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	214	240	228	216	194	n/a	n/a	219	
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	298	330	301	286	290	n/a	n/a	301	
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	280	287	274	269	295	n/a	n/a	281	
GTA	n/a	n/a	190	201	214	210	204	n/a	n/a	204	
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	116	121	106	149	121	n/a	n/a	123	
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	14	n/a	n/a	3	
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on eds and egpr matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

Table 5b: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for College Division Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day					Rolling 5 year average				
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
(College Division level) Total	n/a	n/a	238	253	253	243	237	n/a	n/a	245
Tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	211	226	230	207	199	n/a	n/a	215
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	293	280	290	278	323	n/a	n/a	293
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	227	256	258	284	252	n/a	n/a	255
GTA	n/a	n/a	271	292	271	259	261	n/a	n/a	271
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on eds and egpr matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

Table 5c: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for Program Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
(Program level) Total	n/a	n/a	165	150	156	147	133	n/a	n/a	150
Tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	134	135	133	118	131	n/a	n/a	130
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	292	259	263	242	251	n/a	n/a	261
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	114	89	116	139	102	n/a	n/a	112
GTA	n/a	n/a	154	159	139	129	130	n/a	n/a	142
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on eds and egpr matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities

Department: Mod Cia Lang

Program: GR Spanish

Table 6: Program Majors (including double majors) on Fall Census Day

Student Class	Year of Fall Census Day						Rolling 5 year average			
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
Total	24	21	18	18	18	12	15	20	17	16
freshmen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
sophomore	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
junior	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
senior	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
masters	24	21	18	18	18	12	15	20	17	16
post masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: majors include all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; other includes guest or non degree students; KBOR minima 25 UG, 20 GR masters and 5 GR doctoral.

Table 7: Degree Production by Fiscal Year

Degree level:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)							Rolling 5 FY average		
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013
Total	9	11	2	3	4	5	4	6	5	4
Doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters	9	11	2	3	4	5	4	6	5	4
Bachelor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Associate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes: KBOR minima 10 UG, 5 GR masters & 2 GR doctoral.

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; KBOR minima 10 UG, 5 GR masters & 2 GR doctoral.

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities Department: Mod Cia Lang Program: GR Spanish

Table 8 provides data for Section 3a of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 8: Mean ACT score of Juniors and Seniors Enrolled on Fall Census Day (source=Fall Census Day)

Statistic:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
University level	22.1	22.3	22.5	22.5	22.7	22.8	23.0	22.4	22.6	22.7	22.7	22.7	22.7	22.7	22.7
Program majors	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Program majors count	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percent reporting ACT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percent reporting	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

note: If ACT missing and SAT available, SAT is used converted to ACT metric; KBOR captures ACT data for enrolled Juniors & seniors only; KBOR minima >=20.

Table 9 provides data for Section 3b of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 9: Mean Application GPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications)

Statistic:	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
University level	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Program majors	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Program majors count	15	9	10	9	9	6	8	10	9	9	8	8	8	8
Percent reporting GR gpa	13	8	9	8	7	6	7	9	8	8	7	7	7	7
Percent reporting	86.7%	88.9%	90.0%	88.9%	77.8%	100.0%	87.5%	86.5%	88.4%	88.1%	88.1%	88.1%	88.1%	88.1%

note: graduate student application gpa based on last 60 hours of course work earned.

Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 10: Satisfaction with Program among Undergraduate and Graduate Students at End of Program Exit

Student level:	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
University Undergraduate level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
College Division Undergraduate level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Program Undergraduate majors:														
Percent satisfied or very satisfied	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
mean	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
median	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
count	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
University Graduate level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
College Division Graduates level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Program Graduate majors:														
Percent satisfied or very satisfied	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
mean	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
median	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
count	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

note: primary majors only; data from the Application For Degree Exit Survey; scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being high (very satisfied).

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities

Department: Mod Cia Lang

Program: GR Spanish

Tables 11 through Table 15 provide data for Section 4 of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 11: Applications, Admits and Enrollment for Undergraduate and Graduate Applicants

Student level:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)										Rolling 5 FY average		
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013			
Undergraduates:													
Applicants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Admitted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Census day	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduates:													
Applicants	16	13	10	10	10	7	9	12	10	9	9	9	9
Admitted	15	10	10	10	9	6	8	11	9	8	8	8	8
Census day	10	11	10	7	7	6	5	9	8	7	7	7	7

note: unduplicated count as last record of FY; applicants exclude incomplete or cancelled applications.

Table 12: Percent Under-represented Minorities (URM) on Fall Census Day

Student level:	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
University level:													
Freshmen & Sophomores	15.3%	14.5%	15.0%	15.7%	17.0%	18.0%	18.5%	15.5%	16.0%	16.8%			
Juniors & Seniors	12.3%	12.0%	12.3%	13.0%	14.0%	14.9%	15.4%	12.7%	13.2%	13.9%			
Masters	5.8%	6.6%	6.8%	7.8%	8.2%	9.7%	11.3%	7.1%	7.8%	8.8%			
Doctoral	5.0%	6.9%	6.8%	5.6%	6.6%	5.4%	6.7%	6.2%	6.2%	6.2%			
College division level:													
Freshmen & Sophomores	10.7%	10.5%	15.3%	12.1%	16.4%	17.4%	16.4%	13.0%	14.3%	15.5%			
Juniors & Seniors	17.2%	15.8%	13.5%	14.6%	19.4%	18.2%	15.4%	16.1%	16.3%	16.2%			
Masters	12.1%	15.5%	12.8%	9.9%	10.7%	7.6%	7.9%	12.2%	11.3%	9.8%			
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Program level:													
Freshmen & Sophomores	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Juniors & Seniors	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Masters	41.7%	52.4%	33.3%	38.9%	50.0%	25.0%	26.7%	43.3%	39.9%	34.8%			
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			

note: Includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; URM includes black non-hispanic, hispanic, american indian/alaskan native & hawaiian.

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities

Department: Mod Cia Lang

Program: GR Spanish

Table 13: Race/Ethnicity on Fall Census Day

Student level:	Total	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
Freshmen & Sophomores	Total	24	21	18	18	18	12	15	20	17	16			
	Total URM	10	11	6	7	9	3	4	9	7	6			
white non-hispanic	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
black non-hispanic	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
hispanic	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
asian non-hispanic	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
american indian/alaskan native	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
foreign	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
hawaiian	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
multiple race	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
unknown	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Juniors & Seniors	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
white non-hispanic	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
black non-hispanic	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
hispanic	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
asian non-hispanic	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
american indian/alaskan native	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
foreign	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
hawaiian	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
multiple race	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
unknown	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Master	Total	24	21	18	18	18	12	15	20	17	16			
white non-hispanic	Total	12	7	11	10	9	8	9	10	9	9			
black non-hispanic	Total	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	1			
hispanic	Total	10	10	5	4	7	2	4	7	6	4			
asian non-hispanic	Total	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1			
american indian/alaskan native	Total	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1			
foreign	Total	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0			
hawaiian	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
multiple race	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
unknown	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Doctoral	Total	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1			
white non-hispanic	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
black non-hispanic	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
hispanic	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
asian non-hispanic	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
american indian/alaskan native	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
foreign	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
hawaiian	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
multiple race	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
unknown	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities Department: Mod Cla Lang Program: GR Spanish

Table 14: Percent Under-represented Minorities (URM) of Degreed Conferred Students by Fiscal Year

Degree level:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
University level:										
Doctoral	8.7%	1.5%	7.2%	6.1%	6.3%	6.5%	6.5%	6.0%	5.5%	6.5%
Masters	4.9%	6.0%	6.4%	6.1%	6.4%	8.7%	10.5%	8.0%	6.7%	7.6%
Bachelor	10.2%	10.7%	11.3%	11.1%	12.0%	12.7%	12.7%	11.1%	11.5%	11.9%
Associate	21.4%	13.8%	11.8%	16.0%	18.8%	18.4%	23.1%	16.4%	15.8%	17.6%
College division level:										
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Masters	8.6%	23.1%	11.1%	12.8%	10.7%	8.6%	16.7%	13.3%	13.3%	12.0%
Bachelor	14.4%	17.6%	13.7%	6.9%	15.0%	12.8%	15.5%	13.5%	13.2%	12.8%
Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Program level:										
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Masters	22.2%	72.7%	0.0%	33.3%	50.0%	40.0%	25.0%	35.7%	39.2%	29.7%
Bachelor	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes. URM includes black non-hispanic, hispanic, american indian/alaskan native & hawaiian.

Table 15: Race/Ethnicity of Degreed Conferred Students by Fiscal Year

Degree level:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
Year of Fall Census Day										
Total	9	11	2	3	4	5	4	6	5	4
Total URM	2	8	0	1	2	2	1	3	3	1
Rolling 5 year average										
Doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters	9	11	2	3	4	5	4	6	5	4
white non-hispanic	7	3	1	1	2	2	3	3	2	2
black non-hispanic	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
hispanic	2	7	0	1	2	1	1	2	2	1
asian non-hispanic	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

(Table continued on next page)

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Humanities Department: Mod Cia Lang Program: GR Spanish

(Table 15 continued)

Degree level:

	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
Bachelor	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Associate Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: Includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

Tables 16 provides data for Section 5 of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 16: Department Student Credit Hour (SCH) by Student Department Affiliation on Fall Census Day

Major & student level:	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
Total	5,540	5,715	5,312	5,034	5,157	5,336	5,399	5,352	5,311	5,248			
Program UG majors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Program GR majors	129	108	92	125	77	92	112	106	99	100			
Non-program majors	5,411	5,607	5,220	4,909	5,080	5,244	5,287	5,245	5,212	5,148			
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			
Program UG major	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Program GR major	2.3%	1.9%	1.7%	2.5%	1.5%	1.7%	2.1%	2.0%	1.9%	1.9%			
Non-program majors	97.7%	98.1%	98.3%	97.5%	98.5%	98.3%	97.9%	98.0%	98.1%	98.1%			

note: program majors includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.



U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

Interpreters and Translators

Summary



Interpreters and translators convert information from one language into another.

Quick Facts: Interpreters and Translators	
2012 Median Pay	\$45,430 per year \$21.84 per hour
Entry-Level Education	Bachelor's degree
Work Experience in a Related Occupation	None
On-the-job Training	Short-term on-the-job training
Number of Jobs, 2012	63,600
Job Outlook, 2012-22	46% (Much faster than average)
Employment Change, 2012-22	29,300

What Interpreters and Translators Do

Interpreters and translators convert information from one language into another language. Interpreters work in spoken or sign language; translators work in written language.

Work Environment

Interpreters work in schools, hospitals, courtrooms, and conference centers. Many translators work from home. Self-employed interpreters and translators frequently have variable work schedules. Most interpreters and translators work full time during regular business hours.

How to Become an Interpreter or Translator

Although interpreters and translators typically need at least a bachelor's degree, the most important requirement is to have native-level fluency in English and at least one other language. Many complete job-specific training programs.

Pay

The median annual wage for interpreters and translators was \$45,430 in May 2012.

Job Outlook

[Media and Communication >](#)

Interpreters and Translators

[EN ESPAÑOL](#) | [PRINTER-FRIENDLY](#)[Summary](#) | [What They Do](#) | [Work Environment](#) | [How to Become One](#) | [Pay](#) | [Job Outlook](#) | [Similar Occupations](#) | [More Info](#)

Job Outlook

[About this section](#)

Employment of interpreters and translators is projected to grow 46 percent from 2012 to 2022, much faster than the average for all occupations. Employment growth reflects increasing globalization and a more diverse U.S. population, which is expected to require more interpreters and translators.

Demand will likely remain strong for translators of frequently translated languages, such as French, German, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish. Demand also should be strong for translators of Arabic and other Middle Eastern languages and for the principal Asian languages: Chinese, Japanese, Hindi, and Korean.

Demand for American Sign Language interpreters is expected to grow rapidly, driven by the increasing use of video relay services, which allow people to conduct online video calls and use a sign language interpreter.

In addition, growing international trade and broadening global ties should require more interpreters and translators. The need for military interpreters and translators should result in more jobs as well. Emerging markets in Asia and Africa are expected to increase the need for translation and interpreting in those languages.

Computers have made the work of translators and localization specialists more efficient. However, these jobs cannot be entirely automated. Computers cannot yet produce work comparable to the work that human translators do in most cases.

Job Prospects

Job prospects should be best for those who have at least a bachelor's degree and for those who have professional certification. Those with a master's degree in interpreting and/or translation should also have an advantage.

In addition, urban areas—especially Washington DC, New York, San Francisco, and Los Angeles—should continue to provide the largest numbers of jobs, especially for interpreters.

Job prospects for interpreters and translators should also vary by specialty and language. For example, interpreters and translators of Spanish should have good job prospects because of expected increases in the population of Spanish-speakers in the United States. In particular, job opportunities should be plentiful for interpreters and translators specializing in healthcare and law, because of the critical need for all parties to fully understand the information communicated in these fields.

In addition, there should be many job opportunities for specialists in localization, driven by the globalization of business and the expansion of the Internet.

Interpreters for the deaf will continue to have favorable employment prospects because there are relatively few people with the needed skills.

Employment projections data for interpreters and translators, 2012-22

Occupational Title	SOC Code	Employment, 2012	Projected Employment, 2022	Change, 2012-22		Employment by Industry
				Percent	Numeric	
Interpreters and translators	27-3091	63,600	92,900	46	29,300	[XLS]

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment Projections program

[< Pay](#)[Similar Occupations >](#)

SUGGESTED CITATION:

Foreign language skills provide sharp edge in the job market

By IBTimes Staff Reporter on January 22 2011 4:00 AM

Job seekers with bilingual skills could look forward to a profusion of opportunities in the coming year, according to various reports and company hiring plans. With the globalization of businesses and populations growing increasingly cosmopolitan, the need for transactional knowledge of languages has become very important in both private and government sectors.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the employment of translators and interpreters in the country is expected to increase by 22 percent between 2008 and 2018. Another book on the employment scenario, *Closing America's Job Gap* (W Business Books, January 2011), predicts that For those completely bilingual in Spanish and English, these highly marketable language skills open doors to new careers.

In the US in particular with people of different linguistic origins converging for medical treatment, the need for medical interpreters has grown by leaps and bounds. *Consumeraffairs* - the news and advocacy portal - also points out that the new standards imposed by the Joint Commission requiring hospitals and health organizations to provide language interpreting and translation services will further boost the demand for personnel fluent in speaking foreign languages.

A big name in the translation and interpreting industry, thebigword has announced that it will be creating 3000 jobs for linguists in 2011. Worldwide, thebigword's interpreting business, is expected to grow by 150 per cent during 2011, fuelled by major contract wins.

Within the US itself, the company's expansion rate has touched 20 percent per month. thebigword has identified the government sector as one of the largest areas demanding linguists and interpreters; in an official release the company says that increasingly cosmopolitan populations are driving the need for regional and national Government bodies to communicate in a range of languages in the USA and Britain.

The company has won substantial Government business based on its ability to deliver savings expected to be US\$100 million per year.

Strangely however, based on a report by the University of Phoenix Research Institute, the Wall Street Journal reports that while proficiency in languages - especially in Chinese and Spanish - seems to be among the most critical skills likely to be sought by recruiters over the next decade, very few workers had plans to invest in language instruction.

A survey among 419 employers and 511 workers last fall revealed that 42% of employers expected the demand for business proficiency in Chinese to be high among recruiters; 70% said the same of Spanish. However, a majority of workers said that they neither planned to learn Spanish nor attain business knowledge of Chinese in this period.

However, going by the explosive growth in the number of students enrolling in Mandarin and Chinese cultural courses at the school level across the US, the workforce of the future may be better prepared to meet such demand. In fact, as the Congress takes a relook at the No Child Left Behind Act (or the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) language enthusiasts hope that it will pass the \$400-million proposed funding for teaching world languages to K-12 students.

NEWS

All Sections

Home > Featured Articles > **Foreign Language**

Bilingual jobs: Foreign-language careers on rise

November 26, 2012 | By Jason Lee | Tribune Media Services

Recommend { 26 } Tweet { 26 }

+1 { 2 }

Bilingual? Bye, unemployment!

Fourteen years ago, Leslie Lancry founded Language Stars, a Chicago-based foreign language education program for children. The effort started modestly, with just one classroom and 15 students.

Fast-forward to 2012, and how things have changed. Today, Language Stars educates more than 10,000 students from four states and Washington, D.C., at more than 20 locations and in dozens of schools. The company has plans to expand nationwide.



The demand for foreign language skills creates opportuniti...

Keystone Pipeline Project

keystone-xl.com

Support Keystone XL And Help Improve The Economy. Learn More.

As the U.S. economy has become globalized and more industries have put a premium on foreign language skills for potential employees, Lancry has seen explosive growth in the demand for multilingual education at an early age.

"The world is getting smaller, and employment trends are a sign of that," she says. "I think there are a lot of parents looking at their children's futures and see (learning a second language) as a worthy investment."

While Spanish is understandably stressed as the most important language for Americans of any

age to learn, the rise of China as an economic power has thrust Mandarin into the limelight. "It is our fastest-growing language," Lancry says.

Regardless of your age, it's never too late to add a skill that will boost your employment prospects and possibly your paycheck. The need for employees with foreign language skills is only expected to grow in the next 10 years, and there are many fields where being bilingual can have a real bearing on your candidacy.

Health care

Many medical facilities are in need of multilingual personnel to communicate often-complicated information with patients and their families, especially in emergencies. Registered nurses, home health aides and paramedics are the health care fields most often in need of bilingual workers.

Education

Being a teacher in America can expose you to many different cultures. Walk into nearly any classroom from elementary to graduate schools, and you'll likely find students from multilingual households. Also, with the rise in demand for multilingual education, those who can teach foreign languages are also hot commodities.

Customer Service/Hospitality

When dealing with people who may be from foreign countries, either on the phone or at a hotel's front desk, knowing a second language can be a huge asset. Customers and tourists appreciate being able to communicate with customer service and hospitality workers in their native language, making you more attractive to employers.

Government

Many government agencies are recruiting and rewarding bilingual workers with extra pay. While Spanish is the language most in demand, Chinese, Arabic and Russian speakers are also especially needed in various parts of government. Whether gathering intelligence for a government agency, working for a foreign embassy or serving as a translator, there are many bilingual opportunities in public service.

Finance

As the U.S. economy has grown increasingly global, employees in the financial industry are dealing with customers and clients who use various currencies and speak many different languages. Learning another language can give you an advantage and make you much more valuable to multinational companies.

Information technology

The impact of outsourcing on the tech industry has led to a great need for those who possess foreign language skills. It's important for technology firms to limit language barriers when managing large projects that often have an international workforce and span various countries, where clear and concise communication of highly technical work is key.