

In fall of 2017 the department underwent a conscientious and exhaustive review of its many components and levels in preparation for the external evaluation conducted in the spring semester of 2018. As a result of this meticulous and comprehensive process we wrote an extensive departmental self-study, reflexive of the new routes and improved comprehensive approaches to the teaching of language, literature, and culture to ever-changing student generations. The Department of Languages welcomed Dr. E. Skomp to campus in the spring semester of the 2017-2018 academic year. Dr. Skomp's external report points out many of the departmental strengths, identifies some practices that reveal the strength of a department, and suggests many options for ways forward. Dr. Skomp's report has undergone careful review by every individual, every program and by the department as a whole, whose members have had many fruitful discussions thereon. In these discussions, though geared towards writing a departmental response, we were able to better assess where we are as a department.

Because we do not assess curriculum or individual classes at the departmental level, I offer what the department has deemed to be the External Evaluator's proposals that we plan to enact, and, lastly, the departmental needs, identified by Dr. Skomp, which we cannot fulfill on our own.

I. Positive steps we are interested in taking. There are many recommendations in the report that we recognize as ways to improve and/or have already started to work on:

- In response to the idea that the language programs are mostly misunderstood on campus, Dr. Skomp suggests a “flash presentation” (pg. 1). This may not be the best way to educate our campus about the possibilities found in the Department of Languages. We need an appropriate venue, maybe a focus on how to advise students, and will be in contact with Dr. Templeton for ways on how to achieve best results. Obviously, we will continue to work on ways to enhance our visibility on campus.
- It was noted that students can't tell when individual upper level courses will be offered. Although we do have a “three-year rolling course schedule (subject, of course, to change)” (pg. 2), we do not post it publicly. We are considering the possibility of having a 3-year plan on the program websites. We are concerned, however, that students might consider such a tentative sketch a promise or guarantee, even if we identify it as subject to change.
- The report also suggests that we participate in ACTFL pedagogy workshops. Although we have not customarily participated in ACTFL pedagogy workshops, many of us participate in pedagogy workshops available in both on-campus and off-campus venues. While ACTFL isn't pertinent to Classics, it is relevant to the modern language programs. Given the limited funding for conference travel, a pedagogy conference would replace the usual academic conference. It would be ideal if we could send two members of the department to pedagogy conferences a year without sacrificing research objectives.
- Dr. Skomp also strongly “recommend[s] the refinement and standardization—to the extent that it is possible—of assessment instruments on the departmental level” (pg. 3). To this end, she believes that “learning goals must be articulated for the department as a whole, not just for individual languages. There will be some

differences, to be sure, but the department has an opportunity to identify points of intersection and increase fruitful collaborations” (pg. 3). This has been taken to heart as the department has undergone a process of gleaning learning goals from our programs, identifying the commonalities while respecting the diversity of course offerings we provide the community. Although in our discussions we have created several documents compiling these goals, allowing individual programs to compare and contrast programs, we have chosen not to make these the learning goals from our courses. We have concluded that what we gain from commonality is simply insufficient to compensate for what we lose in detail. Instead, we are working to make our learning goals clearer and more assessable and productive for our individual programs.

- It is also mentioned in the report that students “indicated they would like to see informal language use promoted in extracurricular venues” (pg. 4). The department as a whole is aware that the campus is inundated with events, and that having more events doesn’t translate into having more success. As a department, we continue to work on the balance between having sufficient programming while not depleting student interest. We are committed to continuing to offer robust programming. Having more administrative help in this programming, such as catering, would make this more feasible for the faculty.
- The evaluation also states that “Students would like to have a conversation hour offered for every language taught at Hendrix. If possible, increase faculty participation in the conversation hours” (pg. 4). German and French are already doing it. Chinese and Spanish have tried it before, and are trying it again.
- In the same section, Dr. Skomp states that she “finecommend(s) that expansion of the current language house program be considered” (pg. 5). By virtue of the administrative decision to not continue the tenure line in German, we are having to reconfigure our pattern in the offering of the language house. We are currently in the process of discussing the possibilities available to us. We are being careful about crafting a new vision of the house that is sustainable. This process may take years to hammer out.
- In her report, Dr. Skomp suggests that we create a “Faculty Learning Community, such as a beginning language instruction” (pg. 6). Various members of the department have shown enthusiasm for this idea, and some members of the department have organized such learning communities among themselves in the past. It has been and will continue to be something that we look into with great interest.

II. Institutional support that is needed by the department. There are many suggestions in the report that we support but cannot implement without the approval and action of the administration. We commend the following three recommendations from Dr. Skomp to the attention of the administration as the suggestions that will result in the most substantial improvement for the department:

- The continuation of a tenure-track line in German (pg. 5). The college curriculum and the students’ learning experiences are negatively affected by the administration’s current suggestion to offer only the beginning sequence of German and only through adjunct staffing.

- More support for our small programs: “single-faculty languages are an area in need of additional support” (pg. 5) by creating part time teaching staff positions designed to aid in programming.
- Financial compensation for program coordinators (pg. 6). This is invisible work that should be recognized.

We hope to continue the good work of the department, ever improving and providing more opportunities for growth. We look forward to what comes.

Direct Assessment Instrument for FL Coded Classes								
Course Number and Title:								
Semester/Date:								
Number of Students in Class:								
Instructor:								
Rubrics: Type in each box the number of students in the class whose performance relative to the listed Learner Outcome is described by the label at the top of the column.								
Strong (STR) = outstanding performance in course; exceeds expectations of course performance								
Satisfactory (SAT) = performance that meets the expected level for the course								
Needs Growth (NG) = some need for improvement, although overall performance meets expected level for the course								
Unsatisfactory (UNSAT) = overall performance not acceptable for the course								
Not applicable (NA) = this learning goal is not applicable to the course								
Upon completion of this course, students were able to:								
STR	SAT	NG	UNSAT	NA	Learner Outcomes			
					1a. Understand the language in written form.			
					1b. Understand the language in spoken form.			
					2. Analyze the language grammatically.			
					3a. Use the language in written form.			
					3b. Use the language in spoken form.			
Descriptive Evidence of Performance: Please indicate the source of data used to complete this form. Feel free to add to the list.								
	Quizzes		Papers		Presentations		Tests	
Other (please list):								

Direct Assessment Instrument for LA Coded Classes								
Course Number and Title:								
Semester/Date:								
Number of Students in Class:								
Instructor:								
Rubrics: Type in each box the number of students in the class whose performance relative to the listed Learner Outcome is described by the label at the top of the column.								
Strong (STR) = outstanding performance in course; exceeds expectations of course performance								
Satisfactory (SAT) = performance that meets the expected level for the course								
Needs Growth (NG) = some need for improvement, although overall performance meets expected level for the course								
Unsatisfactory (UNSAT) = overall performance not acceptable for the course								
Not applicable (NA) = this learning goal is not applicable to the course								
Upon completion of this course, students were able to:								
STR	SAT	NG	UNSAT	NA	Learner Outcomes			
					1a. Ability to understand the language in written form.			
					1b. Ability to understand the language in spoken form.			
					2. Ability to analyze the language grammatically.			
					3a. Ability to use the language in written form.			
					3b. Ability to use the language in spoken form.			
Descriptive Evidence of Performance: Please indicate the source of data used to complete this form. Feel free to add to the list.								
	Grades		Papers		Presentations		Exams	
Other (please list):								