

Asian Studies: Assessment Plan

*The Asian studies program is still quite new to the department. We have been examining the learning objectives and how to best assess them. Our plan is to move to the three learning objectives noted below. We are going to create a new capstone course for Asian Studies majors. We will submit that new course proposal in the fall of 2018. In that class the students will be required to produce a major paper and have an interview with a faculty member. Using the rubrics provided at the end of this document each of the objectives will be assessed for the graduating students. In addition we will continue to contact our Asian Studies recent graduates to get their feedback on how well they believe the objectives were met.

Asian Studies: Learning Objectives

Students will be:

1. able to apply an Asian language at intermediate low or above level to gather information, evaluate and discuss literary and media sources.
2. able to develop insights about diverse Asian cultures, communities and peoples through examination of Asian literatures, cultures, and civilizations.
3. able to articulate a situated and comparative understanding of diverse Asian communities and countries by examining the historical background and socio-cultural norms of Asian countries and civilizations.

Utah State University Asian Studies Major Rubric for Assessment

I. Language Skills and Competence Rubric Based on ACTFL

***Note:** The following rubric is based on American Council on the Teaching Foreign Languages (ACTFL) standards for reading, writing, listening and speaking. Each student's work is assessed with regards to Objective 1 on a point scale of 1 to 4 (with 4 being the highest). If needed, instructors may consult assessment language in the most updated full-length ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines (2012) at www.actfl.org

	4 [Advanced Low]	3 [Intermediate High]	2 [Intermediate Mid]	1 [Intermediate Low]
Linguistic accuracy and comprehensibility (Writing)	Writer has some problems with basic grammar usage or is inconsistent. Frequently uses slang terms or lacks formal, academic, or professional style. Reader can understand less than half of what the writer is trying to communicate.	Writer makes a significant number of basic errors in language usage, such as basic conjugations, present tense, agreements, etc. Lacks appropriate formal, academic, or professional style.	Writers at the Intermediate Mid sublevel are able to meet a number of practical writing needs. They can write short, simple communications, compositions, and requests for information in loosely connected texts about personal preferences, daily routines, common events, and other personal topics.	Writers at the Intermediate Low sublevel are able to meet some limited practical writing needs. They can create statements and formulate questions based on familiar material. Most sentences are combinations of learned vocabulary and structures. These are short and simple conversational-style sentences with basic word order.
Linguistic accuracy and comprehensibility (Reading)	Readers understand the main ideas, and some supporting details. Comprehension may often derive primarily from situational and subject-matter knowledge. Readers at this level will be challenged to comprehend more complex texts.	Readers are able to understand short, non-complex texts that convey basic information and deal with personal and social topics to which the reader brings personal interest or knowledge. These readers are also able to understand some connected texts featuring description and narration although there will be occasional gaps in understanding.	At the Intermediate Mid sublevel, readers are able to understand short, non-complex texts that convey basic information and deal with basic personal and social topics to which the reader brings personal interest or knowledge, although some misunderstandings may occur.	At the Intermediate Low sublevel, readers are able to understand some information from the simplest connected texts dealing with a limited number of personal and social needs, although there may be frequent misunderstandings. Readers at this level will be challenged to derive meaning from connected texts of any length.
Linguistic accuracy and comprehensibility (Speaking)	Speaker demonstrate the ability to narrate and describe in the major time frames of past, present, and future in paragraph-length discourse with some control of aspect. Speaker is able to participate in most informal and some formal conversations. Speech is typically marked by a certain grammatical roughness.	Speaker can narrate and describe in all major time frames using connected discourse of paragraph length. Speaker is able to handle successfully uncomplicated tasks and social situations requiring an exchange of basic information. When the speaker attempts to perform Advanced level tasks, their speech exhibits certain features of gaps and failure.	Speakers at the Intermediate Mid sublevel are able to handle successfully a variety of uncomplicated communicative tasks in straightforward social situations. Conversation is generally limited to those predictable and concrete exchanges necessary for survival in the target culture.	Speakers at the Intermediate Low sublevel are able to handle successfully a limited number of uncomplicated communicative tasks by creating with the language in straightforward social situations. Conversation is restricted to some of the concrete exchanges and predictable topics necessary for survival in the target-language culture. These topics relate to basic personal information
Linguistic accuracy and comprehensibility (Listening)	Listeners are able to understand short conventional narrative and descriptive texts with a clear underlying structure though their comprehension may be	Listeners are able to understand, with ease and confidence, simple sentence-length speech in basic personal and social contexts. They can derive substantial	At the Intermediate Mid sublevel, listeners are able to understand simple, sentence-length speech, one utterance at a time, in a variety of basic personal and	At the Intermediate Low sublevel, listeners are able to understand some information from sentence-length speech, one utterance at a time, in basic personal and

	uneven. The listener understands the main facts and some supporting details. Comprehension may often derive primarily from situational and subject-matter knowledge.	meaning from some connected texts typically understood by Advanced-level listeners although there often will be gaps in understanding due to a limited knowledge of the vocabulary and structures of the spoken language.	social contexts. Comprehension is most often accurate with highly familiar and predictable topics although a few misunderstandings may occur.	social contexts, though comprehension is often uneven.
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

II. Critical Thinking and Methodology Rubric

***Note:** This rubric is based on and amplified from Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) Critical

Thinking Value Rubric. **Definition:** “Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration

of issues, ideas, artifacts and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.”

[for more information, please contact value@aacu.org].

	4	3	2	1
Explanation of issues	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, and uses relevant information necessary for understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and examined so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined and ambiguous, and backgrounds unexplored.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
Evidence [Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion]	Information is taken from source(s) with substantial interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent and comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Findings from the literature are questioned thoroughly	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Findings from the literature are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Findings from the literature are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Findings from the literature are taken as fact without question.
Context and reflections on assumptions	Thoroughly, symmetrically and methodically analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a	Identifies and questions own and others' assumptions. Evaluates several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies some assumptions but may be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa). Identifies some relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Shows an emerging awareness of assumptions but sometimes labels assertions as assumptions. Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.

	position.			
Students' perspectives, thesis and hypothesis	Specific perspective, thesis and hypothesis are sophisticated, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of perspective, thesis and hypothesis are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within perspective and thesis/hypothesis.	Specific perspective, thesis and hypothesis take into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within perspective, thesis and hypothesis.	Specific perspective, thesis and hypothesis acknowledge different sides of an issue.	Specific perspective, thesis and hypothesis are stated, but are simplistic and obvious.
Conclusions and related outcomes	Conclusions and outcomes are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information, since information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion; some related outcomes are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes are oversimplified.

III. Historical Context Analysis Rubric

***Note:** This rubric is based on the rubric for upper-division classes of USU History Department [at this link](#) with slight format condensation of subcategories under the three major areas of learning outcomes [historical knowledge, historical thinking, historical skills] to keep formal consistency with other rubrics of the Asian Studies Major.

Learning outcome	4. Excellent Mastery	3. Good Mastery	2. Some Mastery	1. Minimal Mastery
------------------	----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------

<p>Historical knowledge</p>	<p>Student's paper displays clear chronological understanding of events; complex grasp of historical relationships; analyzes a range of factors shaping the sequence and outcome of events; situates issues within larger contexts; reflects on larger themes informing specific events.</p>	<p>Sound chronological framework; good grasp of historical relationships; omits some key informing factors shaping events; some effort at contextualizing the question; proposes a sufficient range of larger themes.</p>	<p>Some chronological confusion; weak causal analysis; narrow range of informing factors in the discussion; weak contextualization; little discussion of broader themes.</p>	<p>Many chronological errors; simplistic causal analysis; few informing factors tied to the discussion; little to no discussion of wider context of events; thin discussion of wider themes.</p>
<p>Historical Thinking</p> <p>1) Student addresses historical questions in a thoughtful, critical manner</p> <p>2) Student evaluates and analyzes primary sources effectively</p>	<p>The paper addresses the questions posed in an especially insightful manner. Focuses on critical analysis rather than mere description. Key terms defined. Student clarifies the significance of the question. The response is conceptually strong, logically formulated, and precisely stated.</p> <p>Demonstrates thorough awareness of origins, authors, <i>contexts</i> of primary sources; consciously employs verification strategies as needed; complex analysis of sources. Thorough, fair-minded, and informed assessment of sources, summarizing main ideas clearly and accurately; raises historically legitimate critiques concerning the beliefs/main arguments of historical subjects.</p>	<p>The paper addresses the questions posed in a very informed manner. Focus rests largely on critical analysis. Key terms usually defined. Responses posed with minimal logical flaws in framing of the question; offers evidence for claims.</p> <p>Demonstrates some awareness of contexts of primary sources; employs some verification strategies; sound analysis of sources. At some points, critical analysis remains either inappropriate or misinformed.</p>	<p>The paper addresses the questions posed in a reasonable manner. Focus shifts between critical analysis and mere description. Some key terms left undefined. Does not clarify significance of questions. Lapses in logical framing of the question. Vague, unsupported assertions.</p> <p>Offers partial evaluation of primary sources; spotty verification; at times departs from subject's historical context; not all claims supported by the evidence. Critical analysis often unfair, irrelevant, misinformed, or unsubstantiated</p>	<p>Significance of questions not demonstrated; commentary is largely descriptive rather than analytical; key terms often undefined; the central points in the paper are of inappropriate scope or illogically presented; frequently relies on sweeping generalizations</p> <p>Little evaluation of primary sources; no verification; imposes contemporary judgments on historical material; sources usually do not support interpretive weight placed upon them. Critical analysis commonly unfair, irrelevant, misinformed, or unsubstantiated.</p>
<p>Historical Skills</p> <p>1) Organization of argument</p> <p>2) Well-substantiated argument; proper citation of evidence</p> <p>3) Mechanics</p>	<p>Responses to questions addressed in a succinct and comprehensible manner; clear framework for analyzing the questions; argument unfolds through a logical sequence of points; excellent transitions.</p> <p>The writer correctly and thoroughly cites sources for specific arguments.</p> <p>Spelling, punctuation, grammar all correct; proper sentence and paragraph construction</p>	<p>Structure of the argument is sound, understandable, and appropriate to the project. Good transitions.</p> <p>Usually cites sources; however, some gaps in citation, errors in their construction</p> <p>Occasional errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence & paragraph construction; not severe enough to hinder an understanding of the paper's main points.</p>	<p>Difficult to detect a logical sequence to the points raised in the paper. Weak transitions between parts of argument.</p> <p>Offers partial citation for arguments made in the paper; spotty verification</p> <p>Weaknesses in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence & paragraph construction make sections of the paper unintelligible.</p>	<p>Difficult to determine the meaning, appropriateness, or significance of the response. Sequence of points raised in the argument remains episodic, confused, puzzling.</p> <p>Offers little to no citation of primary sources; no verification.</p> <p>Problems in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence & paragraph construction make sections of the paper unintelligible.</p>

