Annual Assessment Report to the University 2007-2008

Academic Year: 2007-2008    Liaison: Barbara Kroll
Department: Linguistics     College: Humanities

Program of this report: BA
Note: If you have multiple programs for which it is difficult to compile one report, submit a separate report for each.

Answer each question for which you have information; otherwise leave blank. Be concise! The form fields are limited to 3000 characters (roughly half a single-spaced page). Please use 10 point type.

1. Give a brief overview of the significant assessment-related activities for the program this year. Particularly focus on relevant information that is not captured in any of the questions below (e.g., unanticipated turns, refining assessment tools, why changes to SLOs were needed, etc.).

We focused on assessing a single SLO this year, the most broad-based of our program SLO's. The Linguistics Committee found it challenging to assess the SLO we selected for analysis because it cuts across several different fields of linguistics. In other words, in comparison to the SLO we assessed last year that focused on communication skills within the field of linguistics, this year we were assessing whether students could demonstrate knowledge of core linguistic fields that are studied in several different courses. Not unexpectedly, we find that students perform better in some subject matter areas than others due to variations in interest level, study skill habits, and effort.

We determined that the knowledge required to fulfill the SLO under review was presented in three of our core courses: LING 402, LING 404, and LING 408. We then identified 5 BA students who were enrolled in all three core classes during the 2007-2008 academic year. The teacher of each course evaluated a representative sample of student performance in each of the three courses according to a 4-point rubric, in which students were determined to demonstrate Excellent (4), Good (3), Adequate (2) or Weak or Absent (1) understanding in that core field.

2. If you have made any changes to your SLOs this year, please paste in the entire list here. This information will be used to update the SLO webpage on the Assessment website. If you have made no changes, skip this question.

No changes
3. Fill in the chart. Please list the SLO or SLOs that you evaluated this year, the tool or tools that you used to evaluate each SLO (e.g., embedded questions, rubric), and a brief summary of the results, focusing on how they met your expectations of student learning for this SLO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Tool or tools</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand what linguists mean by “knowing a human language” by demonstrating knowledge of such core fields as phonetics phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics.</td>
<td>Teachers in three separate courses reviewed a representative sample of work from each of five students who were enrolled in each of the three courses and rated the work on a 4-point scale ranging from Excellent to Weak or Absent understanding of the core field.</td>
<td>Student performance was varied in each of the three courses. Three students achieved average scores at the “good” or better range while two students had scores that were “adequate” or slightly better than adequate. Using these averages, we can determine that the average overall performance across courses was 2.72, which is just below the “good” range.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Completing the assessment loop.** If this year’s activities included assessment of programmatic changes that were made based upon previous assessment of this SLO, answer this question. Otherwise, skip to the next question. Fill in the chart to show how the programmatic changes based on assessment data have impacted student learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Semester/year change was implemented</th>
<th>Brief description of change</th>
<th>Impact of change based on new assessment results from this year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5. Based on faculty discussion of the assessment results of this year’s activities, what changes are being considered to improve student learning in the program? Faculty recognize that further discussion is needed to clarify the construct of the SLO itself so that students who receive a BA in Linguistics will have a strong sense not only of "what it means to know a human language" but of how they can explain their understanding of this phrase and how they can demonstrate their knowledge within a linguistic framework.

6. Describe resource needs to improve and support student learning that you have identified based on your assessment evidence. Access to tutors able to help students understand basic linguistics concepts in phonetics/phonology, morphology/syntax, and semantics/pragmatics might allow more students to achieve higher levels of understanding as they undertake their studies.

7. If anyone in your program has submitted a manuscript this year that includes assessment data from the program or information about program assessment activities, please check the box and someone will contact you for further information. You can also add information about publications in the form field if you wish.

[ ]

N/A