# Annual Assessment Report to the College 2008-2009

**College:** Humanities  
**Department:** ________________________  
**Program:** Linguistics

Note: Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator and to the Associate Dean of your College by September 30, 2009. You may submit a separate report for each program which conducted assessment activities.

**Liaison:** Tineke Scholten

## 1. Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. <strong>Assessment Process Overview:</strong> Provide a brief overview of the intended plan to assess the program this year. Is assessment under the oversight of one person or a committee?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Following a 5-year plan of assessment, the program committee decided in the fall of 2008 to assess the extent to which two program SLOs are being met by our undergraduate linguistics majors. Since the program does not have an exit exam or other culminating activity and does not require students to take courses in a specific sequence, the program committee decided to draw assessment data from the two classes that most directly address the two selected SLOs. A small subcommittee that included the current instructors of these two classes was formed to work out specifics. Data were gathered and results were presented to the linguistics committee for review and evaluation in September of 09.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1b. <strong>Implementation and Modifications:</strong> Did the actual assessment process deviate from what was intended? If so, please describe any modification to your assessment process and why it occurred.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project: Answer questions according to the individual SLO assessed this year. If you assessed an additional SLO, report in the next chart below.
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2a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?

SLO3: Demonstrate a familiarity with the study of language in context in such fields as sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis.

2b. What assessment instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?

A rubric was developed by the assessment subcommittee tailored to the evaluation of this SLO as well as SLO6 (see below).

2c. Describe the participants sampled to assess this SLO: discuss sample/participant and population size for this SLO. For example, what type of students, which courses, how decisions were made to include certain participants.

All undergraduate linguistic majors that were enrolled in Ling 408 (Semantics and Pragmatics) and Ling 441 (Sociolinguistics) were part of the sample. The total number of students polled from Ling 441 was 20 and from Ling 408, 25. Graduate students and non-majors were excluded from the sample.

2d. Describe the assessment design methodology: For example, was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.

Considering the small size and nature of the linguistics program (no cohorts), a longitudinal approach to data assessment is not feasible nor is it feasible to compare freshmen and seniors; students’ performance relative to the SLO was assessed towards the end of the semester in which the students took the two courses that most directly addressed the SLO.

2e. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO: Provide a summary of how the data were analyzed and highlight important findings from the data collected.

The instructors of the two courses selected relevant course assignments (papers) and scored all students based on the constructed rubric. The rubric distinguished between knowledge of concepts, knowledge of research findings and data analysis. An average score was calculated for each criteria of the rubric. Overall, students scored quite high in both classes, indicating that the SLO is generally met. On a scale of 1-4, the average score in both courses ranged between 3 and 4 with 4 showing the highest level of competency.

2f. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO: Think about all the different ways the results were or will be used. For example, to recommend changes to course content/topics covered, course sequence, addition/deletion of courses in program, student support services, revisions to program SLO’s, assessment instruments, academic programmatic changes, assessment plan changes, etc. Please provide a clear and detailed
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Results of the assessment were discussed in the linguistics program meeting in September 09. Despite the overall positive results, it was decided that a few ongoing limitations of the linguistics program were reaffirmed during this study: 1. The program lacks an in depth introduction to linguistics exclusively for linguistics majors as a prerequisite for its 400 level classes, which negatively affects the entry level for those 400 level courses; 2. While familiarity with Discourse Analysis is included in the current statement of SLO 3, the program is unable at present to devote enough resources to this subject at the undergraduate level. 3. The distinction between SLOs 3 and 6 is difficult to draw and the program committee is considering reformulating the program SLOs to address this overlap in the future.

Some programs assess multiple SLOs each year. If your program assessed an additional SLO, report the process for that individual SLO below. If you need additional SLO charts, please cut & paste the empty chart as many times as needed. If you did NOT assess another SLO, skip this section.

2a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?
SLO6: Recognize and understand how sociocultural diversity manifests itself in language

2b. What assessment instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?
A rubric was developed by the subcommittee tailored to the evaluation of this SLO as well as SLO6 (see above).

2c. Describe the participants sampled to assess this SLO: discuss sample/participant and population size for this SLO. For example, what type of students, which courses, how decisions were made to include certain participants.
All undergraduate majors that were enrolled in Ling 408 (Semantics and Pragmatics) and Ling 441 (Sociolinguistics) were part of the sample. The total number of students polled from Ling 441 was 20 and from Ling 408, 25. Graduate students and non-majors were excluded from the sample.

2d. Describe the assessment design methodology: Was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.
Considering the small size and nature of the linguistics program (no cohorts), a longitudinal approach to data assessment is not feasible nor is it feasible to compare freshmen and seniors; students’ performance relative to the SLO was assessed towards the end of the semester in which the students took the two courses that most directly addressed the SLO.
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2e. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO: Provide a summary of how the data were analyzed and highlight important findings from the data collected.

The instructors of the two courses selected relevant course assignments (papers) and scored all students based on the constructed rubric. An average score was calculated for each criteria of the rubric. Overall, students scored quite high in both classes, indicating that the SLO is met. On a scale of 1-4, the average score in both courses ranged between 3.8 and 4 with 4 showing the highest level of competency.

2f. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO: Think about all the different ways the results were (or could be) used. For example, to recommend changes to course content/topics covered, course sequence, addition/deletion of courses in program, student support services, revisions to program SLO's, assessment instruments, academic programmatic changes, assessment plan changes, etc. Please provide a clear and detailed description of each.

Results of the assessment were discussed in the linguistics program meeting in September 09. Despite the overall positive results, it was decided that a few ongoing limitations of the linguistics program were reaffirmed during this study: 1. The program lacks an in depth introduction to linguistics exclusively for linguistics majors as a prerequisite for its 400 level classes, which negatively affects the entry level for those 400 level courses; 2. While familiarity with Discourse Analysis is included in the current statement of SLO 3, the program is unable at present to devote enough resources to this subject at the undergraduate level. 3. The distinction between SLOs 3 and 6 is difficult to draw and the program committee is considering reformulating the program SLOs to address this overlap in the future.

3. How do your assessment activities connect with your department’s strategic plan?

An updated strategic plan is currently under construction. The program committee considers assessment through data collection and analysis as well as through the evaluation of informally gathered experiential data of vital importance to the continued success of the program.

4. Overall, if this year’s program assessment evidence indicates that new resources are needed in order to improve and support student learning, please discuss here.

The program has been struggling to keep the class size of its core courses at a level that ensures a quality learning experience to the students. One of these core courses, Ling 408, provided the data for this assessment. Despite the overall positive results of this assessment, it was felt by
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the instructor of this class that a smaller class size would have allowed several struggling students much needed support.

5. **Other information, assessment or reflective activities not captured above.**

The program has made significant progress in 2008-2009 towards the development of a clear and effective assessment structure: 1. A revision of the alignment between Course Objectives and Curriculum was developed and adopted by the program committee in May of 09, 2. Faculty has proposed and evaluated Course Objectives for all currently taught linguistics courses and the program is committed to ensuring that faculty includes course objectives in all their syllabi. 3. Alignment between Course Objectives and SLOs was also established and approved by the program committee. 4. A dedicated Assessment U-drive was created to ensure easy access and tracking of relevant assessment documents.

6. Has someone in your program completed, submitted or published a manuscript which uses or describes assessment activities in your program? Please provide citation or discuss.

No
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