Annual Assessment Report to the College 2009-2010

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, 2010. 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. Assessment Process Overview:</th>
<th>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>The Linguistics Program Committee decided on a procedure for data collection and assessment, following the 5-year Program Assessment Plan that is in place. After an outline of the procedure for data collection and evaluation was approved by the entire committee, a subcommittee of two faculty members and the Assessment Coordinator was appointed to fine-tune and execute the assessment plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1b. Implementation and Modifications:</th>
<th>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>
<td></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?

This year’s plan was to assess SLO 6: (Students will) define the connections between linguistic study and its practical applications.

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

All instructors teaching a 400 level class (402, 404, 408 and 417) included the same embedded question in one of their assignments (final exam or other) towards the end of the spring semester. To ensure that students answered the question to the best of their abilities, instructors assigned some form of credit to the question.

The embedded question:

Describe how what you have learned in this course about linguistics has practical applications. In order to do this:

1. Cite actual linguistic content material (theories, insights) from this course and
2. Describe concretely how this material helps prepare someone for a particular career or for a number of careers. You could refer to careers in education or in any other area that seems relevant to you.

### 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 Linguistics Majors who were enrolled in a 400 level class in the Spring of 2010 were included in the study. The program (until recently) only offered 400-level courses in linguistics. The population sizes were as follows: Ling 402 (n=23), 404 (n=22) 408 (n=25) and 417 (n=4). Considering the relatively small number of students involved, it was possible to include all students, rather than select a 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.

Since our program is unable to offer its courses in a sequential format, and since all our students are at the junior or senior level when taking linguistics classes a longitudinal study or a cross-sectional comparison is not possible.

### 2e. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO:

Provide a summary of how the data were analyzed and highlight important findings from the data collected.

Students’ responses were evaluated in terms of how well they established a connection between a mentioned career and relevant linguistic content material. A rubric ranging from “excellent” to “good” to “weak” to “absent” (no connection) was used. A course “GPA” was derived by assigning 4-1 points to the columns in the rubric and computing a weighted average.
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It was noted that some students opted to mention a range of careers in which case they also did not typically specify in detail how these careers related to the course material. For that reason, a course GPA was also calculated for just those students who opted to discuss the relevance of only one career relative to the course content. The results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade: one Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LING 402 (n=23)</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.07 (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING 404 (n=22)</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.75 (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING 408 (n=25)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.31 (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING 417 (n=4)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students mentioned the following careers or other connections in order of frequency. The number of times each career was mentioned is indicated in parentheses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>CAREER REFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LING 402 (n=23)</td>
<td>ESL Teaching (16), Speech Pathology (5) Elementary School Teaching (2) Theater/Coaching (2), Accent Modification (1), Medical (1), Journalism (1), Learning an L2 for career (1), Research (Field work) (1), Law (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING 404 (n=22)</td>
<td>Teaching Academic English (8), ESL Teaching (6), ASL Interpreting (3), Science (Scientific Thinking) (3), Court Interpreting (1), Creating Fictional Languages (1), Journalism (1), Research (Language Documentation) (1), Law (1), Political Analysis (1), Speech Pathology (1), Teaching (1), Technical Writing (1), Writing Poetry (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING 408 (n=25)</td>
<td>ESL Teaching (6), ASL Interpreting (5), Law (5), Marketing and PR (4), Personal Life (4) Research (3), Business/HR Departments (2), Communication Oriented Careers (2), Theater and Comedy (2), Politics (1), Counseling (1), Culturally Diverse Work Places (1), Editing/Technical Writing (1), Translation (1), Workplace (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING 417</td>
<td>ESL Teaching (3), ASL Interpreting (1), Elementary School Teaching (1), Personal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall the tone of the responses was positive. Students professed invariably that the course had been extremely relevant.

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 description of how the assessment results were or will be used.

Although the assessment results were excellent and demonstrated that our students draw meaningful connections between theoretical linguistic concepts and potential careers, the study highlights the importance of clarifying those connections to our students wherever possible. While strictly not part of the data collection, the study also draws attention to the importance of conveying to Lower Division CSUN students the relevance of linguistics to a wide ranging set of disciplines and careers. To that end the program has and will continue to develop courses that meet the needs of the broader CSUN population. The Linguistics Program Committee did not find any other programmatic changes necessary at this point.

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?

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

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.

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.

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

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
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program SLO’s, assessment instruments, academic programmatic changes, assessment plan changes, etc. Please provide a clear and detailed description of each.

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

   The program intends to formulate its strategic plan later this year.

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.**

   Does not apply.

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

   Difficulties in assessing two SLOs in the previous academic year prompted the program committee to revisit the wording and organization of all its SLOs. The program committee has restructured and adopted a less ambiguous wording of its program SLOs in the Spring of 2010. The 5-year Program Assessment Plan has also been updated and course alignment has been brought in accordance with the new versions of the program SLOs.

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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