

2018-2019 Annual Program Assessment Report Guide

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College, and to james.solomon@csun.edu, Director of the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review, by **September 30, 2019**. You may, but are not required to, submit a separate report for each program, including graduate degree programs, which conducted assessment activities, or you may combine programs in a single report. **Please include this form with your report in the same file and identify your department/program in the file name.**

College: Humanities

Department: Linguistics/TESL

Program: B.A. Linguistics

Assessment liaison: Tineke Scholten

1. Please check off whichever is applicable:

- A. Measured student work within program major/options.
- B. Analyzed results of measurement within program major/options.
- C. Applied results of analysis to program review/curriculum/review/revision major/options.
- D. Focused exclusively on the direct assessment measurement of General Education Arts and Humanities student learning outcomes

2. Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s). On a separate sheet, provide a brief overview of this year's assessment activities, including:

- an explanation for why your department chose the assessment activities (measurement, analysis, application, or GE assessment) that it enacted
- if your department implemented assessment **option A**, identify which program SLOs were assessed (please identify the SLOs in full), in which classes and/or contexts, what assessment instruments were used and the methodology employed, the resulting scores, and the relation between this year's measure of student work and that of past years: (include as an appendix any and all relevant materials that you wish to include)
- if your department implemented assessment **option B**, identify what conclusions were drawn from the analysis of measured results, what changes to the program were planned in response, and the relation between this year's analyses and past and future assessment activities
- if your department implemented **option C**, identify the program modifications that were adopted, and the relation between program modifications and past and future assessment activities
- if your program implemented **option D**, exclusively or simultaneously with **options A, B, and/or C**, identify the basic skill(s) assessed and the precise learning outcomes assessed, the assessment instruments and methodology employed, and the resulting scores
- in what way(s) your assessment activities may reflect the university's commitment to diversity in all its dimensions but especially with respect to underrepresented groups
- any other assessment-related information you wish to include, including SLO revision (especially to ensure continuing alignment between program course offerings and both program and university student learning outcomes), and/or the creation and modification of new assessment instruments

3. Preview of planned assessment activities for 2019-20. Include a brief description as reflective of a continuous program of ongoing assessment.

Overview of Assessment Activities 2018-19

The department participated in the assessment of the student learning outcomes for the GE Section Arts and Humanities. The department offers one GE class in this section, *LING 200, (How) Language Matters*. Of the following GE Arts and Humanities SLOs, the ones in bold were assessed:

Students will:

1. Explain and reflect critically upon the human search for meaning, values, discourse and expression in one or more eras/stylistic periods or cultures.
- 2. Analyze, interpret and reflect critically upon ideas of value, meaning, discourse and expression from a variety of perspectives from the arts and/or humanities.**
3. Produce work/works of art that communicate to a diverse audience through a demonstrated understanding and fluency of expressive forms.
4. Demonstrate ability to engage and reflect upon their intellectual and creative development within the arts and humanities.
5. Use appropriate critical vocabulary to describe and analyze works of artistic expression, literature, philosophy or religion and a comprehension of the historical context within which a body of work was created or a tradition emerged.
- 6. Describe and explain the historical and/or cultural context within which a body of work was created or a tradition emerged.**

Students in LING 200 were given a graded assignment that required them to analyze the social commentary embedded in a brief Chris Rock monologue taken from his introduction to the 'Best Animated Feature' category at the 2012 Academy Awards. The monologue connects racial discrimination in the voice-over industry with misconceptions about African American actors and African American English; misconceptions that are perpetuated through the industry's practices. Two faculty members not teaching the course rated the responses from 40 students in one of the sections of LING 200 in Spring of 2019 with help of a rubric that was tailored to the assignment and to the GE SLOs in Arts and Humanities. Results were averaged and are summarized below:

CRITERION	Points on scale 4-1, with 4 outstanding and 1 marginal
1. The student accurately identifies socially relevant linguistic/dialect features that Rock uses to highlight differences between the speech of a studio worker and the speech of Rock when voice-acting.	2.31
2. The student accurately explains why the selected feature(s) are socially relevant in terms of race and voice-acting roles.	1.98
3. The student accurately relates Rock's examples to Hill's insights on race and language.	1.84

The faculty discussed these results during its September Linguistics/TESL department meeting. It was noted that many students missed crucial aspects of the social commentary in the monologue and did not effectively relate the monologue to course content about language discrimination. Since this is a lower division class where the SLOs are to be “introduced”, the overall results may in fact be inline with what one should expect at this level; however, it is clear that the students in general are not meeting these SLOs with this one class. To determine whether the course is effective in addressing the GE as well as the Linguistics/TESL B.A. program’s SLOs a “value added” approach might be a better assessment design. It would be interesting to find out whether the students’ demonstrated significant progress by comparing their responses to a survey about language discrimination administered at the beginning and at the end of the semester.

Assessment Activities and the University’s Commitment to Diversity

The Linguistics/TESL Department strives to provide a comprehensive and well-thought-out curriculum that strongly emphasizes independent and critical thinking. Moreover, the Linguistics/TESL Department faculty requires that its students closely examine commonly held beliefs about language use and language acquisition that directly affect societal opinions about the merits of (typically economically disadvantaged) groups of language users. (See, for example, this year’s analysis of the Chris Rock monologue.) To meet the SLOs for the B.A. in linguistics, a thorough appreciation and understanding of diversity in the context of language variation and acquisition is required.

Additional Assessment Activities

Assessment is on the agenda of every monthly faculty meeting. During 2018-19, the faculty has made significant progress in reviewing the SLOs of all undergraduate courses. The goal is to determine whether the current course objectives are clear, realistic, and reflect the faculty’s current beliefs as to what each course is to accomplish, whether there is any overlap between courses and where that is a positive or where it should be avoided. The department plans to complete this process in the upcoming academic year for the undergraduate courses before revisiting the course objectives of its graduate programs.

Preview of Planned Assessment Activities for 2019-20

As mentioned earlier, the department intends to continue its evaluation of the current course offerings for its B.A. as well as for its M.A. programs. Intrinsicly connected to this is a discussion of how each course aligns to the department’s B.A. student learning outcomes. Based on this discussion, the department plans to identify key questions regarding the efficacy of its current program and derive from that a plan for direct assessment in the upcoming academic years.