**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: M.A. in Linguistics and M.A. in TESLAssessment liaison: Tineke Scholten**

1. **Please check off whichever is applicable:**

**A. \_\_\_\_x\_\_\_ Measured student work within program major/options.**

**B. \_\_\_\_x\_\_\_ 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**

1. **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
1. **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 (cf. Option A)

In 2017-18, the department executed a pilot study to determine whether the portfolios that our graduating M.A. students submit for their culminating experience provides the relevant data for program assessment. Selected faculty assessed the portfolios and poster presentations of students in the Spring 18 semester with help of a rubric tailored to the SLOs of the students’ M.A. programs. This was found to be the most effective way to assess our students’ performance relative to most of the department’s desired student learning outcomes. The department therefore implemented this method to assess the portfolios of 14 M.A.-TESL students during the 2018-19 academic year. (Assessment of M.A.-LING portfolios was postponed until the 2019-20 academic year.) Each portfolio was rated by minimally two faculty members. Ratings were as follows:

4 = SLO is clearly met

3 = SLO is largely met but there are some potential areas of concern

2 = borderline

1 = SLO is clearly not met

The results are summarized in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcomes M.A.-TESL** | **Average Rating** |
| 1. *Demonstrates a basic knowledge of linguistic theory in phonetics, phonology, morphology, and syntax.*
 | N/A |
| 1. *Demonstrates a solid knowledge of TESL theory and methodology.*
 | 3.08 |
| 1. *Demonstrates an understanding of how theories of language structure and theories of language in context and pedagogy can be applied in teaching language.*
 | 3.0 |
| 1. *Demonstrates the ability to read, analyze, and critically evaluate research and demonstrate a high level of critical thinking and problem solving.*
 | 2.85 |
| 1. *Demonstrate skills in the design of TESL testing and assessment as well as TESL curriculum development.*
 | 2.7 |

## Evaluation of Assessment Procedure and Results (cf. Option B)

These results were discussed during the September meeting of the Linguistic/TESL faculty. A qualitative evaluation of the student’s portfolios continues to be a valuable avenue to evaluate whether the current course offerings and content of these courses effectively prepare our graduate students. For now, no changes in the curriculum are considered. The faculty observed that, while the portfolios do provide data to measure how well students are able to apply their knowledge of linguistics and TESL when creating lesson plans and proposing curricula (See SLO #3 above), the portfolios do not allow us to evaluate how well students are able to execute lesson plans. For that reason, the department intends to design a procedure that evaluates its TESL students’ actual teaching efficacy in the classroom in the upcoming academic year.

## 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. To meet the SLOs for the M.A.s in TESL and Linguistics, a thorough appreciation and understanding of diversity in the context of language variation and acquisition is required.

## Preview of Planned Assessment Activities for 2019-20

The department intends to review the Course Objectives for its two M.A. programs and update them where necessary. Time permitting, the department will also re-evaluate how the core courses in the curriculum align with the SLOs of the respective programs. An evaluation of the portfolios of M.A.-Ling students is also planned for the upcoming academic year and a preliminary evaluation of our M.A. TESL students teaching skills (cf. M.A. TESL SLO 3).