April 30, 2009

To: Manjari Ohala, Chair  
Department of Linguistics and Language Development

From: Mike Adams, Interim Associate Dean  
College of Humanities and the Arts

Subject: College Curriculum Committee Report on the 
Linguistics and Language Development Program 
Review

Per Section V (A) of University Policy S96-10 the Curriculum Committee for the College of Humanities and the Arts provisionally accepts the plan with suggestions for improvement outlined in the following report.

The College Curriculum Committee would like to commend the Department of Linguistics and Language Development for drafting a comprehensive, candid and self-reflective analysis of its programs and services. The Committee is equally impressed by the Department’s addressing and implementing, whenever feasible, suggestions or changes proposed in the previous and current Program Review. The external reviewers noted that the Department is “harmonious and energetic” and that it is enjoying a greater reputation both in and outside the Bay Area. As the self-study aptly notes, the Department is unique in the region for its degree offerings: “The LLD Department has the only program in the San Francisco Bay Area to offer an MA TESOL degree (and a TESOL Certificate).” The Department has also been successful in placing its MA students in Linguistics in PhD programs. As the self-study points out, this may partly be the result of the “required course list [being] more similar to the PhD granting institutions … than to other CSU campuses.” Although the number of respondents is limited, alumni survey results are overall positive showing an upward trend.

Through its various undergraduate and graduate degree programs (Linguistics and TESOL), courses in the Academic English program, lower and upper-division GE offerings, minor and certificate programs (TESOL and Computational Linguistics), the Department
student advising, have been resolved, a current .7 Administrative Assistant position still needs to become full-time. The Department also makes a solid case for hiring a part-time technician which would have the added benefit of enhancing the Department’s and the students’ technologically mediated exposure and presence on the Web.

With regard to these on-going personnel and workload issues, the paucity of LLD students choosing to write a Master’s thesis is symptomatic of a systemic problem whereby faculty and resources have been spread too thinly. During both its previous and current Program Review, external reviewers urged the Department, and implicitly the College and possibly the Provost’s Office, to collaborate so that release time could be awarded to faculty serving as thesis directors in both the Linguistics and TESOL MA programs according to some pre-established and agreed upon criteria. Without such an incentive, it is no wonder that faculty are reticent about taking on additional thesis advising responsibilities beyond their already overly burdensome workload without any sort of system of recognition in place. In fact, the external reviewers of the current Program Review identified workload issues as their most important recommendation: “Now to our most important recommendation. The workload for full-time tenure-track faculty needs to be redistributed.” Given their heavy loads, it is all the more praiseworthy, as the self-study points out, that the LLD faculty have remained “actively engaged in research and scholarly activities” having made significant contributions to scholarship and professional development during the period under review.

MA/fk

CC: Karl Toepfer, Dean, college of Humanities and the Arts Bob Cooper, AVP, Undergraduate Studies Shailaja Venkatsubramanyan, University Program Planning Committee Liaison
Department of Linguistics and Language Development 2008-2009
Program Planning Committee Report to the Provost
March 19, 2010

The Program Planning Committee commends the Department of Linguistics and Language Development on a thoughtful and well-written self-study on the program. The Department offers the following: B.A. in Linguistics, Minor in Linguistics, M.A. in Linguistics, Certificate in Computational Linguistics, seven GE classes, M.A. in TESOL, Graduate Certificate in TESOL, Undergraduate Certificate in TESOL, service courses and four Academic English courses. The Department of Linguistics and Language Development is commended for its valuable function in the College of Humanities and the Arts and the University.

The Linguistics Department is making good progress on assessment of students learning. The BA and MA programs reported that nearly half of the students' writing skills improved after implementing a draft and feedback policy. The committee urges the program not to drop the draft process because of workload issues. Student performance is more important than time in class, number of assignments or tests, amount of material covered in the course, or many other factors that might be adjusted. Please look creatively at what is working best for students rather than what is "covered" in courses. You could also look creatively at other, less faculty-intensive, options that might serve student needs.

The MA TESOL program reported closing the loop on one of the student learning objectives on the March 1, 2010 assessment report. We congratulate the department on improving student performance on this learning objective, though the results are mixed, statistically.

Instructors can and should participate in assessment (of GE and other courses). Regular course assignments and tests should focus on learning objectives. At least part of student evaluation (grading) should involve student learning objectives that students have been given. That data can also be used to assess student learning in the program or in GE.

The final step in the program planning process is a meeting with the Provost Selter (or his designee), Vice Provost for Academic Administration & Personnel Whitcomb, AVP of Undergraduate Studies Jaehne, AVP of Graduate Studies and Research Stacks, Dean Toepfer, and Department Chair Ohala. The Chair may invite directors of programs within the department. The department should contact Kim Huynh in the Office of Undergraduate Studies to schedule the final meeting. The following topics for discussion are summarized from the reports:

- Adapting Department plans and goals to changing financial and course requirements
- Consideration of culminating experience of graduate programs

If the Department would like to propose other issues for the meeting, please discuss the appropriateness of the topics with your Dean.

The Program Planning Committee recommends acceptance of the self-study. The self-study provided an excellent examination of the issues for subsequent reviewers. The next program plan will be due to your Dean in spring 2013.

2009 - 2010 Program Planning Committee:
Mary Calegari, Chair
Charles Whitcomb
Dennis Jaehne
Pam Stacks
Sutee Sujitparapitaya

Susan McNiesh
Shalaja
Venkatsubramaniam
Chunlei Wang
Lisa Oliver
Xiaolu Hu

Beverly Grindstaff
Debra Caires
Elaine Collins
Robert Cooper
Annabel Prins
Jackie Snell  Gary Stebbins  Carolus Boekema  
Ashwini Wagle  M. E. Fayad  

CC:  
- Dr. Manjari Chala, Chair, Department of Linguistics and Language Development  
- Dr. Karl Toepfer, Dean, College of Humanities and the Arts  
- Dr. Elna Green, Associate Dean, College of Humanities and the Arts  
- Malu Roldan, Chair, Curriculum and Research  
- Dennis Jaehne, AVP Undergraduate Studies  
- Pam Stacks, AVP Graduate Studies and Research  
- Charles Whitcomb, Vice Provost for Academic Administration & Personnel  
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Appendix

Department of Linguistics Self Study

Executive Summary

- Description of the department and its programs:
  - The department of LLD offers programs in Academic English (addresses the needs of students who have not yet mastered college level writing skills in academic English prose), TESOL, Linguistics as well as GE courses.
  - As of December 2007, the department had 2834 students, 8 tenure and tenure track faculty and 44 part time faculty.
  - A major portion of the department FTES (Academic English) is non degree generating.
  - The bulk of the degree program courses are taught by tenure-track faculty.
  - TESOL and the linguistics degree have seen a growth in student numbers.

- Significant additions since last program review include: special sections for business students (including online sessions), phonetics lab, and a Master Teacher program for supervising the teaching assistants.

- Previous program review recommendations implemented (salient points):
  - Staff and space improvements have been taken care of with funding from the Dean and the Provost.
  - Grant writing workshops and release time initiated to help faculty get external grants. However, 2 release considered not sufficient to write grant proposals.
  - Students instructed to get prior permission from advisors before enrolling in electives outside the department in lieu of updating the list of over a hundred elective courses in other departments.
  - A number of TESOL courses now have hands on experience in classroom oriented tasks.
  - The course LLD 250W: Becoming a Professional in Linguistics/TESOL is now a core and not an elective course for the M.A. TESOL.

- Previous suggestions still to be implemented:
  - Several relating to the Computational Linguistics including filling a full time faculty position.
  - A website to attract students to Linguistics.
  - Encouraging the thesis option in the M.A. program left to the choice of the individual faculty member. Given the teaching load of faculty members, it is difficult for them to find the time to guide thesis writing. To meet enrollment targets set by the Dean, getting release time for guiding theses is not feasible.
  - Computer assisted language learning courses for TESOL students
  - Cutting back enrollment numbers in TESOL not considered realistic at our campus.

- Present program review recommendations (salient points):
  - Change the required units within the 36 unit major for the B.A. in Linguistics from 18 to 21.
  - Offer English for Specific Purposes (ESP) in the summer and require all TESOL students to engage in practical training before entering the practicum program and offering computer assisted language learning.
  - Offer additional lower division GE courses.
  - Recruit more students, improve the website and tighten up advising.
  - Hire more tenure track faculty members to teach GE courses, get travel money and release time for faculty, depending on course enrollments and retirements.
- Change the administrative assistant position to full time, get a part time lab technician, improve staffing in the Language Development Center (LDC) and increase journal subscriptions in the library.

**Context and Scope**
- The department of LLD includes three units: Academic English, TESOL, and Linguistics.
- The three units offer three degree programs, three certificate programs, and a number of general education and service courses.
- The department contributes to the mission of SJSU in the following ways:
  - Students who enroll in the department’s courses come from diverse backgrounds. One third of the students are from other countries. The diversity as well as the seminar format of the graduate courses enhances the students’ familiarity with world cultures.
  - The M.A. degrees (TESOL & Linguistics) strive for a balanced combination of knowledge and theory, with the direct application of these constructs. For example, the GE writing course for business students focuses on writing for survival in the corporate culture.
  - The LLD faculty is actively engaged in research and scholarly activities that complement one another’s efforts and that are incorporated into the courses taught.

**Curriculum**
- Linguistics Program
  - The M.A. in Linguistics:
    - Students with Bachelor degrees from a variety of fields, such as English, Art History, Engineering, Management, Foreign Languages, Psychology, and Anthropology, are admitted conditionally into the M.A. in Linguistics program. In addition to coursework, students must fulfill a culminating experience requirement either take six units of thesis work or take the M.A. Comprehensive Exam, usually in their final semester (A great majority of students opt for the comprehensive exam).
  - The B.A. in Linguistics:
    - This is a 120-unit major, but unlike most majors at San José State, this does not require any lower division courses. A great majority of linguistics students enter the program as juniors, having already completed all lower division requirements. In addition to the listed elective courses, with the advisor’s approval, students may choose relevant courses from outside the department to complete their elective requirements. Students are also required to fulfill a foreign language requirement. The B.A. Linguistics – Preparation for Teaching is a concentration under this major offered in collaboration with the Department of English and Comparative Literature.
  - Minor in Linguistics:
    - Students majoring in fields such as Foreign Languages, Communication Studies, English, or Computer Science may choose to minor in Linguistics. The Minor consists of 15 units.
  - Computational Linguistics Certificate:
    - This certificate is intended for students either in the linguistics major or in other majors, such as Computer Science, who would like to show basic preparation in the area of computational linguistics. The certificate consists of 18 units.
  - Curricular changes since last review:
    - A new course, LLD 115: Corpus Linguistics, was added.
    - The curriculum also added LLD 250W: Becoming a professional in Linguistics and TESOL.
  - Miscellaneous points:
    - The core curricula for the B.A., the Minor, and M.A. in Linguistics is more similar to Ph.D. granting institutions than to other CSU campuses.
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Due to curricular bottlenecks, pre-requisites have to be relaxed. Due to this, classes may have to be taught at a lower level.

LLD 166: Sociolinguistics (part of the Undergraduate TESOL certificate) is currently taught every third semester because of insufficient enrollment, and the lack of availability of a faculty member to teach it. This impacts students who are graduating with the Undergraduate TESOL certificate.

The B.A. Linguistics – Preparation for Teaching program has been generally under-enrolled - Only one student has completed this program in the past five years. The main reason for this trend is the large number of units involved in completing this emphasis.

- TESOL program
  - The TESOL Program offers an M.A. TESOL, an undergraduate TESOL certificate, a graduate TESOL certificate, and two service courses.
  - To fulfill concerns related to hands on experience raised in the previous review, students now design and present language lessons to a real ESL class among other options such as tutoring and being teaching associates.
  - Curricular changes since the last review:
    - The English for Specific Purposes (ESP) option which was listed as a significant feature of the program in the last review has been put on “hold” due to inadequate enrollment and the retirement of a faculty member who taught ESP.
    - The content, title, and grading method of LLD 250W has been changed.
    - The weight of student teaching was increased from 25% to 50% in the TESOL Practicum.
  - Comparison to other programs:
    - The LLD-TESOL curriculum addresses language analysis, language learning, and language teaching, including assessment. Other programs focus on one or the other area.
    - The Department of LLD is the only one in the San Francisco Bay Area to offer an M.A. TESOL degree (and a TESOL Certificate).
    - The faculty in the Department of LLD has broad interdisciplinary backgrounds.
  - Curricular bottlenecks
    - Inability to take courses concurrently due to one being the prerequisite for another can possibly lead to delays in graduation.

- Bottlenecks in the Linguistics and TESOL programs
  - Students opting for the thesis option take longer to finish because of the difficulty in finding an advisor willing to chair the thesis committee. Only six students in the past four years have worked on theses in the Department.
  - Electives offered by the department get cancelled due to a lack of enrollment. The department has recently revised their policy to limit the number of courses that the students can take outside the Department to only three units.

- GE and Service Courses
  - During the period under review, the Department has not introduced additional GE courses.
  - Shortage of tenured/tenure-track faculty is already creating staffing, coordination, and supervision problems for existing GE courses.
  - The majority of GE offerings each semester must be taught by part-time faculty who are not expected to put together assessment data required for continuing certification of the courses. One of the three courses that are up for continuing GE certification this year has not had a course coordinator since the Department’s last self-study; another has not had a course coordinator since spring 2005. One tenured faculty member reassigned time of .07 (equivalent to one-third of a 3-credit course) to serve as GE coordinator for all of the Department’s GE courses.
Some of the upper division GE courses face enrollment problems due to intense competition across departments at SJSU to attract upper division non-majors to their GE courses. Advertising the courses to international students and retirees have not worked because of the demand to have the course tailored to the particular audience.

One challenge for LLD 100WB is the relatively low “name recognition” of LLD: The LLD 100W/WB coordinator is working to expand the visibility of LLD 100WB by coordination with the Business Advising Center and by both word-of-mouth and brochure advertising.

• Service Courses (Academic English)
  o The Academic English program at SJSU is designed to provide support for students who have not yet mastered the skills of writing in academic English prose, as measured by the English Placement Test (EPT) and the upper division Writing Skills Test (WST).
  o San José State University, unlike most other CSU campuses, has no ESL program.
  o Instructors use a variety of materials and curricula to achieve the same goals.
  o Curricular changes since last review:
    ▪ The exam format for the LLD 1 and 2 courses has been modified by deleting the clause that stated “Essay prompt will require that students comprehend, summarize, and respond to a short reading passage”.
    ▪ Some other curricular changes such as the integration of the language development lab with its parent courses and pairing of TAs with Master Teachers are in their infancy.
  o Differences from standard curricula in the discipline:
    ▪ San Jose State University is among just a very few of the CSU campuses that retain an exam-only option for students in the LLD 1 and 2 courses.
  o Curricular bottlenecks:
    ▪ Enrollment in the LLD 1 and 2 courses are dependent on factors outside the department’s control such as scores on the English Placement Test. This leads to situations where more sections have to be offered and there is no faculty to teach them.
  o Wish List for resources:
    ▪ The department hopes for more resources that would allow paid training of all Academic English instructors, a full-time position for each of the coordinators, an expansion of the LDC so that LLD 2 course students could also be served there, as well as a higher status for the LDC coordinator.
    ▪ The department also strives for better communication with departments that require LLD courses for their students. Any changes that are not communicated to the Department of LLD affects their ability to resource efficiently.

Assessment of Student Learning

• Linguistics and TESOL degree programs
  o The department undertook data collection from the Spring of 2005 to the Spring of 2007.
  o Both direct assessment (collecting data on the student success rate of particular SLO-s) and indirect assessment methods (collecting information from students through open-ended questions based on the course objectives or by conducting some instructor-made surveys) were used.
  o The following challenges were observed:
    ▪ Data collection is difficult with part time instructors.
    ▪ There is no accrediting agency for Linguistics or TESOL.

• GE and Academic English
  o Coordinators, instructors/tutors, and full-time faculty deliberate any curricular changes before such changes are fully implemented.
  o The Language Development Center keeps track of statistics regarding the pass/fail rate of students in the Academic English courses.
Curricular Recommendations

- **Linguistics**
  - The department plans to increase the core units from 18 to 21 in order to make morphology a required course.
  - Since the B.A. enrollment has increased, the department is considering to offer LLD 166: Sociolinguistics once a year.

- **TESOL**
  - The department is exploring the possibilities of offering one ESP course as an elective course during the summer session to see whether there is sufficient enrollment.
  - Although some students would like the TESOL program to give more attention to practical matters of teaching, such as lesson planning, the department is of the view that this can be an unrealistic expectation. To deal with this dilemma, the department is considering whether to require TESOL students to engage in practical training before they reach the Practicum where they get to teach a full classroom of 10 or more students.
  - The department plans to look into developing courses in technology mediated language learning.

- **GE Courses**
  - The coordinator will put in place procedures for assessment data collection and reporting. This process may be impeded by the fact that most of the GE courses are taught by part timers.

- **Academic English courses**
  - The department has taken the proactive measure of developing SLO-s for non degree courses.
  - The department wishes a more flexible approach in designing a common final exam for the LLD 1 and LLD 2 courses.
  - The department wishes to move away from an exam only format in the remedial English program i.e. the LLD 1 and 2 courses.
  - Common guidelines are being developed in the LLD 1 and 2 courses and the LDC to address issues about conflicting information from the two sides.
  - The department is working on building close ties with the Departments of English and Comparative Literature to get feedback about performance of the LLD 1 and LLD 2 course students in English 1A and 1B, as well as with the Testing Office in charge of Writing Skills Test as to the passing grade, and passing rate, of students who have taken the LLD 98 and 99 courses.
  - Finally, the department recommends that the academic English courses are integrated with courses such as Metropolitan University Scholars Experience (MUSE) for student success, and not be branded as "remedial".

- **Service courses**
  - The department plans to collect assessment data about whether their service courses meet the needs of other departments.

Students

- **Linguistics**
  - In the five-year review period, a total of 79 degrees have been awarded, 41 B.A. Linguistics and 38 M.A. Linguistics. The increase in the number of M.A. degrees is particularly significant since, during the previous review period, the M.A. Linguistics program was on probation with the condition of increasing the number of graduates.
  - Upon graduation, students with a BA Linguistics degree continue on for a Masters in Linguistics or TESOL, find employment in secondary education or find employment in adult education.
  - Students with a M.A. Linguistics degree work as language analysts in companies that create software using natural language processing tools – e.g. Yahoo and Google, join...
financial institutions examining documents for language use or opt for a second M.A. in TESOL or a Ph.D.

- TESOL
  - An average of 48 students have been admitted to the program in Fall semesters and an average of 17 students in Spring semesters.
  - Enrollment has grown significantly over this period. The program has served an average of 74 students per semester compared to an average of 61 students per semester, as reported in the last review, an increase of 21.3%.
  - Over the review period, a total of 124 M.A. TESOL degree, 65 Graduate TESOL certificates and 22 Undergraduate TESOL certificates were granted.
  - After graduation, students teach in community colleges, adult programs, intensive programs, K-12 schools, join Ph.D. programs in Applied Linguistics or Education, or go back to their home countries to teach English as a Foreign Language.

- Student Demographics
  - B.A. Linguistic students fall in the 20-24 age group, while those in the M.A. programs are in the 25-39 age range.
  - A great majority of students are female.
  - The students are ethnically diverse with a slight increase in the Hispanic group. M.A. programs are in three groups – White, Asian and Other.
  - International students constitute 20-25% of the total student population.
  - In the review period, the department got 5 Fulbright scholars.

- Student Advising
  - The department offers orientation sessions, and assign advisors to new students. Students are encouraged to visit their advisors regularly.
  - The department website provides answers to frequently asked questions.
  - There are five TESOL advisors and two (three as of the Fall of 2007) Linguistics advisors.

- Student Assistance
  - The department hires a graduate student in linguistics who is available for ten hours per week to assist students with assignments.
  - For assistance with writing on all levels, students can use the Writing Center and the Learning Assistance Resource Center (LARC) – both university resources.

- Alumni Surveys
  - B.A. alumni rated all areas favorably, and appeared generally satisfied with the curriculum. There were some concerns about the amount of career information and assistance as well as the amount of computational linguistics instruction students received.
  - TESOL alumni seemed to be adequately satisfied with the overall quality of the program. The six items registering somewhat less than adequate satisfaction are for courses related to language teaching methods and materials, curriculum and assessment, methods, and the practicum. Most of the recommendations suggest that students want more attention in the curriculum to practical preparation for teaching, specifically in the areas of lesson planning, materials selection and development, assessment of student learning, and integration of the four skills areas (listening, speaking, reading & writing).

- Student Recruitment and Graduation
  - The majority of our new students receive initial information about our programs from our website.
  - The Department of LLD participates in recruitment efforts organized by the College of Humanities and the Arts and the University.
  - Full-time students take three to four semesters to graduate and part-time students take longer.

- Student Scholarship and Creative Achievements
  - Students have won CSU, SJSU, college and departmental awards.
- A yearly average of nine B.A. students has been on the Dean's List for having achieved a GPA of 3.65 or higher for two consecutive semesters.
- Students are encouraged to undertake conference presentations and publications.
  - Student engagement activities
    - The LLD Student Association (LLDSA) invites speakers, maintains a website about job information and organizes the Spring graduation ceremony.
  - Goals and Plans (Recommendations)
    - Advising:
      - The department needs to tighten advising procedures to take care of students who do not come in for advising, and improve career advising. Improvements are also required for information dissemination via the website.
    - Recruitment
      - The department needs to build direct ties with community college counselors and visit local high schools promoting linguistics. Getting approval for the Center for Human Language Technologies is also highly recommended. This center can help students find internships and jobs. Furthermore, ties need to be built for local industries for internships or job opportunities.
      - A regular colloquium series under the charge of a full-time faculty would also be desirable for healthy interaction with the outside world.

Faculty
- Faculty profile
  - There are 3 female and 5 male faculty members.
  - There are 3 South Asian and 5 White faculty members.
  - There are 3 full professors, 2 Associate professors and 3 Assistant professors in the faculty.
  - Two faculty members are likely to retire in the next three years.
- Lecturers
  - There are no full time lecturers
  - Of the 29 lecturers, 22 hold M.A. or M.S. degrees, while 7 hold Ph.D. degrees.
- Scholarly Achievements
  - The faculty has published books, articles in refereed journals, chapters in refereed volumes, a monograph, a technical report, book reviews, and so on.
  - The faculty has been a notable presence in international, national and regional conferences.
  - The faculty has also contributed toward editorial boards, manuscript reviews, and shown professional organizational leadership
  - The faculty has received grants from the University and the CSU system from time to time.
- Faculty Recommendations
  - Given that faculty in the department carry a four course teaching load, and each serves on a number of committees, the department considers this workload to be excessive. There is a need for a balance among teaching, research, and service that is commensurate with the university requirements for tenure and promotion. Specific recommendations:
    - The department needs to hire additional tenure-track faculty (particularly if there are any retirements), get release time for chairing Masters theses committees, provide travel money so that faculty can engage in professional development, and get release time to write external grant proposals.
Resources

- The department has one full-time Administrative Support Coordinator, one .7 Administrative Assistant, and hires one or two part-time students on Work Study money. These resources support 44 faculty members.

- The only full-time instructional staff member is the LDC Coordinator and .2 faculty assistant to assist the LDC coordinator who support more than one thousand students.

- Recommendations:
  - The Administrative Assistant position has to be made full-time.
  - The department needs to hire a full-time technician.
  - The LDC Coordinator position has to be upgraded.

- Equipment and Facilities
  - All of the faculty members have computers in their offices. In the next few years of course, some of these will have to be replaced.
  - The Department has so far managed to fulfill its equipment needs from the Operating Expenses & Equipment (OE & E) budget it receives every year from the Dean’s Office. Since the move to Clark Hall, its facilities are adequate.
  - The LDC still needs some infrastructure improvement.
  - Additional equipment (e.g., a Sun Blade 2500 Workstation) would be required for the new Computational Linguistics faculty member.
  - University Library Resources:
    - The support the Department receives from the library is good, and a positive and cooperative working relationship exists between the Department of LLD and the University Library.
    - However, current funding is not adequate for the addition of new journal subscriptions to support the diverse teaching needs and research interests of the LLD faculty.

- Resource Management
  - The majority of funds from the Dean’s office are in two categories – Salaries and Operating Expenses & Equipment.
  - The department also receives some Work Study Funds, and in the past, has received Lottery Funds, and money from the Foundation account.
  - Due to the very high number of part-time faculty compared to full-time faculty, the full-time faculty has a very high workload due to committee work, peer evaluations, and Annual Achievement Summary write-ups. The department can hire more full-time faculty if it can grow the enrollment in degree program courses. A 3-3 teaching load would allow the Department of LLD to hire more full-time faculty to cover existing courses.

- Goals and Plans (Recommendations):
  - The .5 Administrative Assistant position needs to be made full-time.
  - There is a need for a part-time lab technician to support the phonetics lab and the Computational Linguistics Lab (when it is established).
  - The full-time academic coordinator position of the LDC needs to be upgraded to faculty position or higher-level staff position with career development salary steps.
  - In the Fall of 2007, the Administrative Assistant position was upgraded to two part-time student assistants; this level of staffing needs to be maintained.
  - In the Fall of 2007, a LDC faculty assistant was hired at .2 for just the semester. This position should continue.
  - The LDC needs new furniture, computers, and resources for the Academic English library.
  - Powerful workstations are required for the Computational Linguistics lab.
  - Funding is necessary for new journal subscriptions.
  - New tenure track faculty members have to be hired to replace retirements.
Summary of External Reviewer's Report

The external reviewers, Professor James Kohn, Professor, English Department, San Francisco State University and Professor Keith Johnson, Professor, Department of Linguistics, University of California at Berkeley, paid a visit from April 24 to April 25, 2008.

Following are the salient points in their report:

General Points
- The department is quite harmonious, energetic, hardworking and conscientious.
- The graduate students interviewed seem to be generally pleased with their education.
- The faculty seems to have pretty good morale, and the staff seem to be happy.
- The external reviewers made a note that the department's reputation in the Bay area (and perhaps more widely) is improving – to the credit of SJSU.
- "Large enrollment growth in the BA program must depend on attracting students from outside the major; Linguistics is not a major that attracts great numbers of freshman students. Therefore the LLD program must consider ways of expanding enrollments in its undergraduate GE courses."

Academic English Program
- The Language Development Center (LDC) is well run.
- "The exit exam for LLD 1 and 2 is a high stakes writing exam, and not appropriate for testing students' abilities in writing... The University needs to reconsider the high-stakes writing exam that results in the need to offer remedial writing courses, particularly for upper-division students. In a recent external review of the writing program at neighboring San Francisco State, the reviewers made it clear that high-stakes tests such as WST are not an accurate or relevant measure of students' ability to write academic papers".
- Recommendations
  - The university faculty and administration should review current policies on how written English proficiency is measured and taught in the disciplines.
  - The department should develop a certificate program in cooperation with the English Department for the teaching of composition and reading. This program should be designed for graduate students wanting to teach in community colleges.
  - With partners in other disciplines, the department should develop a set of courses designed to teach literacy to adults in other fields e.g., health professions, engineering, community service work.

Lower Division GE Courses
- Recommendation:
  - College freshmen could be introduced to Linguistics using courses such as LLD 21 "Language and Thinking". LLD 20 "Nature of Languages" could be an effective feeder course but suffers from low enrollment and is being used as a remedial course.
  - The department should propose additional courses in lower-division introductory courses in linguistics and language studies. These large classes should be taught by tenure-track faculty, with graduate readers.
  - The department should find partners on campus who require or recommend Linguistics courses for their students. One example would be an introductory course in linguistics designed for foreign-language majors and pre-credential students.

B.A. in Linguistics
- The external reviewers commend the core curriculum of the B.A. in Linguistics and the SJSU participation in the North American Computational Linguistics Olympiad.
- Recommendations:
- The department should double the number of B.A. in Linguistics majors – at least 30 students should graduate every year.

**M.A. in Linguistics**
- The external reviewers commend the M.A. in Linguistics program as being well designed and well implemented.
- Recommendations:
  - The department should aim to graduate 50% of M.A. in Linguistics students with a thesis.
  - The department needs to require any student who wishes to do a thesis to choose this option at the start of the degree, so that the adviser can prepare the student for the proper sequence of courses.
  - The department needs to require "How to teach Linguistics" in the MA in Linguistics as a way to establish a group of graduate readers for undergraduate sections with large numbers of students.

**TESOL**
- The external reviewers commend the graduate program in TESOL for consistent and healthy enrollments, and for achieving the learning goals. The department should:
  - Based on feedback from students, the external reviewers recommend the following:
    - Require the phonetics course as a pre-requisite to the graduate degrees in TESOL and Linguistics. This will permit an additional elective course in the TESOL program, and provide an additional large section in the undergraduate program.
    - Require the second language acquisition course as a pre-requisite to the TESOL program. This will provide an additional large section for upper-division, and will allow room for an additional choice of seminars.
    - Provide at least one seminar in pedagogy, curriculum and assessment in the TESOL core to replace language acquisition or phonetics.
    - Provide an optional practicum course for inexperienced teachers as an elective in TESOL

**General Recommendations**
- Establish and communicate clear expectations for junior faculty – make sure that they know what tenure criteria will be used to evaluate them at both the departmental and college level.
- Reduce the frequency of peer evaluation of teaching for more experienced lecturers and professors.
- Update course catalog and departmental promotional materials so that prospective students know what is actually offered.
- Reduce the teaching load to three courses each semester for TT faculty by redistributing workload:
  - Re-design the curriculum with some larger classes, and some classes not offered as frequently. Subsequently, faculty assigned time can sponsor theses, serve as coordinators of multi-section courses, and conduct research projects.

**Department Response to the External Reviewer Report**
- Recommendations that have already been taken care of:
  - From the summer of 2008, there is a mailing list of all majors (graduate and undergraduate).
  - There has been a clarification of the policy on what happens if a student fails the comprehensive exam for the second time. The faculty decided to allow students to take the exams an unlimited number of times.
- Corrections pointed out by the department:
  - The department offers both the 100W as well as the 100WB courses.
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o The department clarified that whether courses taught by full time or part time faculty has no impact on total FTE.

o The GE course LLD 20 "Nature of Language" does not have low enrollment.

o Not all sections of the lower division GE classes are taught by lecturers; at least one section of LLD 20 every semester is taught by one of the tenured faculty members, Dr. Lowenberg.

o Regarding the recommendation requiring the phonetics course (LLD 111) as a prerequisite to the graduate degrees in TESOL and Linguistics, the department points out that LLD 111 is already a prerequisite to the M.A in Linguistics.

o Regarding the recommendation having a course in second language acquisition as a prerequisite, it would increase the number of prerequisites without changing the 30 unit M.A in Linguistics.

o Regarding the recommendation that a "...seminar in pedagogy, curriculum and assessment in the TESOL core..." be included "...to replace language acquisition or phonetics", the phonetics course never was a part of the TESOL M.A. Also, such a course is already a part of the core courses for the TESOL M.A. (LLD 283 "Curriculum and Assessment in TESOL").

o Regarding the concern that "Adult education teachers need more experience getting certification", the department response points out that Adult Education and Teacher preparation are areas that come under the jurisdiction of the School of Education.

o Regarding the concern of some international students regarding finding a place to do the practicum, the department's response points out that international students are given a lot of help in finding a place to do their practicum through a list of sites, contact information where students have done practica, letters to Master Teachers explaining program's expectations, and when possible, direct contacts between Practicum instructors and site supervisors.

o Regarding the suggestion from the students that the program would require phonetics, as part of the pre-requisites, the department points out that they do offer a course in phonetics (LLD 111) that TESOL students can take as an elective under the 30 unit M.A.

o Regarding complaints from students about not being able to plan their courses ahead of time and problematic summer school schedules, the department points out that the Chair does consult with students well in advance and emails are sent out to students.

o Regarding the concern that students do not know the rules and regulations about the comprehensive exams, the department's response mentions a Comprehensive Exam Orientation day each semester.

o Regarding thesis writing, very few students who enter the program are well prepared both in writing and research skills, and have some knowledge of the subject matter of either of the two disciplines (Linguistics or TESOL). Besides, aiming to graduate more than 50% of the students with thesis is not realistic since students prefer to graduate sooner rather than later.

o Regarding clear RTP requirements for junior faculty, the department points out that this is a university-wide problem and is not specific to the Department of LLD. Also, CFA-CSU contract has specific guidelines as to what are expected of the junior faculty for their tenure and promotion and the University

o Regarding reducing the frequency of peer evaluation of teaching for more experienced lecturers and professors, the frequency of peer evaluations is based on the University Senate policy; it is not determined at the department level.

Summary of College Committee Comments

- Commended the Department of Linguistics and Language Development for drafting a very comprehensive, candid and self-reflective analysis of its programs and services, and doing an admirable job in spite of having only eight tenured/tenure-track faculty members and a "deplorable" tenure/tenure track to lecturer ratio (1:5.5).
• There has been a 15% increase in the number of students enrolled in the BA in Linguistics and a 75% increase in the MA in Linguistics compared to the previous period.

• The B.A. program "needs to double in size" by graduating approximately 30 students per year to be sustainable and as a means of justifying additional tenure-track positions according to the external reviewers.

• The "high-stakes" writing exit exam for the LLD 1 and 2 courses needs to be revamped. A move to a portfolio system has been proposed and will be implemented the Spring of 2010.

• The college committee concurred with the external reviewers' suggestion that curricular changes should be made to include courses about how written English proficiency is measured and taught in the disciplines, and develop a certificate program for the teaching of composition and reading and a set of courses designed to teach literacy to adults in other fields.

• The College Committee agrees that the current .7 Administrative Assistant position still needs to become full-time and that a part-time technician should be hired to enhance the Department's and the students' technologically-mediated exposure and presence on the Web.

• Regarding the paucity of students choosing to write a Master's thesis, the College Committee agrees that faculty and resources have been spread too thinly. The College Committee agrees that release time could be awarded to faculty serving as thesis directors in both the Linguistics and TESOL graduate programs according to some pre-established and agreed upon criteria.

• Regarding the external reviewers' recommendation regarding workload issues that should be redistributed, the College Committee commends the fact that the LLD faculty have remained "actively engaged in research and scholarly activities" having made significant contributions to scholarship and professional development during the period under review.

Summary of Dean's Report

Dean Toepfer signed, via email, as agreeing with the college committee report.
2.3.0.0 Linguistics

While the core and the elective Linguistics courses cover all areas of the stated Student Learning Outcomes, the linguistics faculty have noticed that competencies acquired in LING 162: Introduction to Morphology, an elective course, do not figure among the SLOs. The Linguistics faculty, therefore intend to revise the SLOs to reflect this aspect of the Linguistics programs.

Upon reviewing the course offerings as part of the core curriculum for the B.A. Linguistics, the faculty have identified a gap in the area of morphology. Although we have a course in morphology (LING 162: Introduction to Morphology), since the course is only an elective, not all students choose it as part of their elective courses. The Linguistics faculty believe that morphology is an integral part of a linguist’s education and so the curriculum should reflect this conviction. Therefore, the faculty plan to cover the gap by proposing a minor curriculum change making LING 162 a required course and increasing the core units from 18 to 21. Electives will be reduced to 15 units, leaving the number of total units for the major intact at 36. As a required course, LING 162 will have to be offered more frequently. With the addition of Dr. Daniel Silverman, the Department now has a tenure-track instructor to cover this area. LING 162 will continue to be an elective in the M.A. Linguistics program.

Since the B.A. enrollment has increased, we should consider offering LING 166: Sociolinguistics once a year.

2.3.0.0 TESOL

The LLD faculty are interested in exploring the possibilities of offering one ESP course as an elective course during the summer session to see whether there is sufficient enrollment. Currently the Department does not offer any degree program courses in the summer; thus most of the foreign students, in order to complete the program in two years, opt to do an elective course in the School of Education in summer. We think that there is sufficient demand for a summer course from non-international students also.

As suggested in the alumni survey data in Appendix D-8, some students would like the TESOL program to give more attention to practical matters of teaching, such as lesson planning, choosing appropriate materials or developing materials, and assessing student learning. As faculty members, we understand students’ desire to leave the program fully confident with their teaching effectiveness. On the other hand, we see this as a somewhat unrealistic expectation, since teaching is both a profession and a skill that grows incrementally through experience. Right now, the only course that requires students to teach a full classroom of 10 or more students is the Practicum, which is taken toward the end of the MA program. One way to address the need for more practical experience is to require all TESOL students to engage in practical teaching and/or tutoring experiences before they reach the Practicum. Although we offer several options currently for this practical preparation (tutoring in the LDC, becoming a Teaching Associate in the Department, and tutoring at DeAnza College’s ESL Readiness Program), not all students take advantage of these opportunities. We need to explore and develop other reciprocal agreements with local adult schools and other institutions where students can gain more practical experience and where feedback and support will be provided to them.

Once we have filled the tenure-track position we advertised for this year, we will explore the possibility of developing courses in technology-mediated (-enhanced) language learning (including computer-assisted language learning).
2.3.1. General Education and Service Courses

3.4.2.1. General Education Courses
The GE coordinator will put in place uniform procedures for assessment data collection and reporting, and will supervise the content and the teaching of the courses (as per the BOGS requirements). However, to do this, the GE coordinator will need to meet frequently with the instructors of the courses to check on progress and exchange suggestions. Doing so will remain problematic if the majority of GE course sections continue to be taught by part-time instructors, who won’t be compensated for their time and who often are also teaching at other institutions.

Additionally, the GE coordinator will have to oversee the continuous development of the GE offerings of the Department by identifying potential areas in the Lower Division GE to develop new courses and faculty willing to develop and teach such courses.

Part of the new GE coordinator’s charge will also be to collaborate with the course coordinator of LING 129: Culture, Language, and Ethnicity in the U.S., who is a tenured faculty member, in creating and promoting a “niche” for LING 129 of the sort that has been found for LING 122: English as a World Language.

For the above-mentioned goals, it is important that the Department continues to appoint a GE coordinator. Additionally, it would be helpful if the new Linguistics and TESOL faculty being hired this year can teach the GE courses whenever possible.

3.4.2.2 Academic English Courses

(a) Developing Student Learning Objectives for LLD 1, 2, 98, & 99
SJSU currently requires that all syllabi in degree courses describe specific “student learning outcomes” and linking those SLOs to specific class assignments. As a department, we accept and embrace the benefits of this sort of transparency. We also suspect that this particular requirement will eventually (by university decree) extend to non-degree courses; thus, in a proactive spirit, the coordinators of the LLD 1/2 and LLD 98/99 courses are in the process of developing well-formulated student learning objectives for the assessment of the students’ work and the subsequent inclusion of the work in the portfolio.

(b) Modifying the common final exam for LLD 1 and LLD 2
An allowance for more flexibility in designing the common final exam for LLD 1 and LLD 2 is recommended at this time. The coordinator is currently in consultation with the faculty teaching LLD 1 and LLD 2 as to the optimum exam design, possibly for a first run in spring 2009.

(c) Moving away from exam-only format in LLD 1 and LLD 2
The Department administers one of the few remaining exam-only forms of assessment in any CSU remedial English program (the LLD 1 and LLD 2 courses). The LLD 1/2 coordinator is in the early stages of researching new ones. The current preliminary idea is to move, with much consultation with colleagues at other CSUs and other authorities, toward a more common portfolio system of assessment, in which the course grade will be based mostly on students’ in-class work (as rated by two instructors in a communal effort) in addition to the common final.
(d) Providing better articulation between the LDC and AE instructors in terms of content.
We are also in the process of developing common guidelines to be employed in the LLD 1 and LLD 2 courses and the LDC instructors in order to address complaints regarding conflicting information from the two sides.

(e) Feedback from other departments: We are in the process of promoting closer ties with the Department of English and Comparative Literature to obtain feedback as to how well LLD 1 & LLD 2 students perform in English 1A and 1B. Additionally, we need feedback from the Testing Office in charge of Writing Skills Test as to the passing grade, and passing rate, of students who have taken LLD 98/99.

In all, we strive for greater recognition of the contribution of the Academic English program at higher levels of and across the university. 50-60% of incoming SJSU freshmen score fairly low on the EPT. These students enroll in the LLD 1 / 2 courses. These courses, thus, are by default the foundation for writing skills for most of the university’s students. However, there seems to be a distinct lack of recognition among other units on campus as to the importance and far reach of the courses. If the university is serious about the educational welfare of its newest entrants (and it is, judging by initiatives such as “ASPIRE: The Freshman Experience”; see http://aspire.sjsu.edu/freshman.htm), it is recommended here that the academic English courses are integrated with courses such as Metropolitan University Scholars Experience (MUSE) for student success, and not to be branded simply as “remedial”.

3.4.2.3. Service Courses
We are planning to gather assessment data from other departments to assess how our courses (LLD 107: Patterns of English and LLD 108) meet their needs.

3.0. STUDENTS

3.0 Analysis of Student Data
The following analysis is based on data provided by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). Detailed data appear in Appendix C.

3.0.0 Linguistics

In the past five years the demand for the Linguistics programs has increased steadily as can be seen by the number of students accepted and enrolled in the B.A. and M.A. programs. This has resulted in an increase in enrollments and number of degrees awarded (See Table 3 & 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA Linguistics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Teach Prep</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Linguistics</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No data available from OIR
As can be seen from Table 3, the Linguistics programs have served an average of 59 students each semester. The student population has peaked during the 2005-2006 academic year with 68 students in the Spring 2006 semester. The 2005-06 peak is due to an above average number of students in the B.A. program. The number of students in the B.A. Linguistics- Preparation for Teaching has been low; only two students have taken the option since Fall 2005 (For possible reasons, see Section 3.1.1)

| Table 3: Number of Linguistics students enrolled per semester |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| BA Ling         | 22     | 27     | 25     | 25     | 22     | 25     | 30     | 32     | 35     | 35     |
| BA Teacher Prep | 25     | 23     | 31     | 24     | 26     | 31     | 29     | 31     | 33     | 27     |
| MA Ling         | 47     | 50     | 56     | 56     | 56     | 63     | 66     | 68     | 64     | 58     |
| Total           |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

The enrollment numbers in Table 3 show a significant increase since the last review. The average number of students enrolled in the B.A. Linguistics program per semester was 30, compared to 26 during the period 1997-2002, an increase of 15%. In the M.A. Linguistics program, the average number of students enrolled per semester was 28 compared to 16 during the period of the last review, an increase of 75%.

The increase in enrollment has also led to an increase in the number of degrees awarded. In the five-year review period, a total of 79 degrees have been awarded, 41 B.A. Linguistics and 38 M.A. Linguistics. The increase in the number of M.A. degrees is particularly significant since, during the previous review period, the M.A. Linguistics program was on probation with the condition of increasing the number of graduates. (Graduation data from the last review are not available) During this period we have also awarded 15 Computational Linguistics Certificates to both undergraduate and graduate students.

Table 4: Number of Linguistics degrees awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY 02-03</th>
<th>AY 03-04</th>
<th>AY 04-05</th>
<th>AY 05-06</th>
<th>AY 06-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA Linguistics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Teacher Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Linguistics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Ling Certif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where students go after graduation

Upon graduation, some of our B.A. Linguistics graduates choose to continue on for a Masters degree either in the MA Linguistics or the MA TESOL programs. Others find employment in secondary education, often after completing a credential program in the School of Education, or in adult education.

Several of the recent graduates from the M.A. Linguistics program have accepted positions as language analysts in area companies that create computer products using natural language processing tools (such as Yahoo, Inc., Google Inc., IBM, Sedha, Tellme) or in financial institutions (such as JP Morgan) examining documents for language use. A few of our students have opted to continue for a second M.A. degree in TESOL or a higher degree in Ph.D.-granting institutions.
3.0.0 TESOL

For the period of the review, an average of 48 students have been admitted to the program in Fall semesters and an average of 17 students in Spring semesters (Table 5).

Table 5: Number of students admitted to the M.A. TESOL Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA TESOL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By year</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollment has grown significantly over this period (Table 6). The program has served an average of 74 students per semester compared to an average of 61 students per semester, as reported in the last review, an increase of 21.3%.

Table 6: Number of students enrolled in the M.A. TESOL Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA TESOL</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By year</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of M.A. TESOL students complete the program in two years.

Graduation data reflect patterns similar to the enrollment data discussed above. Over the review period, a total of 124 M.A. TESOL degrees were awarded (Table 7). In addition, 65 Graduate TESOL certificates and 22 Undergraduate TESOL certificates were given.

Table 7: Number of degrees awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY 02-03</th>
<th>AY 03-04</th>
<th>AY 04-05</th>
<th>AY 05-06</th>
<th>AY 06-07</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA TESOL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate UG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate GR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where students go after graduation

Most students, after their graduation, teach in community colleges (e.g., Mission College, De Anza College, and Cañada College), adult schools (e.g., Milpitas Adult Education and Metro Ed) and intensive programs (e.g., SAL and Golden Gate Language School.) Additionally, some who have credentials teach in public K-12 schools. A few of the recent graduates have been admitted to Ph.D. programs in Applied Linguistics or Education at universities such as Stanford, University of California Santa Cruz, University of California Riverside, and Texas A & M University. Most of the international students choose to return to their home countries after graduation to teach English as a foreign language (EFL) in high schools and universities.

4.1.3 Age – Gender – Ethnicity profiles of the students in the degree programs

The Office of Institutional Research provided us with ethnographic data of our enrolled students in two categories: undergraduate students and graduate students. Our discussion, therefore, will focus on the profile of the students in the B.A. Linguistics program and on the students of the M.A. Linguistics and M.A TESOL program combined.
In terms of age, the majority of the B.A. Linguistics students fall in the expected 20-24 range. In the M.A. programs (Linguistics and TESOL), although the age brackets with the greatest number of students are the 25-29 and 35-59 (with almost equal numbers), the 30-34 range is also well populated.

In terms of gender, although there is an increase in the number of male students in both the undergraduate and graduate programs, the great majority of students are female.

In terms of ethnicity, students in the B.A. Linguistics program are diverse with no one particular group being more represented than another, although there has been a slight increase in the number of students who classify themselves as ‘Hispanic’. In the M.A. programs, our students appear distributed in three groups: ‘White’, ‘Asian’, and ‘Other’. International students constitute about 20% to 25% of the total student population at any given year. In the last 4 years, the Department has received 5 Fulbright scholars.

These data substantiate our observations that we serve a diverse student population, in terms of age and ethnicity.

4.2. Student Experiences

4.2.1 Advising

Current Students
Advising procedures for students in all degree programs follow similar guidelines and practices. Upon admission, students are assigned an advisor. In the fall semester, the two Degree Programs Coordinators conduct an orientation in which students are introduced to the program. In this orientation, students become acquainted with the curriculum, the frequency of course offerings, necessary steps towards graduation, rights and policies, opportunities for tutoring, scholarships and awards, the LLD Student Association (LLDSA), and important deadlines for submission of forms. They also get to meet all their professors and advisors. There are two separate orientation sessions, one for undergraduate and one for graduate students. Students entering the programs in the spring semester receive their initial advising by the Chair of the Department if they arrive in January before the spring semester starts, otherwise by the appropriate program coordinator.

Graduate students have the opportunity to explore the two culminating experience options, the comprehensive examination and the thesis, in a special orientation session offered by the Degree Program Coordinators every semester. In this session, students get acquainted with the policies and procedures of the two options as well as the content, expectations, and grading of the comprehensive exam.

Students are encouraged to visit their advisor regularly, and many of them do. Advisors help them plan their required courses, choose their electives, and make sure that all required forms are completed in order for them to graduate in a timely fashion. Moreover, students can refer to the departmental website (http://linguistics.sjsu.edu/bin/view/Public/StudentInformation) for many of their frequently asked questions and for downloading the multitude of forms they need to complete throughout their program. (See Appendix F for various advising materials)
There are five TESOL advisors and each is assigned ten to fifteen students as advisees every semester. In the linguistics programs, advising has so far been handled by the only two full-time faculty members teaching primarily linguistics courses, Dr. Manjari Ohala and Dr. Soteria Svorou. Each advisor has been responsible for an average of 32 students per semester, which has added to their already overburdened schedule. Despite the load, we believe that our students have received adequate attention and have had as smooth an experience in the program as possible. Dr. Daniel Silverman has joined the full-time Linguistics faculty starting with Fall 2007, so we now have three advisors to share the load.

Prospective Students
Prospective students receive initial information on our programs from our website (http://linguistics.sjsu.edu/cgi-bin/view/Public/) where they can also consult “Frequently Asked Questions” links for M.A. Linguistics and M.A. TESOL:
http://linguistics.sjsu.edu/bin/view/Public/LinguisticsMAFaq
http://linguistics.sjsu.edu/bin/view/Public/MaTesolFaq
For more specific information, they are referred to the Degree Programs Coordinators whom they contact via email, phone, or in person. Coordinators respond promptly to such requests and schedule two hours per week for advising prospective student. Prospective students may also receive information in the form of brochures available in a rack outside the Department office (CL 473).

Student Assistance
Students with special needs are encouraged by all advisors and faculty to contact the Disability Resource Center (DRC) on campus to receive appropriate accommodations for participating fully in academic life, including the Masters Comprehensive Examination.

Students in introductory linguistic classes (LING 101, 111, 112, 113) who need assistance beyond classroom instruction and instructor office hours have a tutor available to them. The Department hires a graduate student in linguistics who is available for ten hours per week to assist students with assignments. Students have found this resource very helpful. Tutors have also benefited from the experience, which has contributed to their development both in terms of knowledge and teaching.

For assistance with writing on all levels, students can use the Writing Center, a new university resource for students of all disciplines and writing abilities. There they may receive tutoring and workshops tailored to their needs. Additionally, the university’s Learning Assistance Resource Center (LARC) is another resource available to them.

Alumni Survey Results
Linguistics
Of the 73 survey questionnaires mailed to the graduates of the past five years (for whom we had addresses) we received only 13 responses: 5 for B.A. and 8 for M.A. The five B.A. alumni rated all areas favorably with an average score of 3.6 on a 4-point scale. Their comments on open-ended questions also reflect their general satisfaction with the curriculum as well as the experience they had as students in our programs. The eight M.A. alumni were also generally satisfied with their experience in the program. In the eleven areas they were surveyed, they gave average ratings ranging from 2.8 to 3.8 on a 4-point scale. In the open-ended questions, the comments were generally positive about advising and curriculum. There were some concerns about the amount of career information and assistance as well as the amount of computational linguistics instruction students received. The survey instruments and the responses can be found in Appendix D-2 and D-5.
TESOL
Of the 112 survey questionnaires sent out to the graduates of the past five years, we received responses from only 24 alumni. Since this represents only about 15% of the total number of students who have graduated since Fall 2003, the following findings should be interpreted with caution. The scores range from 1.65 to 2.57 on a 3-point scale. The overall score for all the categories from the 24 survey responses is 2.1. In other words, the students seem to be adequately satisfied with the overall quality of the program. However, findings also indicate that out of 12 items, the students are more than adequately satisfied for only 6 items. These items are the ones related to courses on language structure, language learning, and culture. The six items registering somewhat less than adequate satisfaction are for courses related to language teaching methods and materials, curriculum and assessment, methods, and the practicum. Most of the recommendations suggest that students want more attention in the curriculum to practical preparation for teaching, specifically in the areas of lesson planning, materials selection and development, assessment of student learning, and integration of the four skills areas (listening, speaking, reading & writing). The survey instrument and responses are given in Appendix D-8.

4.3. Student Recruitment and Retention

Student recruitment process for Linguistics/TESOL
The majority of our new students receive initial information about our programs from our website. We have, therefore, been maintaining the departmental website with the help of one faculty member who is receiving some reassigned time for being the web master. In addition, the LLD Department has always participated in all recruitment efforts organized by the College of Humanities and the Arts and the University. Such efforts have targeted primarily undergraduate students, although in Spring 2003 we also participated in the university-wide event organized by Graduate Studies and Research. We regularly participate in the Transfer Student orientation days, New Student Orientation Days, as well as all Open House events organized by the College of Humanities and the Arts and the University. It is rather difficult to evaluate such efforts with regards to the results they bring in terms of enrollment. Moreover, our alumni have been advocates for our programs, since some new students have come to SJSU on their recommendation.

Student retention
Student retention is addressed in our advising efforts. Advisors in all programs make themselves available through scheduled office hours for addressing problems students may have in academic affairs. In addition, the Chair and the Degree Programs coordinators act as advocates for students to help them through various difficult situations.

Graduation
Students are given an orientation on the steps they need to follow towards graduation when they first enter the programs. During the course of their program, they meet with their assigned advisor not only to plan their program but also to ensure timely submission of paperwork. The Degree Programs coordinators and the Chair, who have to review the paperwork before submitting it to the appropriate offices, also try to monitor this. Through this process the Department has always had success in ensuring efficient handling of student’s graduation procedures. The majority of our students graduate in a timely fashion. Full-time students take three to four semesters and part-time students take longer. If a student is about to graduate, and a required course is not being offered, we allow for a substitution, i.e. we do not hold back graduation. Delays in graduation are almost exclusively due to students’ personal reasons.
4.4. Student Scholarly and Creative Achievements

Our students have been competitive in receiving various CSU, SJSU, college, and departmental awards. **Robin Melnick** (M.A. Linguistics) is the first linguistics student to receive a Sally Casanova CSU Pre-Doctoral Scholarship in 2007. This scholarship provides deserving students with $3000 to cover expenses towards applying for a doctorate program (e.g., travel to conferences, Ph.D.-granting institutions, purchase of books and software, fees for applications and standardized tests). Additionally, it provides a fully funded summer internship opportunity to a Ph.D.-granting institution. Melnick also received a SJSU Alumni Association Scholarship in 2007, the second linguistics student to receive the award after **Nurcan Hınik** (M.A. Linguistics) in 2003. Melnick also received the Dr. Josephine Chandler Humanities Scholarship in 2006. **Kate Rudnicka** (M.A. TESOL) won the 2002-2003 Student Research Competition in the College of Humanities and the Arts and also the SJSU Student Research Competition, for which she was awarded $500 and a plaque, with her thesis entitled “Continuity and Change in the Cultural Beliefs and Practices of Bay Area Polish-Americans”. She went on to represent SJSU at the CSU level competition. Three students received Bertha Kalm Scholarships: **Rosana Spinzi** (M.A. Linguistics) in 2007, **Michelle Tan** (M.A. Linguistics) in 2005, and **Elaine Drom** (M.A. Linguistics) in 2004. In addition, several students have been recipients of our departmental awards. Every year, the Department offers two Outstanding Student Awards, one or more scholarships based on academic achievement and financial hardship, a community service award, and a scholarship offered by the LLD Alumni Association. In the past four years, a total of 26 students have received awards and scholarship through the Department. Although the monetary value of these awards is small, students feel honored and are appreciative of the gesture.

An average of nine of our B.A. students per year have been on the Dean’s List for having achieved a GPA of 3.65 or higher for two consecutive semesters, and one student, **Sarah Nilsson** (B.A. Linguistics) was on the President’s list (GPA 4.0) for two consecutive years.

Our students are encouraged and supported in reaching their highest academic potential through conference presentations and publications. **Sarah Nilsson** and **Nick Wu** (B.A. Linguistics) have given a collaborative presentation at the conference of the American Anthropological Association, 2006, and **Virak Chan** and **Kristjan Bondesson** (M.A. TESOL), at the CATESOL Conference, 2007. **Heidi Kent** (M.A. Linguistics) gave a poster presentation entitled “Vocabulary Chunking: An Experiment in Memory” at the 2007 Spartan Psychological Association Research Conference. **Robin Melnick** is scheduled to give a poster presentation of his paper entitled “A gradient grammar approach to concord variation in existential THERE+BE constructions” at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Chicago, Jan. 2008.

In the past four years, some of our students have also published articles and book reviews resulting from papers they worked on as part of class assignments or theses. **Iris-Thot Johnson** (M.A. TESOL) published part of her thesis in the CATESOL Journal. Similarly, **Andrea Withers** (M.A.TESOL) published her revised thesis in the Bilingual Research Journal. **Chris Donlay** (M.A. Linguistics) had a book review accepted for publication in the journal Language in Society. **Virak Chan** and **Elizabeth Ornelas** (both M.A. TESOL) also had book reviews accepted for publication. Finally, **Mari Takai** (M.A. TESOL) has an article in CATESOL’s Intercultural Interest Group Newsletter. See Appendix I-1 for details.
We are proud of our students’ accomplishments. To showcase their accomplishments, we have instituted a display case on the 2nd floor of Clark Hall where publications are displayed.

3.4 Student engagement activities

Students in the linguistics and TESOL programs are automatically members of the LLD Student Association (LLDSA). The LLDSA is a student group that was formed many years ago by students interested in language and linguistics with the goal to provide a venue for support of students and the exchange of ideas outside of class in a fun environment. The LLDSA has the primary responsibility for funding and organizing spring graduation activities. Depending on the make up of the student body, the LLDSA has also engaged in other activities, for example, the organization of colloquia talks by invited speakers, obtaining money for high-profile speakers (for example, George Lakoff, Carlos Gussenhoven, and Deborah Tannen) career days, and lectures by professors. Members of the LLDSA keep a continuously updated website (http://linguistics.sjsu.edu/bin/view/Public/StudentAssociation) and an email list through which job information as well as other events of student life are disseminated. A student representative serves as the liaison between the LLDSA and the Department and attends all department meeting and Curriculum Committee meeting providing valuable student perspectives on issues discussed by faculty. This semester the LLDSA organized the Spartan LingFest07, a well-attended forum on Linguistics and Language Development with eight student speakers. Through LLDSA activities, our students become visible within the university and provide visibility for our department as well.

Several of our graduate students participated in the Linguistic Institute at Stanford University last summer. As part of the Institute activities, they enrolled in classes and attended many talks. Their learning from the Institute has added to the intellectual excitement in their classes at SJSU. A few of our students also attended the Linguistic Society of America’s Annual Meeting in January 2007.

TESOL students generally take part in the CATESOL-regional conferences either by presenting papers or by attendance.

LLD students have also engaged in several activities with the community. Although it is not always easy to know the multiple facets of our students’ lives, we get to know some of these activities through one of the Departmental awards. The Martha Bean Memorial Award honors students with exceptional community service. In the past four years we have given this award to students who have provided support and interpretive services to migrant workers, have participated in programs by tutoring in citizenship classes, have educated minority children and adults, and have lead children to appreciate the richness of our environment and its inhabitants. Other students have volunteered as student assistants in conversational ESL classes and language interpreters at various churches and Immigrant Resettlement and Cultural Centers in San José and cities surrounding San José.

4.6 Goals and plans: Recommendations regarding students

Advising and retention
In all our programs we need to tighten procedures in order to ensure that students receive advising at critical junctures in their academic careers. Otherwise, they miss important deadlines and cannot complete their degrees on time. Despite our efforts some students simply do not come in for advising. We are considering how to remedy this problem. One possibility would be to put an advising hold on
their being able to register for classes. We need to find out how we can do this at the Department level. Moreover, our goal is to strengthen the role of our website. Currently, our website provides basic information about the programs and current important dates. We would like to expand the information for prospective students and make information for current students more complete and accessible. One of the points that the alumni survey revealed is the need for more career advising. We plan to address this issue by strengthening the information on our website, offering more career workshops and getting advisors to be more informed and helpful to their advisees.

Recruitment
During the academic year 2006-2007, the Admissions and Records Office made a major push for outreach related to student recruitment. They sent out spreadsheets giving the names and contact information for students who had indicated an interest in our majors. There were a number of “Newly Admitted Student” orientation days this past summer and the Dean’s office helped coordinate advising with departments in the College. The Department Chair (Ohala) mailed out personal letters of invitation to students who have been admitted to the B.A. in Linguistics to come and meet with her (or an advisor) when they come to visit the campus. In the opinion of the faculty, the efforts have been paying off since enrollment in the Linguistics B.A. has been gradually increasing. We have admitted 28 new majors this semester.

We also hope to build direct ties with Community College counselors by obtaining lists of such advisors and their email addresses with the help of our Dean’s office. (Last year, the Admissions & Records outreach person turned down our request for such a list since prior permission had not been obtained from these counselors for releasing their email addresses.)

In the Spring 2008 semester, San José State University will be a site for NAMCLO (North America Computational Linguistics Olympiad), a competition targeting high school students with an interest in languages. In preparation for the event, we will visit several local high schools promoting linguistics and NAMCLO. We hope that the event will be of interest to high school students and will motivate them to opt for linguistics as a major when they join SJSU.

Another potential opportunity for student (as well as faculty) recruitment is the Center for Human Language Technologies. We are in the final stages for having this center approved by the university as an Organized Research Unit. The goal of the center is to create a home for research engaging faculty and students and, through the center’s activities and liaisons, to allow students to find internships and jobs after graduation.

Recruitment for the Linguistics M.A. has somehow lagged. We have not yet systematically mailed out brochures and posters to regional institutions. However, given reports that nowadays students prefer obtaining such information from web sites, it is unclear how much help such mailings would be. Our degree offerings are displayed on the Department’s website. In 2007 February, one of our graduate students (Melnick) helped us develop an attractive brochure advertising our Department. We hope to do more recruiting this year. Additionally, once the tenure-track computational linguistics position is filled, we hope that the newly recruited faculty member will be able to build ties with local industries for internship/job opportunities; this too should attract students.

As for the TESOL program, enrollment continues to be fairly high, for example, we admitted 45 new students in Fall 2007. Thus, at present we have not been actively recruiting for it, but are considering it
for the future so that we can justify additional tenure-track faculty positions. Increasing the number of tenure-track faculty could in turn alleviate some of the problems we face by proving a greater basis for sharing the load of self-governance.

**Student engagement activities**
To further enrich student experiences, we plan to start a regular colloquium series under the charge of a full-time faculty member. We are exploring ways to make such a series successful given that in the past student participation in the few colloquia held had been rather low.

## 5. Faculty

### 5.1. Faculty Profile

#### 5.1.1. Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty
Regarding gender, out of eight tenured and tenure-track faculty, three are female and five are male. In terms of ethnicity, three are South Asian and five are White. Six are tenured and two are tenure-track. Of the eight, three are full professors, two are associate professors and three are assistant professors. In the next five years, two of these eight are likely to retire.

#### 5.1.2. Lecturers
The Department does not have any full-time lecturers. In the past five years the LLD Department has employed an average of nineteen female and eight male part-time lecturers per semester. (See Table 8) In terms of ethnicity, while the majority have been White, each semester there have been some Asian, Hispanic, and Other lecturers. For example, currently there are nine Asian, one Hispanic, and 33 White lecturers. (See Appendix C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of level of education, of the current 29 lecturers working in the Department, 22 hold M.A. or M.S. degrees while seven hold Ph.D. or Ed.D. degrees. Nine are in their first-year of lecturing at SJSU; two are in their second; two are in their third; one is in his fourth; and fifteen have been lecturing at SJSU for five or more years.

### 5.2. Scholarly and creative achievements

#### 5.2.1. Scholarly Achievements

**Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty**
During the report period, the full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty have continued to make significant contributions to scholarship and professional development. The following is a summary of their achievements:

5 Single-authored books; 2 Co-authored books; 2 Edited books; 26 Articles in refereed journals; 21 Chapters in refereed volumes; 1 Monograph; 1 Technical report; 5 Book reviews; 5 Other publications

The books were published by internationally reputed publishing houses in the fields of linguistics and applied linguistics. The names of the publishing houses are as follows: Continuum Books, Corwin Press, Oxford University Press, Rowman and Littlefield, TESOL Inc., and Yale University Press.


In addition to publications, the faculty have been a notable presence in international, national and regional conferences. Collectively, they have made 89 academic presentations during the report period. The venues for these presentations include the meetings of the American Anthropological Association, American Association of Applied Linguistics, Australian Association of Applied Linguistics, Brazilian National Congress of Applied Linguistics, California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Chicago Linguistic Society, European Second Language Association, International Association for World Englishes, International Association of Applied Linguistics (AILA), International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language, International Cognitive Linguistics Association, International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, International Society for Gesture Studies, International Society for Humor Studies, Linguistic Society of America, North American Symposium on Corpus Linguistics, Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, Regional English Language Centre, Singapore, Semiotic Society of America, Society for Applied Anthropology and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Included in the total tally of presentations are thirteen keynote/plenary addresses delivered by faculty in international conferences held in various countries: Australia, Brazil, Colombia, England, Finland, Hong Kong, Mexico, Thailand, and the U.S.. Other countries in which the faculty have presented in conferences include Belgium, Canada, Philippines, Poland, Scotland, Singapore, South Korea, and Spain.

Professional and scholarly activities of the faculty are not confined to publications and presentations. They extend to the realm of editorial boards, manuscript reviews, and professional organizational leadership. During the report period, two faculty members have served (and continue to serve) on the editorial boards of The CATESOL journal (Frazier), IKALA: Revista de language y cultura from Colombia (Kumaravadivelu), Language Teaching Journal from Iran (Kumaravadivelu), and Reflections of English Language Teaching from Singapore (Kumaravadivelu). Two other faculty have served as editors for two series published by John Benjamins (Huebner, and Svorou). Several faculty members have served as manuscript reviewers for such prestigious journals as Applied Linguistics, Developmental

In addition, four faculty members have been book-length manuscript reviewers for leading publishing houses: Allyn & Bacon (Vanniarajan), Thomson Heinle (Frazier), Yale University Press (Kumaravadivelu), and John Benjamins (Svorou, Henze). (See Appendix J-1)

Lecturers
During the report period, lecturers have continued to make significant contributions to scholarship and professional development. The following is a summary of their achievements:

4 articles or reviews in refereed journals; 4 articles or reviews in popular journals

In addition to publications, the lecturers have presented four papers in international or national conferences and eight papers at regional or local conferences while twelve have attended national or international conferences and 20 have attended regional or state conferences. The most common venue for these presentations has been the CATESOL conference, although other venues include the International Cognitive Linguistics Association conference.

Lecturers have also had presence in professional organizations as three lecturers have held office in local, regional, or state professional organizations (Testing Chair for the Northern California Chapter of American Association of Teachers of German; Project director at the National Hispanic University), and one has held office in a national/international professional organization (Chair of the MLA Committee: Discussion Group on General Linguistics; Member of Board of reviewers for TESOL-EJ)

Several lecturers have conducted Best Practices workshops on topics ranging from multiculturalism to WEBCT to reading strategies to the WST. One lecturer has applied for and received a lottery grant and another was awarded the International Education Award for Teaching Methods. Finally, one lecturer has provided professional editing for an MA thesis.

1.1.1 Awards and Grants

The contributions made by the faculty in the areas of scholarship and service have been recognized by the University and the CSU system from time to time. During the current report period, faculty members have received CSU Summer Research grants (Kumaravadivelu, and Svorou), University Planning Council Research grants (Frazier, Svorou), Teacher Scholar award (Henze), Junior Faculty Career Development grant (Frazier), Global Studies Institute Fellowship (Kumaravadivelu), Learning Productivity Program grant (Henze), College of Humanities and the Arts Outstanding Researcher Award (Kumaravadivelu) and Outstanding Service Award (Svorou), and numerous lottery grants used primarily for travel to conferences (Frazier, Henze, Huebner, Kumaravadivelu, Svorou, Ohala, Vanniarajan).

1.1.1 Collaborations with Other Institutions Across Campus and Outside

LLD faculty have been assisting and collaborating with faculty in other disciplines within the University by contributing to the Student Success Reading Group co-sponsored by the SJSU President (Frazier); writing a major section of on-line Handbook for 100W Instructors to help writing teachers across the
campus (Henze); reviewing and evaluating reading, language and literature related Subject Matter Programs across the campus to determine how well they complied with the new standards of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Henze); co-authoring books and articles with faculty in other departments (Henze); and leading a group of undergraduates in various majors on a study trip to El Salvador (Henze).

LLD faculty have been collaborating with faculty in other institutions by developing an internship program for MA TESOL students with De Anza Community College (Henze); providing leadership, through Learning Productivity Program, toward improving student writing on campus and in local community colleges (Henze); evaluating, for the CSU Chancellor’s Office, proposals to establish a Program in Linguistics at CSU Chico, and at CSU Long Beach (Huebner); evaluating the Program of Linguistics at CSU Northridge (Huebner); examining and evaluating PhD dissertations for the Universities of Queensland, and Melbourne in Australia, and the Universities of Bharathidasan, Madras, and Madurai-Kamaraj in India (Kumaravadivelu) and UC Berkeley (Svorou).

1.1. Service and Community Engagement

University
During the report period, the full-time tenured and probationary faculty have served on numerous committees at the University, College and Department levels. Prominent University-level Committees that they have served include the Academic Senate and other Senate-related committees such as Policy, Government & Organization (Vanniarajan), and Committee on Committees (Ohala), Writing Requirements Committee (Frazier, Henze), BOGS (Lowenberg), GEAP for Oral Communication (Svorou), Assessment (Huebner, Lowenberg), Higher Education Round Table (Henze), Global Studies Institute (Huebner), and Faculty-led Programs Advisory Council (Lowenberg).

College
Faculty’s College-level service engagement covers all the major Committees: Retention, Tenure and Promotion (Henze, Master & Kumaravadivelu), Curriculum (Kumaravadivelu, Svorou), Research (Huebner, Lowenberg, Vanniarajan), Ed Equity (Lowenberg) and Sabbatical (Kumaravadivelu, Lowenberg and Vanniarajan).

Faculty have also served on committees for other departments within the college (Ohala- RTP Committee for Foreign Languages)

Department
At the Department level, all the tenured and probationary faculty have regularly served on the Curriculum Committee in which all academic, curricular and student affairs are discussed and decided. Similarly, they have all served on the Comprehensive Exam committee as well as on Faculty Search Committees that are appointed from time to time. Svorou and Vanniarajan have continued to serve as Coordinators of Linguistics, and TESOL programs, respectively. In addition, they have also served on Committees on Awards, and Graduation Ceremony.

Community Engagement
Several faculty members regularly volunteer their time and services to help with social causes beyond the campus. During the report period, they have worked with Big Brothers and Big Sisters of the East Bay (Henze), and with the Hellenic Heritage Institute (Frazier, Svorou). Another institute that has
benefited from faculty volunteer work is California Tamil Academy (an affiliate of Tamil University in Tamilnadu, India) for which annual teacher education workshops were conducted in order to train more than 120 parents who teach Tamil to Bay Area children (Kumaravadivelu).

Professional Field
Three faculty members have provided leadership for professional organizational activities: International Association for World Englishes (Lowenberg), Anthropology Education Commission (Henze), and Linguistic Society of America’s Undergraduate Program Advisory (Ohalu).

5.4 Goals and Plans: Faculty Recommendations
In reviewing the contributions of faculty in terms of instructional, research and service activities for the past five years, we would like to point out that the above-mentioned accomplishments have been achieved in spite of a four-course teaching load and committee work. There are only eight of us who are full-time faculty and yet we do as much committee work as departments with a large number of full-time faculty. As a result, each of us has to serve on many committees. This results in a widespread feeling of constant stress, for which faculty see no relief except during the summer period (for which they are not paid). We consider the workload associated with teaching and committee work in this department to be excessive, affecting the balance a faculty member needs in order to do more in the area of scholarly achievements, which are required for tenure and promotion. As individuals, we have taken steps to reduce the load by applying for all release time opportunities that the college and the university makes available on a competitive basis and we have been successful. But we will continue to be vocal about the need for the administration to provide a balance among teaching, research, and service that is commensurate with the university requirements for tenure and promotion. Therefore, we make the following recommendations:

- Explore hiring additional tenure-track faculty, especially if there are any retirements.
- Request the Graduate Studies Office and/or the Provost for providing release time for chairing Masters thesis committees.
- Request the administration to provide travel money so that faculty can engage in professional development.
- Request release time to write external grant proposals.

4. Resources

4.1 Program Support

6.1.1 Clerical/technical staff/instructional staff

The Department has one full-time Administrative Support Coordinator (Alice Martin) and one .7 Administrative Assistant (who is currently working full-time on a temporary basis). We still need for this position to be full-time. The Department office is run very efficiently due to the expertise and professionalism on these two staff members. For example, at the start of this semester the Administrative Support Coordinator had to deal with office space, hiring paper work, etc. for 44 part-time faculty. Things went so smoothly that the rest of us did not even notice it. However, as we mention in section 6.3, the Administrative Assistant position needs to be made full-time. The Department also hires one or two part-time students on Work-Study money. The Department currently does not have a technician. In section 6.3 we will give the rationale for hiring a part-time technician.
The only full-time instructional staff member we have currently is the LDC Coordinator (John Leih), who is doing a superb job, often under great time-pressure, as for example when he has to process and assign students to LLD 1/2 sections at the start of the semester. (During the current semester this involved a staggering total of 1,530 students between these two classes.) It is thanks to his careful monitoring that we only open as many sections of these classes as will fill. In section 6.3 we recommend that his position be upgraded. In addition, this semester the LDC also has a .2 faculty assistant to assist the LDC Coordinator.

1.1.1 Equipment & Facilities

All of the tenure-track and tenured faculty have computers of their choice (Apple or IBM PC) in their offices. They also have their own printers. Since all of the LLD computers are networked, the faculty can additionally print in the main office’s laser color printer. All of the part-time faculty also have computers in their offices. In the next few years of course, some of these will need to be replaced.

Clark 242 is a fully equipped classroom with 20 Dell OptiPlex 170L Small Desktop Intel Pentium 4 Processor 3.00 GHZ computers and five Apple computers. Students use these computers in the classes such as phonetics, computational linguistics, LLD 100W, as well as some of the TESOL classes.

For a detailed list of the Department’s equipment and facilities, see Appendix L-1.

The Department has so far managed to fulfill its equipment needs from the Operating Expenses & Equipment (OE & E) budget it receives every year from the Dean’s Office. Since the move to Clark Hall, its facilities are adequate. However, the LDC still needs some infrastructure improvement (See section 6.3 for details) in order to maintain a high quality of education for the first-year experience of freshmen. Additionally, once we hire a tenure-track faculty member for Computational Linguistics, additional equipment (e.g., a Sun Blade 2500 Workstation) would be required.

6.1.3 University Library Resources for LLD

The support the Department receives from the library is good. There is a dedicated annual library allocation for linguistics of about $11,000, as well as some additional funding for electronic resources, which are separately funded. Purchasing decisions are guided by a collection development policy (See Appendix K-1), which reflects the Department’s current teaching and research priorities. Faculty participation in building the collection is encouraged, and a number of faculty help to select books and media. Funding is sufficient to purchase faculty recommendations.

A positive and cooperative working relationship exists between the LLD Department and the University Library and a specific librarian is designated as the Linguistics librarian to act as liaison. This librarian also provides instruction sessions for department courses with a strong library research focus (LLD 100W and 250W) as well as in-depth reference assistance to department faculty and students. She also introduces the Library to candidates being interviewed for faculty appointments and other visitors hosted by the Department.

A new program has recently been announced which allocates $1,000 for library resources to each new tenure-track SJSU faculty member. This funding supports new faculty research, expands the Library’s
collection, and builds a strong relationship between discipline faculty and subject-specialist librarians. It will benefit current and future faculty.

Thus, the materials allocation to date has been adequate to support faculty requests for the purchase of specific book titles. We also appreciate the library administration’s periodic invitation to the LLD faculty to take part in the selection of materials. However, current funding is not adequate for the addition of new journal subscriptions to support the diverse teaching needs and research interests of the LLD faculty.

6.2 Resource Management

6.2.1 Process for distribution/allocation of resources

The Department receives the majority of its funds from the Dean’s office in two major categories: Salaries, and Operating Expenses & Equipment. (See Charts in Appendix L-1 for details.) It also receives some Work Study Funds and in the past has received Lottery Funds (this last category no longer exists). In addition, there is a very small amount of money in the Foundation account ($784).

The Chair makes decisions on the distribution of resources in consultation with the Administrative Support Coordinator who keeps track of faculty requests for computers, furniture, etc. Additionally, during the Spring semester the Chair takes out a fixed amount of money (usually $5000) and allocates it for travel money to both full-time and part-time faculty (according to a rather complicated formula, which has been in place for approximately 10 years). The current Chair, towards the end of the 2007 fiscal year, also asked all faculty for any equipment needs and a number of faculty received new computers as requested. With the addition of our new tenure-track faculty member (Dr. Silverman), equipment money (and space) was also allocated for a Phonetics Lab.

Photocopying: At the beginning of the semester, each of the faculty is given a quota of 500 photocopies for each of the classes they teach. Apart from that, the faculty can also place photocopying orders for their class materials a day or two in advance with the office staff.

Reflections on resource utilization: The Department has a very high number of part-time faculty compared to full-time (i.e. tenured/tenure-track) faculty. This semester we have 44 part-time faculty and 8 full-time faculty (See Appendix C). This results in a very heavy workload for the full-time faculty. There are only eight faculty members to serve on committees (department/college/university). Each of these eight faculty have to do four to five peer evaluations per semester and during the Spring semester, in addition, do the Annual Achievement Summary write-ups for all the part-time faculty. The solution, of course, would be to hire more tenure-track faculty. However, the majority of the part-time faculty (all but two or three) are hired to teach Academic English classes, the numbers of which depend on outside factors, such as how well the high schools are preparing students for college level academic English skills. Thus the number of such classes the Department offers keeps changing. Therefore, currently the Department is attempting to grow the enrollment in the degree program courses such that there are enough courses for assigning eight courses per year to more full-time faculty. Of course, if the University went to a 3-3 teaching load, that too would allow us to hire more full-time faculty to cover the existing courses.
Prioritize any instructional support needs in order of importance to program
The Department needs to continue to hire tenure-track faculty to replace retirements etc.

6.3 Goals and Plans: Resources Recommendations

Clerical support: The recommendation from the last Review was for the .5 Administrative Assistant position to be made full-time—it was .5 at that time. We still need for this position to be full-time. Although both the Administrative Support Coordinator and the Administrative Assistant are extremely competent and effective, in a department as large as ours both positions need to be full-time. (This semester we have 44 part-time faculty, eight full-time (i.e. tenured/tenure-track faculty, and a total of 2,834 students enrolled in our Department.)

Technical Support Staff: For computer support, the University’s Information Technology Services has provided adequate help so far. However, now that we have a Phonetics Lab and hope to have a Computational Linguistics Lab (once the ORU is established), it would be desirable to have a part-time lab technician.

Instructional Support Staff: The LDC provides an essential array of administrative services to the Academic English program. In order for the program to support the work of 30+ graduate instructional student assistants serving 700+ freshmen as well as 30+ instructors serving 1500+ freshmen, further investment be made in the administration and infrastructure supporting the LDC:

- The full-time academic coordinator position needs to be upgraded to faculty position or higher-level staff position with career development salary steps.

- In Fall 2007, the Administrative Assistant position was upgraded to two part-time student assistants; this level of staffing needs to be maintained.

- In Fall 2007 a LDC faculty assistant was hired at .2 for just the semester. This position should continue.

Equipment and Facilities:
The LDC needs a partition divider, tall bookshelves, reading chairs and table, lamps (in order to create a reading resource area); wall shelves, basic appliances (for the LDC coach lesson preparation room); 4-8 new computers and tables for the internet lab area. It also requires the purchase of relevant resources for the Academic English library.

Computational Linguistics: Once the tenure-track computational linguist has been hired, resources such as powerful workstations should be purchased.

Library resources: The current funding is not adequate for the addition of new journal subscriptions to support the diverse teaching needs and research interests of the LLD faculty. We plan to work with the library to add to such subscriptions.

Faculty: Hire tenure-track faculty to replace any retirements. Seek ways to increase degree program enrollments to justify additional tenure-track positions.
0.2.2 **Faculty Recommendations** (see section 5.6):

- If course enrollments justify (or if retirements take place), hire more tenure-track faculty.
- Hire more tenure-track faculty who have the expertise to teach our General Education courses.
- The administration should find a way for giving faculty travel money.
- The College Dean should continue (and try to expand) the release time programs.
- The University should find a way to fund release time for faculty to guide M.A. theses.

0.2.2 **Resource Recommendations** (see section 6.5):

Faculty
- For faculty position recommendations, see section 1.3.3 above.

Clerical Support
- The Administrative Assistant position should be made full-time.

Technical Support Staff
- Explore the possibility of a part-time lab technician position.

Language Development Center
- Upgrade the LDC full-time Coordinator position.
- Maintain the current level of LDC Administrative Assistant positions.
- Continue the LDC Faculty Assistant position.
- Upgrade the LDC equipment/facilities as detailed in section 6.3.

Library
- Library funds should be increased to allow for new journal subscriptions.

1. **Context and Scope**

As mentioned above, the Department includes three units: Academic English, TESOL, and Linguistics. These three units include the following offerings: three degree programs, three certificate programs, and a number of general education and service courses. Figure 1 on the next page gives an overview of the academic structure of the Department.

The demographics, curriculum, instructional activities, and faculty research and scholarship of the Department address the core objectives included in the mission statement of San José State University, the College of Humanities and the Arts, and the Department.

One major component of the Mission of the San José State University is "to enrich the lives of its students." The mission of the College of Humanities and the Arts is to instill in students an understanding of human existence that is both tolerant and moral. The degree programs, the service courses and the GE courses offered by the Department, by their very nature, continually enrich the lives of our students in a number of ways. One such enrichment results directly from the diverse backgrounds
of the students who enroll in the courses offered by the Department, including those from other countries. (Approximately one third of our degree students come from other countries, particularly from Asia.) The seminar format of our graduate classes, each of which is led by a faculty member with extensive experience living and teaching abroad, assures that these students constantly interact with one another, understand the true meaning of diversity, become tolerant of others’ viewpoints and backgrounds, and thus enhance their familiarity with world cultures.

A second key component of the Mission of San José State University is "to transmit knowledge to its students along with the necessary skills for applying it in the service of our society." The mission of the Department is to “foster understanding of language structure and use in the context of a technological and multi-cultural society.” The entire curriculum of the Department of Linguistics and Language Development is geared towards these goals. For example, the curriculum of both the M.A. degrees (TESOL & Linguistics) strives for a balanced combination of knowledge and theory, with the direct application of these constructs in service to a multicultural society and to the increasing prominence of high-tech solutions in both education and the work place (the latter is particularly true for the computational linguistics emphasis). Our GE writing courses, especially the 100WB: Writing Workshop for Business Students, focus specifically on the writing skills the students need for successful survival in the corporate culture. In the TESOL courses, students are required to apply their knowledge in a variety of real as well as simulated classroom contexts.

The third component of the Mission of San José State University is to "expand the base of knowledge through research and scholarship." The LLD faculty are actively engaged in research and scholarly activities that complement one another's efforts and that are directly incorporated into the courses taught. The faculty also involve students (especially graduate students) in such research (see section 4.4 for details.)
1. CURRICULUM AND ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

2.0. Description of Programs

3.1.1 The Linguistics Program

The Linguistics Program offers two degrees: a M.A. Linguistics and a B.A. Linguistics, with the latter including a Preparation for Teaching option for teaching at the middle and high school levels. Additionally, it offers a Minor in Linguistics, a Certificate in Computational Linguistics and five General Education (GE) courses (two in core GE and three in advanced GE).

In order to accomplish the missions stated in section 2.0, the following goals are emphasized (See Appendix D-1 for details):

0. To transmit in-depth knowledge of the structure and function of language and its use and change in various cultural and social settings.
0. To help students develop critical thinking skills, analytical skills, and reading, writing and research skills.
0. To help students develop an understanding of the relationship between linguistic theories and areas such as artificial intelligence, cognitive science, language acquisition and learning, and language policy
0. To help students develop an appreciation for the diversity and dynamic nature of human languages and cultures in the U.S. and the world.

There are, however, some differences in the objectives for the B.A. in Linguistics and the M.A. in Linguistics reflecting different degrees of depth of knowledge and inquiry of the field.

B. A. Linguistics: Description

The B.A. in Linguistics is a 120-unit major. Unlike most majors, Linguistics at San José State does not require any lower division courses. We offer two lower division GE courses, which cannot be used to fulfill requirements in the major. The reason for this is that the great majority of linguistics students enter the program as juniors, having already completed all lower division requirements (See data on incoming students, Appendix C).

The major consists of 36 units -- 18 units of required courses and 18 units of electives. The required courses cover the core of the discipline with courses in phonetics, phonology, syntax, semantics, and historical linguistics. Our elective offerings may be clustered to provide an informal concentration (along with the required courses) as follows (For titles of these classes, see Appendix G-1):

   General Linguistics: LING 161, LING 162, LING 166, LLD 107, LING 122/123/129
   ESL (leading to a TESOL certificate): LLD 107, LLD 108, LING 129 or 122, LING 166
   Natural Language and Computers (leading to a Computational Linguistics certificate): LING 115, LING 124, LING 165, LING 162, LING 166, LING 123

In addition to the listed elective courses, with the advisor's approval, students may choose relevant courses from outside the department to complete their elective requirements.
Students are also required to fulfill a foreign language requirement. This involves demonstrating competence equivalent to one-year college-level language instruction in a language other than the student’s native language by providing either transcripts of the completed foreign language courses or the results of a placement test taken at the Department of Foreign Languages.

B.A. Linguistics – Preparation for Teaching
This concentration under the major is offered in collaboration with the Department of English and Comparative Literature. It is designed for students interested in teaching English, English as a Second Language (ESL) or English Language Development (ELD) in high school or middle school. This 120-unit program requires students to take 27 required units, 6 elective units, and 21 support units. For a full list of the courses, please see Appendix G-2. This course work satisfies San José State University’s requirements for a B.A. in Linguistics. In addition, this program (along with the courses from the Department of English and Comparative Literature) is approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) as subject matter preparation for a single subject credential in English with an ESL emphasis. Students are also required to fulfill a foreign language requirement. This involves demonstrating competence equivalent to one-year college-level language instruction in a language other than the student’s native language by providing either transcripts of the completed foreign language courses or the results of a placement test taken at the Department of Foreign Languages.

Minor in Linguistics
Students majoring in fields such as Foreign Languages, Communication Studies, English, or Computer Science may choose to minor in Linguistics. The Minor consists of 15 units. Students are required to take LING 101: Introduction to Linguistics, LING 111: Phonetics, and LING 112: Introduction to Syntax and they can choose 6 units of upper-division electives with their advisor’s approval. In addition, students must fulfill one year of college-level instruction in a language other than their native language.

Computational Linguistics Certificate
This certificate is intended for students either in the linguistics major or in other majors, such as Computer Science, who would like to show basic preparation in the area of computational linguistics. The certificate consists of 18 units. Students are required to complete the following courses with a minimum 3.0 GPA: LING 101: Introduction to Linguistics, LING 111: Introduction to Phonetics, LING 112: Introduction to Syntax, LING 115: Corpus Linguistics, LING 124: Computers and Spoken Language and LING 165: Computers and Written Language. In addition, they must demonstrate basic proficiency in a programming language, such as C(++), Java, Lisp, Perl, Prolog, Python, or Ruby.

M.A. Linguistics Program Description
Students with Bachelor degrees from a variety of fields, such as English, Art History, Engineering, Management, Foreign Languages, Psychology, and Anthropology, are conditionally admitted into the M.A. in Linguistics program. As detailed in the next paragraph, upon completion of the prerequisite courses with a letter grade of “B” or better, they become classified students in the program. The goals of the M.A. Linguistics Program are common with the ones for the B.A. in Linguistics. Each goal is associated with a list of learning objectives, which in turn are introduced, reinforced and advanced in a number of linguistics courses (See Appendix D-3 for a detailed description of goals, objectives, courses in which objectives are addressed, and assessment tools.)

All students admitted to the M.A. Linguistics program must have completed at a minimum LING 101: Introduction to Linguistics, LING 111: Introduction to Phonetics, and LING 112: Introduction to Syntax
(or equivalent courses) before they can become classified as graduate students. Classified students take
the following 18 units of core courses: LING 113: Introduction to Phonology, LING 114: Introduction
to Semantics and Discourse, LING 201: Phonology: Theory and Applications, LING 202A: Syntactic
Theory, LING 203: Semantic Structures, and LING 213: Field Methods. In addition to the core,
students are required to take 12 units of electives toward this 30-unit degree. They can choose from a
variety of courses from the graduate curriculum, the undergraduate curriculum, the M.A. TESOL
curriculum, as well as courses offered by other departments. A list is provided in Appendix G-3.

In addition to coursework, students must fulfill a culminating experience requirement. To do so, students
may choose Plan A (thesis option) and take up to six units of thesis work (LING 299: Master’s Thesis)
in lieu of six elective units. Students who elect Plan B (non-thesis option) are required to take the M.A.
Comprehensive Exam, usually in their final semester (see Appendix G-4 for descriptions of Thesis
Option and the Comprehensive Exam, and Appendix G-5 for a sample of the M.A. Linguistics
Comprehensive Exam). A great majority of students opt for the comprehensive exam as their
culminating experience. (See “Bottlenecks for both programs”, p.15)

Students are also required to fulfill a foreign language requirement. For native speakers of English, this
involves demonstrating competence equivalent to two years of college-level instruction in an Indo-
European language or one-year of college-level instruction in a non-Indo-European language (including
American Sign Language). For international students whose language of instruction for their previous
degree was not English, English satisfies this requirement. For admission to our program, international
students must provide minimum TOEFL scores of 577 (PBT) or 233 (CBT) or 90 (IBT).

Curricular changes
The core curriculum for all three programs (B.A., M.A., and Minor) has remained the same since the last
review. Changes occurred in the electives area. A new course, LING 115: Corpus Linguistics, was
added to strengthen the computational linguistics offerings. This course can be used as an elective for
the B.A. and the M.A. programs. The other change involved LING 250W: Becoming a professional in
Linguistics and TESOL. As is mentioned on page 14, this course was changed in terms of content to
include a section on research, and rather than being a pass/fail course it is now letter-graded. In its new
rendition, the course can be used as an elective in the M.A. program, in addition to satisfying the
University’s Writing Requirement.

Curricula in the discipline
The core courses for the B.A., the Minor, and the M.A. degrees conform to program offerings at
universities from across the country. We compared the programs offered by San José State University to
programs at two other CSU campuses -- Fresno State and San Diego State, and three Ph.D.- granting
institutions -- UC Berkeley, University of Oregon, and Ohio State University. The core curricula for the
B.A., the Minor, and M.A. in Linguistics are comparable to these universities in terms of number of
units and required courses. However, we would like to point out that our required course list is more
similar to the Ph.D granting institutions mentioned above than to other CSU campuses. We consider this
to be one of our strengths. SJSU Linguistics offers a broad range of required classes comparable to the
offerings of Ph.D.-granting institutions. For a detailed comparison, please see Appendix G-7.

Interdisciplinary nature of the program
The field of linguistics is interdisciplinary by nature. Many of the areas of linguistics, such as
psycholinguistics or neurolinguistics, reflect the intersection of two different disciplines.
Curricular bottlenecks (See also page 15)

Sequencing of Courses: In the B.A. Linguistics program, there are a number of sequences of courses that students must follow because one is a prerequisite to the other:

LING 101 → LING 111 → LING 113
LING 101 → LING 112
LING 101 → LING 114
LING 101 → LING 111 → LING 113 → LING 125
→ LING 112 → → →

We have allowed students to register for LING 101: Introduction to Linguistics, LING 111: Introduction to Phonetics, and LING 112: Introduction to Syntax or LING 114: Introduction to Semantics and Discourse concurrently, if the instructor of the class judged that a student was able to handle the load. We have also faced some difficulties with students not having completed LING 113: Introduction to Phonology before registering for LING 125: Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics. LING 113 is a fall class and LING 125 is a spring class. Students graduating in the fall semester need to take LING 113 a year before graduating, which does not always happen. As a result, on several occasions we need to relax the LING 113 requirement for LING 125. This means that the instructor cannot always teach the class at the level they would wish for.

Frequency of offerings: We have also faced some challenges with offering LING 166: Sociolinguistics as part of the Undergraduate TESOL certificate. It is currently taught every third semester because of insufficient enrollment, and the lack of availability of a faculty member to teach it. The low frequency with which the course is offered impacts on students who are graduating with the Undergraduate TESOL certificate.

The B.A. Linguistics – Preparation for Teaching program has been generally under-enrolled. We have had only one student complete this program in the past five years although several had originally been interested and declared it as a major. The main reason for this trend is the large number of units involved in completing this emphasis. Students coming in as freshmen could easily fit them in their 120 unit graduation requirements. However, so far students declaring linguistics as their major as freshmen have been rather few. Most majors come in as transfer students, i.e. as juniors, with few extra available units beyond a 36-unit major and SJSU studies unit requirements.

3.1.2 The TESOL Program


The M.A. TESOL Program at San José State University prepares its graduates to become teachers of English as a second or foreign language, either in the U.S. or in other countries. For TESOL majors, in accord with its overall mission, the Department emphasizes “an in-depth knowledge of theories and practices of language teaching and learning”, as detailed in the next section.
Description of the M.A. TESOL Program

The primary goals of the M.A. TESOL Program are to impart in our students:

1. Knowledge of language, i.e., knowledge of the major elements of language as a system consisting of phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and discourse;
2. Knowledge of language learning, i.e., knowledge of current theories concerning linguistic, cognitive, affective, social and cultural factors governing the acquisition and use of additional languages, particularly English;
3. Knowledge of language teaching, i.e., knowledge of curricular frameworks, teaching methods, assessment techniques for teaching English as an additional language; and
4. Skills and attitudes necessary to understand, analyze and synthesize the systems of knowledge listed above in order to put them to appropriate use in different classroom settings.
5. Proficiency in English for academic purposes with particular focus on Linguistics and TESOL.

The M.A. TESOL program seeks to realize its primary goals through a cluster of prerequisites, core courses, electives, and a culminating comprehensive exam or thesis. The matrix provided in Appendix D-6 shows where in the curriculum these goals and related student learning outcomes are principally introduced, reinforced, or advanced, with particular reference to core courses, and how they are assessed.

Students entering the M.A. program are expected to have basic knowledge of what language is, therefore, those with Bachelor degrees from a variety of fields get admitted as conditionally classified students. Upon completion of LING 101: Introduction to Linguistics and LLD 107: Patterns of English they become classified students.

The core courses are offered in a seminar format with an enrollment cap of 15 students. This format is ideal for graduate instruction as it allows students to develop their skills in formal and informal oral presentations as well as to interact extensively with their peers, both essential elements for developing their skills as future teachers.

The M.A. TESOL program requires 30 units of course work (excluding pre-requisites) beyond the B.A., 24 units of core courses and 6 units of elective courses (For a list of core courses and a list of approved elective courses, please see Appendix H-1). The Department requires that all M.A. TESOL students take LLD 250W: Becoming a professional in TESOL/Linguistics at the beginning of their course work and LLD 282: Practicum in TESOL near the end of their course work.

With regard to the culminating experience, students have two options: Plan A and Plan B. Plan A requires the generation of a thesis in an area of common interest to the student and a faculty member. (See Appendix G-4 for further details on the procedures for opting for the thesis). Plan B requires the students to do six units of elective course work and pass a comprehensive examination. The LLD-TESOL Comprehensive Examination is a take-home, weekend-long, open book examination in three areas: I. Analysis of Language Structure and Language Development, II. Social and Psychological Contexts of Language Learning and Teaching, and III. Pedagogical Issues. (See Appendix G-4 for further details on the procedures of the Comprehensive Examination and H-3 a sample of the Comprehensive Exam).
Students also have to fulfill a foreign language requirement to obtain the M.A. degree in TESOL. Native speakers of English are required to have two semesters of college work in a foreign language. For non-native speakers of English, English satisfies this requirement. For admission to our program, international students must earn minimum TOEFL scores of 577 (PBT) or 233 (CBT) or 90 (IBT).

**Practical Experience:** Since the outside evaluator in the last review raised some questions about hands-on experience in classroom oriented tasks (Recommendations # 20, 21), we describe here in some detail some of the ways in which TESOL students gain such experience:

- Although all M.A. TESOL students engage in peer teaching and tutoring experiences in several core courses, they have an extensive teaching assignment, usually off-campus, in LLD 282: *Practicum in TESOL*, the culminating teaching experience. In this course, students design and present language lessons to a real ESL class. Students are also required to observe a minimum of ten hours of ESL instruction in at least two different settings (e.g., Adult schools, community college ESL programs, university ESL programs, private language schools) and to provide six hours of aiding (e.g., helping during group work, photocopying, correcting homework), through which they identify a preferred setting and a master teacher. In consultation with the master teacher, they then teach ten hours of a real ESL class under the supervision of a master teacher, two hours of which are videotaped for subsequent discussion in the Practicum class, and one hour of which is observed and commented on, in both oral and written form, by the Practicum instructor. Students are required to keep an extensive hour-by-hour record of their observation, aiding, and teaching experiences, and to write ten reflective journal entries for the Practicum Notebook, which is read and commented upon by the Practicum instructor. With regards to recommendation #21, a general list of possible practicum sites is posted on the LLD website and a list of “recent contacts” is made available to students in the practicum course; the practicum instructor and the master teacher provide mentoring and guidance during the practicum.

- In LLD 283: Curriculum and Assessment in TESOL, students develop curricula for hypothetical student populations and then develop language tests which they field-test on real student populations.

- Apart from practicum, the Department offers additional optional means for graduate students to gain teaching experience before they graduate: tutoring and classroom teaching. Many students take advantage of the tutoring positions in the Department’s Language Development Center, a required 2-unit lab course for LLD 1 students, (with any spaces then opened to LLD 2, LLD 98, and LLD 99 students). This is a paid position with supervision provided in a required fifteen-hour tutoring practicum (a 1-unit course with the title LLD 4: *Tutorial Success Writing* offered every Spring semester by the director of the LDC).

- Another paid tutoring opportunity is available through a collaborative agreement our department established in 2004 with DeAnza College’s Readiness Program. Each year, a few students apply to DeAnza College to become regular Resource Teaching Associates in the Readiness Program. If accepted, they tutor small groups of 8 non-native English-speaking students in writing throughout the Fall and Winter quarters at DeAnza. They are able to use this tutoring experience to complete their LLD 282: *Practicum in TESOL* tutoring requirement, and they are also usually able to complete their student teaching in a full-sized ESL class at DeAnza College.
• Classroom teaching is made available through three or four Teaching Associate positions in the LLD 98 and LLD 99 courses in the fall semester each year. For those selected, this is a paid position with the Associate Teacher functioning completely independently in running the class. Supervision is provided by the LLD 98/99 Coordinator, and each Associate Teacher is paired with a mentor teacher who regularly teaches the same course. This individual observes and gives feedback to the Associate Teacher. The Practicum instructor also observes and provides feedback as with any other practicum student. The Associate Teachers also take part in faculty meetings, where issues related to the teaching of writing to students who have failed the Writing Skills Test (WST) – the University’s test for assessing students’ preparedness for upper division writing - are discussed.

• A few graduate students are employed as teachers and tutors by the university’s private intensive English language program, Studies in American Language (SAL) or as tutors by the University Writing Center, established in 2006 and located on the 1st floor of Clark Hall.

The graduate certificate in TESOL program requires 18 units of course work. The following courses comprise the graduate certificate program: LING 101: Introduction to Linguistics, LLD 107: Patterns of English, LLD 280: Methods & Materials for TESOL, LLD 283: Curriculum & Assessment, LLD 270: Second Language Acquisition, & LLD 271: Intercultural Communication & Second Language Acquisition. Since Fall 2003, 65 students have received the graduate certificates in TESOL. This number includes students who were and are enrolled in the M.A. degree program, since any student who has completed these six courses can receive the graduate certificate.

The undergraduate certificate in TESOL program also requires 18 units of course work. The following courses comprise the undergraduate certificate program. LING 101: Introduction to Linguistics, LLD 107: Patterns of English, LLD 108: Introduction to Second Language Development & Teaching, LING 166: Sociolinguistics, and two electives approved by the TESOL coordinator. Since Fall 2003, 19 students have received undergraduate certificates in TESOL. This includes students who were and are enrolled in the B.A. Linguistics degree program, since any student who has completed these six courses can receive the undergraduate certificate.

Curricular Changes since the last review
The English for Specific Purposes (ESP) option which was listed as a significant feature of the program in the last review has been put on “hold” due to the following reasons: The three ESP courses (which made up the ESP Certificate) were only electives (not required) courses in the TESOL degree, and when they were offered they frequently either did not have the required enrollment and thus were cancelled or had to be held with very low enrollment. With the retirement of Dr. Peter Master, the faculty member whose area of specialization was ESP, the faculty decided to put ESP on “hold”. The faculty is now considering offering just one ESP course as an elective (i.e. making it a single course) and not offering an ESP Certificate. This course could be taught either by part-time faculty, or, if the tenure-track hire on the current search has ESP as an interest, he/she could teach it.

Upon the recommendation of the external reviewers for the previous program review, the Department worked hard to solve the University Writing Requirements Issue. After extensive deliberations in a department retreat, it was decided to change the content, title, and grading method of LLD 250W. The new rendition of LLD 250W is titled Becoming a professional in Linguistics and TESOL and includes a new component that focuses on research design in both qualitative and quantitative research. Student
assessment for the course has also been changed from Credit/No Credit to letter grading. The course is now part of the required core units for the degree and continues to satisfy the University Writing Requirement. Before this change, this course was over and above the 30-unit M.A. Now it is included in the 30 units; however this has been at the cost of reducing the number of electives from 9 units to 6 units. In LLD 250W, students learn how to do library research, write professional papers in the genres of their respective disciplines (Linguistics or TESOL), and understand qualitative and quantitative research designs so that they become better readers of the scholarly literature.

A change in the weighting in student assessment for LLD 282 (Practicum in TESOL) was effective Fall 2006. The weight of student teaching was increased from 25% of the grade to 50% of the grade. This change addressed a problem the regular Practicum professor had seen over several years: Students sometimes were very diligent in completing all the written work to an acceptable standard, but lacked teaching skills, as evidenced by the observation. The Practicum instructor felt that increasing the weight of the teaching would signal more clearly to students how important their teaching skills are. The outcome shows that the shift in weighting probably changes nothing for students who already take their practice teaching seriously and have good teaching skills. It becomes important only for students whose teaching is marginal or weak; it gives the Practicum instructor the grounds to give a No Credit (NC) or an incomplete to these students if their teaching skills are not satisfactory.

Comparison with Other Programs
The standard curricula for the TESOL programs based on the TESOL organization guidelines contain three areas: language analysis, language learning, and language teaching, including assessment. The LLD-TESOL curriculum addresses all these three areas and gives equal emphasis to all three. Generally, other programs focus on one or the other area. In addition, due to the high enrollment of foreign students in the program, the program also emphasizes issues such as “World Englishes,” and “Globalization of English.”

The LLD Department has the only program in the San Francisco Bay Area to offer an M.A. TESOL degree (and a TESOL Certificate). San Francisco State University and CSU East Bay offer an M.A. in English with a TESOL Emphasis. Several UC Extension programs provide TESOL-related courses in the local area, but these offer only professional development credit, not graduate degree credit. Outside the Bay Area, the Monterey Institute of International Studies (MIIS) in Monterey offers an M.A. TESOL degree. It is a private program and thus rather expensive. Sonoma State University offers only a TESOL Certificate. The Department is thus unique in the region for its degree offerings. CSU Chico also offers an Interdisciplinary M.A. in Teaching International Languages with TESOL as Emphasis, housed in the Office of International Programs. Please see attached the Appendix H-4 for TESOL Program descriptions for the following universities: San Francisco State University, Fresno State University, and California State University, Los Angeles.

The interdisciplinary nature of SJSU TESOL program
The TESOL program is interdisciplinary in several ways. Our faculty have broad interdisciplinary backgrounds which are reflected in the courses they teach. A number of the elective courses students take are either interdisciplinary in nature (e.g., LING 161: Psycholinguistics) or are in other departments (e.g. Foreign Languages).
Curricular bottlenecks

LLD 107: Patterns of English, LLD 260: Grammar for Teachers of English I and LLD 261: Grammar for Teachers of English II are structured in such a way that LLD 107 is a pre-requisite for LLD 260 and LLD 260 is a pre-requisite for LLD 261. These courses cannot be taken concurrently. Thus, for a student entering the program without the pre-requisite LLD 107, it will take a minimum of 3 semesters to complete the program. And for those who do not carefully plan their classes, it is possible that this sequencing can delay their graduation process.

Overall, delays in graduation are rarely due to a lack of course offerings or the time of course offerings; the Department regularly offers required courses in the late afternoons and evenings to accommodate students who have to work in the daytime.

Bottlenecks for both programs

Thesis

Students who choose to fulfill the culminating experience by opting for Plan A (Thesis option) face some challenges. In forming a thesis committee, a student first has to identify a thesis supervisor whose research interests match the student's interests and who is willing to chair a thesis committee. Second, in order for supervisors to agree to chair a thesis committee, they have to be convinced that the student can conduct research independently and has the requisite writing skills. Additionally, faculty are sometimes hesitant in agreeing to chair thesis committees because of the related extra workload. Faculty members who are willing to direct theses are not given any release time towards thesis supervision though the previous external reviewers have recommended to the Dean and the University Administration that they be given due credit for supervising theses. Moreover, students opting for the thesis usually take longer to finish the program, having to spend at least an extra semester. Students may perceive the time it takes to complete a thesis as a bottleneck, but we do not see it as such. We make sure that students are aware that the process of thesis writing is driven primarily by them and, consequently, any delays are a result of how much progress they make. For all the above reasons, most students opt for the comprehensive examination. Only six students in the past four years have worked on theses in the Department (See Appendix G-6 for a list of thesis titles and thesis supervisors in M.A. Linguistics and MA. TESOL).

Electives

Yet another bottleneck is the enrollment problem in the electives offered by the LLD faculty. In order to check on the magnitude of the problem, i.e., how many electives were being taken outside the Department, over this past summer, we conducted a systematic survey for the years 2002-2007 by looking at the student petitions for the “Departmental Request for Candidacy and Graduate Degree Program” which includes a list of the electives taken by the student. The findings indicate that the majority of the electives are being taken within the Department. Of the 34 students who have graduated from the M.A. Linguistics program in the past four years, the majority chose courses within the LLD department. Only seven students chose five different courses from outside the Department (See Appendix G-3-1 for details.) In the case of TESOL, the majority also took electives within the Department: 167 students took electives within the Department and only 52 took electives outside the Department (see Appendix H-2-1 for more details).

However, it is still the case that some of the electives that our faculty offer get cancelled due to a lack of enrollment. This has happened at least three times in the past four years. We have recently revised our policy to limit the number of courses that the students can take outside the Department to only three
units. The faculty plan to continue to monitor the situation in curriculum committee meetings and would welcome any suggestions the reviewers might offer.

2.1. General Education and Service Courses

3.2.1 General Education Courses

Every semester during the period under review, the LLD Department has offered one or more sections of our two lower division (“Core”) GE courses and one section each of our four upper division (“SJSU Studies”) courses. The lower division courses are LING 20: The Nature of Language and LING 21: Language and Thinking. The upper division courses are LING 122: English as a World Language; LING 123: Sound and Communication; LING 129: Culture, Language, and Ethnicity in the U.S; and LLD 100W: Writing Workshop and LLD 100WB: Writing Workshop for Business Writers.

During the period under review, the Department has not introduced additional GE courses. Our present courses position the Department to serve students from a broad range of disciplines in most subject areas of the University’s GE program. Moreover, a 2005 University GE regulation blocks students from taking more than one upper division course from a single department for GE credit; since LLD already offers a course in each of the upper division GE areas, the introduction of additional upper division courses could result in decreased enrollment in our current GE courses. This restriction does not apply to lower division courses, and there are three GE areas in which LLD does not yet offer courses. However, as explained below, our current shortage of tenured/tenure-track faculty is already creating staffing, coordination, and supervision problems for our existing GE courses. Once solutions to these problems are in place, as also explained below, we can consider offering additional lower division courses.

The academic quality of all of our GE courses is enhanced by the Department’s adherence to strict guidelines and reporting requirements imposed by the SJSU Board of General Studies (BOGS) in order for courses to earn continuing GE certification. Two of the above courses (LING 20: The Nature of Language and LING 122: English as a World Language) are currently certified through fall 2010. The Department is presently applying for the other three courses to receive continuing certification, which, based on our past experiences with the certification of these courses, should be granted during this academic year.

Concurrent with this certification process, the high pedagogical effectiveness of all of our GE courses has been consistently indicated by the overall performance of most of the students who complete our GE courses, by peer teaching reviews, and by generally high quantitative and open-ended evaluations of these courses via the University’s Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) questionnaire.

Curricular Bottlenecks
The success of our GE courses has been and continues to be achieved in spite of two bottlenecks in the areas of GE faculty and enrollments.
Bottleneck #1: GE Faculty
Due to the Department’s shortage of tenured and tenure-track faculty, most permanent instructors’ teaching assignments are filled with required courses and electives in our BA and MA degree curricula. As a result, by far the majority of our GE offerings each semester must be taught by part-time faculty. Since the resignation of one of our tenure-track faculty in spring 2005, two of the three courses coming up for continuing certification this year have not been taught by a tenured/tenure-track faculty member, and this semester, no tenured/tenure-track faculty member is teaching a GE course.

As indicated by student performance, peer reviews, and SOTE results, these part-time instructors are doing an excellent job in their teaching. However, since these instructors are paid only for their actual teaching and office hours, they cannot be expected to coordinate among themselves the content and activities of their GE courses, and to gather, analyze, and report the voluminous student assessment data required for continuing certification of the courses.

According to University guidelines, for each GE course, the above tasks are to be completed by a faculty member who serves as the “course coordinator.” One of the three courses that are up for continuing GE certification this year has not had a course coordinator since the Department’s last self-study; another has not had a course coordinator since spring 2005. As a result, the above coordination, administrative, and assessment tasks for these two courses have de facto been added to the workload, without augmented compensation, of the part-time instructors teaching the courses.

This semester, Chair Ohala has been able to provide to one tenured faculty member reassigned time of .07 (equivalent to one-third of a 3-credit course) to serve as GE coordinator for all of the Department’s GE courses. This faculty member is currently working with the part-time instructors of two of the courses coming up for review to compile and analyze the required student assessment data and to prepare the documentation needed for this year’s applications for continuing certification.

Bottleneck #2: GE Enrollments
Maintaining consistently high enrollments is not a problem in our lower division GE courses, for which we are regularly able to fill two or more sections, or in our upper division LING 123: Sound and Communication course, which attracts many students from the sciences. However, enrollments in our other upper division GE courses, LING 122: English as a World Language and LING 129: Culture, Language, and Ethnicity in the U.S., have been less dependable, occasionally necessitating their last-minute cancellation – In the case of LING 129, it has only made its enrollment minimum three times since 2004. This problem results largely from the intense competition across departments at SJSU to meet their constantly increasing University-imposed FTE/S targets by attracting upper division non-majors to their GE courses.

Former Department Chair Huebner was able to stabilize enrollments in LING 122: English as a World Language by persuading the College of Business, particularly the Business Students Advising Center, to recommend that undergraduate business majors enroll in the course to fulfill one of their upper division GE requirements. As a result, large numbers of Business students regularly enroll in the course, which is of direct relevance to their career goals.

Attempts to pursue this strategy with LING 129: Culture, Language, and Ethnicity in the U.S. have not been successful to date, perhaps because of the lack of a natural “fit” between that course and other departments’ curricula and because of competition from the large number of upper division courses
(including Human Sexuality, an obvious favorite among many students!) in the same area of GE that are offered by other departments. One strategy that worked well for one semester was to advertise the course to international exchange students. Many of these students enrolled. However, they expected a course that was designed as an orientation to US culture for people who have never lived in the US before, and as a result the Director of International Studies did not think it was appropriate to advertise it to this constituency in the future. In another semester, the course was advertised with an organization of retirees who were coming back to complete their degrees. Only one person enrolled from this group. All in all, the search for a constituency has been problematic because if a large number of students from a new constituency are attracted, they justifiably expect the course to be geared to their needs. This logic, however, seriously compromises the GE learning objectives, which need to remain in place if LING 129 is to continue as an upper division GE course.

Part of the new GE coordinator's charge will be to collaborate with the course coordinator of LING 129: Culture, Language, and Ethnicity in the U.S., who is a tenured faculty member, in creating and promoting a "niche" for LING 129 of the sort that has been found for LING 122: English as a World Language.

The Department currently offers two courses that fulfill the SJSU Studies area Z requirement for discipline-specific writing workshops. The first, LLD 100W: Writing Workshop, has been offered in each semester of the period under review. Though it is aimed primarily at linguistics majors, the course serves students from several other departments as well.

The second course, LLD 100WB: Writing Workshop for Business Students, was first offered in Spring 2007 as one of three successor courses to Business 100W, which the College of Business decided to stop offering. In Spring 2007, 30 sections of the successor courses were taught: 6 by LLD and 12 each by English and Communication Studies. LLD is offering 6 sections of 100WB again in fall 2007 and plans to offer 6 in spring 2008. The LLD sections have filled to capacity, and preliminary results indicate that the students are receiving rigorous training in both language use and business discourse.

Both LLD 100W and LLD 100WB are periodically reviewed by the Writing Requirements Committee of the College of Humanities & Arts. This term LLD 100WB received initial certification for a period of two years (the customary period for new courses). On October 1st, 2007, a recertification package was submitted for LLD 100W with the expectation that the course will be re-certified for four years.

One challenge for LLD 100WB is the relatively low "name recognition" of LLD; when business students learned that Business 100W would no longer be offered, they tended to look to English for the replacement writing course. The LLD 100W/WB coordinator is working to expand the visibility of LLD 100WB by coordination with the Business Advising Center and by both word-of-mouth and brochure advertising. As efforts become successful, it may be possible for the Department to increase the sections of LLD 100WB.

We do not have appropriate data from other departments to assess how well these courses meet the needs of the programs served. This is one of the areas we plan to work on.

3.2.2.1 Service Courses: (LLD 107, LLD 108)

The LLD department offers two courses, LLD 107: Patterns of English and LLD 108: Second Language Development and Teaching, which, in addition to being electives in the B.A. Linguistics program and
part of the Undergraduate TESOL Certificate program, also fulfill requirements in the B.A. in Liberal Studies – Preparation for Teaching. Also, LLD 108 fulfills requirements in the B.A. in English – Preparation for Teaching.

2.1.1.1 Service Courses: Academic English (LLD 1, LLD2, LLD 98 & LLD 99)

Academic English Programs: Description
The Academic English program at SJSU is designed to provide support for students who have not yet mastered the skills of writing in academic English prose, as measured by the English Placement Test (EPT) and the upper division Writing Skills Test (WST). The Department provides two courses for lower-division students (LLD 1 and LLD 2), and two courses for upper-division students (LLD 98 and LLD 99). LLD 1 includes a 2-unit lab, which takes place in the Language Development Center (LDC), making this a course of 5 units total. The other three courses all carry 3 units each.

It is important to state here that San José State, unlike most other CSU campuses, has no ESL program. Students are enrolled in the Academic English courses for a variety of reasons, including lower proficiency in Standard American English for academic purposes, and lack of adequate preparation in expository writing at either the high school or community college level. While many of these students either have international or Generation 1.5 backgrounds, others are native speakers of English who have been educated entirely in the U.S. All information below, especially the data on students’ backgrounds, assumes this diverse student population.

Current Curriculum
In all of the Academic English classes offered by LLD, the central goal is to prepare students for academic reading and writing in English so that they will succeed in their content classes. Please see Appendix D-9 for the goals and objectives of the Academic English Programs.

With many sections of each course (LLD 1, 2, 98, 99), there is a need for both consistency in terms of a unified core, and flexibility in terms of instructor preference and individual student needs. All sections of the Academic English courses share the same goals and objectives, but exactly how they achieve these objectives varies depending on the instructor. In other words, instructors are given the latitude to use different materials and curricula depending on their preference and philosophical approach. Some instructors prefer a highly structured curriculum with a focus on developing the correct forms in students’ final products; some view writing as a process and prefer to focus on the stages of that process (i.e., prewriting, first drafts, editing, revisions, second drafts, final drafts). Some focus on written genres, developing students’ abilities to recognize and produce a wide variety of genres that are used in academic and work settings. Still others take a critical literacy approach which views writing as a vehicle for exploring and critiquing aspects of the world we live in (e.g., environmental policies, social policies, current legislation, media behavior, etc.). Most classes use a reading text that provides short essays and other input that can be used as a springboard for writing assignments, as well as modeling different genres that students are expected to produce. Most classes also use a text that focuses on the conventions and rhetorical styles of academic English. In addition, instructors use supplementary materials as appropriate to meet individual student needs.

The Academic English classes vary in terms of instructional activities also. Many classes employ cooperative learning, using small groups or pairs to develop students’ expertise in brainstorming, prewriting, editing, etc. Students often read each others’ rough drafts and provide feedback through a
peer editing process. Since all of the courses use a timed writing task as the final (and since the WST requires this as well), all classes incorporate several timed writing tasks at various points in the semester so that students can practice this very specific genre. All classes also include review of language structure and mechanics, with more focused attention to structural problems according to student needs.

It should be emphasized here how crucial the LDC’s role is in the success of our LLD 1 students, thanks largely to the initiative and innovation of the LDC’s coordinator and the graduate students who make up the tutoring force. Informal reports from LLD 1 instructors indicate a great appreciation of the extra help coming from the LDC. (Many instructors who have taught both LLD 1 and LLD 2 lament that their LLD 2 students don’t receive that extra help).

Curricular changes since last review
In the LLD 1 / 2 courses, there has been only one change since last review. In a Curriculum Committee meeting in the spring of 2007, the LLD 1 / 2 coordinator proposed a minor change and had it approved that would allow the exam format for LLD 1 / 2 to be modified (though the format itself has not actually seen any modification). Specifically, whereas the previous course outlines for LLD 1 and 2 contained a clause that limited the way the exam could be given – “Essay prompt will require that students comprehend, summarize, and respond to a short reading passage” – that clause was deleted.

In proposing this change, the coordinator felt that a liberation of the exam format was in order. The format specified by the clause served a good purpose, one that has worked for many years; yet there are other possible formats that could serve even better purposes, and the coordinator felt that that option should be open to the Department.

Since fall semester 2003, the Language Development Center (LDC, the lab all LLD 1 students must attend for two extra units) has engaged in an action-research approach to curriculum improvement designed to enhance the integration of the lab with its “parent” courses and create a more effective learning atmosphere for its students. Based on research of student attitudes and learning outcomes, as well as consultation with LLD 1 instructors and LLD full-time faculty, the LDC has developed a curriculum structure that endeavors to balance the supportiveness of in-person consultation with the intellectual challenge of an electronic curriculum (Calibrated Peer Review) that stimulates students’ critical thinking capacities. The stages of this action-research approach to curriculum development have been presented at various academic conferences, including CATESOL and CRLA (College Reading and Learning Association). This curriculum development initiative has culminated in the portfolio-based approach explained above in 3.1.a.

There have been no curricular changes to the LLD 98 / 99 courses. However, there has been an addition to the Teaching Associate (TA) training in 98 / 99. As mentioned elsewhere in this report: over the last two years the Department has instituted a program whereby each 98 / 99 TA is paired up with a Master Teacher (MT, who receives extra compensation); this is a mentor-mentee relationship in which curriculum, lesson planning, assessment, and other issues are discussed. The MT also does at least two observations of the TA. Informal feedback has shown this program to be quite successful and welcomed.

It should however be stated here that the curricular changes described above are still in their infancy. Greater understanding of these is forthcoming in future semesters.
Differences from standard curricula in the discipline
Students in LLD 1/2 are assessed on an exam-only basis, that is, their success or failure (their ability to move out of remedial status and on to English 1A) is entirely determined by a single common in-class final. Course work only counts inasmuch as, if students don’t complete a threshold amount of it, they are barred from taking the final exam.

SJSU is among just a very few of the CSU campuses that retain this exam-only situation, and it is a situation that has been demonstrated by composition research to be ineffective for student learning and needlessly punitive in nature. A prevailing attitude among LLD 1/2 students on this “high-stakes” form of testing is that they reside in a holding cell during their time in remedial status and that the courses’ assessment method is unfair for three reasons: the exam’s reliance on a prompt that is held secret until exam time and thus does not allow students to fully reflect and consider the topic before writing about it; the exam’s time limit, which, again, does not allow for a fuller reflection; and the fact that “nothing else we do in this course counts.” All of these objections are legitimate.

Students in LLD 98/99 are assessed on both their final examination and coursework. However, simply receiving credit for the class does not allow students to dispense with the WST, but allows them to retake the WST as many times as necessary. After a third failure, students may apply to the Vice-President for Undergraduate Studies for a waiver; about 20% of petitions for waivers are granted unconditionally.

Curricular bottlenecks
LLD 1/2. This is a topic that we, as a department, can imagine no remedy for. Enrollment numbers in LLD 1 and 2 are entirely dependent on an externality that the Department has no control over: scores on the English Placement Test, required of all incoming first-year students across the CSUs. At SJSU, all students scoring 151 or below on this exam are placed in one of the two courses. If total SJSU first-year enrollment is high in any given year – something we cannot control – the number of the 50-or-so percent of incoming students who place into remedial English is that much higher.

During the summer prior to the fall semester, thus, we are forced to open any number of new sections of LLD 1 or 2, whether or not we have the faculty to teach them. In the final weeks leading up to semester’s start, the Department chair is under great pressure to find faculty – most of whom have already accepted appointments at other places. We are often faced with hiring instructors from other fields or very recent Master’s graduates, many of whom have little to no experience teaching basic writing. We do our best, with very limited means, to train them, and most of them do well. But it is a nerve-wracking situation, especially for the Department chair and the LLD 1/2 coordinator.

Certainly, among items on an ideal wish list would be: more resources that would allow paid training of all Academic English instructors; a full-time position for each of the coordinators; more resources also for an expansion of the LDC, possibly so that LLD 2 students could also be served there; a higher status for the LDC coordinator.

LLD 98/99. Demand for LLD 98/99 is more predictable. Providing a total of 16-18 sections in fall and spring, as well as 6 summer sections, seems to meet student needs.

How well the courses meet the needs of the students serviced?
At the present time, we do not have adequate data to be able to assess this.
Management/Resource challenges
It is a challenge to offer the mix of GE courses, service courses and courses required in the major with just eight full-time faculty. When departments that require some of the classes that we offer change their requirements and do not notify us, our courses are negatively affected. One year ago we noticed that the enrollment in LLD 108 was dropping. We finally found out that the School of Education had not been offering ED 108, which linked up with LLD 108 to satisfy certain requirements in the B.A. in Liberal Studies – Preparation in Teaching. Thus students who needed both classes stopped taking this option. At the current time the matter has been resolved with the full cooperation of the School of Education once again offering their ED 108 every semester.

2.1 Assessment of Student Learning

2.2.0. Degree Programs: Linguistics and TESOL

The process
As mentioned above, we have specified broad goals for the Linguistics and the TESOL programs. Each goal is associated with a list of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), which in turn are introduced, reinforced, and advanced in a number of linguistics and TESOL courses respectively. The learning of the objectives is assessed by various instruments, including data analysis problems, quizzes, exams, projects, research papers, presentations, theses, and alumni surveys. (See Appendix D for a detailed description of goals, objectives, courses in which objectives are addressed, and assessment tools for each program.)

For the Linguistics degree programs, direct assessment data were collected during the period Spring 2005-Spring 2007 from all the core courses in the B.A. Linguistics, and all but LING 213: Field Methods in the M.A. Linguistics program. For the M.A. TESOL degree program, both direct and indirect assessment data have been collected from all of the core courses at least once during the period Spring 2005-Spring 2007. The direct assessment is conducted by collecting data on the student success rate of particular SLOs. The indirect assessment is conducted by collecting information from students through open-ended questions based on the course objectives or by conducting some instructor-made surveys. Based on the data collected, instructors compile assessment reports of individual courses. The reports are reviewed in the LLD Curriculum Committee each semester and at an annual retreat at the end of the Spring semester during which the bottlenecks, the impact of curricular changes (if any), learning objectives, courses, and curricular structures are discussed and actions initiated. Summaries of assessment findings and actions to be taken about each program are reported every semester to the Dean. (Please see Appendices D-4 and D-7 for samples of Linguistics and TESOL Semester Program Assessment Reports)

Evaluation of procedures
Although the assessment process described above could be useful in improving the programs, the actual process of data collection has proven somewhat challenging, especially when part-time instructors are involved. It seems that the challenge lies with the alignment of assignments and SLOs, an exercise that appears difficult to some. Moreover, the lack of an accrediting agency for either linguistics or TESOL and the fact that the SLOs can be changed according to the outcomes creates the picture that the assessment process is not credible.
Evaluation of results of student learning assessments
As shown in the reports in Appendix D-4 and D-7, students in the Linguistics programs and the TESOL program have by and large demonstrated competence to various degrees in the tasks specified by the SLOs. In order to improve the process of data collection, we have created a rubric for evaluating term papers for graduate students. We have also adjusted one SLO in the linguistics program relating to the expectations of knowledge of phonetics.

6.2.1. General Education and Academic English Courses

3.3.2.1. General Education Courses
The goals, objectives, and student assessment of General Education courses are governed by the Board of General Studies, also known as BOGS. The guidelines are strictly followed in all of our GE courses without any exception.

3.3.2.2 Academic English Courses

There are three coordinators for the Academic English programs: one each for LLD 1 / 2, LLD 98 / 99, and the LDC. The first two sit on the Department’s Curriculum Committee, while the third is in close contact, and any review of learning objectives or curriculum, after deliberation among the coordinator and the relevant instructors / tutors, becomes ratified at that level. Thus, the respective coordinators, instructors/tutors, and full-time faculty deliberate any curricular changes before such changes are fully implemented. The Language Development Center keeps track of statistics regarding the pass/fail rate of students in the Academic English courses. These numbers serve as our evidence of goal achievements.

The Language Development Center (LDC) enhances and deepens the learning provided in the LLD 1 classroom (but not in LLD 2). In this hands-on lab setting, LLD 1 student writers complete three four-week portfolio assignments with graduate student tutors (from TESOL, English, Journalism, and other SJSU graduate programs), which receive final scores from the LLD 1 instructors. The LDC provides three complementary activities to support the completion of these portfolios: 1) Coaching Conferences, in which two student writers engage in discussion of their written work with a graduate tutor; 2) Reading/Writing Seminars, in which small groups study strategies for reading/writing effectiveness; and 3) independent revision work using an electronic curriculum which offers writing models and facilitates peer review (“Calibrated Peer Review”). The graduate Instructional Student Assistants complete a 16-hour training program each semester, which includes workshops from LLD full-time faculty and LLD 1 instructors, and is offered as a one-unit course in the spring semester (LLD 182). As a component of training, LDC graduate ISAs are required to schedule meetings with LLD 1 instructors during office hours.

The LDC also generally keeps all of the statistics regarding the pass/fail rate of students in the all of the Academic English courses. These numbers serve as our evidence of goal achievements.

2.1 Goals and Plans: Curricular Recommendations

2.3.0 Degree Programs
February 1, 2008

Dr. James Kohn, Ph.D.
23 Topaz Way
San Francisco, CA 94131

Dear Dr. Kohn:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as the external reviewer for San José State University’s Program in TESOL. Reviewers take on such a task only out of love for the profession and respect for their colleagues, definitely not as a way of building a retirement income. SJSU will pay an honorarium of $1,000 in appreciation of your willingness to serve as a reviewer, and from that amount you are expected to cover your own expenses. Typically the host department provides at least some meals. The Chair of the program, Dr. Manjari Ohala, will help you complete the necessary paperwork, and will see that you are paid promptly.

In accepting this assignment, you agree to review the self-study prepared by the program. Please feel free to ask Dr. Ohala or this office for any additional materials you need. Additionally, the university web site has much information, especially on the College of Humanities and the Arts at http://www.oir.sjsu.edu/assessment/progrev/

The visit itself should take about a day and a half to two days. It typically begins with an administrative overview that includes me, the College Dean Karl Toepfer, the Associate VP for Graduate Studies and Research Dr. Pamela Stacks and the Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Budgets Bill Nance. This will be a good opportunity for you to clarify with us the key university goals of your visit. You will then meet with faculty, staff, students, and graduates of the program. I encourage you to be forthright in your questioning and probing. Please let me know if, having seen the schedule for the visit, you would like to have any additions made to that schedule.

The visit ends with your presenting an exit interview of around an hour. Some reviewers prefer to make a statement that is then open to questions; others prefer an interactive format throughout the interview. That choice is yours. The interview may be recorded for the use of faculty who are not able to attend. Your exit interview will be attended by several administrators, the College Dean, the liaison faculty member from the Program Planning Committee, the Director of Assessment and as many program faculty as are available. Reviewers normally do not have meetings with the Provost.

San José State’s review process emphasizes planning rather than retrospective evaluation. The Dean and the Provost want to ensure that the program is making realistic plans for curricular development, for faculty hiring and for strategies to garner whatever additional resources might be necessary for the program’s success. In the CSU, a program’s intentions must match the probability that there will in fact continue to be students desirous of enrolling in the program, so it is important to take into account the SJSU student in evaluating the plans.
The Program Planning guidelines, which I enclose, require that the program have a definite plan for collecting evidence of student learning. As you are aware, regional and specialized accreditation agencies now insist that programs document their educational successes, and show how they are making program modifications based on data rather than anecdote. SJSU believes that assessment of student learning must be carried out by faculty, and that the program level is the most effective place for faculty to undertake this work. As of the spring 2006 all programs were expected to have collected and analyzed data on at least some student learning outcomes. Please address the program’s strengths and weaknesses in systematic assessment of student learning in the exit interview and in your written report. Such assessment often takes different forms in graduate programs, yet such typically undergraduate “general education” issues as communication skills, team-work, global and cultural sensitivity, environmental awareness, and the like, remain critical. Also, a program’s encouragement for and success in research and scholarship is essential at the graduate level. In all events, the program’s assessments should be closely matched to its specific goals.

We will expect a written report within three weeks of your visit. Please send that report to me and another copy to the Department of Linguistics and Language Development. The written report, and any comments the program cares to make, will then provide the basis for recommendations to the Provost by a College committee, the College Dean, and the Program Planning committee.

Again, thank you for your assistance in this process, and I encourage you to call or email me (Robert.cooper@sjsu.edu) should you have questions or should you like to engage in any preliminary discussion about your visit. I look forward to meeting you, and I thank you for your assistance in this important planning task. Dr. Ohala will contact you directly about scheduling the date of the visit.

Sincerely,

Robert Cooper, Ph.D
Associate Vice President

Attachments

Cc:      Manjari Ohala, Chair, Department of Linguistics and Language Development
         Karl Toepfer, Dean, College of Humanities and the Arts
         Thom Huebner, Associate Dean, College of Humanities and the Arts
         Pamela Stacks, AVP, Graduate Studies & Research
         Dan Perales, Chair, Program Planning Committee
January 3, 2008

TO: Robert Cooper, AVP
Undergraduate Studies

FROM: Karl Toepfer, Dean
College of Humanities and the Arts

RE: LLD External Reviewers

Attached are vitae of persons the Department of Linguistics and Language Development has selected as potential external reviewers for its. I have reviewed the resumes, and I am happy with the persons suggested. The Department wants to use two proposed evaluators. Professor Keith Jackson would evaluate the Linguistics Program, while Professor James Kohn would review the TESOL curriculum.

Attached also is the documentation for the review provided by the Department. I have reviewed it and regard the Department as ready for further evaluation by the external reviewers.

Please let me know if you have any questions or advice about the recommendations. Thanks, as always, for your help.

Attachments

KT/mp

Cc: Chair Ohala
December 12 2007

To: Karl Toepfer, Dean  
    College of Humanities & the Arts  
    Bob Cooper, AVP  
    Undergraduate Studies  

From: Manjari Ohala,  
    Chair, Linguistics & Language Development  

RE: LLD Five –Year Program Review  

Attached is our Five-Year Review report. Also attached are the names and CV’s of possible external reviewers.

As in the past, we have submitted names for two external evaluators, one for TESOL and one for Linguistics. Each of these two evaluators should receive an honorarium of $1000 (as specified on pg 21 of the Program Planning Guidelines) from the office in charge of Five-Year Reviews (i.e., not from LLD’s budget). Our Department will take care of their expenses. In Fall ’06 we were granted two .20 releases, one each for the Coordinators of TESOL and Linguistics. We justified our request on the basis of having two separate degree programs, and also the fact that we have always had two separate external evaluators. We therefore hope that (as in the past) both evaluators are paid the honorarium listed in the Guidelines (i.e., $1000 each).

Thank you.
December 13 '07

Names of External Evaluators for the Department of LLD and their CV's.

Linguistics:

1. Professor Keith Johnson, UC Berkeley
2. Professor Stanley Peters, Stanford
3. Dr. Thomas Payne, Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL)

TESOL:

1. Professor Roberta Ching, CSUS
2. Professor John Hedgcock, Monterey Institute of International Studies
3. Professor James Kohn, San Francisco State University
SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
PROGRAM PLANNING SELF-STUDY
DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

PROGRAMS
LINGUISTICS
B.A. in LINGUISTICS
   Single Subject Credential Preparation
MINOR in LINGUISTICS
M.A. in LINGUISTICS
   Certificate in Computational Linguistics
GE classes (LING 20, LING 21, LING 122, LING 123, LING 129, LLD 100W, LLD 100WB)
TESOL
M.A. in TESOL
   Graduate Certificate in TESOL
   Undergraduate Certificate in TESOL
   Service Courses

ACADEMIC ENGLISH (LLD 1, LLD 2, LLD 98, LLD 99)

December 7, 2007

The enclosed self-study report has been reviewed by the faculty of the Department of Linguistics and Language Development and is now submitted for external review.

[Signature]
Chair, Department of LLD

Dec 12 '07
Date

Draft has been read and deemed ready for external review by:

[Signature]
Dean, College of Humanities & the Arts
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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Description of the Department and its Programs

The Department of Linguistics and Language Development’s (LLD) offerings fall into three separate but interlocking programs.

- Academic English, which addresses the needs of students who have not yet mastered college level writing skills in academic English prose. It includes the LLD 001, 002, 98 and 99.
- TESOL, which includes an M.A. and both graduate and undergraduate TESOL Certificates.
- Linguistics, which includes a B.A. (with the option of a single-subject credential preparation program in collaboration with the Department of English and Comparative Literature), a Minor, an M.A., and a Certificate in Computational Linguistics.

The Department also offers a number of General Education (GE) courses. (See Figure 1 in section 2 for a diagram of the Department Program offerings.) This semester the Department is servicing a staggering number of 2,834 students with 8 tenured/tenure-track faculty and 44 part-time faculty. Table 1 gives the Full Time Equivalent of Faculty (FTE/F), Full Time Equivalent of Students (FTE/S) figures (based on data provided by the Dean’s office). It also lists total number of degrees awarded (undergraduate and graduate). For a breakdown of degrees awarded by the separate programs, please see sections 4.1. It should also be pointed out that a major portion of the Department, namely Academic English (i.e. LLD 001/2, 98, 99), is non-degree generating; thus the FTE/F numbers given below produce more than just the degrees listed in the Table. As a matter of fact, the major portion of the FTE/F figures reflect part-time faculty hired primarily for the Academic English classes; the tenured/tenure-track faculty FTE/F is currently just 7.3 and the bulk of the degree program courses are taught by the tenure-track faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Indicators of Department Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees awarded*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These totals include Linguistics B.A., Linguistics, M.A. & TESOL M.A. For a breakdown of numbers by degree see section 4.0.

Significant additions to the programs since the last program review

Starting with Spring 2007, under the category of LLD100W: Writing Workshop, we have added special sections (LLD 100WB) for students majoring in Business. (See section 3.2.1 for more details.) Starting with Spring 2008, we will also be offering on-line sections of LLD100WB. Although not a new program, we would like to mention that after many years of attempting to establish one, we now finally have a Phonetics Laboratory (headed by Dr. Daniel Silverman). Additionally, we have proposed an Organized Research Unit (ORU): Center for Human Language Technology (section 4.3). We have also started the Master Teacher program for supervising the Teaching Associates teaching LLD 98/99 (see section 3.2.2.2). Finally, both the TESOL degrees and the Linguistics degrees have seen a growth in student numbers.

Changes since the last review

(a) We have made a number of minor curriculum changes in our degree programs (see section 3.1 and 3.2 for details). (b) We have temporarily postponed offering the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) emphasis within the TESOL M.A. (See sections 3.1.2 and 3.4.1.2 for discussion and details.) (c) The
Exam format for LLD 1/2 has been modified. (See section 3.2.2 for details). The Language Development Center (LDC) lab is better integrated with the LLD 1 course (See section 3.2.2)

1.2 Synopsis of the Previous Program Review Recommendations (See Appendix A for a complete description of the recommendations)

The two external reviewers for the 2002 program review, Professor Ann Snow (California State University, Los Angeles) and Professor Leanne Hinton (UC Berkeley) submitted 29 recommendations (given in Appendix A) as part of their final report. These recommendations pertain to ten different categories: (a) Space, (b) Staff positions, (c) Academic English, (d) Computational Linguistics, (e) Grant opportunities, (f) Student recruitment, (g) Electives, (h) Thesis, (i) MATESOL, and (j) LLD 250W, and (k) Student advising. Many of the recommendations relating to space and staff positions have been taken care of with the adequate funding provided by the Administration, especially by the Dean of the College of Humanities and the Arts, and the Provost. The Department would like to take this opportunity to thank them for all of the assistance they have provided and also for the continued support they have been providing to the Department.

(a) Space
A number of the recommendations (Recommendations #1, #2, #15, & #16 in Appendix A) made by the evaluators of the last review relating to space have been resolved since the Department moved to Clark Hall in Summer 2006. The Department currently enjoys 32 faculty offices on the 4th floor of Clark Building. The Department also has an office suite in CL 473. The full-time faculty and a number of the part-time faculty have individual offices. The Department office has adequate space including a room for the photocopier. There is also a small conference room for meetings. The Language Development Center also has adequate space on the 2nd floor of Clark. Additionally, there is now also space for the Phonetics Lab (Clark 402B). With regards to lab space for computational linguistics and classrooms with student consoles, some of the equipment in the Phonetics Lab can also be used for computational linguistics. Moreover, Clark 242 has student consoles and is currently used as a classroom for computational linguistics as well as other classes. Ultimately, the Department hopes to be able to dedicate this room solely for the use of computational linguistics (including a computational linguistics lab).

(b) Staff positions
As recommended (recommendation #5), a staff person has been hired to fill the vacant position; however, only at .7. We still need this to be a full-time position. In 2003 the Department also hired a director of the Language Development Center (recommendation #7).

(c) Academic English
The external reviewers recommended that the Academic English Program should continue to remain as an integral component of the Department (Recommendation #8). To this date, the Academic English Program does remain an integral component of the Department.

(d) Computational Linguistics
A number of the recommendations (#10, #11, #14, #17, & #19) related to the area of computational linguistics. Since the last review, the faculty member holding the tenure-track position in Computational Linguistics resigned and left the University. Although the Department received authorization to advertise a tenure-track position in this area, the last two searches have been unsuccessful with the top
candidates turning down the job offer, largely due to factors such as the heavy teaching load and high cost of living in the Silicon Valley. Thus, currently, our course offerings in this area are being covered by a part-time faculty member (Dr. John Fry). Due to these reasons the Department has had to put on hold the following desirable recommendations of the Reviewers: strengthening the Advisory Board for the Computational Linguistics program, making ties with campus departments such as Computer Science, developing ties with local industry. (Although Dr. Fry is very well qualified to teach the computational linguistics courses, as a part-time instructor, he is not expected to do committee work since he is not paid for such.) We are hopeful that by next Fall things will change for the following reasons: (a) This year the Department has again received authorization for a tenure-track position search and hopes to be able to fill the position. (b) Largely due to the efforts of the past Chair, Dr. Huebner (now Associate Dean for the College), and strong support from Dean Toepfer, the Department has proposed an Organizational Research Unit (ORU): 'The Center for Human Language Technology'. This Center would greatly facilitate our being able to attract a computational linguist to fill our tenure-track position since it would allow for release time for grant writing for obtaining external funding. It will also facilitate internship/job possibilities for our students and thus, hopefully, also increase the enrollment in Linguistics. To summarize, the Department is working towards satisfying the recommendations of the reviewers with regards to these areas and hopes to be in a much better position in this regard by next Fall semester.

(e) Grant opportunities
Recommendations # 3 & # 4 dealt with grant writing opportunities. The campus offices of Graduate Studies, Faculty Affairs, the Center for Faculty Development, the Foundation office, etc., have been conducting workshops regularly and are also doing an admirable job of bringing such opportunities to the notice of faculty. Additionally, the Dean of our College, Dr. Karl Toepfer, has initiated .2 release time grant opportunities within the college. Thus, we feel the concerns expressed in the reviewers' recommendations are being addressed to a degree. However, the faculty would like to point out that, even with their best of intentions, it is difficult to make time for writing external grant proposals when they are teaching four courses as well as doing student advising and committee work. Also, in the opinion of the LLD faculty, a mere .2 release time is not sufficient to write a grant proposal for external funding agencies.

(f) Student Recruitment
Recommendations #9, #10, and #12 dealt with student recruitment. A number of the concerns expressed in these recommendations have been addressed (see section 4.3 for details).

Recommendation #12 of the last review suggested that the campus Career Center perhaps consider developing a website page with a section titled “What can you do with a major in ___?” and ask majors such as linguistics to develop material for inclusion. As far as we know such a web page has not yet been developed by the Career Center. However, web sites with the title: “What can you do with linguistics?” do exist; for example the Linguistic Society of America (LSA) has one, and our website gives a link to the LSA.

(g) Electives
Recommendation #23 deals with the issue of electives that our degree program students can take from other departments. It is not feasible to implement their suggestion that we update yearly the list of over a hundred courses from other departments that are on our flier of possible electives from other departments. Moreover, since a number of these courses have multiple sections and varying instructors, it is not clear to us whether the time and effort spent on obtaining syllabi (Greensheets) for all of these
courses in order to do such an update will yield the desired results. Instead, we plan to do the following: The advisor of the student requesting an elective course from outside the Department will ask the student to bring a copy of the syllabus for that course. The advisor will then determine the suitability of the course for the student. (The syllabus will be kept on file in the Department office.) We have changed our flier to clearly state that students require prior permission from their advisors before enrolling in courses to be taken as electives from outside the Department. (See Appendix H-2 for a list of such courses.)

(h) Thesis
Recommendations #24 and #25 deal with the thesis option in the M.A. First, it is important to clarify at the outset that the Department as a whole does not discourage the thesis option (as seems to be implied in recommendation #24). As in all universities, it is an individual faculty member’s choice as to whether or not he/she will guide a thesis. This depends on commonly used criteria such as the topic that the student wants to work on and the faculty member’s assessment of the student’s research skills/writing skills. In the past five years, six theses have been filed by students in the Department. (See Appendix G-6 for details.) One additional variable that many other institutions do not have to contend with is the heavy teaching load of faculty in the CSU system. It is difficult to contemplate guiding theses when one is teaching four courses and doing committee work. Furthermore, there is, unfortunately, currently no way of implementing recommendation #26 by giving faculty course relief for guiding theses. The Department has to meet certain enrollment targets set by the Dean, and release time for guiding a thesis (which at 3-6 units of credit generates very little FTE/$) is not feasible.

(i) TESOL courses
Recommendations #20, #21, #18, #22 pertain exclusively to the MATESOL program and they have already been addressed. In relation to recommendation #20 and #21, a number of the TESOL courses now provide hands-on experience in classroom-oriented tasks. (See section 3.1.2 for details.) Recommendation #18 suggests developing computer-assisted language learning courses for TESOL students. We hope to be able to consider this recommendation after we have recruited someone to fill the tenure-track TESOL position this year.

Recommendation #22 suggested that we should consider cutting back enrollment numbers of TESOL students in order to have a better balance of required and elective courses. This recommendation is not realistic in the context of our campus. We need to increase enrollment and not cut it.

(j) LLD 250W
Recommendations #26, #27, #28, #29 deal with the issue of LLD 250W: Becoming a Professional in Linguistics/TESOL. This problem has been addressed: This course is now an elective course for the M.A. in Linguistics but a required core course for the M.A TESOL (see section 3.1.2 for details.) The Department makes sure that 250W is offered every semester so that adequate space is always available. Finally, the University does not permit granting waivers for the university writing requirement; thus LLD cannot develop criteria to waive this requirement.

(k) Student Advising
Recommendation #6 suggests improving dissemination of information to students and updating advising material. This has already been addressed (see section 4.2.1 for details).
1.3 Summary of the Present Program Review Recommendations

0.2.0 Curricular Recommendations

Linguistics (see section 3.4.1.1):

- Ling 162: Introduction to Morphology will be required for the B.A. Linguistic students and thus the required units within the 36-unit major will change from the current 18 to 21.
- Increase the frequency of the offering of Ling 166: Sociolinguistics.

TESOL (3.4.1.2):

- Explore the possibility of offering English for Specific Purposes (ESP) as an elective course during the summer.
- Explore the possibility of requiring all TESOL students to engage in practical teaching/tutoring experiences before taking the Practicum course.
- Explore the possibility of offering a course in Computer-Assisted Language Learning once the new tenure-track position is filled this year.

General Education (see section 3.4.2.1.):

- Offer more lower division GE courses
- Explore the possibility of finding a “niche” for Ling 129: Culture, Language, and Ethnicity in the US
- Expand the visibility of LLD 100WB by coordinating with the Business Advising Center.

Academic English (see section 3.4.2.2):

- Develop shared Student Learning Objectives (SLO’s) for the Academic English classes
- Modify the common final exam for LLD 1 and LLD 2.
- Explore the possibility of moving away from the exam-only format of LLD 1 and LLD 2.
- Develop better articulation between the LDC and Academic English instructors in terms of content.
- Attempt to develop avenues of obtaining feedback from units that Academic English classes feed into (e.g. English 1A, 1B, the WST exam).
- Explore with the administration the possibility of moving away from branding Academic English courses as “remedial” and integrating them with courses such the MUSE courses.

1.3.2 Student Recommendations

Linguistics and TESOL (see section 4.5):

- Work on improving the website.
- Tighten up advising.
- Initiate a regular colloquium series under the direction of a tenured/tenure-track faculty member.
- Expand efforts at student recruitment.
The Department of Linguistics and Language Development's
Response to the External Evaluators' Review/Evaluation

The Department of Linguistics and Language Development is very grateful to the two
Outside Evaluators, Professor James Kohn, Professor, English Department, San
Francisco State University and Professor Keith Johnson, Professor, Department of
Linguistics, University of California at Berkeley, for their comprehensive review and
evaluation of the program. In the next few years, we will attempt to implement as many
as we can of their very helpful suggestions. However, we would like to clarify here
some areas where their representation is not entirely accurate.

Before discussing clarifications, we would first like to point out that two of the
evaluators’ recommendations have already been taken care of: 1) Starting with
Summer ’08 we now have a student listserv which permits us to send emails to all majors
(both graduate and undergraduate). 2) We have clarified the policy on what happens if a
student fails the comprehensive exam a second time. (The faculty voted to allow students
to take the exam unlimited number of times.)

(Note: In what follows, page numbers refer to the Evaluators’ Report.)

Introduction

1. In the last paragraph on page 1 of their report, in describing our Department, the
evaluators state that “...lower-division courses in Linguistics for GE...” Actually
we have both lower-division and upper-division GE classes (as the evaluators
themselves note later).

The Academic English Program:

2. On page 3, with regards to the 100W courses, we would like to point out that the
Department offers two kinds of 100W courses: one is labeled 100W and the other
is labeled 100WB, and not as evaluators have mentioned 100WB only. 100WB is
intended for business majors and 100W is intended for anyone who has passed the
WST (this course is taken by undergraduate majors in Linguistics as well as
students from Child Development, Liberal Studies, etc).

3. On page 3, with regards to the comment “Since these courses are staffed mainly
by part-time Lecturers, and since there is a limit on the class size of these courses,
the numbers of sections offered does little to provide a resource of FTE
enrollment growth for LLD”, although we see the relevance of limiting class size
on total FTE, we do not see the relevance for FTE of whether these courses are
taught by part-time faculty or full-time faculty.

GE Courses:

4. On page 3-4, contrary to what is claimed by the evaluators, the GE course Ling 20
“Nature of Language” does not have low enrollment. We offer more than one
section of this class and each fills up close to its maximum enrollment of 40.
Also, it is not the case that all sections of our lower division GE classes are taught by Lecturers; at least one section of Ling 20 every semester is taught by one of our tenured faculty members, Dr. Lowenberg. (Teaching assignments for GE courses also vary by semester; for example, last semester one section of Ling 21 was taught by a full-time faculty member and this semester two sections of this class are being taught by a full-time faculty member.)

A minor point: there is an error on pg 4 regarding the description of Ling 129 Culture, language and ethnicity in the U.S. It does not satisfy “Sound and Communication” as stated in the evaluators’ report. It satisfies Area S – “Self, Society and Equality in the US.”

TESOL M.A.

5. In recommendation 5.1 on page 10, the evaluators recommend requiring the phonetics course (Ling 111) as a prerequisite to “…the grad degrees in TESOL, Linguistics.” We would like to point out that Ling 111 is already a prerequisite to the Linguistics M.A. With regards to the TESOL M.A., we fail to see how this would “…permit an additional elective course in the TESOL program…” since students complete prerequisites to the M.A. TESOL as Conditionally Classified students before embarking on the M.A. The 30 unit TESOL M.A. currently includes 6 units of electives. These would not change even if the current 6 units of prerequisites were changed to 9 units to include Ling 111. Thus there seems to be some misunderstanding here.

In recommendation 5.2, the evaluators similarly recommend having a course in second language acquisition as a prerequisite. The above arguments would hold for this also. It would increase the number of prerequisites without changing the 30 unit M.A. unless we were to remove the current graduate course in second language acquisition from the 30-unit M.A. However, we don’t think this is what the evaluators were recommending.

Thus there seems to be some misunderstanding here which carries over to their next recommendation in 5.3 in which they suggest that a “…seminar in pedagogy, curriculum and assessment in the TESOL core…” be included “…to replace language acquisition or phonetics.” As mentioned above, the phonetics course never was a part of the TESOL M.A.

In the next few years we will certainly discuss the changes suggested by the evaluators. Here we are simply clarifying some misunderstandings.

With regards to the recommendation in 5.3 to provide a seminar in curriculum and assessment in the TESOL core, we are a bit perplexed because such a course is already a part of the core courses for the TESOL M.A. (LLD 283 “Curriculum and Assessment in TESOL”)

6. We now turn to clarifying some points given on pg 7 of the report under the heading of “Students’ recommendation for changes in the MA-TESOL program”.

a) In # 7 the evaluators relay students’ concern that “Adult education teachers need more experience getting certification, e.g. ABE. Preparing teachers for CBEST, preparing students to teaching in the adult education job market. The Department doesn’t give enough information about credentialing and the job market.” We would point out that Adult Education and Teacher preparation
are areas that come under the jurisdiction of the School of Education. It would not be appropriate for us to duplicate their efforts.

b) In #9 the evaluators convey the concerns of some international students regarding finding a place to do the practicum. We would like to point out that actually international students are given a lot of help in finding a place to do their practicum. All Practicum students are provided with a list of sites, contact information where students have done practica, letters to master teachers explaining program’s expectations, and when possible, direct contacts between Practicum instructors and site supervisors. The department has been partnering with De Anza College and some of our students always get trained there.

c) Regarding the students’ suggestion given in #11, the Department does offer a course in phonetics (Ling 111) that TESOL students can take as an elective under the 30 unit M.A. (Making it a required prerequisite would add to the number of units to the M.A. and thus delay graduation.)

d) Regarding suggestions listed in #13 and #14: The Chair does consult with students well in advance (in August/September for Spring semester and in January/February for Fall semester) about the courses to be offered and at what times. The Linguistics & Language Development Student Association (LLDSA) also sends e-mails to all students who are on its list regarding this. With regards to Summer School, we are puzzled by the statement “...two courses in applied ling. another in ling offered at the same time;” because the only Ling class offered was a GE class which graduate students cannot take. The one graduate TESOL class (LLD 270: Second Language Acquisition) that we attempted to offer had to be cancelled due to lack of enrollment.

e) Item #16 also contains some misunderstandings. First of all it is not true that students don’t know the rules and regulations of the comprehensive exams. Every semester the coordinators of the Linguistics and TESOL programs schedule a Comprehensive Exam Orientation day (which is announced to all students) in which they walk students through all the procedures and requirements and also pass out handouts detailing these. Second, International students take the comprehensive examination along with domestic students and the department does not have a separate policy as to who can take the comprehensive examination at what point of their graduation process. Therefore we are puzzled by the comments reflected in #16.

f) Students’ recommendations given in #17 and #18 and the evaluators’ recommendations given on page 12 under 4.1 and 4.2 pertain to the issue of a thesis. While we agree that writing a thesis can be a valuable experience for students (for the reasons given by the evaluators), we would like to clarify some points. (Incidentally, in 4.1 on page 12 under “Summary list of recommendations” these recommendations are given for “MA students” in general but earlier on page 6 under the recommendations for the “Graduate Program: MA in Linguistics” these were given as recommendations just for linguistics. It is thus unclear to us whether the evaluators’ comments apply to both degrees, however, our comments hold in either case.)
• In 4.2 the evaluators recommend that our program should "Require any student who wishes to do a thesis to choose this option at the start of the program..." We would like to point out that this is only possible for the very few students who enter our program well prepared both in writing/research skills and also have some knowledge of the subject matter of either of the two disciplines (Linguistics or TESOL) represented by our M.A. degrees.

• In 4.1, the evaluators recommend that the department “Aim to graduate about 50% of MA students with a thesis.” This is not realistic, not only for the reasons given above in the previous paragraph, but also because students desire to graduate sooner than later. It is also not feasible for faculty to carry this additional load given the teaching load of four and four courses each semester, pressure to do research, and a full load of administrative responsibilities.

7. We now turn to clarifications of some of the points given by the evaluators in their section 6. General Considerations. (Their recommendations are also included in their “Summary list of recommendations” #6.1 and #6.2). First, just a small correction: the new TESOL Professor is Dr. Scott Philabaum and not Dr. Stefan Frazier (as stated by the evaluators).

a) In 6.1 the evaluators recommend that the department “establish and communicate clear expectations for junior faculty” and that “they [the junior faculty] know what tenure criteria will be used to evaluate them at both the departmental and college level.” First, we would like to point out that this is a university-wide problem and is not specific to LLD. However, having said that, we would also point out that the CFA-CSU contract has specific guidelines as to what are expected of the junior faculty for their tenure and promotion and the University Senate policies are made within the framework of the contract accordingly. These guidelines are distributed to tenure-track faculty by the Office of Faculty Affairs. The Dean of the College of Humanities and the Arts also has written an extensive document regarding what the College expects out of the junior faculty in the tenure process.

b) The second recommendation given in #6.2 is that the LLD strive to “Reduce the frequency of peer evaluation of teaching for more experienced lecturers and professors.” The frequency of peer evaluations that an instructor has to go through is based on the University Senate policy; it is not determined at the department level.
DATE: May 15, 2008

TO: Robert Cooper, Ph.D., Associate Vice President

Office of the Provost
San José State University

FROM: James Kohn, Ph.D.  Keith Johnson, Ph.D.
Professor, English Department  Professor, Department of Linguistics
San Francisco State University  UC Berkeley

RE: Evaluation of the Linguistics Program at San José State University

We submit this report after having reviewed the Program Planning Guidelines, the departmental self-study, and having interviewed faculty, staff and students during a site visit on April 24 and 25, 2008. In this report we endeavor to assess both the undergraduate and the graduate programs in the Linguistics Department, and to make recommendations on the basis of this assessment. In preparing this report, we are very grateful for the help of the faculty and students in the Linguistics program, and particularly the assistance of Dr. Manju Ohala, who served as our host, provided us ample space and time, and answered many questions throughout the visit.

Overall, we found a department that is quite harmonious and energetic. The graduate students that we talked with seem to be generally pleased with their education, the faculty seem to have pretty good morale, and the staff seem to be happy. We were struck by how hard working and conscientious the department is, and we would note that the department's reputation in the Bay area (and perhaps more widely) is improving – to the credit of SJSU.

Our recommendations aim to suggest ways to channel all of this hard work into more efficient delivery of service in the undergraduate teaching mission of the department, and more effective service in the department's graduate and research missions.

We have organized our comments in six parts: (1) The Academic English program, (2) Lower division General Education (GE) courses, (3) Upper division Linguistics courses, (4) graduate courses in the Linguistics MA program, (5) graduate courses in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), and (6) a few general comments.

We understand the Linguistics and Language Development Department was formed several years ago from components of the former English Department. It now consists of courses in the Academic English program, lower-division courses in Linguistics for GE, upper division courses in Linguistics, and the two graduate programs, with several certificate programs and academic
minors as adjuncts. LLD is a relatively small department, which has the burden of teaching service courses, as well as the opportunity for more growth. Plans are in place to expand offerings in computational linguistics in the MA Linguistic program, and there are options to increase the enrollment in the MA-TESOL program. But large enrollment growth in the BA program must depend on attracting students from outside the major; Linguistics is not a major that attracts great numbers of freshman students. Therefore the LLD program must consider ways of expanding enrollments in its undergraduate GE courses.

1. The Academic English program

As we understand it, the Academic English program is a service program for the University as a whole. Undergraduate students who are admitted to the University, but whose scores on the entry English Placement Exam are below a certain threshold are required to take course in Academic English, LLD 001, 002, as pre-requisites to English 1A and 1b, required for all undergraduates. LLD 98 and 99, remedial writing courses for those students who do not pass the WST, are also administered through the Academic English program. The department’s “Language Development Center” coordinated by John Leih is also an important (and very well run) resource for the university community at large.

LLD 001
“Academic English I
Description
Emphasis on development of English for academic purposes. Integration of reading and writing, supplemented by use of oral language. Required for students scoring 141 and below on the EPT. Misc/Lab: Lecture 3 hours/act 2 hours Notes: No graduation credit. “ (32 sections offered Sp 08)

LLD 002
Academic English II
Description
Continued emphasis on the development of English for academic purposes. Integration of reading and writing, supplemented by use of oral language. Required for students scoring between 142 and 148 (inclusive) on the EPT or advancing from LLD 01. Notes: No graduation credit. (34 sections offered Sp 08)

LLD 098
Applied Grammar
Description
Knowledge and application of conventions in English grammar, punctuation and usage. Focus on writing structure and its application. Required for students who fail the Writing Skills Test (WST), with scores in the bottom half of those failing the test. Prerequisite: Written Communication I. Misc/Lab: No graduation credit. (5 sections offered Sp 08)

LLD 099
Grammar for Writers
Description
Expository and argumentative writing. Mechanics and composition. Required for students who fail the Writing Skills Test (WST) twice, with scores in the top half of those failing the test. Prerequisite: Written Communication I. Notes: No graduation credit. (11 sections offered Sp 08)

According to Dr. Stefan Frazier, the coordinator for the Academic English courses, the exit examination for LLD 001 and 002 is a high-stakes writing exam for 1,2 as exit from these courses, which do not count toward graduation. Such a system is not an appropriate way of testing students’ capabilities in writing. Dr. Frazier has been working to change the final exam so that the exam question is on a thematic unit which the students have discussed in class, based on the readings that they have done. This revised system is due to be implemented next Spring. Dr. Frazier said he foresees an eventual move to portfolio system, like normal writing class.
Entry into LLD 098 and 099 is the result of failure in the WST: “At SJSU, completion of 100W course with a passing grade satisfies the GWAR. However, a passing score on the WST is required of all undergraduate and graduate students prior to enrollment in 100W courses.”

ABOUT THE WST
The WST is a two-part test: a 45-minute multiple-choice test and a 60-minute essay (on selected test dates more than one essay may be given). Although you may pass the WST on the basis of a single test part, you must provide responses to both test parts in order to have your test scored. The WST is designed to assure that your writing skills are sufficient for you to profit from composition instruction at the upper division level.”

The LLD department also offers an upper-division writing course designed to satisfy the GWAR requirement, LLD 100WB: Writing Workshop for Business Students. There are currently eight sections of that course, each with 25 students enrolled.

Since these service courses are staffed mainly by part-time Lecturers, and since there is a limit on the class size of these courses, the numbers of sections offered does little to provide a resource of FTE enrollment growth for LLD. It may be the case that the University needs to reconsider the high-stakes writing exam that results in the need to offer remedial writing courses, particularly for upper-division students. In a recent external review of the writing program at neighboring San Francisco State, the reviewers made it clear that high-stakes tests such as WST are not an accurate or relevant measure of students’ ability to write academic papers. But that issue is not within the scope of the present report.

Recommendations:

1.1 We believe that the department is doing an admirable job with the difficult task of managing these writing courses. The university faculty and administration should review current policies on how written English proficiency is measured and taught in the disciplines, and LLD should endeavor to keep this issue “on the table” because the students of SJSU are not being well-served by the current system.

1.2 Develop a certificate program for the teaching of composition and reading, in cooperation with the English Department, designed for graduate students wishing to teach in community colleges.

1.3 With partners in other disciplines, develop a set of courses designed to teach literacy to adults in other fields, e.g., health professions, engineering, community service work.

2. GE courses.

The General Education courses offered by LLD fulfill two functions for the department. First, they serve the general education mission of the department - to help SJSU students appreciate linguistic and cultural diversity (within the US and beyond), use language effectively in critical thinking in everyday life, learn to investigate complex phenomena in the world in a reasoned, scientific way, etc. Second, general education courses, particularly lower division GE courses are important for the department as “feeder” courses for the linguistics BA degree. Because college freshmen do not generally know what linguistics is when they come to college, it is important for LLD to have courses that introduce students to the discipline. Ling. 21 “Language and Thinking” is one such course and seems to be on track. Ling. 20 “Nature of Languages” could be an effective feeder course, but not as currently taught (it has low enrollment and is
being used as a remedial writing course). In the current semester, there is one section of Ling 20, Nature of Languages, and three sections of Ling 21, Language and Thinking. Each section of these courses has about 40 students enrolled. The sections are taught by part-time Lecturers. Ling 20 satisfies the GE requirement in Human Behavior (D1); Ling 21 satisfies the GE requirement in Critical Thinking (A3).

In looking at the SJSU guidelines for general education courses (http://www2.sjsu.edu/senate/geguidelines.pdf) and in consultation with faculty members in the department, we discussed a number of ideas for lower division feeder courses:

- "Languages of the US" (Social Issues D3) diversity, general linguistics, sociolinguistics
- "Panini" (Letters C2) on Sanskrit grammarians in modern perspective
- "Language Acquisition" (Human Behavior D1) child language acquisition
- "Quantitative Linguistics" (Mathematical Concepts B4) extracting patterns from corpora
- "Speech Physiology and Acoustics" (Life Science B2) basic anatomy and physics
- "Forensic Linguistics" (Mathematical Concepts B4) statistical determination of authorship
- "Vocabulary" (Comparative Systems D2) historical linguistics and etymology
- "Language and politics" (Social Issues D3) discourse analysis for political science majors, prelaw students.

While it is important for the department’s faculty to develop courses that fulfill the General Education requirement, there are a number of conditions for success that should be in place before investing the effort. Tenure track faculty should be involved in building up the major by teaching lower division courses. “Partners” on campus – units who will require or recommend a linguistics course should be found because it is important to identify the enrollment audience before developing the course (some candidates are: Education, Child Development, Engineering, Computer Science, and Liberal Studies). In designing new lower division courses the department should aim for high enrollment courses.

According to Dr. Peter Lowenberg, who coordinates the GE courses for LLD, there are three additional courses in upper-division General Education program: SJSU Studies courses:

Ling 122 English as world language, students from business, 3,000 words writing requirement. Satisfies Area V “A survey of the ways and the purposes which English is used in diverse societies and cultures around the world, including the United States; implications for international and cross-cultural communication.”

Ling 123 Sound and communication. Satisfies Area R Earth and environment. “Basic acoustics and nature of sound as applied to the study of vocal communication by humans and other animals. Voice communication as transmission of a speech code via sound.”

Ling 129 Culture language and ethnicity in the U.S. Area. Satisfies Area S, Sound and communication. “The role of language in the formation of culture and ethnicity in the U.S. Language and culture contact between indigenous, colonial and immigrant peoples.”
We feel that these courses offer potential for enrollment growth for LLD, as they attract students beyond the major, and provide opportunities for the creation of larger classes. Larger class size for lower division GE courses and upper division GE course will provide the FTE necessary to support smaller, more research intensive f courses in the major.

Recommendations.

2.1 Propose additional courses in lower-division introductory courses in linguistics and language studies. These large classes should be taught by TT faculty, with grad readers. The FTEs garnered will help support smaller upper division and graduate classes.

2.2 Work with other departments in the college to develop undergraduate courses that would be a part of several majors, e.g., an introductory course in linguistics designed for foreign-language majors and pre-credential students.

3. Undergraduate Linguistics BA program

The required common core of courses for the Linguistics BA degree is Ling 101 “Introduction to Linguistics”, Ling 111 “Introduction to Linguistic Phonetics”, Ling 112 “Introduction to Syntax”, Ling 113 “Introduction to Phonology”, Ling 114 “Introduction to Semantics and Discourse” Ling 125 “Introduction to Historical-Comparative Linguistics”, and Ling 162 “Introduction to Morphology”. This set of core courses provides an excellent foundation for students seeking the linguistics BA. Recent activities with undergraduates, such as the SJSU participation in the North American Computational Linguistics Olympiad, sound very promising, and may result in attracting new Linguistics majors.

The SJSU BA program in Linguistics is a well-designed program, however the number of students enrolled in the BA program is too small. To be sustainable, the program needs to double in size. Our belief is that new lower-division courses (as described in section 2) are key to growing the program, but there may also be strategies that the department can adopt to increase majors including: (1) advertise the major on campus, (2) make course offerings attractive through TT faculty involvement, and emphasis on excellent teaching, (3) build community among undergraduates (we were surprised to learn that the department staff do not maintain an e-mail group alias to maintain good contact with majors).

Recommendation:

3.1 Aim to double the number of Linguistics BA majors – so that at least 30 students graduate with the Linguistics BA each year.

4. Graduate Program: MA in Linguistics

The SJSU has had success in the last few years in placing MA students in Linguistics PhD programs. Students in the program seem to be in good spirits, forming a cohesive and generally up-beat group. Faculty also expressed satisfaction with their students. The program’s curriculum is well-designed and well implemented with very capable faculty in almost every position.
The main concern that we have about the MA programs, both in Linguistics and in TESOL is that students are not encouraged to write MA theses. It is understandable, given the four and four teaching load expected of full time faculty and the administrative responsibilities that faculty also have, that faculty would feel reluctant to work with students writing theses because the effort involved in this sort of intensive student training is substantial. Yet if the program is to fulfill the obligations implied by offering a thesis option in the MA program, faculty must be willing to direct MA theses. Our survey of about 20 graduate students indicated that more than half of them wished that they could have written a thesis but could find no faculty member who was willing to work with them. In our discussions with faculty members we found that most had trouble naming a single student who completed a thesis in the last few years. This situation constitutes false advertising on the part of the program because in practice there is (virtually) no MA thesis option. Linguistics MA students who wish to go on to PhD programs are not very well served by this because they need to be able to demonstrate research creativity and skills when they apply to a PhD program after obtaining the MA. Additionally, international students whose home institutions expect to see an MA Thesis as proof of the degree are also short-changed by the department’s current practice. Beyond this, professors loose the opportunity to gain young collaborators in on-going research programs. We are all stretched for time, so it is essential to recruit motivated and talented students into the professor’s ongoing research program. Professors should keep a list of research topics and be prepared to allow students who wants to write a thesis to choose a topic from a “menu”.

Graduate students get relatively few opportunities to be involved in teaching over the course of their MA training. A course specifically on “how to teach linguistics” would involve both discussions on teaching and hands on experience as graders for undergraduate courses. Increased opportunities for Graduate Student Teaching Assistantships would also be very good experience for graduate students in the Linguistics MA. The ability to provide this aspect of training is dependent upon having large enrollment lower division undergraduate courses in linguistics.

Recommendation:

4.1 Aim to graduate about 50% of MA Linguistics students with a thesis.

4.2 Require any student who wishes to do a thesis to choose this option at the start of the program, so that the adviser can prepare the student for the proper sequence of courses.

4.3 Require “How to teach Linguistics” in the MA Linguistics program as a way to establish a group of graduate readers for undergraduate sections with large numbers of students. Grad students register for a seminar with meetings, papers, consultations with faculty member, and duties reading papers for large undergraduate classes.

5. Graduate program in TESOL

Achievement of learning goals: In general the students in the program seem to be achieving the learning goals set out in the self study. The enrollments in the MA-TESOL Program seem consistent and healthy:

In general, alumni of the MA-TESOL Program seemed satisfied with their degree. Of the 24 responses received from alumni in the MA-TESOL program, most rated the programs as giving
them “adequate preparation” to “more that adequate” on most items polled. Exceptions, though, included Item #7 “Preparing sound and comprehensive lesson plans and units for a variety of purposes,” Item #9, “Varying curricula (e.g., survival English, academic English) according to the needs of the learner,” Item #10, “Using appropriate classroom materials (i.e., evaluating and adapting prepared materials and supplementing them when necessary),” and Item #11, “Assessing language level and achievement of the learner, and Item #12 “Preparing you to secure employment in the field of TESOL”. All of these items averaged less than adequate among the alumni responses.

Current students had similar concerns. In the interview we conducted with those students, most of the 25 students who appeared at the interview were from the MA-TESOL program, (It is a testimonial to the interest that students have in the program that so many were able to appear for this interview).

Those students had several comments relating to ways of improving the program. Many of these comments had to do with requests for more practical emphasis in teaching:

**Students' recommendation for changes in the MA-TESOL program:**

1. Over fifty per cent students are international, but program oriented toward SL, FL not being served. Recommend at least one course in EFL teaching.

2. The program is University oriented, for teaching in community colleges. There is not enough focus on teaching in the community: e.g., workshops for teachers from community giving practical examples of current teaching in the community.

3. Student teaching: connecting to some schools would be convenient, as with the Elementary Education credential, Students are required to teach for ten hours in classroom. Students without prior teaching experience could have benefited from a semester of internship prior to student teaching. Relationship between dept and schools would give you a connection between teaching venues and dept is useful.

4. Some students preferred more training in how to prepare lesson plans: some did not.

5. One lack in the program is that there is no preparation for using technology in teaching TESOL: one needs to be conversant in basic methods of using tech in teaching.

6. Some teachers model good teaching, other do not. The students felt they need more teachers that are modeling good practices.

7. Adult education teachers need more experience getting certification, e.g. ABE. Preparing teachers for CBEST, preparing students to teaching in the adult education job market. The Department doesn’t give enough information about credentialing and the job market.

8. There should be a workshop or lab on dealing with problems in class management. The students felt they needed more attention in classes other than practicum to deal with classroom issues.
9. International students have difficulties finding a place to do the practicum; they have no connections, and there is a transportation problem.

10. Many students felt there should be a departmental online course management system, like WebCT, to share ideas about ways to improve program, find places to find practical training opportunities.

MA-TESOL students also had suggestions for improving the curricular offerings in the program, including Linguistics courses:

11. Students wish the program would require phonetics, as part of the pre-requisites. Even if they are not teaching pronunciation, it is useful skill, especially for EFL students.

12. Pedagogical grammar would be a useful course. They wouldn't want to replace the structure class, got a broader picture, need higher level. 260 and 261 are meant to be pedagogical grammar classes. 261 pragmatics and discourse turned into intro to general field of pragmatic rather than how to teach pragmatics, not how to do this in your class.

The students also had questions about the scheduling of courses, and some suggestions for improvement:

13. It would be useful to have a list of courses that will be offered in the following semesters to plan ahead. Program sends e-mails to help with planning choices of courses, and times.

14. Summer school schedules were problematic for some students: two courses in applied ling. another in ling offered at the same time; conflicts mean access to summer classes is problematic. About a third of students want more classes, core classes in MA programs.

15. Some courses are listed in the set of courses offered by the program, but those courses are never offered. The students wished that there could be more electives offered. But if those electives are not available, they should not be listed.

There was also concern about preparing for the culminating experience, either the thesis or the comprehensive examination:

16. Students don’t know the rule and regulations about the comprehensive exams, i.e., when they take it, how to prepare. International students can take it early, but other students might wish to have the same option. Also, it wasn’t clear to some students what consequences ensue if a student doesn’t pass the exam a second time. Finally, students were not clear on the criteria for the exam. They would appreciate seeing a rubric, or some examples of passing comprehensive exams from previous semesters.

17. One international student wanted to do a thesis, but can’t find adviser. In her country, a thesis is required to qualify for a teaching position at a college. The students appreciated the fact that a reduced teaching load would permit some teachers to advise theses.

18. Some students commented that they were discouraged from doing a thesis in TESOL, although it is listed as an option in the description of the program. If thesis is
not available as a viable option, the students felt it should not be included in program advertising.

Students were also interested in finding out more about tutorial and teaching opportunities on campus:

19. Not enough information was shared about how to apply for TA-ship. Student applying for position found the application is short, only a letter of recommendation is required

20. There needs to be a closer connection between courses and LDC; LD gives training. It is not ESL oriented, but a writing program. Students were interested in the process of finding practical training there.

These student recommendations reveal some fundamental issues about the TESOL Program. There is satisfaction with the program generally, but there is a need to focus more squarely on the intended goals of the program. If the faculty wishes the program to be primarily a research-oriented one, then more attention needs to be giving to the preparation of students to do reach in applied linguistics or TESOL. If the program in intended to focus primarily on practical applications of TESOL principles, then there needs to be an expansion of opportunities for students to receive practical experience.

These sentiments were also expressed by faculty members in a set of interviews.

Dr. Stefan Frazier explained the procedures for admitting students: There are rolling admissions. A BA degree and 3.0 average, and letter of recommendation are required. There is no special screening to decide which students are interested in doing a thesis, and which are interested in preparing for a comprehensive exam.

The comprehensive exam consists of three parts. There are options for each part. Six faculty members participate in writing the questions. Two readers read each exam, send scores to coordinator. Discrepancies in scores are sent to a third reader. Every semester one or two people fail, out of ten to thirteen. Of the sixteen who took the exam this year, no-one has failed. But there is no clear policy about what happens should a student fail the comprehensive exam.

Dr. Frazier said that he encourages students to do a thesis if they have depth in the area. Otherwise he would not encourage it. He would like to see more students do theses but commented that thesis advising could be paired with course reduction in teaching load.

Dr. Frazier agreed that the comprehensive exam may not be an adequate measure of a student's full capabilities. He said he would explore portfolios as an alternative to comprehensive.

Dr. Frazier was agreeable to the suggestion of requiring a phonetics course as a pre-requisite too the MA-TESOL program. That would then allow space in the MA Program for other seminars as requirements.

During our visit to the campus, other faculty members expressed agreement with the need for the inclusion of more practical experience opportunities for the MA-TESOL students, particularly given the presence of such teaching facilities as the Academic English courses within the LLD and the LDC, which recruits and trains teachers for remedial students.
In general, both students and faculty expressed the need for the MA-TESOL program to define more clearly what its main focus was. If it is no longer a program intended to produce M.A. Theses, which seems clear from the interviews, and if both faculty and students see the need for an emphasis on practical application of principles to teaching, then it seems clear that the program d-needs to re-consider which courses it should require for the core, and which courses it should offer as electives. For example, if the MA-TESOL program no longer can offer an emphasis on English for Specific Purposes, then it should not continue to promote that course or that option. The core courses currently include only one course in pedagogy, LLD 280, Methods and Materials in TESOL, and one course in practical training, LLD 282, Practicum in TESOL. If the program wishes to devote more attention to the application of principles to teaching, it needs to offer more pedagogy courses.

If, on the other hand, the faculty and students wish to have a greater opportunity to write theses, then the program should consider how to prepare students to do research, by offering courses in research methods and measures. Since mentoring students through thesis work requires significant amounts of faculty time, the program should consider how to re-arrange the faculty workload such that faculty members have a teaching load that also accommodates thesis advising, i.e., a three-course normative teaching schedule.

There are a number of students who have come to study from overseas. These students plan to return to their countries to teach English, usually in secondary schools or in intensive programs. Courses which appeal to these students, such as the teaching of reading and writing in EFL settings, should be attractive for enrollment. There is also a segment of the MA-TESOL student population that is interested in teaching ESL in community settings. Seminars which focus on the pedagogy of teaching in the community will attract students into the program, and will also serve those teachers already in the community who want to improve their professional skills. Lastly, several students expressed an interest in the use of technology for teaching English learners. A seminar on this subject should attract enrollment, and may also attract in-service teachers, and teachers in credential programs.

Whichever route it takes, the program should be forthcoming with its plans for course offerings. Students have requested advance notice about which seminars will be offered in the near future. Advance planning will enable both students and teachers to prepare their schedules, and will allow students to make choices that will match their goals.

Recommendations:

5.1 Require the phonetics course as a pre-requisite to the grad degrees in TESOL, Linguistics. This will permit an additional elective course in the TESOL program, and provide an additional large section in the undergraduate program.

5.2 Require the second language acquisition course as a pre-requisite to the TESOL program. His will provide an additional large section for upper-division, and will allow room for an additional choice of seminars.

5.3 Provide at least one seminar in pedagogy, curriculum and assessment in the TESOL core to replace language acquisition or phonetics.

5.4 Provide an optional practicum course for inexperienced teachers as an elective in TESOL.

We conclude with a few observations that cut across most of the functions of the department.

The program has hired a new phonetician/phonologist Dr. Dan Silverman, a new computational linguist Dr. Hahn Koo, and a new TESOL professor Dr Stefan Frazier. The hiring of these new faculty members is a significant development for the program which has had a positive impact on the department's reputation. Because it may have been some years since the department has dealt with the tenure and promotion process, now would be a good time to review the university's tenure policies and to communicate clearly with the assistant professors what the department's expectations are. The department should also consult with the dean and college-level tenure and promotion committee to be sure that advice given to the assistant professors is accurate.

Quite a lot of time seems to be spent in peer evaluation of teaching. We think that the department may be going a little overboard with this. Experienced teachers who are submitting their syllabi each term, and who have had a peer evaluation in the not too distant past, and who are getting reasonably good student evaluations do not need to be evaluated each term – there is no reason to suspect that a teacher will suddenly loose the ability or self-respect needed to do a good job in the classroom. It may be the case as well, that frequent evaluation of long term lecturers actually runs counter to the terms of their contracts.

Now, to our most important recommendation. The workload for full-time tenure-track faculty needs to be redistributed. We have recommended that new courses be developed as a way to draw new majors into the Linguistics BA program and that MA students in both TESOL and Linguistics be encouraged to write a master's thesis. These developments are vital if the department is to grow in enrollment and in quality, two goals that are well worth working for. Our interviews with faculty convinced us that faculty are eager to take up these aims. However, the faculty teaching load of four courses each semester is too heavy. Faculty effort is expended on this heavy teaching load leaving little time or energy to design the new courses needed for the BA degree, or to provide the intensive mentoring needed in the MA programs. Redistributing the LLD faculty workload so that less time is spent in classroom teaching will entail re-designing the curriculum with some larger classes, and some classes not offered as frequently. Faculty assigned time then can sponsor theses, serve as coordinators of multi-section courses, conduct research projects.

Recommendations:

6.1 Establish and communicate clear expectations for junior faculty – make sure that they know what tenure criteria will be used to evaluate them at both the departmental and college level.

6.2 Reduce the frequency of peer evaluation of teaching for more experienced lecturers and professors.

6.3 Update course catalog, departmental promotional materials so prospective students know what is actually offered.

6.4 Reduce teaching load to three courses each semester for TT faculty.
Summary list of recommendations:

1.1 The university faculty and administration should review current policies on how written English proficiency is measured and taught in the disciplines, and LLD should endeavor to keep this issue "on the table" because the students of SJSU are not being well-served by the current system.

1.2 Develop a certificate program for the teaching of composition and reading, in cooperation with the English Department, designed for graduate students wishing to teach in community colleges.

1.3 With partners in other disciplines, develop a set of courses designed to teach literacy to adults in other fields, e.g., health professions, engineering, community service work.

2.1 Propose additional courses in lower-division introductory courses in linguistics and language studies. These large classes should be taught by TT faculty, with grad readers. The FTES garnered will help support smaller upper division and graduate classes.

2.2 Work with other departments in the college to develop undergraduate courses that would be a part of several majors, e.g., an introductory course in linguistics designed for foreign-language majors and pre-credential students.

3.1 Aim to double the number of Linguistics BA majors – so that at least 30 students graduate with a BA in Linguistics each year.

4.1 Aim to graduate about 50% of MA students with a thesis.

4.2 Require any student who wishes to do a thesis to choose this option at the start of the program, so that the adviser can prepare the student for the proper sequence of courses.

4.3 Require "How to teach Linguistics" in the MA Linguistics program as a way to establish a group of graduate readers for undergraduate sections with large numbers of students. Grad students register for a seminar with meetings, papers, consultations with faculty member, and duties reading papers for large undergraduate classes.

5.1 Require the phonetics course as a pre-requisite to the grad degrees in TESOL, Linguistics. This will permit an additional elective course in the TESOL program, and provide an additional large section in the undergraduate program.

5.2 Require the second language acquisition course as a pre-requisite to the TESOL program. This will provide an additional large section for upper-division, and will allow room for an additional choice of seminars.

5.3 Provide at least one seminar in pedagogy, curriculum and assessment in the TESOL core to replace language acquisition or phonetics.

5.4 Provide an optional practicum course for inexperienced teachers as an elective in TESOL.

6.1 Establish and communicate clear expectations for junior faculty – make sure that they know what tenure criteria will be used to evaluate them at both the departmental and college level.
6.2 Reduce the frequency of peer evaluation of teaching for more experienced lecturers and professors.

6.3 Update course catalog, departmental promotional materials so prospective students know what is actually offered.

6.4 Reduce teaching load to three courses each semester for TT faculty.
Visit of Outside Evaluators  
Professor Keith Johnson (UC Berkeley) and  
Professor Jim Kohn (SF State University)  
Thursday, April 24, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9:30   | Greeting by Chair  
CL 473                                                     |
| 10:00-11:00 | Entrance interview: Dean Toepfer, AVP Cooper,  
AVP Stacks, Vice Provost Nance.  
Humanities & the Arts conference room – WSQ 120 |
| 11:00-12:00 | Meeting with Chair plus facilities inspection                  |
| 12:00-1:30 | Lunch                                                              |
| 1:30-3:00 | Meeting with lecturers  
CL 412                                                     |
| 3:00-3:30 | Break                                                              |
| 3:30-5:00 | Meeting with students: BA & MA Ling, MA TESOL  
CL 412                                                     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30-9:50</td>
<td>Meeting with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CL 473D – LLD conference room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:50-12:00</td>
<td>Meeting with John Leih (LDC Coordinator) and full-time faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CL 473D – LLD conference room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-2:30</td>
<td>Meeting with full-time faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CL 473D – LLD conference room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-3:00</td>
<td>Meeting with Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-4:00</td>
<td>Break plus quiet place to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CL 485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-5:00</td>
<td>Exit interview: Dean, AVP’s, Vice-Provost, LLD faculty, staff, students – all are welcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CL 412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 1, 2008

Dr. Keith Johnson, Ph.D.
Department of Linguistics
1203 Dwinelle Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-2650

Dear Dr. Johnson:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as the external reviewer for San José State University’s Program in Linguistics. Reviewers take on such a task only out of love for the profession and respect for their colleagues, definitely not as a way of building a retirement income. SJSU will pay an honorarium of $1,000 in appreciation of your willingness to serve as a reviewer, and from that amount you are expected to cover your own expenses. Typically the host department provides at least some meals. The Chair of the program, Dr. Manjari Ohala, will help you complete the necessary paperwork, and will see that you are paid promptly.

In accepting this assignment, you agree to review the self-study prepared by the program. Please feel free to ask Dr. Ohala or this office for any additional materials you need. Additionally, the university web site has much information, especially on the College of Humanities and the Arts at http://www.oir.sjsu.edu/assessment/progres/

The visit itself should take about a day and a half to two days. It typically begins with an administrative overview that includes me, the College Dean Karl Toepfer, the Associate VP for Graduate Studies and Research Dr. Pamela Stacks and the Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Budgets Bill Nance. This will be a good opportunity for you to clarify with us the key university goals of your visit. You will then meet with faculty, staff, students, and graduates of the program. I encourage you to be forthright in your questioning and probing. Please let me know if, having seen the schedule for the visit, you would like to have any additions made to that schedule.

The visit ends with your presenting an exit interview of around an hour. Some reviewers prefer to make a statement that is then open to questions; others prefer an interactive format throughout the interview. That choice is yours. The interview may be recorded for the use of faculty who are not able to attend. Your exit interview will be attended by several administrators, the College Dean, the liaison faculty member from the Program Planning Committee, the Director of Assessment and as many program faculty as are available. Reviewers normally do not have meetings with the Provost.

San José State’s review process emphasizes planning rather than retrospective evaluation. The Dean and the Provost want to ensure that the program is making realistic plans for curricular development, for faculty hiring and for strategies to garner whatever additional resources might be necessary for the program’s success. In the CSU, a program’s intentions must match the probability that there will in fact continue to be students desirous of enrolling in the program, so it is important to take into account the SJSU student in evaluating the plans.
The Program Planning guidelines, which I enclose, require that the program have a definite plan for collecting evidence of student learning. As you are aware, regional and specialized accreditation agencies now insist that programs document their educational successes, and show how they are making program modifications based on data rather than anecdote. SJSU believes that assessment of student learning must be carried out by faculty, and that the program level is the most effective place for faculty to undertake this work. As of the spring 2006 all programs were expected to have collected and analyzed data on at least some student learning outcomes. Please address the program's strengths and weaknesses in systematic assessment of student learning in the exit interview and in your written report. Such assessment often takes different forms in graduate programs, yet such typically undergraduate "general education" issues as communication skills, teamwork, global and cultural sensitivity, environmental awareness, and the like, remain critical. Also, a program's encouragement for and success in research and scholarship is essential at the graduate level. In all events, the program's assessments should be closely matched to its specific goals.

We will expect a written report within three weeks of your visit. Please send that report to me and another copy to the Department of Linguistics and Language Development. The written report, and any comments the program cares to make, will then provide the basis for recommendations to the Provost by a College committee, the College Dean, and the Program Planning committee.

Again, thank you for your assistance in this process, and I encourage you to call or email me (Robert.cooper@sjsu.edu) should you have questions or should you like to engage in any preliminary discussion about your visit. I look forward to meeting you, and I thank you for your assistance in this important planning task. Dr. Ohala will contact you directly about scheduling the date of the visit.

Sincerely,

Robert Cooper, Ph.D
Associate Vice President

Attachments

Cc: Manjari Ohala, Chair, Department of Linguistics and Language Development
    Karl Toepfer, Dean, College of Humanities and the Arts
    Thom Huebner, Associate Dean, College of Humanities and the Arts
    Pamela Stacks, AVP, Graduate Studies & Research
    Dan Perales, Chair, Program Planning Committee