**General Education Annual Course Assessment Form**

Course Number/Title: **LING 129: Culture, Language, and Ethnicity in the US**    GE Area: **S**

Results reported for AY: **2013-14**   # of sections: **2**   # of instructors: **2**

Course Coordinator: **Rosemary Henze**   E-mail: **rosemary.henze@sjsu.edu**

Department Chair: **Swathi Vanniarajan**   College: **H & A**

**Instructions**: Each year, the department will prepare a brief (two page maximum) report that documents the assessment of the course during the year. This report will be **electronically submitted**, by the department chair, to the Office of Undergraduate Studies, with an electronic copy to the home college by October 1 of the following academic year.

**Part 1**

To be completed by the course coordinator:

(1) What SLO(s) were assessed for the course during the AY?

**SLO 1**: Describe how identities (i.e., religious, gender, ethnic, racial, class, sexual orientation, disability, and/or age) are shaped by cultural and societal influences within contexts or equality and inequality.

(2) What were the results of the assessment of this course? What were the lessons learned from the assessment?

**Fall 2013**: The course grades indicate that overall, this was a high achieving group. Out of 28 students, 71% (20) received Bs and 29% (8) received As. There were no Cs, Ds or Fs. In terms of SLO 1, the assignments related to this objective indicate that all students met or exceeded a standard of “B” (good) performance or better. Among those who were “good” but not “excellent”, two areas for improvement are noted: (a) Reflective and analytical writing: students have no trouble writing personal narratives about identity, but some are weaker when it comes to analyzing material in the readings in relation to their own experiences or in relation to other readings (making explicit intertextual connections); (b) Exam performance: Some students do not do as well on multiple choice answers and short answer formats in a timed exam. 36% (10) of the students received Cs on the exam; however, this apparently served as a wake-up call since all of these students were able to pull their grades up at least to a B by the end of the semester.

**Spring 2014**: Most students showed enthusiasm and passion for the course, especially, writing about papers on Explaining Identity and Critical Analysis of a Language Group. It is great to see that many students made some friendly bonds with their interviewee for their final paper. The overall grade reflects a hardworking group of students: A + (2 students); A (9 students); A – (9 students); B+ (3 students); B (1 student); C+ (1 student); C (2 students); F (1 student). Their exam performance is very similar to the students performance in Fall 2013.
(3) What modifications to the course, or its assessment activities or schedule, are planned for the upcoming year? (If no modifications are planned, the course coordinator should indicate this.)

In Fall 2014 we will use a different book, David Johnson’s *Myths about Language for Educators* (2008). In the past we have used other books with varying success (Trudgill 1998 was used for many years but is now rather dated). Although the book is written for educators, adjustments will be made for the students who are going into other fields. About 50% of the class plans to go into some form of teaching (ChAD majors). Other books used in the past were either too high in their level (more appropriate for graduate students) or too statistically oriented. Each semester, we also update the course reader, replacing some articles with more current ones.

Part 2

To be completed by the department chair (with input from course coordinator as appropriate):

(4) Are all sections of the course still aligned with the area Goals, Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), Content, Support, and Assessment? If they are not, what actions are planned?

**Chair:** Yes, all sections of the course are well aligned with the GE area Goals, SLOs, Content, Support and Assessment. As such, no action needs to be taken at this time.

(5) If this course is in a GE Area with a stated enrollment limit (Areas A1, A2, A3, C2, D1, R, S, V, & Z), please indicate how oral presentations will be evaluated with larger sections (Area A1), or how practice and revisions in writing will be addressed with larger sections, particularly how students are receiving thorough feedback on the writing which accounts for the minimum word count in this GE category (Areas A2, A3, C2, D1, R, S, V, & Z) and, for the writing intensive courses (A2, A3, and Z), documentation that the students are meeting the GE SLOs for writing.

**Chair:** Though this is not a large course as the enrollment cap has been set at 28, yet, the oral presentations are evaluated using two different rubrics. According to the instructors, the first is a group presentation and it is evaluated by the presenters themselves using a “self-evaluation” rubric, on which the instructor provides overall comments and grade. The other oral presentation comes at the end of the semester and is individually delivered. The instructor and two randomly selected students fill out the rubric, and results are tabulated, graded, and returned to the presenter.