General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title: LING 129: Culture, Language, & Ethnicity in the USA  
GE Area: S

Results reported for AY 2014-15  
# 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 to <curriculum@sjsu.edu>, 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?

GELO 2: Students will be able to describe historical, social, political, and economic processes producing diversity, equality, and structured inequalities in the USA.

This SLO was assessed through (1) Reflective Response Paper to the video Do You Speak American?, Mid-term exam, and Group presentations on Language Myths. Grade points earned accounted for 35% in one section and 40% in another section.

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

The distribution of the grades is as follows (N=56):

A grade: 28 (50%), B Grade = 22 (39%), C = 4 (7%), D = 0, F = 0, Other (WU) = 2 (4%).

The distribution indicates that a great majority of students worked consistently and very well throughout the semester to be able to demonstrate their learning in all areas of assessment including writing, oral presentation, and exams.

Reflective Response on Do You Speak American?: (worth 5% of course grade): About 50% of the students received the maximum scores between 4.5 and 5 (As), 34% received a score of 4 or 4.25 (Bs). 5.5% received a score of 3.5 or 3.75 (Cs) and the rest received a score of 2.5 F. 2 students did not turn in the assignment. Students who received Cs and below somehow did not link the idea presented in the video to one in an article. Students who received an F did not explain how they would apply what they learned in the video to their own lives. All of those who scored 2.5 in the assignment received passing scores in subsequent video reflection paper.
Mid-term exam (worth 15-20% of the course grade): 37% received As, 34% received Bs, 21% received Cs, 4% received Ds and 4% was absent for the exam. Mid term shows a lower range of performance compared to video reflection paper, which could be due to not preparing for the exam adequately. Second term exam, however, shows that more students studied more effectively in the second half of the semester.

Group presentation on Language Myths: (worth 10% of the course grade). 62% received the maximum score of 10, 7% received 9, 21% received 8, and 4% received 5. The majority did very well on this assignment and seemed to enjoy taking an active role in leading the class.

In one of the sections, a new textbook (David Johnson’s Myths about Language for Educators) was used and students seem to like this book better than the last one.

The assessment shows that students need to apply their critical thinking skills to assignments such as the reflective paper on Do You Speak American? This aspect needs to be emphasized more when the instructors explain the assignments. The assessment also shows that students are to be made accountable for reading course materials, perhaps by instructors giving frequent short quizzes leading up to the mid-term.

(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.)

Bases on this assessment, it is recommended that Ling 129 to have more short term quizzes so that students could be pushed to read materials, also instructors are to emphasize on students using their critical thinking skills while working on assignments and reflective papers. Also, in the future, it might be better for instructors to collaborate on putting together a collection of language myths by different authors.

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?

Yes, both the sections of the course are in alignment with course goals, SLOs, content, support, and assessment.

(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.

This course has an enrollment cap of 28 students and so the instructors are able to give individual attention to student writings. However, the following observations have been made by the instructors:

- In large classes, group presentations will be self-evaluated by students themselves based on a rubric given by the instructor.