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1. **What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?**

   a. We indirectly assessed the outcome that “Students will demonstrate their knowledge of subsentential, sentential, and suprasentential levels of language.” Because we made substantial changes to the curriculum for 2011-12, including a wider range of elective possibilities, we wanted to measure whether those changes have impacted the students’ courses of study.

2. **How were they assessed?**

   a. Course distributions were compared for graduating cohorts from 2010-2011 and 2012-2013 by reviewing transcripts. All courses that would count as credit toward the M.A. degree were included; courses that would not count toward the degree, such as courses below the 400-level or ENG 510, Practical Applications in Teaching Composition, were not counted. We tracked how many elective credits focused on pedagogy, linguistics, or other topics. These electives included courses from other departments and individual study credits. In some cases, students completed more eligible credits than were required. Since the program was designed so the it could be completed in four quarters, we also tracked time to graduation.

   For the 2010-2011 graduating cohort, transcripts for seven students were reviewed. For the 2012-13 graduating cohort, transcripts for seven students were reviewed.

3. **What was learned?**

   a. Insofar as virtually all of our required courses require regular assessments of student knowledge of subsentential, sentential, and suprasentential levels of language, the outcome was clearly met. Students in the 2012-13 cohort completed a larger number of credits in required courses than the 2010-11 cohort, though because more students did extra coursework in the second cohort, required courses accounted for the same percentage of credits. Students in the second cohort took more credits in courses focusing on language pedagogy, and somewhat less in courses focusing on linguistics. This may be accounted for by individual interest and also course offerings during each period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Category</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th></th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition electives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students in both cohorts took, on average, five quarters to complete their programs. In the first group, students without graduate fellowships took four quarters and students with fellowships took six quarters. In the second group, three students without fellowships completed the program in four quarters, two others without fellowships took longer, and two with fellowships took seven quarters.

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information?

a. The results do not suggest a need for curricular revisions. However, changes to the program outcomes and assessment plan may be needed to provide more specific information. Further investigation will be needed to see whether there were barriers to the second cohort completing the program in a shorter period. The department’s graduate committee will discuss whether the outcome should be revised or whether a richer assessment can be developed. The committee will make recommendations to the department.

5. What did the department or program do in response to last year’s assessment information?

a. Since last year’s report covered the first year of a new curriculum, no changes were made.