

**Academic Program**  
**Plan for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**  
College of Arts and Sciences  
The University of New Mexico

---

**A. College, Department and Date**

1. College: Arts and Sciences
2. Department: Linguistics
3. Date: November 30, 2016

**B. Academic Program of Study\***

Ph.D. Linguistics

**C. Contact Person(s) for the Assessment Plan**

Jill Morford, Chair	Dawn Nordquist, Visiting Lecturer III
	Assessment Coordinator
<a href="mailto:morford@unm.edu">morford@unm.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:nordquis@unm.edu">nordquis@unm.edu</a>

**D. Broad Program Goals & Measurable Student Learning Outcomes**

**1. Broad Program Learning Goals for this Degree/Certificate Program**

Goal A: To demonstrate detailed knowledge of a chosen subarea of linguistics

Goal B: To be able to critically analyze advanced, state-of-the-art research

---

\* Academic Program of Study is defined as an approved course of study leading to a certificate or degree reflected on a UNM transcript. A graduate-level program of study typically includes a capstone experience (e.g. thesis, dissertation, professional paper or project, comprehensive exam, etc.).

Adapted from Kansas State University Office of Assessment

## 2. List of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for this Degree/Certificate Program

- A.1. Students will critically compare and evaluate theories and bring relevant data to bear on those theories in the subarea of linguistics chosen for doctoral research.

UNM Goals (  Knowledge  Skills  Responsibility)

- B.1. Students will pose an original research problem in their chosen subarea.

UNM Goals (  Knowledge  Skills  Responsibility)

- B.2. Students will produce a publishable research paper or monograph on a scientific problem.

UNM Goals (  Knowledge  Skills  Responsibility)

## E. Assessment of Student Learning Three-Year Plan

### 1. Timeline for Assessment

Year/Semester	Assessment Activities
Year 1, Fall 2016	Collect direct measures of A.1, B.1, B.2 Review/discuss direct measures of A.1 in faculty meeting Submit Program Assessment Report (A.1)
Year 1, Spring 2017	Collect direct measures of A.1, B.1, B.2
Year 2, Fall 2017	Collect direct measures of A.1, B.1, B.2 Review/discuss direct measures of B.1 in faculty meeting Submit Program Assessment Report (B.1)
Year 2, Spring 2018	Collect direct measures of A.1, B.1, B.2

Year 3, Fall 2018	Collect direct measures of A.1, B.1, B.2 Review/discuss direct measures of B.2 in faculty meeting Submit Program Assessment Report (B.2)
Year 3, Spring 2019	Collect direct measures of A.1, B.1, B.2

## 2. How will learning outcomes be assessed?

### A. What:

- i. A.1: The comprehensive examinations completed by PhD students will be assessed using the below rubric

B.1: The dissertation defense proposals completed by PhD students will be assessed using the below rubric.

B.1: The dissertation defenses completed by PhD students will be assessed using the below rubric.

B.2: Monographs or academic articles published by PhD students will be assessed using the below rubric.

- ii. A.1, B.1 and B.2: Measures are direct

### iii. Success

A.1: The criterion for success is that at least 75% of the comprehensive examination papers will receive a score of either 3 or 4.

B.1: The criterion for success is that at least 75% of the dissertation proposal defenses will receive a score of either 3 or 4.

B.1: The criterion for success is that at least 75% of the dissertation defenses will receive a score of either 3 or 4.

B.2: The criterion for success is that at least 75% of the monographs/published articles will receive a score of either 3 or 4.

PhD comprehensive exam/dissertation (proposal) defense committees should use the following rubric to assess *relevant* SLOs *independently* of the submitted work as a whole. The committee should arrive at a consensus for each *applicable* SLO and then return this rubric to the Assessment Coordinator.

PhD Program SLO Assessment Chart

Check one:	0 = n/a; SLO is not relevant to the student work (this column is expected to be rarely used but may be needed in certain cases)	1 = PhD student is unable to meet the SLO due to severe misunderstandings or inaccuracies	2 = PhD student meets the SLO, but major lapses in clarity or accuracy exist for the SLO	3= PhD student meets the SLO with only minor lapses in clarity or accuracy	4= PhD student surpasses expectations with respect to meeting the SLO
<input type="checkbox"/> PhD Comprehensive Exam					
<input type="checkbox"/> PhD Dissertation Proposal Defense					
<input type="checkbox"/> PhD Dissertation Defense					
<input type="checkbox"/> PhD Published Monograph/Article					
Students will critically compare and evaluate theories and bring relevant data to bear on those theories in the subarea of linguistics chosen for doctoral research.					
Students will pose an original research problem in their chosen subarea.					
Students will produce a publishable research paper or monograph on a scientific problem.					

B. Who:

Faculty assessment of student performance will be collected each academic semester for those students submitting relevant work. This will, over time, result in a sample of all students in the program.

**3. What is the unit's process to analyze/interpret assessment data and use results to improve student learning?**

1. The assessment coordinator will collect the direct measures from the relevant faculty each semester. The data will be organized by the assessment coordinator. Depending on the year of the reporting cycle, A.1, B.1, or B.2 assessment data will be presented during a faculty meeting at the beginning of the Fall semester.
2. The faculty as a whole will discuss the assessment data in a Fall semester meeting per the timeline in Section E of this assessment plan. The faculty as a whole will discuss the result of the assessment process, and whether revision, if any, is necessary to the assessment instrument, the curriculum, or to pedagogy to improve student learning. If only minor revisions are necessary, they may be resolved at the initial faculty meeting. If major revisions appear necessary, then the faculty will appoint a PhD Program Committee, and charge the PhD Program Committee to develop recommendations for revisions. The PhD Program Committee will present the recommendation to the faculty in the following semester. The faculty will discuss the recommendations and adopt or amend them. The adopted recommendations will be implemented in the same year, and reviewed again at the end of that academic year.
3. Review of assessment data is scheduled for the beginning of each Fall semester during one or more faculty meetings, as necessary. Recommendations to come out of faculty meetings will be communicated to faculty and will be recorded in meeting minutes.