



MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Senate
 FROM: Dilson Rassier, Provost and Vice-President Academic, and Chair, SCUP
 RE: External Review Report and Action Plan for the Department of Linguistics (SCUP 24-49)

DATE Oct 31, 2024

PAGES 1/30

At its meeting on October 23, 2024, SCUP reviewed the External Review Report for the Department of Linguistics that resulted from its External Review.

The Educational Goals Assessment Plan was reviewed and is attached for the information of Senate.

Motion: That Senate approve the Action Plan for the Department of Linguistics that resulted from its external review.

C: Laurel Weldon, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
 Panayiotis A. Pappas, Chair, Department of Linguistics

8888 University Drive, Burnaby, BC
Strand Hall, Room 3000
Canada V5A 1S6

TEL: 778.782.5731
FAX: 778.782.5876

vpacad@sfu.ca
www.sfu.ca/vpacademic

MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION Dilson Rassier, Chair, SCUP **DATE** October 9, 2024
FROM Peter Hall, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President, Academic **PAGES** *[Signature]*
RE: External Review of the Department of Linguistics

Attached are the External Review Report and the Action Plan for the Department of Linguistics. The Educational Goals Assessment Plan and constructive feedback from SCUTL are included for information only. The site visit took place at the Burnaby campus from February 5-7, 2024. The external review committee met with students, faculty, staff, and senior administrators.

Excerpt from the External Review Report:

“Overall, the Committee is impressed by the quality of the unit’s academic programs, the research profile of the Department, as well as the collegial and supportive environment that exists. The successes of the Indigenous Language Programs (INLP, INLL) are remarkable. The Department is also seen to be carrying the interdisciplinary Major in Cognitive Science program. Overall, FASS considers Linguistics to be one of its strongest units, routinely “punching above its weight”, as noted in the self-study report.”

Following the site visit, the report of the External Review Committee* for the Department of Linguistics was submitted in March 2024. The reviewers made a number of recommendations based on the Terms of Reference that were provided to them.

Subsequently, a meeting was held with the dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, the chair of the Department of Linguistics, and director of Academic Planning and Quality Assurance to consider the recommendations. An action plan was prepared taking into consideration the discussion at the meeting and the contents of the external review report. The action plan has been endorsed by the department and the faculty dean.

Motion:

That SCUP approve and recommend to Senate the Action Plan for the Department of Linguistics that resulted from its external review.

*External Review Committee:

Philip J. Monahan, University of Toronto (Chair of External Review Committee)
Jila Ghomeshi, University of Manitoba
Sharon L. Hargus, University of Washington
Holly Andersen (internal), Simon Fraser University

Attachments:

1. External Review Report (March 2024)
2. Department of Linguistics Action Plan
3. Department of Linguistics Educational Goals Assessment Plan
4. Feedback on Educational Goals Assessment Plan

cc Laurel Weldon, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Panayiotis A. Pappas, Chair, Department of Linguistics

Report of the External Review Committee

Department of Linguistics

Simon Fraser University

March 24, 2024

Dr. Philip J. Monahan, Chair
Department of Linguistics
University of Toronto

Dr. Jila Ghomeshi
Department of Linguistics
University of Manitoba

Dr. Sharon L. Hargus
Department of Linguistics
University of Washington

Review Summary

An external review of the Department of Linguistics was conducted February 5–7, 2024 on the Simon Fraser University (SFU) campus in Burnaby, British Columbia. The External Review Committee (hereafter “the Committee”) met with members of University administration, Departmental administration, faculty, staff, graduate students (PhD, Masters) and undergraduate students. Additionally, the Committee included an internal-external member, Dr. Holly Andersen (Philosophy, SFU). While Dr. Andersen attended nearly all meetings with the Committee, she did not partake in preparing this report.

The Committee was tasked to assess whether:

1. The quality of the unit's programs (graduate and undergraduate) is high and there are measures in place to ensure the evaluation and revision of the teaching programs.
2. The quality of faculty research is high, and faculty collaboration and interaction provide a stimulating academic environment.
3. Unit members participate in the administration of the unit.
4. The unit's workplace environment is conducive to the attainment of their objectives.
5. Future plans of the unit are appropriate and manageable.

Accordingly, we assess these statements in the first part of this document. In addition, the Department of Linguistics posed the following questions to the Committee:

- 6.1. What areas of Applied Linguistics should we focus on for faculty renewal, contributing to our existing research strengths and adding to them in new ways?
- 6.2. Given the significant growth of the Indigenous Languages Program (INLP) in both student enrolment and numbers of partner communities and languages during the past few years, how can we stabilise and expand the INLP in terms of: Faculty positions, staffing, addressing gaps in student support and access?
- 6.3. How can we evaluate our success with blended courses and build on it?
- 6.4. What can we do to increase our enrolment in lower division courses, in particular in LING 160, LING 190 and LING 200 (see section 5.1.2 in the self-study document)?
- 6.5. Should we reduce course prerequisites and raise capacity for 300 level courses to promote enrolment and teach them fewer times a year, so that we can continue to teach students outside the classroom (graduate and undergraduate supervision, lab-based supervision, directed studies courses)?
- 6.6. Should we invest the resources to create an Indigenous language teaching practicum course, which would be very beneficial to students in the INLP?
- 6.7. How do we better foster career pathways for our Linguistics (LING) and Indigenous Languages and Linguistics (INLL) MA (course-, project-, and thesis-based streams) and PhD graduates? For example: (a) What alumni outreach structures work best (in both LING and INLP programs)? (b) How do we structure professional development activities in our graduate curriculum?

The current document begins with an overview of the Department, followed by specifically addressing the questions posed to the Committee to guide their assessment. The Committee's recommendations are given at the end of the document, and references to individual recommendations are in boldface in the text.

Department Overview

Linguistics, as a field of study at SFU, dates to 1965. In 1987, the Department of Languages, Literatures and Linguistics divided into three distinct academic units, including the Department of Linguistics (hereafter “the Department”). The Department is administratively housed in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASS), where it is one of 28 departments and programs. Historically, the Department concentrated on applied linguistics, but now additionally focuses on theoretical and experimental linguistic investigation. Currently, the Department is home to 16 faculty members, approximately 50 graduate students, including those enrolled in the Indigenous Languages and Linguistics (INLL) program, and approximately 250 undergraduate students, including those enrolled in the Indigenous Languages Program (INLP). There are also nine currently funded staff positions, including staff dedicated to the INLP, although two INLP staff positions are currently unfilled. At the moment, there are two concurrent faculty searches, one in syntax and one in Indigenous languages (100% INLP). An additional INLP staff position has been approved but has not yet commenced due to an SFU-wide staff hiring freeze.

At the graduate level, the Department of Linguistics confers both a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) and Master of Arts (MA) degree. As of 2024, the MA program offers three distinct tracks (i.e., thesis-based, project-based, and course-based), providing students a variety of means to pursue graduate study that best meet their educational goals. At the undergraduate level, the Department confers a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree. Additionally, students can pursue a Minor in linguistics, as well as Certificates in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) and Speech Sciences. Undergraduate students complete Certificates either as they progress through the program or occasionally, after completing their degree. In Indigenous linguistics, at the graduate level, the Department offers an MA in Indigenous Languages and Linguistics and a Graduate Certificate in the same. At the undergraduate level, the Department offers a Minor in Indigenous Languages (for particular Indigenous languages). There is also a Certificate program in First Nations Language Proficiency, as well as a Diploma program, which provides more advanced training than the Certificate.

Overall, the Committee is impressed by the quality of the unit's academic programs, the research profile of the Department, as well as the collegial and supportive environment that exists. The successes of the Indigenous Language Programs (INLP, INLL) are remarkable. The Department is also seen to be carrying the interdisciplinary Major in Cognitive Science program. Overall, FASS considers Linguistics to be one of its strongest units, routinely “punching above its weight”, as noted in the self-study report.

Assessment of the Department

1. The quality of the unit's programs (graduate and undergraduate) is high and there are measures in place to ensure the evaluation and revision of the teaching programs.

Undergraduate Program

The Committee finds that the quality of the unit's programs is excellent. Coursework provides undergraduate students with foundational preparation in linguistics. Students receive required training in the core subfields of syntax and phonology and have the option to take an array of other courses as electives (e.g., neurolinguistics, applied linguistics). On average, 53% of undergraduate course sections are taught by continuing faculty. This is considerably lower than the FASS average of approximately 70% (note that this number was provided by the FASS Dean and diverges from Figure 10 in the Self-Study report). It would be desirable for the unit to consider ways to bring the course sections taught by continuing faculty up closer to the FASS average. The committee recognizes, however, that hiring several more faculty members to fill gaps left by recent retirements and continued administrative secondments/course releases may not be possible. Should the opportunity to hire additional faculty members arises, we urge the Department to undertake strategic planning to identify areas in which additional hires would be best. The Committee's modest recommendations about hiring based on what we see as essential appear in **Recommendations 11 and 13**.

Outside the classroom, an impressive number of undergraduate students receive top-notch, hands-on training in cutting edge research methodologies, providing them with a range of aptitudes and skills, transferable to academic and non-academic careers alike. Moreover, the Linguistics Department Writing Centre is the only discipline-specific writing centre at SFU. This innovative program provides an invaluable resource for students, ensuring consistent, quality opportunities for students enrolled in Linguistics or Cognitive Science courses to improve their writing and academic dissemination skills. The Committee encourages faculty to explore opportunities related to Work Study for the employment of undergraduate Research Assistants that seem, at least in some instances, to be untapped (see **Recommendation 9**).

In addition to the majors and minors in linguistics, students can also complete a Certificate in TESL and/or a Certificate in Speech Sciences, as noted above. Interactions with undergraduate students affirm the value of these programs and an interest in their further development. Retirements have substantially reduced the number of faculty that offer TESL-specific courses. That said, the Committee was impressed by the dedication, enthusiasm and commitment demonstrated by the current TESL faculty. The Committee does not recommend TESL faculty hires in the immediate future, but instead advises that current TESL faculty pursue their articulated plans to determine if program enrolment growth can be obtained via the steps we recommend below.

First, certification from TESL Canada should be sought (**Recommendation 6**). This would provide students with a practical certification upon graduation. Students are looking for certifications and practical skill sets that enable them to directly enter the job market. Second, efforts should be made to increase the visibility of the TESL certificate program (**Recommendation 7**).

As noted in the self-study report, many students are unaware of the program, and in several cases, students only need one or two courses to complete the Certificate. Further, the description of the certificate on the Department's web page does not list the benefits of the Certificate, such as student placement in jobs upon graduation. We recognize that the Chair of the TESL Committee is carrying an already substantial service burden, and so we urge the Department to provide support for her efforts to improve the visibility of the TESL certificate, which should be promoted in the lower-year linguistics courses (e.g., LING 100 (Communication and Language), LING 111 (The Wonder of Words), LING 160 (Language, Culture and Society)). Only four of the 18 students currently enrolled in LING 362-3 (Introduction to Teaching English as a Second Language to Adults) are pursuing the certificate. The rest of the students are completing the course to satisfy other degree requirements.

Given the clear desire of numerous undergraduate students to enter clinical careers in speech-language pathology (SLP) and related fields, the Certificate in Speech Sciences has been instrumental in Linguistics' ability to place their students in top national programs in SLP. We feel that the Certificate would be enhanced by the addition of a practicum component (**Recommendation 8**), which would provide students with first-hand experience in clinical settings, as well as enhance their competitiveness for entry into clinical Masters programs. We also encourage proposing and offering at least one additional course in the speech sciences, given that there is currently only one course (i.e., LING 190, The Science of Speech) dedicated to speech sciences.

The INLP/INLL programs are exceptional, and their success has had demonstrable impacts both in BC Indigenous language revitalization, as well as on the communities themselves. We elaborate on this in section 6.2 along with providing recommendations for faculty positions and staffing.

Graduate Program

The graduate program offers students excellent preparation in a myriad of linguistic subdisciplines. In addition, they receive state-of-the-art training outside the classroom in language documentation, sociolinguistics, and the methodologies psycholinguistics and neurolinguistics. The Committee finds that the current course requirements in the graduate program are appropriate for graduate training in the field. Specifically, we do not recommend removing phonology and syntax as program requirements, even if it would permit greater flexibility in course selection on the part of graduate students. While we find the course offerings for graduate students to be reasonable in the current context, we also heard from graduate students that they find it difficult to plan which courses they will take. Specifically, enhanced predictability of course offerings is important for graduate students to better prepare their academic trajectory toward program completion in a timely manner. On a few occasions, graduate students had inferred decision rationales that did not align with motivations expressed by the faculty. Better communication of how decisions relating to course offerings, program requirements, etc., are made would limit the creation of such (false) inferences and help graduate students understand the constraints with which the Department is currently working. In **Recommendation 1**, we suggest better communication around which graduate-level courses will be offered over any given two-year period.

On the theme of clearer communication, a somewhat similar issue came up in the comments graduate students made to the Committee around expectations surrounding Qualifying Papers, a requirement for students in the PhD program. The Committee recommends (see 1) that the Department update the 2014 document “Regulations for Qualifying Papers” (https://www.sfu.ca/content/dam/sfu/linguistics/Linguistics/Forms/Qualifying_papers_regulations.pdf) to ensure that it is current, that it clarifies the process for requesting extensions and that it describes, in as clear language as possible, the anticipated scope of the Qualifying Papers themselves.

The Committee is impressed with the recent implementation of three streams in the MA program. These should enhance program inclusivity and accommodate a wider range of student goals and abilities. We were also impressed to learn that there is now an established minimum funding level for PhD students at SFU and that the Department had already been funding PhD students at a higher rate. We strongly recommend that the Department establish minimum funding levels for MA students as well, and that this funding level be identical across the three MA tracks. Identical funding levels will help avoid the creation of a tiered-MA system, where course-based MA students may feel like second-class students. Moreover, different funding levels per track could disincentivize students whose goals and aptitudes better align with the Project-track or Course-track from pursuing those tracks if the funding-levels are higher for the Thesis-track (see **Recommendation 2**).

In our meeting with graduate students, we heard about the lack of classroom teaching opportunities, and we understand that other units in FASS use TA-led tutorials, distinct from class lectures, to provide graduate students with enhanced teaching opportunities. This model also serves to provide undergraduates with a smaller classroom learning environment. At present, it seems that only LING 220 (Introduction to Linguistics) offers tutorials, although sometimes when LING 100 (Communication and Language) is offered, tutorials are simulated (i.e., the larger classroom is broken into smaller group settings and TAs help lead these smaller group-based discussions). The Committee recommends that the Department explore options for expanding the suite of lower-year undergraduate courses that provide tutorials for students, in particular, in multi-section courses (**Recommendation 4**). The Department is encouraged to explore the budgetary impact of offering tutorials as we gather there might be some misunderstanding around how this affects the overall budget.

With respect to monitoring graduate student progress, we find the recent addition of mandatory annual check-ins/progress reports for graduate students to be an excellent step to ensure that graduate students stay on track, meeting program requirements and timelines. These are supposed to be meetings of three individuals: the student, the Graduate Studies Committee Chair and the student’s supervisor; however, it was disconcerting to learn that not all supervisors are present at these meetings. Lamentably, this has led to a feeling of a tiered system among graduate students (and some faculty), in which some faculty are perceived to take a vested interest in their students’ academic progress, while others do not. The Committee strongly recommends that supervisor attendance be mandated to not only avoid this perception, but to ensure greater equity in supervision across graduate students (see **Recommendation 3**).

Evaluation and revision of the teaching programs

Primary management of the Department resides with an Executive Committee, consisting of the Chair, the Graduate Studies Committee Chair, and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair. The Graduate Studies Committee and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee are primarily responsible for assessing the coherence of the course requirements and sequencing at their respective levels and revising them as needed. We heard that the Executive Committee is keenly interested in evaluating their teaching programs and revising as necessary with the goals of maintaining enrolments, diversity of offerings, and high quality of instruction and learning. Moreover, they strive to do so in a collegial fashion by consulting the primary instructors of these courses. Specific recommendations regarding consistency in the quality of course delivery are given in **Recommendation 5** (course director for LING 282W¹ (Writing in Linguistics)) and **Recommendation 10**.

2. The quality of faculty research is high, and faculty collaboration and interaction provide a stimulating academic environment.

The Department boasts a vibrant community focused on numerous linguistic subdisciplines. Faculty research is extremely well supported by extramural funding: All research faculty either currently hold or have recently held competitive tri-Council funding (e.g., SSHRC, NSERC). Since the last external review, tri-council funding has represented a substantial proportion of all research funding granted to SFU Linguistics faculty. Faculty routinely disseminate research in top-tier journals and at leading conferences. Since 2016, nine faculty members have published 184 publications, which equates to approximately 2.5 publications per year per faculty member, an extremely respectable ratio within the field. Like extramural funding, the faculty publication rate declined as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, but numbers from 2023 indicate that the number of publications per year is on the increase. Furthermore, among faculty, there are numerous national and international research collaborations. The Department has two SFU Distinguished Professors, three Royal Society of Canada Fellows and one fellow of the Acoustical Society of America. In short, by several metrics typically used to assess the quality of faculty research, that of SFU Linguistics is impressive. From 2016–2020, a large SSHRC grant played a substantial role in establishing the INLP and INLL programs. Securing funding for the INLP/INLL programs is seen as paramount for continuing the excellent upward trajectory the program has observed over the past 5-10 years.

3. Unit members participate in the administration of the unit.

Based on our meetings with the Chair, the Executive Committee, the TESL Committee, the INLP Steering Committee, and with the APSA and CUPE staff, we found that all unit members participate in the administration of the unit. The flow of information within the department seems good and for the most part the role that each member plays is clear and well-defined. We heard from

¹ The SFU website refers to this class as 282W; the self-study refers to this class as 282QW.

the Chair that the creation of the Executive Committee, which has been put into place recently and which meets regularly, has resulted in better transparency and collegiality.

4. The unit's workplace environment is conducive to the attainment of their objectives.

The Committee found the workplace environment generally consistent with the Department's stated aims above. Faculty, graduate, and undergraduate students alike noted that the Department has cultivated a supportive, collaborative, and collegial environment. The Department aims to promote an environment of mutual respect, academic freedom, evidence-based critique, and the synthesis of diverging perspectives (for better problem solving). Graduate students find the program welcoming and supportive and note good comradery among the graduate student body.

The Department reports ample office space for their current needs. All faculty have individual office spaces, while graduate students share offices. That said, certain overdue renovations have been delayed due to the added cost of asbestos abatement, which the Committee believes should be initiated by and paid for by the university.

The quality of the research laboratories is distinctly impressive. The Department is home to seven distinct state-of-the-art laboratory spaces that house a range of methodologies (i.e., child language acquisition research, eye-tracking, testing cabins for behavioural/perceptual experiments, acoustic and production studies, electroencephalography (EEG)). This allows faculty and students alike to engage in studying an array of populations and research topics with a myriad of research techniques.

The one glaring exception to the supportive workplace environment is lack of staff support. There has been an abundance of staff turnover during the previous five years, which has negatively impacted departmental operations. Some administrative positions (e.g., graduate administrator) went unfilled for long periods of time. Many staff positions in the Department are part-time and the staff have consistently requested additional hours and expanded administrative responsibilities. Thus, staff often leave their positions after a short time due to their ability to secure other SFU staff positions with higher pay and/or more hours. (The rapid turnover in CUPE staff can be illustrated by discrepancies in vacancies between the organisational chart for the Department in the Self-Study Report (p. 8), the narrative of the Self-Study Report (presumably prepared on a different date), and the actual staff encountered by the Committee during the site visit. The chart lists two unfilled staff positions in Linguistics: Communications and Events Coordinator and Departmental Secretary. The narrative of the self-study (p. 45), however, states that these positions were filled in 2023. The organisational chart for the INLP program shows one staff vacancy, Communications and Events Coordinator. But at the site visit, it became clear that the INLP Budget/Program Assistant position was now vacant.)

The Committee has several recommendations concerning staff (see **Recommendations 15, 16, 17**), while recognizing that some of the issues are not merely unit-level but are increasingly common across universities in general. First, we heard that CUPE staff members receive minimal training and are only provided with a manual upon starting their position. The Committee

strongly recommends that the Department create formal training procedures/protocols and formalise an onboarding process that is provided to all new staff members. This will facilitate new staff members getting up to speed with the roles and responsibilities of their positions. Second, the Committee recommends that additional hours be allocated to staff members. Limited and part-time hours offered to staff members result in periods of time when the Department is simply not open during normal working hours. For example, the Department office was only open 9:15 am to 2:45 pm during the Committee's visit. Finally, we note that a disproportionate amount of workload is assumed by the Department Manager. Specifically, all student advising responsibilities are carried by the Department Manager and the INLP Manager. The Committee recommends that student advising responsibilities be shared across administrative staff, which would more equitably distribute administrative responsibilities. CUPE staff members indicated a clear interest in taking on student advising responsibilities, which would be appropriate given that the current Departmental Secretary recently received a Linguistics BA.

5. Future plans of the unit are appropriate and manageable.

All future plans (or wishes) of the Department involve hiring faculty or staff. While program enrolment numbers have remained constant, there are fewer current faculty members now than there were in 2015. Moreover, even with the two concurrent faculty job searches, the Department still anticipates a net loss in faculty teaching and research capacity unless additional complement planning is requested and approved. Faculty hiring priorities are discussed in 6.1 and 6.2 below.

It was made clear to the Committee in interview after interview that the Department has many unfilled CUPE staff positions and needs to fill them as soon as possible to assist faculty and students with such vital functions as applying for extramural funding, and to avoid burnout of faculty and current staff; however, there are two problems to solve with staffing: (1) overcoming the current SFU-wide hiring freeze on staff and (2) retaining staff, once hired (due to factors discussed in Question 4).

In terms of administrative support, the INLP is also stretched far too thin. There are only two support staff at present: Lorraine Yam, Manager, Academic & Administrative Services, Academic Advisor, and Shagufta Saddiq, Program Coordinator. Between them, they do a myriad of jobs. They run orientation with new cohorts. They are called on to solve IT problems when students cannot access email or their university accounts. They often deal with mature students, who have other obligations (e.g., families, jobs) and may be unfamiliar with SFU and large bureaucratic institutions in general. Moreover, INLP students may be unable to register at the start of classes or pay tuition when it is due for legitimate reasons, and it falls to the support staff to advocate for them, often facing backlash from university-level administrative units with whom they interact. We understand that FASS has already taken steps to address some of the problems, but additional support is necessary. We strongly recommend that the INLP should be allowed to fill their Budget Assistant and Program Assistant positions to provide the critical support the program needs (see **Recommendation 12**). (In the Self-Study Report it was explained that the current Budget/Program Assistant position should be split into two positions, a 1.0 FTE Budget Assistant, and a 0.4 FTE Program Assistant.)

Unit-Specific Questions

The Committee also considered the following university/unit-specific questions (indicated in bold). The Committee's response is provided beneath each query.

6.1. What areas of Applied Linguistics should we focus on for faculty renewal, contributing to our existing research strengths and adding to them in new ways?

The Committee agrees that the Department is currently unable to compete with the University of British Columbia in their delivery of computational linguistics (CL) training offered to both undergraduate and Masters students. The Committee does not recommend pursuit of a fee-based MA program in CL at the current time as was contemplated as a result of the previous review. That said, the only faculty member who specialises in CL, Dr. Taboada, has recently taken on a heavy administrative load, limiting her ability to offer courses in CL and computing sciences to linguistics students.

We understand that a 0.5 FTE position in Social Data Analytics has been approved. The Committee recommends that this position be expanded to full-time (see **Recommendation 13**). Ideally, the successful candidate would expand CL course offerings and have industry experience and connections. This would help confer a practical skill set to project-based MA students, which should increase their ability to obtain positions in industry.

6.2. Given the significant growth of the Indigenous Languages Program in both student enrolment and partner communities and languages during the past few years, how can we stabilise and expand the INLP in terms of: Faculty positions, staffing, addressing gaps in student support and access?

The review team found ample evidence that SFU is a leader in Canada for Indigenous language education and programming, as stated in the Self-Study Report. The Indigenous Languages Program (INLP) is a jewel in the Department. It is an incredibly strong and successful program built on 50+ years of relationships with community organisations in BC and the Yukon. The INLP has demonstrated success on four interconnected fronts: teaching languages for which pedagogical materials do not exist, training speakers (mostly second language learners) to become language teachers, revitalising languages that are in peril, and documenting those languages. It has done so by bringing programs to people in their communities and by showing great flexibility in accommodating existing and new students—the importance of which cannot be overstated. Without community-based efforts and flexibility (which runs counter to the way universities typically function), these programs could not operate.

The Committee team spoke with the faculty, staff, and students of the INLP programs. Team members were most moved by the opportunity to hear from students, graduates, and teachers in three of the 11 communities with which the program has Memorandums of Agreement (i.e., Vancouver Island (Hul'q'umi'num'), Squamish Nation (Skwxwú7mesh Snichim), Williams Lake (Secwepemctsin)). These individuals shared stories about the ways in which learning, speaking, and teaching their languages have had a profoundly meaningful impact on their lives.

Unfortunately, the INLP is not operating in a sustainable way. There are currently three faculty members and two administrative staff who each work tirelessly but are stretched too thin.

As mentioned in the Self Study Report, two of the three faculty members are approaching retirement age within the next five years. There is a search currently underway for a new faculty member, but an additional faculty hire is urgently needed. Our recommendations for hiring an additional continuing faculty line (CFL) member and filling gaps in the support staff complement are in **Recommendations 11 and 12**, respectively. This program is important and has arisen from relationships of trust that have been built over decades. We feel most strongly that it should be supported.

6.3. How can we evaluate our success with blended courses and build on it?

The Department is a University-wide leader in the delivery of blended courses, which are popular with both students and instructors, due in part to the difficulties of commuting to the Burnaby campus of SFU. Overall, the Committee was very impressed by the gains made in blended course delivery and the positive impacts of their implementation. We see value in the Department continuing with blended course delivery and even expanding this to other courses that do not currently utilise online components. That said, the Committee expresses concern with respect to whether students who pass blended courses are as prepared as students who take the course in-person (only). We recommend that the Department develop a way to formally assess the efficacy of blended teaching versus in-person teaching in terms of knowledge retention or content engagement by students (**Recommendation 10**). We also think it important that the Department ensure consistency from term-to-term in delivery mode—in particular, set guidelines for what percentage of a course will employ a “blended mode”. This will help build a reputation for a given course that should improve enrolments over the medium- and long-term. Inconsistencies in delivery mode hamper these efforts. Extending Course Director positions to additional 100- and 200-level courses (see **Recommendation 5**), would also ensure better term-to-term consistency in delivery mode.

6.4. What can we do to increase our enrolment in lower division courses, in particular in LING 160, LING 190 and LING 200 (see section 5.1.2 in the self-study document)?

While program enrolment numbers generally remained steady across the previous five years, like other programs in FASS, Linguistics has experienced some reduced course enrolment numbers. That said, the Department has already identified the success of offering blended courses (see 6.3) and pointed to specific cases where inclusion of blended delivery modes has led to enhanced undergraduate enrolment numbers. The Committee recommends improved sharing of course materials across instructors and courses to ensure continuity and improve student expectations from one term to the next (**Recommendation 5**).

Undergraduate students requested more diversity in course offerings, particularly an upper division speech science course. Currently there is only one course in speech sciences, LING 190 (The Science of Speech). We therefore recommend that an upper division speech science course be developed and offered regularly (**Recommendation 8**).

Students also requested more advanced planning/notification of the actual content of LING 280 (Linguistics in the Real World).² The Committee believes that enhanced course planning and notifying students in advance of course offerings over a longer period of time would improve the student experience in the program. At the same time the Committee is aware of the constraints limiting the Department's ability to offer additional courses and acknowledges that sudden and unavoidable scheduling changes may occur when minimum enrolments are not met.

We note that SFU identifies that most new, incoming students originate from Surrey, BC. As such, further utilisation of the Surrey campus for delivery of the identified courses should improve enrolment numbers.

6.5. Should we reduce course prerequisites and raise capacity for 300 level courses to promote enrolment and teach them fewer times a year, so that we can continue to teach students outside the classroom (graduate and undergraduate supervision, lab-based supervision, directed studies courses)?

The rationale for teaching 300-level courses fewer times a year is at cross purposes with what we heard from undergraduate students, namely that they would like more course offerings, not fewer. Further, the one prerequisite for 300 level courses is LING 282W (Writing for Linguistics). The Committee heard that LING 282W replaced a 200-level phonology and a 200-level syntax course which used to be prerequisites for 300-level courses. In the Committee's view, removing LING 282W as a prerequisite for 300-level courses would weaken the program. If undergraduate students go straight into the 300-level phonology and syntax courses with less preparation, even if just in writing, this would necessitate an adjustment in course content. The Committee heard from instructors that students do better in more advanced classes after having LING 282W; however, we also learned that the content varies substantially depending on the current instructor. Given the role this course plays in the program, there should be more oversight over the curriculum and more term-to-term consistency in the way it is delivered.

6.6. Should we invest the resources to create an Indigenous language teaching practicum course, which would be very beneficial to students in the Indigenous Languages Program?

According to INLP faculty, LING 363 (currently titled Practicum in Teaching English as a Second Language to Adults) used to serve this purpose before it was recast as a practicum for the teaching of English to adults. The INLP faculty feel it would be easy to resurrect an analogous course for those who want supervised teaching (of learners of all ages, not just adults). In fact, the content of such a course has been offered as a Topics course but is not a regular course offering.

Students enrol in the INLP programs for a variety of reasons, and currently only 25% of them want to become language teachers in their communities. Providing practical training for the population that want to become teachers seems like a good investment in the future of the INLP; however, the proposed practicum could also become a required or recommended course: Since all students in the INLP have enrolled to learn a particular Indigenous language, the exercise of

² LING 280 is devoted to current issues or "hot topics" in language and linguistics (e.g. constructed languages).

learning to teach the language can further their language learning experience, as it will require them to learn aspects of grammar and vocabulary which they might not otherwise do.

At a minimum, the cost of resurrecting this practicum would require instructor salary. If funding could be sought from community partners or grants, we recommend hiring an instructor who could staff a Practicum in Teaching Indigenous Languages course for the INLP (**Recommendation 14**).

6.7. How do we better foster career pathways for our Linguistics (LING) and Indigenous Languages and Linguistics (INLL) MA (course-, project-, and thesis-based streams) and PhD graduates? For example: (a) What alumni outreach structures work best (in both LING and INLP programs)? (b) How do we structure professional development activities in our graduate curriculum?

Finding answers to these questions is a challenge for all Linguistics Departments. The Committee commends the Department at SFU for including these questions in the self-study, as it shows that they are keen to develop professional pathways and industry connections for their students.

(a) Possible ways to keep in touch with former students after they leave the program might include:

- Asking graduating students to complete an exit survey and thereafter sending out an annual or biannual survey.
- Sending a newsletter about the Department to the inbox of alumni (and friends of the Department more generally), which might inspire return communication of some sort.
- Monitoring former students who have LinkedIn profiles.

(b) Professional development options for students might include:

- A project-based MA thesis with either computational linguistic or SDA focus which could connect to the local tech industry.
- Developing the possible “microcredit” (1 credit) courses in mainly computational/technical skills development mentioned in the self-study (p. 24).
- Developing a speech science practicum course with variable content, which could be a microcredit or full-credit course.
- Restructuring undergraduate courses to include more tutorials, so that graduate students can obtain more teaching experience, another marketable skill. See **Recommendation 4**.

Summary of Recommendations

The Graduate Program and work opportunities for graduate students

1. The Committee recommends better communication with graduate students regarding course offerings and Qualifying Papers (for PhD students). Ideally, students should know which graduate-level courses will be offered in any given two-year period and how decisions relating to course offering have been made. Expectations around Qualifying Papers should be updated, clarified, and made easily available.
2. The Committee strongly recommends establishing minimum funding levels for MA students, and that *this level be the same regardless of track (course, project, thesis)*.
3. The Committee strongly recommends that supervisor attendance be mandated at annual progress meetings with students to ensure greater equity in supervision across graduate students.
4. The Committee recommends that the Department explore options for adding tutorials to lower-year undergraduate courses, particularly in multi-section courses, which will provide teaching opportunities for graduate students.

The undergraduate programs, curriculum, and work opportunities for undergraduate students

5. The Committee recommends that the Department take steps to ensure consistency in curriculum and delivery of LING 282W, perhaps by designating a “course director” or “course chair” for this course, as mentioned in the self-study report. The Committee recommends this option be explored, where feasible, for other 100- and 200-level courses, including blended courses.
6. The Committee recommends that certification from TESL Canada should be sought.
7. The Committee recommends that the department provide support for the efforts of the Chair of the TESL Committee to improve the visibility of the TESL Certificate Program.
8. The Committee recommends that a practicum component be added to the Speech Sciences certificate and at least one additional course in the speech sciences be offered, given that there is currently only one: LING 190, The Science of Speech.
9. The Committee encourages faculty to explore opportunities related to Work Study for the employment of undergraduate Research Assistants.
10. The Committee recommends that the Department continue with blended course delivery but take measures to formally assess the efficacy of blended teaching versus in-person teaching in terms of knowledge retention or content engagement by students. We also recommend that the Department ensure consistency from term-to-term in delivery mode.

Hiring

11. The Committee strongly recommends that the INLP be granted another CFL position in addition to the one currently posted. The search should be timed for overlap with planned retirements.
12. The Committee strongly recommends that the INLP be allowed to fill a Budget Assistant position (1.0 FTE) and a Program Assistant (0.4 FTE) position to provide critical support for the program and the communities.

13. The Committee recommends that the Senate-approved 0.5 FTE position to support teaching in the Social Data Analytics program be converted into a full time CFL position for a faculty member, who can also teach in computational linguistics.
14. The Committee recommends hiring an instructor who could staff a Practicum in Teaching Indigenous Languages course for the INLP, ideally funded by community partners or research grants.

Support Staff

15. The Committee strongly recommends that the Department create formal training procedures/protocols and formalise an onboarding process that is provided to all new staff members.
16. The Committee recommends that additional hours be allocated to staff members to ensure the Department is open during normal working hours.
17. The Committee recommends that student advising responsibilities be shared across administrative staff, which would more equitably distribute administrative responsibilities.

External Review Action Plan

Section A

To be completed by the Responsible Unit Person, e.g., Chair or Director

Unit Under Review: LINGUISTICS (LING)

Date of Review Site Visit: FEBRUARY 5 - 7 2024

Responsible Unit Person: Dr. Panayiotis Pappas, Chair

Faculty Dean: Dr. Laurel Weldon, FASS

Notes

- 1. It is not expected that every recommendation made by the External Review Committee be covered by this Action Plan. The major thrusts of the report should be identified—some consolidation of the recommendations may be possible while other recommendations of lesser importance may be excluded.*
- 2. Attach the required plan to assess the success of the Educational Goals as a separate document (Senate 2013).*
- 3. Should any additional response be warranted, it should be attached as a separate document.*

1. PROGRAMMING

1.1	Action(s) (description of what is going to be done)
Undergraduate: The reviewers' evaluation of our undergraduate offerings is very enthusiastic. Not only do they find the overall quality of the program "excellent", they also praise the balance we have achieved in terms of providing required training in the core areas of the discipline and a good variety of applied and interdisciplinary courses that students can take. They also recognize that we provide hands-on training in our laboratories, support for writing in our Writing Centre, and opportunities for specialization through our certificates. As a unit, we are heartened by this positive assessment. In terms of the specific recommendations, our actions plan is as follows:	
1.1	

Recommendation #4. The Committee recommends that the Department explore options for adding tutorials to lower-year undergraduate courses, particularly in multi-section courses, which will provide teaching opportunities for graduate students.

LING agrees and is willing to discuss the details of implementation with the Dean of FASS.

Recommendation #5. The Committee recommends that the Department take steps to ensure consistency in curriculum and delivery of LING 282W, perhaps by designating a “course director” or “course chair” for this course, as mentioned in the self-study report. The Committee recommends this option be explored, where feasible, for other 100- and 200-level courses, including blended courses

LING believes that the need for more consistency arises from the fact that these courses are often taught by Sessional Instructors. We already have a mechanism in which course content and delivery methods are reviewed by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and we will take steps to make those expectations more clearly understood.

Recommendation #6. The Committee recommends that certification from TESL Canada should be sought.

LING agrees and is already seeking this certification.

Recommendation #8. The Committee recommends that a practicum component be added to the Speech Sciences certificate and at least one additional course in the speech sciences be offered, given that there is currently only one: LING 190, The Science of Speech.

LING agrees with this recommendation, but in order to implement it we would need to replace some of the three Applied Linguistics faculty who have retired in the past 3 years.

Recommendation #10. The Committee recommends that the Department continue with blended course delivery but take measures to formally assess the efficacy of blended teaching versus in-person teaching in terms of knowledge retention or content engagement by students. We also recommend that the Department ensure consistency from term-to-term in delivery mode.

LING agrees with this recommendation and has already began the process of deliberation about how to formally assess the efficacy of blended teaching. Consistency from term-to-term is monitored by the UCC and the Chair of the Department.

Recommendation #13. The Committee recommends that the Senate-approved 0.5 FTE position to support teaching in the Social Data Analytics program be converted into a full time CFL position for a faculty member, who can also teach in computational linguistics.

LING agrees with this recommendation.

Recommendation #14. The Committee recommends hiring an instructor who could staff a Practicum in Teaching Indigenous Languages course for the INLP, ideally funded by community partners or research grants.

LING agrees with this recommendation.

Graduate:

The review committee's findings of our graduate program offerings is very positive. We were found to provide "excellent preparation in a myriad of linguistic subdisciplines" and to provide "state-of-the-art training outside the classroom" in several areas, and significantly in lab-based environments in ways similar to our undergraduate program. This confirms our department's confidence in our graduate training. To improve the program, we address three recommendations that pertain to just the graduate program (Recommendations #1-#3):

Recommendation #1: The Committee recommends better communication with graduate students regarding course offerings and Qualifying Papers (for PhD students). Ideally, students should know which graduate-level courses will be offered in any given two-year period and how decisions relating to course offering have been made. Expectations around Qualifying Papers should be updated, clarified, and made easily available.

LING agrees with this recommendation. For courses, we will release planning in October, but make clear to students that offerings are subject to budget approval and availability of instructors. For QP qualifications, review of the documents is currently being updated and approved and should be completed by Fall 2024.

Recommendation #2: The Committee strongly recommends establishing minimum funding levels for MA students, and that this level be the same regardless of track (course, project, thesis).

LING agrees with this recommendation on two fronts. In practice, we already have an \$18K minimum for MA-Thesis stream students. In principle, we want to extend this minimum to students in the other streams, but we must wait for our FIC funding to recover (it is now 50%) of what it was 4 years ago.

Recommendation #3. The Committee strongly recommends that supervisor attendance be mandated at annual progress meetings with students to ensure greater equity in supervision across graduate students.

LING agrees with this recommendation in principle, but we also recognize that there is great diversity among faculty members in terms of their supervisory duties, their overall workload, and the availability of students and advisors during particular times of the year. We will emphasize the importance of these meetings to faculty members in the coming annual cycles.

Recommendation #6. The TESL director will need one course release per year for 2 years to pursue TESL Canada certification.

Recommendation #8. LING will need to replace some of the 3 Applied Linguistics professors who retired recently in order to improve the Speech Sciences Certificate.

Recommendation #13. LING will need to hire a tenure track Assistant Professor in Computational Linguistics to support our offerings in the Social Data Analytics minor.

Recommendation #14. LING will need to hire a .5 Limited Term Lecturer to offer the practicum in teaching Indigenous Languages.

1.3	Expected Completion Date(s):
	Summer 2027

2. RESEARCH

2.1	Action(s) (description of what is going to be done)
	The reviewers also commend the Department for the quantity and quality of the research output in LING and there are no recommendations to address any specific issues. Our plan is to continue to be productive in this way and to support new hires to have equally successful careers. As the external reviewers note, a large part of our research productivity success relies on intra-departmental collaboration. Thus, to maintain such success, retiring faculty positions will need to be re-filled in a timely fashion.

Recommendation #11. The Committee strongly recommends that the INLP be granted another CFL position in addition to the one currently posted. The search should be timed for overlap with planned retirements.

LING agrees with this recommendation

2.2	Resource Implications (if any)
	Recommendation #11. LING will need to hire a tenure track Assistant Professor in Indigenous Languages.

2.3	Expected Completion Date(s)
	Summer 2025

3. ADMINISTRATION

3.1	Action(s) (description of what is going to be done)
	The external reviewers are affirming about how LING faculty, staff and students work together to achieve the goals of the Department. They do point out some problems that are the result of high staff turnover during and right after the pandemic, but we strongly believe that as we exit those circumstances, the staffing situation in the Department will stabilize. At the same time, INLP does need more staffing.

Recommendation #12. The Committee strongly recommends that the INLP be allowed to fill a Budget Assistant position (1.0 FTE) and a Program Assistant (0.4 FTE) position to provide critical support for the program and the communities.

LING agrees with this recommendation.

Recommendation #15. The Committee strongly recommends that the Department create formal training procedures/protocols and formalise an onboarding process that is provided to all new staff members.

The department agrees that a formal process of onboarding would be helpful. The Department manager will contact HR for support in developing such a process.

Recommendation #16. The Committee recommends that additional hours be allocated to staff members to ensure the Department is open during normal working hours.

The department agrees that more staff hours are required in order to keep the Department open during normal working hours. The department manager spoke to CUPE staff individually about extending hours to keep the Department open during normal working hours. Unfortunately, staff are not able to take on additional hours due to work/life balance and childcare issues. We will keep monitoring the situation and see if staff availability changes.

3.2	Resource Implications (if any)
Recommendation #12. INLP will need to hire a Budget Assistant position (1.0 FTE) and a Program Assistant (0.4 FTE) position.	

3.3	Expected Completion Date(s)
Fall 2024	

4. WORKING ENVIRONMENT

4.1	Action(s) (description of what is going to be done)
The report praises the collegial, transparent and supportive environment that we continuously work to establish in our Department. We commit to continuing this work, especially as we bring on new faculty and staff to help them thrive in their careers.	

4.2	Resource Implications (if any)

4.3	Expected Completion Date(s)

5. OTHER: _____

5.1	Action(s) (description of what is going to be done)
5.2	Resource Implications (if any)
5.3	Expected Completion Date(s)

The above action plan has been considered by the unit under review and has been discussed and agreed to by the Faculty Dean.

Unit Leader (signed)	Date
Name Panayiotis A. Pappas 	2024/08/19
Title Professor and Chair	

Section B

DEAN'S COMMENTS AND ENDORSEMENT OF THE ACTION PLAN

The Dean's office appreciates the time and care dedicated by the Department of Linguistics and the external review committee to a thorough and constructive process. We appreciate and share the external review committee's assessment that the quality of the unit's programs (both undergraduate and graduate) is high. I am glad that the committee saw robust measures to evaluate and improve the teaching programs, as academic excellence requires constant improvement. Further, I agree that the quality of faculty research in the department is high, and that the department is well-governed and offers a supportive environment. The Department's plans for the future are well-conceived, and the educational goals are well articulated and appropriately measured by the plan.

Since the external review concluded, the Dean's Office and the Department of Linguistics have already begun to act on the recommendations articulated. The Department has been authorized to hire a faculty member with research expertise in computational linguistics and who will hold a partial appointment in Social Data Analytics. The Dean's Office has also approved a search for a CFL specializing in Indigenous language(s) of Northwestern North America, including a Coast Salish language, for the Indigenous Languages Program (INLP). The Dean's Office also prioritized two staff positions for the INLP, as proposed, and they are either filled or in the process of being filled.

In order to address the Committee's recommendations, the Dean's office makes several further commitments. First, contingent on the Faculty budget and Provost approval, the Dean's office commits to hiring 1-2 CFL in Applied Linguistics over the next 1-3 years, one at a tenured level and one junior scholar. Again, approving any searches in this timeframe will depend on the budget and other practical considerations, and will be contingent on the continued prioritization of such a position by the department. We also support the Department leadership in their efforts to uphold the quality of graduate supervision through the biennial review and RTP processes. We are also keen to discuss the opportunities for additional tutorials in lower-level classes, though our TI/TA budget is quite constrained at present.

The external review committee also recommended additional staff positions to enable the Department to be open longer hours (this would be above and beyond the additional staff already allocated to support the INLP as indicated above). While we share the view that this is desirable, additional staff positions are difficult to support at this time, given the budget realities. In general, we have been unable to ensure that there are staff people available as receptionists across our 28 Departments and Programs and this is unlikely to change without central funds dedicated for such a purpose.

Faculty Dean (signature)



Date

August 19, 2024

MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Department of Linguistics; SCUP; Senate

FROM: Paul Kingsbury, Vice-President, Learning and Teaching pro tem
and Alice Campbell, Senior Consultant, Program Assessment, Learning Experiences Assessment and Planning

RE: Department of Linguistics Assessment Plan for Educational Goals associated with 2023/24 External Review

DATE: October 2, 2024



The Department of Linguistics has recently submitted its Educational Goals (EG) assessment report and plan to SCUTL following its recent External Review. We appreciate that you have created plans for both the undergraduate and graduate programs.

Undergraduate program

There are several commendable elements to this plan. One is your approach to assessing its Educational Goals through a range of mainly upper division courses. We appreciate that you have identified particular indicators that you will look for in student work. Focusing your inquiry in this way will help facilitate the data collection and ensure the results are interpretable and usable.

We appreciate how concise your plan is. Nevertheless, it would be helpful to provide some additional detail so that we can better understand how the work proposed and the courses you identified fit within the overall undergraduate program and any changes you may be making to the program in the coming years. We are unsure about the rationale used to select the courses listed (are they required? frequently offered with high enrolment? courses where the given program-level Educational Goal is clearly aligned with the course-level educational goals?). We would benefit from an explanation of what the TESL is and how it fits into the program. You indicate you will be using a sample of student work from the courses. A brief explanation of your rationale for this strategy would be helpful. It can be time-consuming. If this work is already being assessed within the context of the courses, an alternative strategy could be for the course instructors to collect and provide aggregate data on how well the students performed on the identified metric.

Graduate programs

We agree that graduate theses are strong indicators of student attainment of educational goals, as they are integrative in nature and represent students' best work at the end of their programs.

For Educational Goals 1-3, your proposed strategy of reviewing external reviewers' (by which we believe you mean external examiners') comments on the theses is novel and would likely provide a useful vantage point for seeing how well your graduates are attaining these key goals.

As with the undergraduate program, a brief rationale for this strategy and the sample size (5) would be helpful. Without knowing the particular subdisciplines within Linguistics, or the number of students the department graduates on an annual basis, we are unsure whether 5 is an appropriate sample, or how you will ensure it is representative.

For Educational Goal 4, publications and conference presentations are a strong measure of students' abilities to disseminate their work within the academic community. As this is a program-level goal, we suggest that your analysis include the proportion of students who are able to publish or present their work. We note that this particular Educational Goal also includes dissemination beyond the academic community, and are wondering how you are thinking of capturing that important work. We also know that many presentations and publications from graduate research occur after students graduate. We wonder if you are planning to capture this work as part of your scan, or if you want to restrict your analysis to those pieces that students have published before graduation.

As you begin to carry out this work, staff in the AVPLT portfolio are well equipped to support you, and want to help ensure it is meaningful and manageable for the Department. The LEAP (Learning Experiences Assessment and Planning) team supports program and Educational Goals assessment. Their supports include assessment design, quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis, and support with data interpretation. The Centre for Educational Excellence can help with program revisions and course re-designs that you may be planning.

Educational Goals Assessment Plan Template

Unit/Program: Linguistics

Contact name: Panos Pappas

Date: April 22, 2024

This template is designed to help units implement assessment of Educational Goals after receiving feedback from their External Review. Units are not expected to assess every Educational Goal every year. *(Textboxes will expand as you type)*

1) Who were the members of your Educational Goals Assessment team? Outline who has worked on the assessment.

Dr. Panayiotis Pappas, Chair of Department, Dr. Henny Yeung, Chair of Graduate Studies Committee, Dr. Chung-hye Han, Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

2) Are your program's Educational Goals current, or do any of them need to be revised?

In some cases, Educational Goals may need to be revised to keep apace with changes in the discipline or in the program's course offerings, or to ensure they continue to align with a unit's mission and values. Feedback from the External Review may inform revision of Educational Goals.

They are current

3) Is your program's curriculum map up to date?

A curriculum map may need to be updated to reflect any major changes to the program's course offerings (i.e. new or substantially revised courses, courses that have been removed).

Yes it is

4) Assessment Plan

For each Educational Goal, outline what data you will use to assess student learning. Indicate what direct evidence you will draw on - which key courses you will sample from and, if possible, the course-based assessments you plan to use. These can be described in general terms (e.g. research paper, final exam questions targeting a particular Educational Goal). Indicate also whether or not you plan to gather indirect evidence (e.g. surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.). The same indirect evidence method (e.g. a survey) can be used for multiple Educational Goals. Describe what would indicate to you that students had met the Educational Goal. Add or delete rows as needed.

Educational Goal 1: Clearly explain the central concepts of Linguistics and their significance			
Description of Assessment Methods: We will randomly sample 20% student work from LING 323, LING 321, LING 322	What would indicate that students had met the EG? If they are able to correctly answers questions about phonemes, morphemes, constituents	Is this direct or indirect? Direct	When do you plan to collect the data? Spring 2025
Educational Goal 2: Clearly explain how linguistic knowledge is obtained and verified, including the importance of detail, accuracy, and honesty			
Description of Assessment Methods: We will randomly sample 20% student work from LING 282, LING 301, LING 309	What would indicate that students had met the EG? If students are able to use clear linguistic argumentation techniques	Is this direct or indirect? Direct	When do you plan to collect the data? Fall 2025
Educational Goal 3: Accurately perform laboratory and field data collection techniques, and clearly report those procedures with proper scientific documentation			
Description of Assessment Methods: A sample of Term papers from LING 415	What would indicate that students had met the EG? If students are able to clearly describe data collection in their papers	Is this direct or indirect? Direct	When do you plan to collect the data? Spring 2026
Educational Goal 4: Clearly explain, compare, and evaluate fundamental assumptions of different types of linguistics theories			
Description of Assessment Methods: A sample of Term Papers from LING 400 or 410	What would indicate that students had met the EG? If students are able to articulate theoretical implications or to make theoretical comparisons	Is this direct or indirect? Direct	When do you plan to collect the data? Fall 2026
Educational Goal 5: Use clear and appropriate documentation to apply linguistic concepts in the fields, disciplines, and professions where language is an important component			
Description of Assessment Methods: Results from TESL practicum	What would indicate that students had met the EG? If students are able to successfully complete the TESL certificate practicum	Is this direct or indirect? Direct	When do you plan to collect the data? Spring 2027
GRADUATE GOALS			

EG1: Clearly explain the central concepts of linguistics and master key concepts and methods of their chosen sub-discipline(s)			
Description of Assessment Methods: Examination of 5 randomly selected theses over the past 5 years	What would indicate that students had met the EG? Evaluation of external reviewer's comments	Is this direct or indirect? Direct	When do you plan to collect the data? Spring 2025
EG2: Know how to obtain and verify linguistic knowledge with detailed accuracy and honesty (through laboratory methodologies or data collection in the field) and know how to report results with proper scientific documentation			
Description of Assessment Methods: Examination of 5 randomly selected theses over the past 5 years	What would indicate that students had met the EG? Evaluation of external reviewer's comments	Is this direct or indirect? Direct	When do you plan to collect the data? Fall 2025
EG3: Conduct original research in their sub-discipline(s). At the PhD-level this must include making novel empirical and theoretical contributions to the sub-discipline			
Description of Assessment Methods: Examination of 5 randomly selected theses over the past 5 years	What would indicate that students had met the EG? Evaluation of external reviewer's comments	Is this direct or indirect? Direct	When do you plan to collect the data? Spring 2026
EG4: Effectively articulate and disseminate research (in written form through publications and orally through conference presentations) to the academic community and beyond			
Description of Assessment Methods: Examination of student dissemination record in conference presentations and publications at the end of their degrees.	What would indicate that students had met the EG? Number of presentations and publications over the last 10 years	Is this direct or indirect? Direct	When do you plan to collect the data? Fall 2026

5) How do you plan on sharing your findings within your unit?

Publish findings on Teams and plan a retreat to discuss them.

6) Assessment Timeline

Next Mid-cycle Review:

Next External Review: