UMass Amherst's Educational Effectiveness Plan (EEP) provides departments with an ongoing structure for conducting systematic inquiry into the effectiveness of their efforts to support student success. Departments initially developed and submitted their EEP inquiry plans and evidence gathering strategies in spring 2018 and are asked to provide updates on their progress on a regular basis. EEP activity is also incorporated into the University's strategic planning process – with departments including their EEP progress and findings into their 2021 Strategic Planning Refresh. What follows is the department's most current reporting, as synthesized by the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment (OAPA).

Linguistics EEP

Identify the evidence you currently use (beyond GPA) to determine that your undergraduates have achieved the objectives you have for them.
We consider a variety of centrally-located data such as that collected by OIR and via the SRTI. We also consider peer faculty observations.

Please describe the focus of your inquiry and explain why this inquiry is important to your department right now.
Line of Inquiry 2018: We have used the EEP process to develop a new set of learning objectives, which we believe will help greatly to inform curriculum development and evaluation. The focus of our inquiry will be to determine how well our courses and overall curriculum are meeting those goals.

Progress your department has made toward addressing your line of inquiry, and the types of evidence that you have collected to inform your inquiry.
Our work since the 2018 EEP submission has focused on integration of our departmental student learning objectives into individual courses, and on developing an objective-centered approach to teaching evaluation, which will provide us data on how well the objectives are being met in the courses. We also conducted focus-group discussions on the student learning objectives in the linguistic student club, and in another undergraduate meeting, *LINGLE,* and discussed SLOs in the context of a departmental curriculum review. Our objective-centered approach to teaching evaluation was developed in the course of our participation in the NSF TEVAL program. It makes use of peer and self-evaluation, and was developed as an alternative to class observation. Our survey of the literature on observation, and discussions in the TEVAL group and in faculty meetings, led us to seek a different approach. We wanted a means of evaluating how well the objectives were being met, and a single observation, or even a set of observations, would not provide that information. There was also general reluctance amongst our faculty to engage in an observation process. Inspired by a suggestion of Gabriela Weaver's for organizing peer evaluation, we adopted a triad approach, where Faculty member A provides

evaluative information to Faculty member B, B to C, and C to A. The three-member group meets at the beginning of the semester to discuss their objectives and how they are incorporated into the syllabi. The peer evaluation happens midterm, in an approach inspired by the Center for Teaching and Learning's MAP process. The faculty member goes to their peer's class, and engages the students in an evaluation of how well the objectives are being met in the course. We are still in the process of discussing how semester-ending evaluations might take place; there has been some suggestion that this could simply be an evaluation of the student's performance relative to the objectives, as demonstrated in tests and assignments. For some data on how the objectives were being perceived at the overall department level, we engaged students in our linguistics club and in *LINGLE* in focus group discussions.

What are your department's next steps regarding your continuing and/or upcoming EEP line of inquiry?
One next step is to make progress on integrating the SLOs into our advising process, and also linking them with career outcomes. We will assess our progress on these measures by holding focus groups at the end of the next academic year. We are also pushing forward with objective-based evaluation. We have a new cohort of faculty participating this semester – nearly half of them. We will continue to discuss how this could be incorporated into formal evaluation, especially with respect to the career trajectory of our assistant professors.

In upcoming semesters, we are planning a second pilot of objective-oriented evaluation, creation of advising materials for SLOs, and linkage of SLOs to career paths. We are also planning a possible department-wide adoption of objective-oriented evaluation, a launch of SLO-based advising, and a focus group assessment of progress on integration of SLOs into curriculum and advising.

What are the Student Learning Objectives for your department or program(s)?
Linguistics and Anthropology, B.A.; Linguistics and Chinese, B.A.; Linguistics and German, B.A. Linguistics and Japanese, B.A.; Linguistics and Philosophy, B.A.; Linguistics and Portuguese, B.A.; Linguistics and Psychology, B.A.; Linguistics and Spanish, B.A.
- Ability to reason analytically about language.
- An understanding of linguistic theories and their relationship to language diversity.
- An understanding of linguistic discrimination.
- Ability to communicate about language.
- Ability to work as an effective member of a team.

Linguistics, B.A.
- Ability to reason analytically about language.
- Basic quantitative and computational competence in language research.
- An understanding of linguistic theories and their relationship to language diversity.
- An understanding of linguistic discrimination.
- Ability to communicate about language.

- Ability to work as an effective member of a team.

Linguistics, Ph.D.
- Advanced ability in linguistic analysis across all sub-fields of linguistics.
- Advanced computational and quantitative skills, where applicable.
- Ability to conduct independent, publishable research in an area of specialization.
- Ability to teach linguistics.