



SLO Assessment Cycle for ESL 261

Low Advanced Listening and Speaking SLO Modified: [03/22/2012]

Craig Norman's Team Members:

1. [Maryanne Ifft](#) (x5385) ESL
2. [Kathy Flores](#) (x8522) ESL
3. [Marcy Betlach](#) (x8394) ESL

Additional Team members not on list/notes about team:

MaryAnne Ifft, Kathy Flores, Marcy Betlach, Pati Carobus, Charles Lee

Additional Notes:

Outcomes:

Outcome 1: Statement Modified: []

Demonstrate understanding of essential points of discussions or speeches on selected academic topics.

Assessment Cycle Records:

Outcome 1: Assessment Planning Modified: [03/22/2012]

Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Spring 2011

Assessors: Craig Norman Charles Lee, Pati Carobus, Angelina Skylar

Assessment Tools: Exams • Performances/Demonstrations

Outcome 1: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [03/22/2012]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 5

Changes:

Methods:

After discussing what we do in different sections of ESL 261, reviewing ESL 261 Course Outline, and sharing copies of our syllabi, we revised our Student Learning Outcome. We felt that the new version better reflects the goals and objectives of the course. Now it reads:

ESL 261 – Low Advanced Listening and Speaking

1. Demonstrate effective speaking skills in a variety of academic settings.
2. Demonstrate listening comprehension of a variety of level-specific materials, including academic lectures, newscasts, and formal speeches by taking notes and answering questions.

SLO Assessment:

We all agreed that we needed to assess both recognition (input) and production (output). We wanted to have students do presentations (output) based on a listening activity (input).

a) The input part of the assessment was a test based on a lecture students listened to. The lecture was from Chapter 7 in the Assessment Tools of Mosaic 2 Listening Speaking, testing students in cause/effect reasoning academically. Students took notes and answered questions.

b) The output part of the assessment was student presentations. Students compared/contrasted cultures in four categories. This was to assess students in their effective speaking skills in an academic setting. We came up with a rubric to evaluate presentations.

Summary:

After discussing what we do in different sections of ESL 261, reviewing ESL 261 Course Outline, and sharing copies of our syllabi, we revised our Student Learning Outcome. We felt that the new version better reflects the goals and objectives of the course. Now it reads:

ESL 261 – Low Advanced Listening and Speaking

1. Demonstrate effective speaking skills in a variety of academic settings.

2. Demonstrate listening comprehension of a variety of level-specific materials, including academic lectures, newscasts, and formal speeches by taking notes and answering questions.

SLO Assessment:

We all agreed that we needed to assess both recognition (input) and production (output). We wanted to have students do presentations (output) based on a listening activity (input).

a) The input part of the assessment was a test based on a lecture students listened to. The lecture was from Chapter 7 in the Assessment Tools of Mosaic 2 Listening Speaking, testing students in cause/effect reasoning academically. Students took notes and answered questions.

b) The output part of the assessment was student presentations. Students compared/contrasted cultures in four categories. This was to assess students in their effective speaking skills in an academic setting. We came up with a rubric to evaluate presentations.

c. Were there any areas where the student performance was outstanding?

In listening to academic lectures, they were successful not only in comprehension of main ideas and details of lecture contents but in recording the information through improved note-taking skills. In speaking, they were able to both use a rhetorical mode such as comparison/contrast or cause/effect and serve a purpose as to make a convincing point with these methods.

d. Any areas where it can be improved?

1. Adding visual to the listening segment. We could make the testing easier and more realistic by using a video clip rather than only playing an audio tape.

2. Making the listening section longer. Instead of choosing a 4 – 5 minute long lecture, we could select a 7 – 10 minute long video.

e. Did your students meet your "expectations of student proficiency or student success?"

Yes, the successful passing rate was 75%.

Enhancement (Part I):

The assessment results suggest that one speaking element could be added to course content: pronunciation. A 5 – 10 minute pronunciation unit is recommended for daily instruction. Recommendations:

1. Revising SLO by adding a pronunciation component
2. Revising course outline by adding a pronunciation component

Enhancement (Part II):

None.

Outcome 2: Statement Modified: []

Demonstrate listening comprehension of a variety of level-specific materials, including academic lectures, newscasts, dialogues and stories by taking notes and answering questions.

Outcome 2: Assessment Planning Modified: [03/22/2012]

Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Spring 2011

Assessors: Craig Norman Charles Lee, Pati Carobus, Angelina Skylar

Assessment Tools: Exams • Performances/Demonstrations

Outcome 2: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [03/22/2012]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 5

Changes:

Methods:

After discussing what we do in different sections of ESL 261, reviewing ESL 261 Course Outline, and sharing copies of our syllabi, we revised our Student Learning Outcome. We felt that the new version better reflects the goals and objectives of the course. Now it reads:

ESL 261 – Low Advanced Listening and Speaking

1. Demonstrate effective speaking skills in a variety of academic settings.
2. Demonstrate listening comprehension of a variety of level-specific materials, including academic lectures, newscasts, and formal speeches by taking notes and answering questions.

SLO Assessment:

We all agreed that we needed to assess both recognition (input) and production (output). We wanted to have students do presentations (output) based on a listening activity (input).

a) The input part of the assessment was a test based on a lecture students listened to. The lecture was from Chapter 7 in the Assessment Tools of Mosaic 2 Listening Speaking, testing students in cause/effect reasoning academically. Students took notes and answered questions.

b) The output part of the assessment was student presentations. Students compared/contrasted cultures in four categories. This was to assess students in their effective speaking skills in an academic setting. We came up with a rubric to evaluate presentations.

Summary:

a. Summarize your assessment results.

The assessment was a success. Though challenging, especially in vocabulary, it evaluated well in both listening and speaking skills, for instance, critical/logical reasoning by using cause/effect and comparison/contrast relations. In listening, it assessed students' listening comprehension and note taking skills while providing exposure to academic contents. In speaking, it tested students' critical thinking ability by having them use rhetorical modes to make points. For example, students adopted comparison/contrast as a method to achieve a purpose of convincing their audience. Student success rate was satisfactory: 75% students passed the assessment testing.

b. What students' needs and issues were revealed?

At this level, students need to learn and master academic skills in both listening and speaking. These skills include, for instance, understanding academic lectures, newscasts, and formal speeches, note-taking, and presenting ideas in an academic setting. The assessment addressed such students' needs and evaluated their efficiency.

c. Were there any areas where the student performance was outstanding?

In listening to academic lectures, they were successful not only in comprehension of main ideas and details of lecture contents but in recording the information through improved note-taking skills. In speaking, they were able to both use a rhetorical mode such as comparison/contrast or cause/effect and serve a purpose as to make a convincing point with these methods.

d. Any areas where it can be improved?

1. Adding visual to the listening segment. We could make the testing easier and more realistic by using a video clip rather than only playing an audio tape.
2. Making the listening section longer. Instead of choosing a 4 – 5 minute long lecture, we could select a 7 – 10 minute long video.

e. Did your students meet your "expectations of student proficiency or student success?"

Yes, the successful passing rate was 75%.

3) Enhancement: Describe how the assessment results will be applied to enhance or improve student learning: content, teaching methods, assignments, course evaluation procedures, the SLO...

The assessment results suggest that one speaking element could be added to course content: pronunciation. A 5 – 10 minute pronunciation unit is recommended for daily instruction. Recommendations:

1. Revising SLO by adding a pronunciation component
2. Revising course outline by adding a pronunciation component

Enhancement (Part I):

3) Enhancement: Describe how the assessment results will be applied to enhance or improve student learning: content, teaching methods, assignments, course evaluation procedures, the SLO...

The assessment results suggest that one speaking element could be added to course content: pronunciation. A 5 – 10 minute pronunciation unit is recommended for daily instruction. Recommendations:

1. Revising SLO by adding a pronunciation component
2. Revising course outline by adding a pronunciation component

Enhancement (Part II):

None.

[Number of Outcomes for ESL 261: 2]