



SLO Assessment Cycle for ESL 272

Advanced Reading and Vocabulary SLO Modified: [04/21/2010]

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, Linda Choi-Yee, Marcy Betlach, Michelle Marchiano, Janell Pekkain,

Additional Notes:

Outcomes:

Outcome 1: Statement Modified: []

Demonstrate comprehension of literal and inferred meaning of fiction and nonfiction texts, and identify main and supporting ideas of expository prose.

Assessment Cycle Records:

Outcome 1: Assessment Planning Modified: [11/04/2010]

Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Spring 2010

Assessors: Linda Yee, Julie Madigan, Gregory Anderson, Letty Wong

Assessment Tools: Papers/Essays • Rubric

Outcome 1: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [02/28/2011]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 4

Changes:

Methods:

ESL 272 faculty met four times during the Spring 2010 quarter. In the first meeting, faculty concentrated on evaluating the SLOs for the course. Faculty decided to include responsive writing as one of the criteria for the SLOs. The following meetings involved creating a common rubric with which faculty could assess summary responsive writing and deciding on a common reading for the assessment. Faculty then brought sample papers for norming and deciding on criteria A, B, C, D, and F papers. In the final meeting, faculty met at the end of the quarter to share and discuss results of the assessment as well as to make recommendations for future assessments.

Summary:

Faculty concluded that most of the students demonstrated comprehension of literal and inferred meaning of the text, and identified main and supporting ideas of expository prose. Because of discussion of the SLOs and SLOAC process, faculty explicitly taught summarizing readings with main and supporting ideas. Some faculty revealed that they had not done this type of instruction before.

Enhancement (Part I):

The instructors participated in the process and all agreed it was very effective. We felt that the various perspectives of instructors who are teaching the course were shared in an open and thoughtful environment. Although overall students performed well on the assessment, some students did not have the writing skills to write an effective summary response. Faculty also discovered that ESL students do not have to take the parallel level writing class, ESL 273, when enrolled in ESL 272. The common rubric proved to be an effective measurement tool to assess student learning outcomes. Instructors for this course will use this rubric to grade students' work in order to be fair and consistent across all sections. We also found that critical thinking and summarizing/paraphrasing skills need to be taught early in the ESL sequence in order for students at this level to successfully demonstrate in writing comprehension and critical analysis of academic reading material. There was a strong consensus that summarizing/paraphrasing and critical thinking skills need to be taught early in the ESL sequence so that students can be more successful in this course, where they are required to read and respond to highly

academic material. Instructors also agreed that students should complete ESL 263 before entering this course so that they will have the writing skills to summarize and paraphrase successfully.

Enhancement (Part II):
None.

Outcome 2: Statement Modified: [01/24/2011]

Demonstrate critical analysis and evaluation of ideas, persuasive techniques, and/or validity of argument found in readings through responsive writing.

Outcome 2: Assessment Planning Modified: [02/28/2011]

Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Spring 2010

Assessors: Linda Yee, Judy Madigan, Gregory Anderson, Letty Wong

Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations • Written Reports

Outcome 2: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [02/28/2011]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 4

Changes:

Methods:

ESL 272 faculty met four times during the Spring 2010 quarter. In the first meeting, faculty concentrated on evaluating the SLOs for the course. Faculty decided to include responsive writing as one of the criteria for the SLOs. The following meetings involved creating a common rubric with which faculty could assess summary responsive writing and decide on a common reading for the assessment. Faculty then brought sample papers for norming and decided on criteria A, B, C, D, and F papers. In the final meeting, faculty met at the end of the quarter to share and discuss results of the assessment as well as to make recommendations for future assessments.

Summary:

Faculty found that though the majority of the students were able to demonstrate some critical thinking skills by only giving personal examples to illustrate their points, they could not use broader and/or deeper analysis of the readings. Students could not formulate their own generalizations to prove or disprove the author's point of view.

Enhancement (Part I):

The assessment underscored the importance of teaching summarizing, paraphrasing and critical thinking skills in our classes, and using a common rubric to evaluate our student consistently across all sections. Faculty agreed that there needs to be more in-class discussions to promote a broader and deeper analysis of the readings.

Enhancement (Part II):

None.

Outcome 3: Statement Modified: [01/24/2011]

Demonstrate in writing understanding and usage of academic vocabulary and language that is relatively free of basic errors.

Outcome 3: Assessment Planning Modified: [02/09/2011]

Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Spring 2010

Assessors: Linda Yee, Judy Madigan, Gregory Anderson, Letty Wong

Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations • Written Reports

Outcome 3: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [02/28/2011]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 4

Changes:

Methods:

ESL 272 faculty met four times during the Spring 2010 quarter. In the first meeting, faculty concentrated on evaluating the SLOs for the course. Faculty decided to include responsive writing as one of the criteria for the SLOs. The following meetings involved creating a common rubric with which faculty could assess summary responsive writing and decide on a common reading for the assessment. Faculty then brought sample papers for norming and decided on criteria A, B,

C, D, and F papers. In the final meeting, faculty met at the end of the quarter to share and discuss results of the assessment as well as to make recommendations for future assessments.

Summary:

Most of the students demonstrated proficiency in writing and vocabulary usage appropriate for this level; however, the faculty realized that a few of the students lacked the proficiency since they had not taken ESL 263, the low-advanced writing/grammar course, which is one level below 272. Faculty agreed that in order for students to succeed in 272, they must have taken 263 to be able to demonstrate in writing the understanding and usage of academic vocabulary and language that is relatively free of basic errors.

Enhancement (Part I):

Instructors agreed that students should complete ESL 263 before entering this course so that they will have the writing skills to summarize and paraphrase successfully. In fall 2010, the faculty revised the course outline for 272, so effective fall 2011 ESL 263 will be a prerequisite for ESL 272.

Enhancement (Part II):

None.

[Number of Outcomes for ESL 272: 3]