



SLO Assessment Cycle for ESL 262

Low Advanced Reading 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/nr

MaryAnne Ifft, Kathy Flores, Lin

Additional Notes:

Outcomes:

Outcome 1: Statement Modified: []

Demonstrate comprehension of literal and inferred meaning of level-specific academic reading materials and fiction.

Assessment Cycle Records:

Outcome 1: Assessment Planning Modified: [09/22/2010]

Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Spring 2010

Assessors: Marcy Betlach

Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations

Outcome 1: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [09/27/2010]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 5

Changes:

Methods:

In Winter 2010, five ESL 262 instructors met to create a common grading rubric for summary writing which was to be used by students. Each was given a packet which included the rubric and anchor papers. Later, we all agreed on a faculty shared their reflections and ideas for enhancement which are summarized below.

Summary:

Faculty found that students met the first SLO, "Demonstrate comprehension of literal and inferred meaning of level-specific academic reading materials, both literal and inferred meaning in their summary writing of a selected reading material." Faculty agreed that using a topic students had not encountered during the quarter might disadvantage those students, it actually was a good idea. Second, prior to the summary exam, the instructors told their students to read the SLO and to write a summary of the SLO. Faculty agreed that the SLO was a good idea and that the SLO was a good idea.

Enhancement (Part I):

Faculty agreed that reading instructors will continue to teach the reading comprehension skills for their students. Faculty agreed that this thinking process made the comprehension of the text more sustaining for both literal and inferred meaning.

Enhancement (Part II):

The teaching of reading comprehension is a standard teaching activity and does not require additional funding.

Outcome 2: Statement Modified: []

Identify and analyze organization and rhetorical modes of extended reading materials.

Outcome 2: Assessment Planning Modified: [09/27/2010]

Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Spring 2010

Assessors: Marcy Betlach

Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations

Outcome 2: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [09/27/2010]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 5

Changes:

Methods:

In Winter 2010, five ESL 262 instructors met to create a common grading rubric for summary writing which was to be used by students. Each was given a packet which included the rubric and anchor papers. Later, we all agreed on a faculty shared their reflections and ideas for enhancement which are summarized below.

Summary:

Faculty discovered that students met the second SLO, "Identify and analyze organization and rhetorical modes of extended reading materials." Faculty agreed that the SLO was a good idea and that the SLO was a good idea.

Enhancement (Part I):

Faculty agreed that reading instructors will continue to teach the identification and analysis of rhetorical modes to their students. Faculty agreed that this thinking process assisted students in identifying rhetorical modes.

Enhancement (Part II):

The teaching of rhetorical modes is a standard teaching activity and does not require additional funding.

Outcome 3: Statement Modified: []

Identify the main and supporting ideas of a level-appropriate text.

Outcome 3: Assessment Planning Modified: [09/27/2010]**Assessment Strategy Used:**

Quarter: Spring 2010

Assessors: Marcy Betlach

Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations

Outcome 3: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [09/27/2010]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 5

Changes:**Methods:**

In Winter 2010, five ESL 262 instructors met to create a common grading rubric for summary writing which was to be used for students' summaries, and A, B, C and no pass anchors (or models) were agreed upon. In Spring 2010, five of the six instructors who participated in the assessment gave their students the summary grading rubric at the beginning of the quarter which included the rubric and anchor papers. Later, we all agreed on a common reading to be summarized as part of the enhancement which are summarized below.

Summary:

Faculty found that not all students met the third SLO for ESL 262, "Identify the main idea and supporting ideas of a level-appropriate text." However, a fair number of students did not demonstrate this ability in the summary. Faculty discussed a number of reasons why some students were not able to identify the main idea and supporting ideas of a level-appropriate text. One instructor said that her students had not done any summary writing before entering her ESL 263, and therefore students lacked the skills necessary to write successful summaries.

The greatest surprise and area of concern is that the assessment revealed very different grading criteria. Even though scores of the summary exam varied greatly. In two classes, roughly 50% of the students passed the summary exam. In

Enhancement (Part I):

Because of the results described above, it is clear that we need to do more norming in the ESL Department in order to ensure summary writing is being taught in ESL 252. (It is included in the ESL 252 course outline.) Creating a common summary grading rubric at the beginning of the quarter which the students model A, B, C and no pass papers is equally useful. Finally, several instructors recommended offering more LinC classes, but also because LinC classes inherently help faculty norm their grading.

At the 2010 Opening Day ESL Program meeting, faculty spent some time reflecting on these difficulties and suggested could provide more support for students at the 244 level so that by the time that they reach ESL 262, they are better prepared to practice rather than evaluating the product at the 244 intermediate level and also about providing more scaffolding to them illustrating the benefit of using oral summaries as a bridge to prepare students for what is a more difficult writing task as and written summaries without relying on the vocabulary from the actual text.

Enhancement (Part II):

According to all the participating ESL 262 instructors, the most beneficial aspect of the SLO assessment was to learn all results also show that much work is still needed to norm instruction, expectations and grading. We need consistent funding for part-time instructor participation.

Outcome 4: Statement Modified: []

Demonstrate understanding and usage of level-specific vocabulary in academic readings.

Outcome 4: Assessment Planning Modified: [09/27/2010]**Assessment Strategy Used:**

Quarter: Spring 2010

Assessors: Marcy Betlach

Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations

Outcome 4: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [09/27/2010]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 5

Changes:**Methods:**

In Winter 2010, five ESL 262 instructors met to create a common grading rubric for summary writing which was to be used for students' summaries, and A, B, C and no pass anchors (or models) were agreed upon. In Spring 2010, five of the six instructors who participated in the assessment gave their students the summary grading rubric at the beginning of the quarter which included the rubric and anchor papers. Later, we all agreed on a common reading to be summarized as part of the enhancement which are summarized below.

Summary:

ESL 262 faculty discovered that not all students met the fourth SLO, "Demonstrate understanding and usage of level-specific vocabulary in academic readings." Several instructors felt that their students were not prepared for

Nonetheless, all five instructors found the SLO assessment tool and process effective and valuable. Summary writing is a skill that requires understanding of vocabulary and tone, and their ability to express the author's ideas with proper form, content and clarity. In all three classes, the instructor had expected higher results on the summary exam. The assessment results showed that much work is still needed to norm instruction, expectations and grading.

Enhancement (Part I):

Because of the results described above, it is clear that we need to do more norming in the ESL Department in order to ensure summary writing is being taught in ESL 252. (It is included in the ESL 252 course outline.) Creating a common summary grading rubric at the beginning of the quarter which the students model A, B, C and no pass papers is equally useful. Finally, several instructors recommended offering more LinC classes, but also because LinC classes inherently help faculty norm their grading.

Enhancement (Part II):

According to all the participating ESL 262 instructors, the most beneficial aspect of the SLO assessment was to learn all results also show that much work is still needed to norm instruction, expectations and grading. We need consistent funding for part-time instructor participation.

results also show that much work is still needed to norm instruction, expectations and grading. We need consistent funding and compensation for part-time instructor participation.

[Number of Outcomes for ESL 262: 4]