



## SLO Assessment Cycle for ESL 251

*High Intermediate Listening and Speaking* SLO Modified: [03/12/2011]

### Craig Norman's Team Members:

1. [Maryanne Ifft](#) (x5385) ESL
2. [Kathy Flores](#) (x8522) ESL
3. [Marcy Betlach](#) (x8394) ESL
4. [Craig Norman](#) (x5325) 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 understanding of essential points of discussions or speeches on selected topics.

### Assessment Cycle Records:

#### Outcome 1: Assessment Planning Modified: [03/12/2011]

##### Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Fall 2010

Assessors: Craig Norman, Craig NormanPati Carobus, Gloria Heistein, Lucinda Cabral, Elaine Anderson

Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations • Interviews

#### Outcome 1: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [03/12/2011]

**Number of people involved in Phase III: 5**

##### Changes:

##### Methods:

ESL 251 faculty met two times as well as kept email correspondence during the fall quarter of 2010. The faculty met in the middle of the fall quarter and again in the first week of instruction in the winter 2011 quarter. Due to conflicting teaching schedules, 251 faculty held email correspondence to review the SLOs for ESL 251. They agreed that the SLOs were indeed relevant and valid. Another goal of the email correspondence was to discuss the types of assignments and assessments ESL 251 faculty would implement to assess whether the students were able to demonstrate satisfactorily the SLOs for the course. Preparation for the first meeting was for faculty to bring assessments and rubrics used in ESL 251 in order to decide what assessment to use for SLOAC. Faculty decided to administer the second assessment at the end of the quarter.

For the first face to face meeting in the sixth week of the fall quarter, ESL 251 faculty brought rubrics, assessments and some student work. From the sharing, the faculty decided to have students conduct an interview with an ESL student who is proficient in English and who did not speak the student's first language and then prepare an oral presentation near the end of the fall quarter. The assessment was developed to assess students' listening comprehension and oral communication skills as well as pronunciation. Another goal of the first meeting was to come up with a rubric for the oral presentation assessment. The faculty brought the rubrics they used for their classes and faculty worked together to have one rubric for the assessment.

At the final meeting, the ESL 251 faculty brought the scored rubrics for each assessment. The faculty discussed the results of each assessment about whether students met the SLOs and ways to improve student success in ESL 251.

##### Summary:

The ESL 251 faculty agreed that for the SLO, "Demonstrate understanding of essential points of discussions or speeches on selected topics," the majority of the students met the standard of the listening comprehension outcome. Faculty shared the results from the assessment and noted that the interview was an effective assessment

to measure students' listening comprehension skills. Faculty pointed out that the topic for the student presentations was very appropriate for the students' English level. All faculty talked about how students were very engaged in the speaking topic and were excited to share the goals, nuances, and success stories of learning a second language. Although the scoring ranged from excellent to low satisfactory, the ESL 251 faculty were satisfied of the overall performance of the students' listening abilities. One critique of the ESL 251 SLOAC assessment was that the directions of the interview assignment need to be more specific in that they differentiate the generation 1.5 and true ESL student. Faculty noticed that some students for their interviews chose generation 1.5 students, who have a unique and different language experience than most ESL 251 students.

#### **Enhancement (Part I):**

The SLOAC 251 faculty agreed that ESL 251 instructors should continue to teach listening skills for their students. Faculty found that giving students plenty of opportunities to conduct interviews on different topics throughout the quarter helped them to hone their listening skills and also gave faculty ample opportunities to give students the needed feedback to be effective oral communicators. The 251 faculty also agreed that the speaking topic plays a vital role in the listening and oral performances. They pointed out that they were surprised at the vitality that students showed during their speeches which enhanced their listening and speaking effectiveness. However, one point that came up from the final meeting was that there was so much course content for 251 instructors to focus on that they were constantly pressed for time and questioned whether they could adequately address the teaching points. This point was brought up at two ESL department meetings during the winter 2011 quarter. ESL faculty agreed that there was much to cover in ESL 251, so they began to prioritize the most important teaching points. The faculty decided to stop teaching idioms and make ESL 251 more academic. The ESL department agreed that the course should be more academic, including focus on oral presentations, pronunciation, and listening comprehension and note-taking skills. Another important outcome of the ESL 251 SLOAC process and the following department meetings was the decision to make a textbook committee, whose focus is to select the best textbooks that cover ESL 251 course content. The results of this committee is that faculty will be able to choose from a small menu of textbooks that concentrate on the revised content focus and therefore it will keep consistency for each ESL course and level.

#### **Enhancement (Part II):**

The teaching of listening comprehension is a standard teaching activity in ESL 251 and does not require additional funding.

---

#### **Outcome 2: Statement** Modified: []

Recognize and demonstrate level-appropriate spoken American English in class discussions and speeches on selected topics.

#### **Outcome 2: Assessment Planning** Modified: [03/12/2011]

##### **Assessment Strategy Used:**

Quarter: Fall 2010

Assessors: Craig Norman, Pati Carobus, Gloria Heistein, Lucinda Cabral, Elaine Anderson

Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations • Interviews

#### **Outcome 2: Reflect & Enhance** Modified: [03/12/2011]

**Number of people involved in Phase III: 5**

**Changes:**

##### **Methods:**

ESL 251 faculty met two times as well as kept email correspondence during the fall quarter of 2010. The faculty met in the middle of the fall quarter and again in the first week of instruction in the winter 2011 quarter. Due to conflicting teaching schedules, 251 faculty held email correspondence to review the SLOs for ESL 251. They agreed that the SLOs were indeed relevant and valid. Another goal of the email correspondence was to discuss the types of assignments and assessments ESL 251 faculty would implement to assess whether the students were able to demonstrate satisfactorily the SLOs for the course. Preparation for the first meeting was for faculty to bring assessments and rubrics used in ESL 251 in order to decide what assessment to use for SLOAC. Faculty decided to administer the second assessment at the end of the quarter.

For the first face to face meeting in the sixth week of the fall quarter, ESL 251 faculty brought rubrics, assessments and some student work. From the sharing, the faculty decided to have students conduct an interview with an ESL student who is proficient in English and who did not speak the student's first language and then prepare an oral presentation near the end of the fall quarter. The assessment was developed to assess students' listening comprehension and oral communication skills as well as pronunciation. Another goal of the first meeting was to come up with a rubric for the oral presentation assessment. The faculty brought the rubrics they used for their classes and faculty worked together to have one rubric for the assessment.

At the final meeting, the ESL 251 faculty brought the scored rubrics for each assessment. The faculty discussed the results of each assessment about whether students met the SLOs and ways to improve student success in ESL 251.

**Summary:**

The ESL 251 faculty agreed that for the SLO, "Recognize and demonstrate level-appropriate spoken American English in class discussions and speeches on selected topics," the majority of the students met the standard of the speaking skills outcome. Faculty shared the results from the assessment and noted that the interview was an effective assessment to measure students' speaking skills. Faculty pointed out that the topic for the student presentations was very appropriate for the students' English level. All faculty talked about how students were very engaged in the speaking topic and were excited to share the goals, nuances, and success stories of learning a second language. Although the scoring ranged from excellent to low satisfactory, the ESL 251 faculty were satisfied of the overall performance of the students' speaking abilities. One critique of the ESL 251 SLOAC assessment was that the directions of the interview assignment need to be more specific in that they differentiate the generation 1.5 and true ESL student. Faculty noticed that some students for their interviews chose generation 1.5 students, who have a unique and different language experience than most ESL 251 students.

**Enhancement (Part I):**

The SLOAC 251 faculty agreed that ESL 251 instructors should continue to teach presentation and speaking skills for their students. Faculty found that giving students plenty of opportunities to present on different topics throughout the quarter helped them to hone their speaking skills and also gave faculty ample opportunities to give students the needed feedback to be effective oral communicators. The 251 faculty also agreed that the speaking topic plays a vital role in the listening and oral performances. They pointed out that they were surprised at the vitality that students showed during their speeches which enhanced their listening and speaking effectiveness. However, one point that came up from the final meeting was that the SLOAC assessment weighed heavily on presentation skills and not enough focus on speaking skills. This point was brought up at two ESL department meetings during the winter 2011 quarter. ESL faculty agreed that since ESL 251 should focus more on academic speaking skills, the assessment was appropriate. so they began to prioritize the most important teaching points. The faculty decided to stop teaching idioms and make ESL 251 more academic. The ESL department agreed that the course should be more academic, including focus on oral presentations, pronunciation, and listening comprehension and note-taking skills. Another important outcome of the ESL 251 SLOAC process and the following department meetings was the decision to make a textbook committee, whose focus is to select the best textbooks that cover ESL 251 course content. The results of this committee is that faculty will be able to choose from a small menu of textbooks that concentrate on the revised content focus and therefore it will keep consistency for each ESL course and level.

**Enhancement (Part II):**

The teaching of speaking and presentation skills are a standard teaching activity in ESL 251 and do not require additional funding.

