



SLO Assessment Cycle for ESL 244

Intermediate English as a Second Language SLO Modified: [09/29/2010]

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: []

Comprehend, analyze and respond to reading and listening low-intermediate materials.

Assessment Cycle Records:

Outcome 1: Assessment Planning Modified: [09/29/2010]

Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Spring 2010

Assessors: Craig Norman, Kathy Flores

Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations • Papers/Essays

Outcome 1: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [09/29/2010]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 5

Changes:

Methods:

ESL 244 faculty met three times during the Spring Quarter of 2010. ESL 244 faculty met at the beginning, middle and end of the spring quarter. The purpose of the first meeting was to discuss the SLOs for ESL 244 and come to agreement that the SLOs were indeed relevant and valid. Another goal of the first meeting was to discuss what types of assessments ESL 244 faculty would implement to assess whether the students were able to demonstrate satisfactorily the SLOs for the course. Faculty decided to have students give an oral presentation near the end of the quarter to assess students' oral communication skills and pronunciation. To assess students' reading comprehension, vocabulary, and writing skills, the faculty chose to have students read a level-appropriate non-fiction reading and then write a short summary about it. Faculty decided to administer the second assessment at the end of the quarter.

For the second meeting, ESL 244 faculty brought student papers to be used as anchors, A, B, C, D, & F grades, for the reading/writing assessment as well as possible reading selections and presentation topics for each assessment. The faculty discussed the anchor papers and came to a consensus of grading. They also chose the the reading selection for the reading/writing assessment and the topic for student presentations. The final goal of the second meeting was to come up with rubrics for oral presentation and reading/writing assessments. The faculty brought the rubrics they used for their classes and faculty worked together to have one rubric for each assessment.

At the final meeting, the final week of the quarter, the ESL 244 faculty brought the summaries and 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 244.

Summary:

The SLOAC ESL 244 faculty had mixed results for the first SLO, "Comprehend, analyze and respond to reading and listening low-intermediate materials." First, listening component of the SLO was not assessed at that time. In regards to analyzing and responding to reading, faculty agreed that the assessment measure, summary writing,

might not have been a fair testing procedure since a number of the faculty argued that writing a summary for ESL 244 was too difficult for students at this level. About 60 percent of the students passed the assessment. Some of the students scored high on the assessment, and many demonstrated good summary form, but a good share of the students did not have the English proficiency and skill needed to write a clear and accurate response to the reading even though faculty introduced summary writing in their classes throughout the quarter. Thus, teachers thought that students did comprehend the reading, but could not articulate the information in summary form. At the end of the meeting, the faculty talked about alternative assessments to assess reading comprehension and writing skills for ESL 244.

Enhancement (Part I):

Because students did not fare well on the first SLO maybe due to inappropriate assessment measure (i.e. summary writing), ESL 244 faculty talked about different types of assessment to measure students' ability for reading comprehension. The SLOAC ESL 244 faculty agreed that for the next cycle to assess ESL 244 students will read a non-fiction reading and then write a reader's response paper. In that way, students will have the vocabulary and grammar to write a more appropriate response.

At the following ESL Program meeting, SLOAC faculty shared the results of the SLO assessment for ESL 244 to the ESL faculty. A fruitful discussion proceeded and good ideas were exchanged at this meeting. They spent some time reflecting on these difficulties and suggested ways faculty 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 handle the demands of writing good summary paragraphs. They talked about emphasizing practice rather than evaluating the product at the 244 intermediate level and also about providing more scaffolding to the summary writing exercises demanded of students in both 244 and 252. Examples were given illustrating the benefit of using oral summaries as a bridge to prepare students for what is a more difficult writing task as well as the efficacy of using simple techniques like closing the reading book and producing both oral and written summaries without relying on the vocabulary from the actual text. It was suggested that a good intermediary approach to paragraph writing, for ESL 244 level students, might be to evaluate their ability to recognize a good summary, and the elements contained in it, but not to evaluate their actual production of the summary itself, keeping the emphasis on practice rather than on production at the 244 level.

Enhancement (Part II):

Stipends will be needed for faculty who take on the added responsibility of level coordination and assessment. The ESL Program will also need funding for additional support for students enrolled in reading and writing classes.

Outcome 2: Statement Modified: []

Write a group of topic-related sentences using level specific grammar and vocabulary.

Outcome 2: Assessment Planning Modified: [09/29/2010]

Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Spring 2010

Assessors: Craig Norman, Kathy Flores

Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations • Papers/Essays

Outcome 2: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [09/29/2010]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 5

Changes:

Methods:

ESL 244 faculty met three times during the Spring Quarter of 2010. ESL 244 faculty met at the beginning, middle and end of the spring quarter. The purpose of the first meeting was to discuss the SLOs for ESL 244 and come to agreement that the SLOs were indeed relevant and valid. Another goal of the first meeting was to discuss what types of assessments ESL 244 faculty would implement to assess whether the students were able to demonstrate satisfactorily the SLOs for the course. Faculty decided to have students give an oral presentation near the end of the quarter to assess students' oral communication skills and pronunciation. To assess students' reading comprehension, vocabulary, and writing skills, the faculty chose to have students read a level-

appropriate non-fiction reading and then write a short summary about it. Faculty decided to administer the second assessment at the end of the quarter.

For the second meeting, ESL 244 faculty brought student papers to be used as anchors, A, B, C, D, & F grades, for the reading/writing assessment as well as possible reading selections and presentation topics for each assessment. The faculty discussed the anchor papers and came to a consensus of grading. They also chose the the reading selection for the reading/writing assessment and the topic for student presentations. The final goal of the second meeting was to come up with rubrics for oral presentation and reading/writing assessments. The faculty brought the rubrics they used for their classes and faculty worked together to have one rubric for each assessment.

At the final meeting, the final week of the quarter, the ESL 244 faculty brought the summaries and 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 244.

Summary:

The SLOAC ESL 244 faculty had mixed results for the first SLO, "Write a group of topic-related sentences using level specific grammar and vocabulary." As noted in the first SLO analysis, faculty agreed that the assessment measure, summary writing, might not have been a fair testing procedure since a number of the faculty argued that writing a summary for ESL 244 was too difficult for students at this level. Thus, teachers thought that students did comprehend the reading, but could not articulate the information in summary written form. About 60 percent of the students passed the written assessment. Some of the students scored high on the assessment, and many demonstrated good summary written form, but a good share of the students did not have the English proficiency and skill needed to write a clear and accurate response to the reading even though faculty introduced summary writing in their classes throughout the quarter. At the end of the meeting, the faculty talked about alternative assessments to assess reading comprehension and writing skills for ESL 244.

Enhancement (Part I):

Because students did not fare well on the second SLO, maybe due to inappropriate assessment measure (i.e. summary writing), ESL 244 faculty talked about different types of assessment to measure students' ability for writing skills. The SLOAC ESL 244 faculty agreed that for the next cycle to assess ESL 244 students will read a non-fiction reading and then write a reader's response paper. In that way, students will have the vocabulary and grammar to write a more appropriate written response.

At the following ESL Program meeting, SLOAC faculty shared the results of the SLO assessment for ESL 244 to the ESL faculty. A fruitful discussion proceeded and good ideas were exchanged at this meeting. They spent some time reflecting on assessing reading and writing and suggested ways faculty 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 handle the demands of writing good summary paragraphs. They talked about emphasizing practice rather than evaluating the product at the 244 intermediate level and also about providing more scaffolding to the summary writing exercises demanded of students in both 244 and 252. Examples were given illustrating the benefit of using oral summaries as a bridge to prepare students for what is a more difficult writing task as well as the efficacy of using simple techniques like closing the reading book and producing both oral and written summaries without relying on the vocabulary from the actual text. It was suggested that a good intermediary approach to paragraph writing, for ESL 244 level students, might be to evaluate their ability to recognize a good summary, and the elements contained in it, but not to evaluate their actual production of the summary itself, keeping the emphasis on practice rather than on production at the 244 level.

Enhancement (Part II):

Stipends will be needed for faculty who take on the added responsibility of level coordination and assessment. The ESL Program will also need funding for additional support for students enrolled in reading and writing classes.

Outcome 3: Statement Modified: []

Demonstrate understanding and usage of level-specific grammar and vocabulary in reading, writing, listening and speaking.

Outcome 3: Assessment Planning Modified: [09/29/2010]**Assessment Strategy Used:**

Quarter: Spring 2010

Assessors: Craig Norman, Kathy Flores

Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations • Oral Presentations

Outcome 3: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [09/29/2010]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 5

Changes:**Methods:**

ESL 244 faculty met three times during the Spring Quarter of 2010. ESL 244 faculty met at the beginning, middle and end of the spring quarter. The purpose of the first meeting was to discuss the SLOs for ESL 244 and come to agreement that the SLOs were indeed relevant and valid. Another goal of the first meeting was to discuss what types of assessments ESL 244 faculty would implement to assess whether the students were able to demonstrate satisfactorily the SLOs for the course. Faculty decided to have students give an oral presentation near the end of the quarter to assess students' oral communication skills and pronunciation. To assess students' reading comprehension, vocabulary, and writing skills, the faculty chose to have students read a level-appropriate non-fiction reading and then write a short summary about it. Faculty decided to administer the second assessment at the end of the quarter.

For the second meeting, ESL 244 faculty brought student papers to be used as anchors, A, B, C, D, & F grades, for the reading/writing assessment as well as possible reading selections and presentation topics for each assessment. The faculty discussed the anchor papers and came to a consensus of grading. They also chose the the reading selection for the reading/writing assessment and the topic for student presentations. The final goal of the second meeting was to come up with rubrics for oral presentation and reading/writing assessments. The faculty brought the rubrics they used for their classes and faculty worked together to have one rubric for each assessment.

At the final meeting, the final week of the quarter, the ESL 244 faculty brought the summaries and 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 244.

Summary:

The SLOAC ESL 244 faculty agreed that for the third SLO, "Demonstrate understanding and usage of level-specific grammar and vocabulary in reading, writing, listening and speaking," the majority of the students met the standard of the the speaking outcome. Again as noted in the previous SLOs analysis, the listening component was assessed during this SLOAC process. Faculty pointed out that the topic for the student presentations which was students sharing an important or interesting aspect about themselves 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 a unique part of themselves. Although the scoring ranged from excellent to low satisfactory, the ESL 244 faculty were satisfied of the overall performance of the students' oral abilities.

Enhancement (Part I):

Faculty agreed that ESL 244 instructors will continue to teach oral presentation 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 244 faculty also agreed that the speaking topic plays a vital role in oral performance. They pointed out that they were surprised at the vitality that students showed during their speeches which enhanced their speaking effectiveness.

Enhancement (Part II):

The teaching of oral presentations and speaking skills is a standard teaching activity in ESL 244 and does not require additional funding.

[Number of Outcomes for ESL 244: 3]