### Course Student Learning Outcome (CSLO) Assessment Form

**Semester:** Fall 2011  
**Course:** ESL-034  
**Sections Assessed:** 1616  
**Faculty Assessing the Course:** Allison Tubio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSLO</th>
<th>Method of Assessment</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Identify at least 3 CSLOs from the COOR to assess. | Review the assessment section of the COOR, identify and describe the assessment activity (exam, project, essay, etc) that would best assess the students’ proficiency of the CSLO. Explicitly state which part of the assessment activity assesses that particular CSLO. | Develop and list the criteria for proficiency for both “High Proficiency” (A level work) and “Meets Proficiency” (C level work) that specifically relates to the assessment instrument for the CSLO being assessed. You may want to review the COOR as a starting point. | Answer the following question for each CSLO assessed:  
**How many students were at each proficiency level?**  
**What did we learn from the assessment?** | Where appropriate identify strategies to try that may improve student learning. Answer the following question:  
**What do we plan next to improve student learning?** |
| CSLO 2: Be understood, with occasional pronunciation-related errors, in speech that is smooth and fluent and demonstrates understanding and control over basic stress and intonation patterns as they relate to various oral communication situations and contexts. | Assessment Activity: A video-taped news broadcast  
Description: Students work in pairs to present a segment of a news broadcast (e.g. national, international, education, technology). Students have the option of interviewing each other or doing a report and commentary (Northstar 4- p. 19).  
The pronunciation portion of the rubric includes word stress, thought groups, reductions and contractions of auxiliary verbs and fluency. | High Proficiency: A-level work involves consistent and smooth production of learned pronunciation patterns 90% of the time.  
Meets Proficiency: C-level work involves inconsistent and uneven production of learned pronunciation patterns (evident 70% of the time). | High Proficiency _31%_  
Above “Meets Proficiency” _38%_  
Meets Proficiency _31%_  
Below Proficiency _0%_  
The high passing rate can be attributed to several factors. This was a planned speaking activity (newscast presentation) and students had plenty of preparation time to practice their presentation. Two assignments in particular aided students’ focus on pronunciation: (1) marking the thought groups in their script; (2) looking up and noting down the word stress and number of syllables on all challenging or new words.  
It was extremely helpful to collect the scripts with students’ marked thought groups to use while listening to the video and assessing students’ pronunciation. I was able to mark pronunciation errors on the script for more accurate feedback.  
Since the speaking was planned and students were allowed to use... | While students made great progress in their comprehension and application of thought groups, they had many errors of intonation (e.g. using rising intonation for statements). I had not reviewed intonation or assessed it as part of this presentation, but it was assessed in the students’ second presentation (see CSLO 4 below). It would be advisable to review basic intonation patterns before the presentation or earlier in the semester since it would be a refresher for ESL 34 students.  
Many students checked online dictionaries for the pronunciation of their challenging/new words list. However, they could benefit from additional one-on-one pronunciation work with the instructor. A practice session was conducted the week before the final presentation whereby students rehearsed with their partner. During this time, the instructor could pull students away individually to check their pronunciation (and marking) of thought groups in their script and offer feedback on their pronunciation of words on their... |
a script for this broadcast, it was not the best measure of students’ fluency skills.

It was difficult to assess the reductions and contractions of auxiliary verbs. This was a pronunciation lesson from the textbook unit corresponding to this presentation. The language and tone used for newscasts is more formal, and therefore, using reductions and contractions of auxiliary verbs seemed unnatural.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSLO 3: Listen and take accurate notes to comprehend essential message and supporting details, synthesize information, and make inferences of lengthy, extended, authentic discourse that is conceptually and linguistically complex.</th>
<th>Assessment Activity: A unit achievement test- Northstar 4 Unit 9, Part 1 Description: “The reproducible Achievement Tests allow teachers to evaluate students’ progress and to identify areas where the students might have problems developing their listening and speaking skills” (Northstar Teacher’s Manual). Part 1.1 asks students to predict the main topic. Questions 1 &amp; 2 deal with main ideas, question 4 with details &amp; questions 3 &amp; 5 with inference. Section 1.3 asks students to contrast main ideas and details from two listening texts.</th>
<th>High Proficiency: 90-100% accuracy in answering the listening comprehension questions Meets Proficiency: 70-79% accuracy in answering the listening comprehension questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Proficiency <em>8%</em> Above “Meets Proficiency” <em>15%</em> Meets Proficiency <em>46%</em> Below Proficiency <em>31%</em></td>
<td>Question Types &amp; % of Students with correct answer: -Prediction 92% -Main Idea (#1) 38% -Main Idea (#2) 92% -Inference (#1) 84% -Inference (#2) 77% -Details 100% -Synthesis of two listenings (3 answers): All students had at least 1 wrong answer. Analyzing the question percentages: While the first question is a “prediction” question, students can check the information later in the listening, so I expected a high percentage correct for this question. Students struggled with the first main idea question, which had students identify the speakers’ identity (teacher/</td>
<td>The most challenging questions for students to answer were the synthesis questions. The textbook has a synthesis activity in each unit. Perhaps more modeling with “out loud thinking” could be done with students on synthesis activities. Other focused listening tasks to practice before tests could involve identification of the speakers’ &amp; speakers’ opinions about a topic; inference questions involving a comprehension of the whole listening text (e.g. what speakers will likely do next or how they feel now). Students also mentioned that the listening sections (on all tests from Northstar 4) were extremely difficult and made them nervous. Teaching general test-taking strategies would be useful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
student/“someone who thinks..”) and/or position on the debate topic. Most of the incorrect answers showed that students incorrectly identified the speakers as students.

The second main idea question involved information we had studied in the unit and listened to in the textbook’s first listening (on multilingual classrooms). Background knowledge could have helped students do well on this question.

Students also could have used their background knowledge on the topic to help them do well on the inference and detail questions.

The second inference question was more challenging for students. It asked students what the speakers would likely do next (agree/disagree/be unsure about the issues). In order to answer this question correctly, students needed a clear comprehension of both speakers’ positions.

Students did poorly on the questions involving synthesis of the two listening texts. This was one of the most challenging question types because it requires students to comprehend main ideas and details for both texts and compare them. It would have been interesting to see how well students comprehended the second listening text, but the textbook tests only have a listening 1 comprehension component and a synthesis component for listening 1 and 2.
### CSLO 4:
Give speeches (5-10 minutes) and participate in classroom role plays, interviews, simulations and debates (20-35 minutes) on complex and often controversial topics using high level functional language and, at times, incorporating research and/or secondary sources to support opinions and in-depth analyses.

### Assessment Activity:
A 5-6 minute persuasive speech on a philanthropy organization

**Description:**
Students will persuade their classmates to invest in a local/national philanthropy. They begin with an interesting attention-getter (“hook”) and proceed to present their research on when and why the philanthropy started, its cause and how the organization meets the cause, and ways donors and volunteers can help. Students end with a powerful conclusion about why their classmates should consider donating to this cause.

The presentation rubric includes incorporation of research in the student’s own words, organization (use of “hook”, transitions & conclusion), visual aid, delivery skills (volume, eye contact, energy/smile, body language), pronunciation (thought groups, word stress, fluency), accuracy (adjective clauses, vocabulary from unit).

Prior to the presentation, students had studied adjective clauses with relative pronouns (*Northstar Unit 6*) to describe philanthropies. Students had also studied vocabulary related to philanthropies.

### High Proficiency:
A-level work involves effective communication of research and opinion, smooth fluidity, clear pronunciation, consistent use of transitions, and accurate use of adjective clauses and unit vocabulary.

**Meets Proficiency:**
C-level work involves limited communication of research and opinion that is sometimes clear, hesitations that interfere with communication, unclear pronunciation, limited transitions, and limited variety and inaccurate use of adjective clauses and unit vocabulary.

**High Proficiency  62%**
**Above “Meets Proficiency”  23%**
**Meets Proficiency  15%**
**Below Proficiency  0%**

The unit on intonation in lists (*Northstar 4, Philanthropy unit*) was a helpful lesson. I heard great improvement in students’ intonation since the first presentation (the aforementioned news broadcast).

Students had four weeks’ preparation time. They needed this amount of time to be able to conduct research on their philanthropy organization. Some students needed extra help putting the research into their own words.

Organization also takes time to teach, including the importance of transitions and using an outline to plan a presentation. Giving class time to practice parts of the presentation and evaluate a partner was beneficial.

To understand the importance of effective organization and delivery skills, students rated effective/ineffective presentation “hooks,” conclusions and presentation skills on TED.com. The concept of a “hook” and its importance was really made clear for students by the videos.

### Planning meeting date and people who attended:
Sept. 16, 2011 - Paula Gunder and Allison Tubio

### Learning and Improvement meeting date and people who attended:
tbd