

Certificate Completion:

In 2006, the ESL program developed two certificates, the Intermediate and the Advanced Certificates of Specialization, for which our students could apply after having completed a sequence of ESL classes.

The lower number of certificates issued in 2013/2014 compared to previous years may be indicative of our overall lower enrollments. It also may indicate that we need to more actively promote these certificates within our program. This is something that we have already discussed with our outreach staff and with our faculty and will address in the coming year.

III. Program Outcomes Assessment and Improvements

A. Assessment Calendar

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

ASSESSMENT CALENDAR

ESL DIVISION

CYCLE STAGE	S 2012	F 2012	S 2013	F 2013	S 2014	F 2014	S 2015	F 2015	S 2016	F 2016	S 2017
<i>SLOs Assessment</i>		ESL 3 ESL 4	ESL 6	ESL 2 ESL 015	ESL 054 ESL 035	ESL 053 ESL 025	ESL 043 ESL 044	ESL 1			
<i>Analyze Results & Plan Improvements (CPAS)</i>	ESL 90 ESL 45		ESL 3 ESL 4	ESL 99E	ESL 2 ESL 015	ESL 054 ESL 035	ESL 053 ESL 025	ESL 043 ESL 044	ESL 1		
<i>Implementation</i>				ESL 053 ESL 043	ESL 99E	ESL 2 ESL 015	ESL 054 ESL 035	ESL 053 ESL 025	ESL 043 ESL 044	ESL 1	
<i>Post- Implementation SLOs Assessment</i>	ESL 90 ESL 045 ESL 5 ESL 015					ESL 99E	ESL 2 ESL 015	ESL 054 ESL 035	ESL 053 ESL 025	ESL 043 ESL 044	ESL 1

*ESL 90 was deactivated in fall 2012.

*In fall 2013, several changes were implemented in the ESL curriculum:

- *Course Deactivations:* ESL 045, ESL 003, ESL 005
- *Course Revisions:* ESL 053 and ESL 054 are new reading and writing courses
- *Course Additions:* ESL 043 (Intermediate Grammar); ESL 044 (High-Intermediate Grammar), ESL 099E : equivalent to English 099

B. Below are our last program-level CPAS documents which were completed in April 2012 after we had completed a full cycle of our course assessments. Each CPAS summarizes the course assessments, implementation, and improvements for each of our Program Outcomes.

Course or Program Assessment Summary

Division: **Student Development and Success** Program: **ESL** Date: **April 16, 2012**

Courses in program, or course:

- ESL 090, Literacy
- **ESL 001, Reading, Writing, Grammar and Conversation**
- **ESL 002, Reading, Writing and Grammar**
- **ESL 003, Reading, Writing and Grammar**
- ESL 004, Reading, Writing and Grammar
- ESL 005, Writing and Grammar
- ESL 006, Writing and Grammar
- ESL 045, Advanced Reading
- **ESL 015, Beginning Conversation**
- ESL 025, Intermediate Conversation
- ESL 035, Advanced Conversation

****Courses in bold contribute to Program SLO #1 discussed below**

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: Douglas Pillsbury, Nancy Seiler, Lucy Conklin, Becca Sciocchetti, Kathy Myers, Regina McKeown, Camille Nelson, Jillian Allen, Anthony Halderman, Amy Kayser, Donna Bower, Lisa Stephens, Jen Henderson

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes X No _____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program <input type="checkbox"/> Course	Develop basic competence in reading, writing, listening, and speaking in order to pursue further study.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESL Level 1 teachers collaborated on final exam that included reading, writing, grammar, vocabulary, and speaking in fall '08. • ESL Level 2 teachers collaborated on a final exam that included reading, writing, vocabulary and grammar in spring '09. • ESL 3 teachers collaborated on a final exam that included reading, writing, vocabulary and grammar in spring '10. • ESL 15 teachers collaborated on a listening/speaking final exam in spring '09.

3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ESL 1 final exam was administered to 7 ESL Level 1 classes in December 2008. A total of 106 students completed the exam. Teachers scored exams using the same answer key. In the case of writing and speaking, teachers used agreed upon rubrics. • The ESL 2 final exam was administered in May 2009 to three ESL 2 classes for a total of 65 students. Additionally, one class completed the Grammar/Reading/Vocabulary portion only (17 students); another the reading/vocabulary portion only (14 students). The instructors used an agreed upon rubric for the writing. • The ESL 3 final exam was administered in spring '10 to three ESL 3 classes for a total of 72 students. • ESL 15 final exam was given to two classes for a total of 16 students in spring '09. Teachers used a common listening/speaking rubric.
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	<p><u>ESL 1:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 72 students out of 106 (i.e., 68%) passed with a score of 70% or better • Students were most successful in speaking. • Students performed similarly on the Reading, Writing, and Grammar/Vocabulary portions of the test. <p><u>ESL 2:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The average score for the combined reading, vocabulary, and grammar portions of the assessment was 74%. • The lowest overall score was in the grammar section, with only 54% total students passing with a “C” or higher. <p><u>ESL 3:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In reading 74% scored a “C” or higher. In discreet skills, student mastery of vocabulary was the strongest, with an 88% average. Reading comprehension was not as strong, with a 67% average overall. • In writing, 74% total students passing with a grade of “C” or higher. • In grammar, 60% scored at a 70% or higher. Although the average score was 65%, the simple past sections along with the simple present and adverbs of frequency tied for the lowest average, 55%. <p><u>ESL 15:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 out of 16 students passed with a score of 70% or better. • Students were generally successful in all sections of the exam.

5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	<p>The results indicate that lower level students in our program are strongest in speaking and listening skills. Grammar, reading, and writing proved more difficult. Several challenges were identified during the SLOs assessment process. First, the fact that we have many literacy students makes covering the necessary course material difficult in ESL 001. Adding ESL 090 has helped this situation somewhat, but there is still the issue of under prepared students. Secondly, the transition from ESL 001 to 002 needs improvement. While the majority of ESL 001 students met the course SLOs, this was not the case with ESL 002. The material, especially in terms of grammar and writing, is much more difficult and even successful 001 students may still not be prepared for the level of difficulty they face in 002. They especially struggle with the concept of present progressive and simple present tense in grammar. The SLO results for ESL 003 further demonstrate this fact. Students performed the worst in grammar, and specifically had trouble with simple present tenses as well as simple past, which is a main outcome for ESL 003 grammar.</p>
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers of different levels need to coordinate more closely to establish a clearer progression from level to level especially in terms of grammar and writing. • Grammar objectives/outcomes need to be more clearly defined in each level. The courses should try to cover less but expect more mastery from students. For example, in Level 3, gerunds and infinitives and direct and indirect objects will be removed so that more time can be spent on the simple present, present progressive, and the simple past verb tenses. • There needs to be a minimum standard for exit from each ESL level. The continued course SLOs assessment and the collaboration the process promotes will help the ESL program to improve in this area.
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers of each level met several times throughout this process to develop the assessments and discuss the results (see related CPAS documents). • Teachers discussed the SLO assessment results of these classes at several faculty meetings. • In October 2010 at an ESL staff meeting, teachers met by level to discuss the specific outcomes of each course. As a result, course SLO documents were revised. Valuable discussions took place regarding the importance of having clear articulation between the levels. Instructors felt that overall the SLOs were fairly accurate, but several key components of the SLOs were changed to improve articulation. For example, in Level 2, "the writing process" was changed to "introduction to the writing process." Additionally, "basic paragraph components" was changed to "sentence components and paragraph building." Furthermore, under grammar components, the simple past tense was changed to "introduction to the simple past tense." • This information was also included in the ESL program review in spring 2011.

Course or Program Assessment Summary

Division: Student Development and Success Program: ESL

Date: April 16, 2012

Courses in program, or course:

- ESL 090, Literacy
- ESL 001, Reading, Writing, Grammar and Conversation
- ESL 002, Reading, Writing and Grammar
- ESL 003, Reading, Writing and Grammar
- **ESL 004, Reading, Writing and Grammar**
- ESL 005, Writing and Grammar
- ESL 006, Writing and Grammar
- **ESL 045, Advanced Reading**
- ESL 015, Beginning Conversation
- ESL 025, Intermediate Conversation
- ESL 035, Advanced Conversation

****Courses in bold contribute to Program SLO #2 discussed below**

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: Madeline Medeiros, Karen Garza, Anthony Halderman, Amy Kayser
Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes X No _____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program <input type="checkbox"/> Course	Demonstrate reading comprehension skills of intermediate or advanced texts.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	The three ESL 4 teachers met to create a common reading exam. The criterion for success was defined as a score of 70% or higher.
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The first reading exam was administered in December 2009. A total of 44 students completed the exam.• The revised reading exam was administered to the three Level 4 sections in fall 2010.

4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In December '09: 58% of the students scored a 70% or higher, 42% scored 69% or lower. • In December '10: 87 % of the students scored a 70% or higher, 13% scored 69% or lower.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The initial ESL 004 SLOs assessment results indicated that students were the weakest in the area of reading compared to writing and grammar. The transition from ESL 003 to 004 is especially challenging because 004 focuses more on academic reading skills. ESL 004 has incorporated more reading skills development in class including practice in the following areas: understanding vocabulary in context, using dictionaries, and identifying detail and main idea. Additionally, teachers reexamined the level of difficulty in test tasks in order to ensure an appropriate progression from 004 to 005. After instituting changes, 86% of the students achieved the reading learning outcome in fall 2010 in ESL 004 (compared to 58% the previous year). • There is insufficient time in 6 hours each week to cover three skill areas appropriately in ESL 004. • Teachers also discussed the fact that some classes were weaker than others. For example, some students seemed to be at a low Level 3 level, yet they were in Level 4. This affected the material covered in class and the final exam/SLO results.
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers can continue to develop the following reading skills: vocabulary in context, dictionary skills, identifying detail and main idea. In addition, listening and video can be incorporated to supplement the reading material. • The ESL division can consider working on Level 4 curriculum by separating the skill areas and adding more units to allow more coverage of skills. Students may not be making sufficient progress because there is not enough time and practice in each skill area.
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level 4 teachers met several times to design the exam, discuss the results and the content of this report. • The results and report were shared with ESL faculty at a monthly meeting.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at <http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa>

Course or Program Assessment Summary

Division: Student Development and Success Program: ESL

Date: April 16, 2012

Courses in program, or course:

- ESL 090, Literacy
- ESL 001, Reading, Writing, Grammar and Conversation
- ESL 002, Reading, Writing and Grammar
- ESL 003, Reading, Writing and Grammar
- **ESL 004, Reading, Writing and Grammar**
- **ESL 005, Writing and Grammar**
- **ESL 006, Writing and Grammar**
- ESL 045, Advanced Reading
- ESL 015, Beginning Conversation
- ESL 025, Intermediate Conversation
- ESL 035, Advanced Conversation

****Courses in bold contribute to Program SLO #3 discussed below**

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: Madeline Medeiros, Karen Garza, Anthony Halderman, Amy Kayser, Kati Wright, Regina Voge
Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes X No _____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program <input type="checkbox"/> Course	Produce paragraphs that communicate ideas clearly.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	ESL 4: Three teachers met to create a common writing exam. Teachers agreed upon a writing rubric. ESL 5: Two instructors collaborated on a writing exam for fall 2010 and again in spring 2011. ESL 6: Two instructors collaborated on a final essay prompt with the same grading rubric. The criterion for success was defined as a score of 70% or higher in all classes.

3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	<p><u>ESL 4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first writing exam was administered in December 2009. A total of 44 students completed the exam. • The revised writing exam was administered to the three Level 4 sections in spring 2010. <p><u>ESL 5</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first writing exam was administered in fall '10 to 24 students. • The revised exam was administered in spring '11 to 34 students. <p><u>ESL 6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first writing exam was administered to two sections of ESL 6A in December of 2008 to 22 students. • The revised exam was administered to two sections of ESL 6A in spring 2010 to 26 students.
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	<p><u>ESL 4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In December '09: 77% of the students scored a 70% or higher, 23% scored 69% or lower. • In spring '10: 81% of the students scored a 70% or higher, 19% scored 69% or lower. <p><u>ESL 5</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall '10: 19 out of 24 passed • Spring '11: 30 out of 34 passed <p><u>ESL 6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In fall '08: 16/22 students passed the exam with a grade of 70% or higher. • In spring '10: 20/26 passed the exam with a grade of 70% or higher.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writing outcomes for Level 3 and 4 are very similar. • Students' writing strength includes content/ideas and organization. • Students are weakest in grammar, especially verb tense usage and vocabulary. • Students need more verb tense review time in the class. • Students need to know more specifically what is expected of them in each writing assignment so as to be more successful. • More in-class time is needed to focus on specific writing issues which arise with each writing assignment. • There is inadequate time to focus on writing in current 6 unit format in ESL 4 and 5.

6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writing outcomes for Level 3 and 4 need to be distinguished. Level 3 could focus more on communicative type of writing, and Level 4 could be an introduction to academic writing. • Teachers need to concentrate more on language accuracy in teaching/grading • Support for the curriculum change which will begin in fall 2012 semester to remove much of the reading component from ESL 5 and place it in a separate course (ESL 045). This will allow more time to focus on writing in class. • The ESL division can consider working on Level 4 curriculum by separating the skill areas and adding more units to allow more coverage of skills like ESL 5 and 6. Students may not be making sufficient progress because there is not enough time and practice in each skill area.
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers met several times by level to design the exams, discuss the results and the content of related CPAS documents. • The results and related CPAS reports were shared with ESL faculty at a monthly meeting.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at <http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa>

Course or Program Assessment Summary

Division: Student Development and Success Program: ESL

Date: April 16, 2012

Courses in program, or course:

- ESL 090, Literacy
- ESL 001, Reading, Writing, Grammar and Conversation
- ESL 002, Reading, Writing and Grammar
- ESL 003, Reading, Writing and Grammar
- ESL 004, Reading, Writing and Grammar
- ESL 005, Writing and Grammar
- ESL 006, Writing and Grammar
- ESL 045, Advanced Reading
- ESL 015, Beginning Conversation
- **ESL 025, Intermediate Conversation**
- **ESL 035, Advanced Conversation**

****Courses in bold contribute to Program SLO #4 discussed below**

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: Madeline Medeiros, Karen Garza, Amy Kayser, Donna Bower
Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes X No _____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program <input type="checkbox"/> Course	Demonstrate aural/oral competence in social and/or academic interactions.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ESL 25: Two teachers collaborated on a listening and speaking test and rubric.• ESL 35: Two teachers collaborated on a listening and oral presentation test and rubric.• The criterion for success was defined as a score of 70% or higher in both classes.

3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	<p><u>ESL 25:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In spring '09: 30 students completed the exam. • In fall '09: 22 students completed the exam. • In both semesters, the exam was administered to two sections of ESL 25. <p><u>ESL 35:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In spring '10: two sections of ESL 35 completed the test, 29 students took listening; 28 took speaking. • Students were retested in spring '11 (see CPAS document).
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	<p><u>ESL 25:</u></p> <p>Spring '09 results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 27 students out of 30 (i.e., 90%) passed the speaking test with a score of 70% or better. • 24 students out of 30 (i.e., 80%) passed the listening test with a score of 70% or better. <p>Fall '09 results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22 students out of 22 (i.e., 100%) passed the speaking test with a score of 70% or better. • 17 students out of 22 (i.e., 77%) passed the listening test with a score of 70% or better. <p><u>ESL 35:</u></p> <p>Spring '10 results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18/29 students (62%) received a grade of 70% or higher on the listening assessment. • 19/28 students (67%) received a grade of 70% or higher on the oral presentation. • Students were retested in spring '11 (see CPAS document).

5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intermediate listening and speaking skills are strengthened - the vast majority met this outcome in ESL 25. • Students do particularly well communicating in social situations (ESL 25 focus). • In advanced listening, students seem to struggle with the sustained listening. • There is a large difference in the number of students who met the ESL 25 SLOs vs. ESL 35 in both speaking and listening. There can be a better transition from ESL 025 to ESL 035. ESL 25 may not be challenging enough.
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These courses are difficult in the present 2 unit format. The 50 minute classes seem inadequate to cover the necessary material. If the class could be taught as a 3-unit class with students meeting for one hour and twenty minutes twice a week, the material could undoubtedly be covered more adequately. • ESL 25 needs to be more aligned with ESL 35. As per the ESL 035 instructors' suggestion from the first shared SLOA in spring 2010, ESL 025 instructors have adopted a new textbook that incorporates more sustained listening. The new book is more challenging and should prepare students better for ESL 35. • Classes can focus on developing students' note-taking skills
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers met several times by level to design the exams, discuss the results and the content of related CPAS documents. • ESL 25 and 35 teachers met to discuss the transition from 25 to 35. • The results and related CPAS reports were shared with ESL faculty at a monthly meeting.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at <http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa>

Course or Program Assessment Summary

Division: Student Development and Success Program: ESL

Date: April 16, 2012

Courses in program, or course:

- ESL 090, Literacy
- ESL 001, Reading, Writing, Grammar and Conversation
- ESL 002, Reading, Writing and Grammar
- ESL 003, Reading, Writing and Grammar
- **ESL 004, Reading, Writing and Grammar**
- **ESL 005, Writing and Grammar**
- **ESL 006, Writing and Grammar**
- ESL 045, Advanced Reading
- ESL 015, Beginning Conversation
- ESL 025, Intermediate Conversation
- ESL 035, Advanced Conversation

****Courses in bold contribute to Program SLO #4 discussed below**

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: Madeline Medeiros, Karen Garza, Amy Kayser, Donna Bower
Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes X No _____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program <input type="checkbox"/> Course	Recognize and use intermediate or advanced grammatical structures.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	Three ESL 4 teachers met to create a common grammar exam. The criterion for success was defined as a score of 70% or higher.
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	The first exam was administered in December 2009. A total of 44 students completed the exam. The revised exam was administered to the three Level 4 sections in spring 2010.

4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	Fall '09 results: 68% of the students scored a 70% or higher, 32% scored 69% or lower. Spring '10 results: 61% of the students scored a 70% or higher, 39% scored 69% or lower.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students had the most difficulty with present perfect questions and past progressive. Simple present/present progressive, simple past and future are all review of material presented in Level 3. Several students did not seem to be prepared to take Level 4, and that could account for the large number of failures in spring '10. ESL 004 SLO assessment showed that many students struggle with tenses they should have already mastered. There are problems with accuracy in producing the forms as well as usage. After comparing Level 3 and Level 4 final grammar assessments, these concerns were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessments seem very similar in both content and level. Level 3 and Level 4 need to coordinate more closely. There needs to be a clearer progression from Level 3 to Level 4.
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For all levels in the ESL program, students should be required to demonstrate proficiency so that they are prepared for more complicated material in the next level. Level 3 and Level 4 need to distinguish their curriculum. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level 3 can focus on basic tenses and forms e.g., simple present/present progressive and simple past. The focus can be on mastery/competency. If other tenses/structures are introduced, they don't need to be a main focus of the final assessment. Level 4 can <i>review</i> the basic tenses (i.e., simple present/present progressive and simple past), but the focus can be on past progressive vs. simple past, future tense and time clauses, and present perfect. ESL 5 and 6A can focus on grammar in their next SLOAs to compare to the results of ESL 4.

7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers met several times by level to design the exams, discuss the results and the content of related CPAS documents. The results and related CPAS reports were shared with ESL faculty at a monthly meeting.
---	---	--

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at <http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa>

Course or Program Assessment Summary

Division: **Student Development & Success** Program: **ESL** Dates: **10/4/13, 11/01/13, 12/6/13, 2/7/14**

v. 3 2012

Courses in program, or course: ESL 002

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: **Becca Sciocchetti, Margaret Lima, Melinda Weaver, Regina Voge, (Lucy Conklin 2/7/14)**

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes X No

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements <input type="checkbox"/> Program <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course	The ESL 02 SLO we chose for our focus as the area of greatest need/where are our students struggle with mastery: <i>Recognize and use high-beginning grammatical structures and verb tenses;</i> our focus will be the simple present question and negative form, including the be verb and do-don't/does-doesn't for other verbs. We unanimously decided this is the most difficult concept for our ESL 2 students to master, and we all feel that we need to improve our instruction of these question and negative forms.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	The ESL 2 instructors decided to use pages 1 and 2 of our final exam as the shared portion of our assessment. The first page is simple present tense; the second page assesses the simple present Wh- questions. Both pages measure both affirmative and negative statements.
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Four instructors administered the final exam during final exam week, December 2013. Class sizes ranged from 11 to 20 students. Instructors were told to average class scores for pages 1 and 2 of the final exam (simple present tense). A total of 77 students were assessed.
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	Page 1 scores ranged from 72-84% with a total weighted average of 76.8%. Page 2 (wh- and yes/no questions) scores ranged from 70.5% to 86%, a total weighted average of 77.7%. Both pages combined average was 77.25%. For both sections, all classes were at mastery (70%) or higher. This total was also much higher than the 63% average of the SLOA from 2009, which measured the same simple present verb tense.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	Level 2 instructors felt that the assessment procedure went smoothly, in part due to the time we spent together agreeing upon the elements to include in the assessment. Results were delivered in January. There was no previous improvement plan as this is the first assessment within this cycle.

6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESL 2 instructors agreed to shoot for the goal of our students scoring at a 79% average on the simple present tense at the end of next semester, moving the average up 1.75% from 77.25% this term. • The four instructors have adopted <u>Grammar in Context Basic</u>, taking the place of the <u>Focus on Grammar 2A</u> text beginning spring 2014 semester. Level 3 instructors have seen remarkable improvement in their students' grammar mastery after switching to the <u>Grammar in Context</u> series. • The instructors plan to include more comprehensive, collaborative review before administering the shared assessment. Two review activities were shared at the 2/07/14 meeting. • Instructors plan to use more kinesthetic and collaborative approaches in each lesson, and plan to meet monthly in mini-pedagogical retreats to share these lessons (three were shared from four different instructors at the meeting 2/7/14).
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	ESL 2 Instructors collaborated in planning the portions of the shared assessment, text section, pedagogy, analysis of assessment results, and plans for changes and instructional improvement on 10/4/13, 11/01/13, 12/6/13, and 2/7/14, for a total of eight hours on the SLO Campus in room 3435.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at <http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa>

Course or Program Assessment Summary

Division: Student Development and Success Program: ESL Date: 2/19/2013

Courses in program, or course: ESL 003 and ESL 004

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: Amy Kayser, Lucy Conklin, Nancy Seiler, Alicia Moretti, Barbara Hawkins, Kathy Myers, Karen Garza

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes X No _____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements <input type="checkbox"/> Program <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course	ESL Level 3: Recognize and use low-intermediate grammatical structures. ESL Level 4: Recognize and use intermediate grammatical structures. Note: This is only one out of three outcomes for each course. We wanted to focus on the grammar outcome and discuss results across the levels.																																												
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	In September 2012, five Level 3 and 4 instructors met to discuss SLO assessment. Teachers of both levels agreed to give a shared final grammar exam to assess how students are achieving the grammar outcome for Levels 3 and 4.																																												
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	ESL Level 3: 49 students took a common grammar final exam in December 2012. One class in SLO and two sections in NCC participated. ESL Level 4: 34 students took a common grammar final exam in December 2012. One class in SLO and two sections in NCC participated. All exams were administered by participating ESL teachers.																																												
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	Level 3 Grammar Exam Results <table><tr><th>Class Average</th><th>Class 1</th><th>Class 2</th><th>Class 3</th></tr><tr><td>Entire Grammar Test</td><td>68%</td><td>73%</td><td>86%</td></tr><tr><td>A- D: Simple present</td><td>78%</td><td>77%</td><td>83%</td></tr><tr><td>E-F: Present Continuous</td><td>63%</td><td>71%</td><td>72%</td></tr><tr><td>G-K: Future</td><td>71%</td><td>N/A</td><td>90%</td></tr><tr><td>L-Q: Simple Past</td><td>64%</td><td>66%</td><td>78%</td></tr></table> Level 4 Grammar Exam Results <table><tr><th>Class Average</th><th>Class 1</th><th>Class 2</th><th>Class 3</th></tr><tr><td>Entire Grammar Test</td><td>86%</td><td>76%</td><td>75%</td></tr><tr><td>Part 1: Simple past and progressive</td><td>85%</td><td>71%</td><td>69%</td></tr><tr><td>Part 2: Future</td><td>87%</td><td>83%</td><td>78%</td></tr><tr><td>Part 3: Present perfect</td><td>85%</td><td>75%</td><td>76%</td></tr></table>	Class Average	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Entire Grammar Test	68%	73%	86%	A- D: Simple present	78%	77%	83%	E-F: Present Continuous	63%	71%	72%	G-K: Future	71%	N/A	90%	L-Q: Simple Past	64%	66%	78%	Class Average	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Entire Grammar Test	86%	76%	75%	Part 1: Simple past and progressive	85%	71%	69%	Part 2: Future	87%	83%	78%	Part 3: Present perfect	85%	75%	76%
Class Average	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3																																											
Entire Grammar Test	68%	73%	86%																																											
A- D: Simple present	78%	77%	83%																																											
E-F: Present Continuous	63%	71%	72%																																											
G-K: Future	71%	N/A	90%																																											
L-Q: Simple Past	64%	66%	78%																																											
Class Average	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3																																											
Entire Grammar Test	86%	76%	75%																																											
Part 1: Simple past and progressive	85%	71%	69%																																											
Part 2: Future	87%	83%	78%																																											
Part 3: Present perfect	85%	75%	76%																																											

5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	<p>Teachers discussed the fact that students scored lowest on the simple past section in Level 3, which is a major objective of the course. One reason could be because the editing task in this section is challenging for students. Also, in Level 4, the simple past and past continuous section results were low. On the other hand, students performed well in the future section in both Levels.</p> <p>We discussed the fact that students performed better on the discrete items on the test. For example, they can memorize simple past verb forms. However, when they are asked to apply their knowledge, they have difficulty. This was evident in the Level 3 editing exercise as well as in the Level 4 writing final. In both sections that reported writing exam results, students scored the lowest on grammar and structure and mechanics compared to other categories such as content and organization.</p> <p>Overall, students appear to be meeting the grammar outcome better than in the last SLO assessment. However, the repetition between the levels with lack of student mastery is still problematic. For example, present progressive and simple past are taught in both levels, yet results for these sections do not indicate strong student mastery of the concepts.</p>
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	<p>The new curriculum merges the current ESL 003 and ESL 004 into a new class, ESL 053: Intermediate Reading and Writing. In addition, there is a 3 unit grammar class, ESL 043: Intermediate Grammar, which will focus on instruction in present, past, and future tenses. This will help to eliminate the repetition that currently exists in our curriculum and focus on mastery of the material.</p> <p>In terms of the new reading and writing course, teachers agreed that we could provide more writing assignments that require students to use the simple past. Also, more in-class writing can be added and a writing journal for fluency. Finally, teachers discussed comparing rubrics in a future meeting to establish clear guidelines about expectations.</p>
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	<p>Five ESL teachers met on 9/14/12 (see attached meeting minutes) to plan the assessment. Four ESL teachers met on 2/8/13 to discuss the results and implications for our new curriculum. The meeting dates, minutes, and SLO results were shared with all fall 2012 ESL 3 and 4 teachers via email.</p>

Course or Program Assessment Summary

Draft Update

Division: Student Development and Success
2013/Fall 2014 Update

Program: ESL

Date: Summer and Fall

Course, or courses required in program: ESL 006, Writing and Grammar / ESL 099E, Advanced Reading and Writing

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: **ESL 006:** Madeline Medeiros and Alicia Moretti; **ESL 099E:** Madeline Medeiros and Jessica Michelsen

Course to program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes X No _____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements <input type="checkbox"/> Program <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course (ESL 006/099E)	1. Produce rhetorically effective texts using clear and accurate vocabulary and advanced grammatical structures. 2. Recognize and use advanced grammatical structures.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	In spring 2013, the two ESL 006 instructors, Madeline Medeiros and Alicia Moretti administered the following common assessments: 1. Direct Assessment: Multi-paragraph in-class, timed essay graded with a shared rubric, which assessed grammar and structure (30%), content and ideas (20%), word choice and vocabulary (20%), organization (15%), and mechanics (15%). 2. Student self-assessment pre- and post-surveys asking students to evaluate their writing and reading skills at the beginning of the semester and again at the end of the semester.
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Final Essay Exam: The two instructors met mid-semester (April 1, 2013) to determine and develop a shared final exam and study guide. The instructors decided on appropriate rhetorical styles and topics for the final in-class, written and timed essay. They also agreed to the evaluation criteria on the rubric. The final essay was administered in both sections of ESL 006: 14 students in the North County and 16 students on the SLO Campus. The week after the instructors administered the final exam and scored the essays, they met to assess student compositions, the rubric that was used to evaluate the compositions, and to discuss skill areas in which students demonstrated a need for improvement. Each instructor read and reviewed several of the essays from the other instructor's class (high, medium, and low-scoring) to cross check for grading consistency to ensure that grading was balanced and unbiased. Student Self-Assessment Survey: Both instructors administered the student self-assessment pre-survey by the end of the second week of the semester and then again the week before the final exam was administered. Survey results were examined to determine if students' perceptions of their reading and writing skills improved over the course of the semester. For both classes, there were slight increases in the students' perceptions of their overall reading and writing skills. For example, in the pre-survey only 6% of students felt that they could write organized and developed compositions of one or more paragraphs "fairly well." In the post-survey, 61% said responded "fairly well" to the same prompt. Likewise, in all other areas of the survey, a higher percentage of students responded either "fairly well" or "very well" in the post survey than they did in the pre-survey.

4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data/Statistical Reports)	Final Essay Exam: Both instructors agreed that an area of persistent weakness in student writing was the ability of students to consistently write complete, grammatically correct sentences. Both instructors agreed that students would benefit from more instruction in sentence concepts and correct sentence structure. This would include increased instruction in simple, compound, and complex sentences and practice in correcting fragment, comma splice, and run-on sentence errors. The instructors also agreed that another area of weakness in student writing was in word choice and vocabulary. Student writing demonstrated a persistent lack of knowledge of word choice, word forms, and/or word order. The instructors also agreed that student writing would benefit from more reading that included vocabulary development exercises and explicit instruction in vocabulary learning strategies.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	<p>The instructors agreed that the final writing assessment and procedures were appropriate and accurately measured students' writing skills and abilities. Additionally, they felt the skill areas on the rubric were appropriately weighted. However, they agreed that there was some duplication in the areas of Grammar/Structure and Mechanics. To correct this, the evaluation of commas and periods will be removed from the Mechanics skill area and will be measured only in the Grammar/Structure skill area. When ESL 006 SLOs were last evaluated in 2010, the instructors agreed to weight Grammar/Mechanics more heavily than the other skill areas and to make that a stronger focus of instruction. Both instructors that participated in this current SLO assessment agreed that Grammar/Mechanics need to remain a strong focus of future instruction as well. However, they also felt that more could be done in the area of vocabulary development.</p> <p>While the survey was useful in determining student perceptions of their reading and writing skills, the instructors found that the direct assessment and the discussion of student skills and classroom instruction techniques was more useful in determining plans for improvement. However, the survey did show that, overall, students perceived their skills to be stronger at the end of the semester than at the beginning of the semester.</p>

6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	<p>Beginning in fall 2013, the ESL program began offering a new curriculum at this level (three levels below transfer). The new course, ESL 054, has a much stronger focus on reading skills, vocabulary development, and grammar skills that are more relevant to composition writing (e.g. using correct sentence grammar and structure, including instruction in compound and complex sentences, and fragment, comma splice and run-on error correction). We feel that this new curriculum will better address many of the skill areas that ESL 006 students most needed to develop and improve.</p> <p>Additionally, a new ESL 099E course, which is the equivalent of English 099 (two levels below transfer), but designed specifically for ESL students, was also offered in fall 2013. This course has a much stronger focus on reading skills and vocabulary development. The textbook for this class is an academic ESL reading and writing textbook (Quest 3, Reading and Writing) with a focus on reading and writing strategies, the mechanics of writing and critical thinking strategies, which includes synthesizing, summarizing, and making inferences. We feel these skills will also help students in developing their vocabulary and writing skills. The two instructors who participated in the ESL 006 SLOA process agreed that grammar skills in this new class should also focus on sentence concepts and structure. The ESL 099E instructors will need to supplement the reading and writing textbook with additional sentence development and editing instruction.</p> <p>In Fall 2013, two instructors taught ESL 099E: Madeline Medeiros and Jessica Michelsen. The instructors collaborated in the design of this class throughout the semester and administered shared exams throughout the semester and shared final exams at the end of the semester, one exam focused on reading skills and the other was an essay writing exam.</p>
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	<p>ESL 006: Madeline Medeiros and Alicia Moretti met on April 1 2013 in Room 3431 on the SLO Campus for one and a half hours and developed a shared final exam and agreed to criteria for assessing student writing. The instructors met again on May 28 at Starbucks, Los Osos for one and a half hours to discuss final exam results and to make plans for improvement. Faculty also administered student pre- and post-surveys in both of their classes.</p> <p>ESL 099E: In December 2013, Madeline Medeiros and Jessica Michelsen met to review the ESL 099E final writing exams. The instructors read and evaluated each other's students' exams to determine student skills, the effectiveness of the writing prompt and the effectiveness of the rubric. The meeting provided an opportunity for the instructors to norm the student compositions, examine areas of strengths and weaknesses in student writing, and to determine instructional improvements for future semesters in this course.</p>

8	Fall 2014 Post-Implementations/Assessment:	<p>Both ESL 099E instructors, Madeline Medeiros and Jessica Michelsen, administered in-class final writing exams. The exams asked students to write a full comparison and contrast essay with an introduction, body and conclusion comparing and contrasting two full-length non-adapted books (fiction and/or non-fiction) that the students had read over the course of the semester. The instructors felt that the increased reading in this course proved to be highly beneficial to the students and this was reflected in their writing where the majority of the students demonstrated the ability to synthesize ideas, use a variety of vocabulary, and organize a full-length essay. According to the NC instructor, "Reading two books was a great addition to the class. It was challenging, but we did have enough time to fit two books into the schedule, especially since <i>The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian</i> is shorter and easier to read. I think that it's a great book to start with because it builds the students' confidence for reading a longer book next. Also, after reading one novel, students can build on the vocabulary learning and critical thinking skills with the second novel. Most of my students hadn't read a novel before ATDPTI, so they had to learn about the reading process with the first novel; then were able to more easily apply and practice these skills to the second novel."</p> <p>Additionally, instructors focused on sentence –level grammatical structures throughout the course of the semester, and this also proved to be beneficial. Overall, students tended to demonstrate adequate sentence skills and correct grammatical structures in their final writing exams.</p> <p>In SLO, 72% of all ESL 099E students (13/18) passed the final exam and also passed the class. Most of the students showed a marked improvement in their writing skills over the course of the semester, and this was reflected in their final essays. Students who passed the class showed especially good skills in content/ideas and synthesis as well as organization and grammar. In the North County, only 2 of 13 students did not pass the final exam. The instructor noted that students seemed to show a marked improvement in essay organization, vocabulary, and critical thinking skills. An area of particular weakness for the NC class appeared to be grammar. However, both instructors feel more confident about the students who are advancing to English 156 in large part because we feel that the increased reading instruction will better prepare them for the reading, writing and critical thinking that they will be expected to do in English 156.</p> <p>Student on both campuses also utilized the tutorial services and the Writing Center. Faculty agreed that these services were highly beneficial to our students and hope that additional evening services will be offered in future semesters.</p>
---	---	--

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at <http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa>

Course or Program Assessment Summary

Division: **Student Development and Success** Program: **English as a Second Language** Date: **10/25/13, 2/18/14** v. 3 2012
 Courses in program, or course: **ESL 015**

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: **Lucy Conklin, Nancy Seiler, Donna Bower**

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes X No

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements <input type="checkbox"/> Program <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course	In general, ESL 015 course assessments have both a written and an oral component. It was agreed upon that the latter would be the focus of this current analysis with regard to the course student learning outcome: <i>Demonstrate the ability to participate in familiar and controlled social situations.</i>
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	In October of 2013, it was decided that instructors would ask similar types of questions on the final exam which would reflect what was covered during the entire semester. In other words, the oral part of the exam would be comprehensive in nature. Even though the two classes which participated in this study were using different textbooks—A Conversation Book 1 and Side By Side Book 1—a consensus was reached as to what types of questions would be asked in order to require the same listening comprehension and to generate the same or similar responses in terms of grammatical structures and vocabulary usage. Students would demonstrate the ability to use the simple present and present progressive, as well as answer questions involving <i>what, where, when, how many, and how often</i> . The criteria for the rubric was <i>understands question, uses targeted grammatical structures and vocabulary, uses clear pronunciation, and demonstrates fluency.</i>
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Two instructors—one from the NC campus and one from the SLO campus, administered the final exam in December. One class consisted of 9 students and the other 11 for a total of 20 students being assessed. The class scores were averaged only for those parts of the oral exam that were the same or similar for both classes.
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	The SLO ESL 15 class averaged 83.7% and the NC class averaged 70.9% for a total weighted average of 77.3%.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	The difference between the class averages could reflect a difference in the student populations at the respective campuses. The NC instructor did identify at least 3 out of the 11 students as being “Level 1” students. Even though ESL 015 is designed for ESL 002 students, occasionally ESL 001 students also enroll (or self-place) in the course.

6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	<p>A change that has begun this semester is the use of the same textbook—Side By Side Book 1—in SLO and NC ESL 015 classes. This will help facilitate the aligning of skills mastery and the assessing of the intended outcome.</p> <p>There will be more discussion among faculty aimed at the consistent use of standardized rubrics and like items in the oral assessment. The discussion will also involve the inclusion of items which have students asking questions and not just answering them.</p> <p>We will continue to refine the discussion about the weighting of the oral component versus the written component of exams so as to have more uniformity in assessment among the ESL 15 classes. Instructors will continue to work on assessing and advising students during the first week of class to ensure the proper placement of students in order to avoid having the “Level 1” or underprepared student prematurely entering ESL 15.</p> <p>There have been and will continue to be more discussions about meshing ESL 15 and ESL 2 so that these two courses, which are aligned on our flow charts, can enhance the language and the learning of each other.</p>
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	<p>Participants met in October of 2013 to agree on the above assessment plan and ESL 15 instructors will be meeting to accomplish the plans for implementation of improvements in time for next semester’s actual implementation.</p>

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at <http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa>

Course or Program Assessment Summary

Division: **Student Development and Success** Program: **ESL** Date: **August 22, 2014** v. 3 2012

Courses in program, or course: ESL 035A, B, C, Advanced Conversation

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: **Jessica Michelsen, Lucy Conklin, Madeline Medeiros**

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes X No _____

1	<p>Student Learning Outcome Statements</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Program</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course</p>	<p>1. Identify and state or record the main ideas and major supporting details from oral presentations, conversations, reports, and lectures.</p> <p>2. Demonstrate the ability to speak and communicate competently in academic, professional, and social environments.</p> <p>3. Recognize and use idiomatic expressions and vocabulary that are relevant to the academic, professional, and social topics in the course.</p> <p>4. Use comprehensible pronunciation in conversations and discussions on the academic, professional, and social topics in the course.</p>
2	<p>Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)</p>	<p>Part 3 of the spring 2014 final exam required students to listen to an audio lecture and identify and record the main idea as well as supporting details that were included in the sustained listening (approximately 4 minutes long).</p>
3	<p>Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)</p>	<p>The assessment was given during final exams week on May 20, 2014 to two sections of ESL 035. In San Luis Obispo, 18 students took the exam. At the North County, 9 students took the exam. The sustained listening section was worth 17 points out of 35 points total. Students received 1 point for multiple choice and one-word answers, and they received 2 points for answers that required students to write short notes containing appropriate details.</p>
4	<p>Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)</p>	<p>For Part 3 of the final exam, 18 students (66.6%) received 70% or higher, and 9 students (33.3%) received 69% or lower, or a failing grade, on this section. Below are observations from each of the instructors who taught the two sections that were offered in spring 2014:</p> <p><u>San Luis Obispo:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students did surprisingly better on this section than the first two sections. I did have some very strong students who raised the class average. • Five students didn't write the information for the headings in the chart (the stages of love). • Some of the lower students couldn't articulate the main ideas/details, showing a lack of note-taking skills. • Some students couldn't identify main ideas at all and either left the box blank or grasped at straws, for example: dopamine/ responsible for: <i>romantic shape for all relationship</i>

		<p><u>North County:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost all students had lower scores on the sustained listening section than the other two sections; the higher performing students mostly scored a little lower on this section, but most of the lower performing students had much lower scores on this section. • The lowest performing students couldn't get the headers (second stage, third stage). • Some students wrote information in the wrong section (there's a lack of awareness of organization/outlines). • The lowest students often couldn't differentiate between details/examples and main ideas. • No one used abbreviations. <p>While a 66.6% success rate on this section is not abnormally low, both instructors noted difficulties with identifying and distinguishing main ideas and details, and both also noted that students lacked note-taking skills (i.e. using abbreviations, demonstrating an awareness of organization/outlines).</p>
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	<p>With regard to the assessment procedure, one instructor provided suggestions for making the chart on which students wrote their responses a little more structured as a strategy for helping students better understand the organization of the lecture. Below were her suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • highlight the different sections of the chart by having the stages of love in their own boxes • number or put point values (or both) in each box on the chart <p>These suggestions will be incorporated the next time this exam is administered.</p> <p>As a result of past assessments, the Student Learning Outcomes for ESL 035A, B, and C were updated to better reflect the course content. Previously, there was one SLO for this course; now there are four SLOs. This allows faculty to better assess the discreet skills that are necessary to succeed in this course. Since we are working with new SLOs, this is the first time this particular SLO (#1 above) has been assessed. Our intention will be to reassess SLO #1 in spring 2015 and/or fall 2015 to determine the effectiveness of our course improvements.</p> <p>Further, this assessment revealed that most students (66.6%) performed at the average to above average level in sustained listening and recording skills. However, it also revealed that students can still use more practice in identifying main ideas and details and in taking notes.</p>
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include note-taking basics in the course packet/workbook. 2. Provide more opportunities to practice notetaking skills during in-class listening exercises and exams. 3. Apply recommendations noted in Section 5 above to the exam.

7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	<p>Lucy Conklin, Jessica Michelsen, and Madeline Medeiros met in March 2014 to discuss which Student Learning Outcome would be assessed. All agreed to asses SLO #1: Identify and state or record the main ideas and major supporting details from oral presentations, conversations, reports, and lectures.</p> <p>After final exams were administered, Jessica M. and Lucy C. compiled test results and sent notes to Madeline Medeiros, who then used their data and summaries to complete this CPAS. All three instructors met again on August 22nd to discuss plans for recommended changes and plans for improvement. Faculty teaching this course will implement improvements fall 2014 and spring 2015.</p>
---	---	---

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at

Course or Program Assessment

Division: Student Development and Success Program: English as a Second Language Date: December 2014 v. 3 2012
 Courses in program, or course: ESL 053: Intermediate Reading and Writing

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: Amy Kayser, Nancy Seiler, Donna Bower
 Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes X No _____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements <input type="checkbox"/> Program <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course	1. Write a focused and unified paragraph on familiar topics. 2. Construct simple and compound sentences using simple and continuous tenses with regular and irregular verbs.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	In-class paragraph about someone you admire with shared scoring rubric. <i>See attachment A.</i>
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Four sections of ESL 053 were given the paragraph assessment during weeks 8-10 of the Fall 2014 semester, for a total of 41 students.
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	<i>See attachment B.</i>
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	<p>The major finding was that students scored lowest on the language use and mechanics sections on their paragraphs. In terms of SLOs, students more easily achieve #1 above, and they are not achieving #2.</p> <p>The teachers discussed that many students do not take the intermediate grammar course (ESL 043) before they take 053. This may cause our classes to become multi-level, where some students are more prepared than others especially in terms of intermediate level grammar. One teacher observed that students seem to make more grammatical mistakes, especially regarding verb tenses, than in the previous Level 3 course (before the curriculum change).</p>

6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	<p>In order to address the students' weaknesses, the following suggestions were made:</p> <p><u>Classroom Teaching Activities</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an idea presented at the recent CATESOL conference, teachers can try to give immediate feedback on language use on in-class writing tasks. Students can be given a prompt to write several sentences, and the teacher can circulate, giving immediate feedback focusing on language use and mechanics. This type of activity can be integrated into class throughout the semester. 2. In order to address the problem with mechanics, teachers will incorporate more whole class editing exercises, where students are asked to identify and correct mistakes in mechanics. The idea is to have the mistakes be student generated, but changed enough to ensure anonymity. 3. Since spelling is a challenge for students, teachers discussed keeping a log of student spelling errors and providing students a list of 10 words on a biweekly basis, then quizzing students on these words throughout the semester. The idea is to use student errors as study material. <p><u>Paragraph and Course Grading</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Teachers discussed the fact that the low to mid-level C students in class and on the paragraph rubric may technically "pass" but will not have necessarily met the SLOs for the writing or course. Consequently, teachers agreed to raise the ESL 053 course pass rate to 76% for spring 2015. 5. Language use is weighted too heavily on the current rubric (i.e., 10/20, or 50%). This seems unfair since many students take ESL 053 without taking ESL 043 first. Consequently, the teachers will change the score to 8 on the rubric for spring 2015. <p><u>Advising</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Students should be advised to take ESL 043 at the same time as ESL 053 or even the semester before wherever possible. For example, when students complete ESL level 2 in the spring, they can be advised to take ESL 043 in the summer and then ESL 053 in the fall. Also, weak students who succeed in ESL level 2 can be advised to take ESL 043 the semester before ESL 053. <p><u>Curriculum Changes</u></p> <p>Since the curriculum has changed and essentially combined ESL 3 and 4 into one level, many students do not seem to get enough instruction. This is especially apparent when comparing the contact hours we offer at Cuesta to ESL programs at other community colleges. For example, SBCC offers 4-unit courses in grammar, reading, writing, and conversation from levels 1-5 (i.e., 16 units/level) and at Cuesta, we have a 6 unit reading/writing course, 2-unit conversation course, and a 3-unit grammar course (11 units/level). To address this and increase student success in ESL 053, these ideas were proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase ESL 025 conversation class to 3 units and refocus it on academic listening/speaking. • Encourage students to take ESL 043 and ESL 025 the semester before taking ESL 053. • Create a 2-unit course that focuses on language use and mechanics at the sentence and paragraph level. It could be a writing workshop course that was offered immediately before ESL 053, so ideally students could take both courses at the same time.
---	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2-unit writing workshop course could also be offered as a late start, so that teachers could identify students in 053 who would benefit from it. <p>These changes would offer students 14 hours of instruction/level rather than 11. By encouraging students to take ESL 043 and 025 first, they would be more prepared. Finally, creating a new course specifically addressing reoccurring problems would further support students. Since our program is undergoing major changes as we merge with non-credit, we may want to explore these changes as we work on making ESL 053, 043, and 025 non-credit courses.</p>
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	Early in the fall 2014 semester, teachers communicated via email to choose an appropriate paragraph assignment and agree on a rubric. After the assessment was administered, teachers met and read each other's paragraphs to norm their grading (weeks 9 and 10). Two teachers met on 12/12/14 to discuss the results of the SLOs assessment, and one teacher shared some observations via email.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at <http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa>

Course or Program Assessment Summary

Division: **Student Development and Success** Program: **English as a Second Language** Date: **1/24 and 5/26 2014** v. 3 2012

Courses in program, or course: **ESL 054: High-Intermediate Reading and Writing**

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis:

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes X No _____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements <input type="checkbox"/> Program <input type="checkbox"/> Course	The course outcomes addressed with the chosen assessment are as follows: -write organized and well-developed paragraphs; -use a variety of sentence structures and verb tenses
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	Three ESL 054 faculty, D. Pillsbury, K. Wright, and R. Voge met on January 24 th , 2014. We determined to use the final exam paragraph writing, contrast paragraph as our shared assessment. The instructors reviewed the assessment rubric to determine which elements we would measure collectively and also try to make a focus in our instruction. These items are bolded on the rubric.
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Three classes of ESL 054 courses, two in North County and one in SLO, were administered the Final Exam Contrast Prompt during finals week in May of 2014. Instructors copied papers before scoring them in order to have clean copies for scoring collectively.
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	Shared Assessment Data Summary, 5/14: Forty Students Total were administered the shared final. The total combined average for the sections was 93.9/125 points, or 75.1%. (see attached data). There was some variation in how the test was administered; for example, one instructor allowed students to brainstorm points of comparison in groups during the exam, whereas another gave students a list of six possible prompts for which to prepare outlines the week before the final, but allowed no collaboration during the exam itself. These variations in administration may have affected the validity when comparing the scores.

5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	<p>Shared Assessment Review, 5/23/14:</p> <p>Instructors brought the clean copies of student final exam paragraph samples of what the instructor considered to be low, average, and superior papers. The different instructors then scored the papers, and dialogue ensued regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the writing exams.</p> <p>SLOA #1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Instructors felt students were successful in using patterns of organization in learning (Point by Point/Side By Side) -There was also a strong degree of success in third level development (explanation, examples, description, quotations). <p>SLOA #2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Instructors found there to be a limited degree of mastery of coordinating conjunctions and transitions; two of the three instructors also found limited mastery of subordinating conjunctions. - Instructors felt the need to focus instruction on more on correct application of connectors, transitions, coordinating and subordinating conjunctions
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	<p>Under SLOA #2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In order to improve instruction for a more accurate application of connectors, transitions, coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, instructors will have students self-edit writing to identify where connectors can be used correctly in their own writing as well as their peers; instructors will provide more cooperative and individual practice activities
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	See #5 above:

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. Examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at <http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa>

Program Outcome to Course Mapping

Program Outcome	Courses/Assessment
1. Develop basic competence in reading, writing, listening, and speaking in order to pursue further study.	ESL 001, 002, and/or 015 discussion of SLO assessment (ESL 703 and ESL 704 non-credit courses for fall 2015 and spring 2016)
1. Demonstrate reading comprehension skills of intermediate or advanced texts.	ESL 053, 054, and 099E discussion of SLO reading assessment
3. Produce paragraphs that communicate ideas clearly.	ESL 053, 054, and/or 099E discussion of writing SLO assessment
4. Demonstrate aural/oral competence in social and/or academic interactions.	ESL 025 or 035 discussion of SLO assessment
5. Recognize and use intermediate or advanced grammatical structures.	ESL 043 and 044 discussion of grammar SLO assessment

C. Program improvements that have been implemented since the last APPW or CPPR.

Curriculum:

In fall 2012, we began revising our curriculum to accelerate our more advanced courses and to change the skill focus to reading and writing as opposed to writing and grammar in ESL 005 and ESL 006 or integrated skills in ESL 003 and ESL 004. Using models that were observed at the Strengthening Student Success Conference in October 2012, the division agreed to increase reading instruction and to more effectively integrate reading and writing instruction. These curricular revisions were submitted by the February 10, 2013 deadline and were approved in time for the classes to be in place for fall 2013. ESL faculty revised ESL 003 and ESL 004, which focused on reading, writing, and grammar, and they developed one course, ESL 053, which focuses only on intermediate reading and writing skills. We also developed a separate grammar course, ESL 043, for students at this intermediate level. Faculty also revised ESL 005 and ESL 006, which focused on writing and grammar skills, and developed a new course, ESL 054, which focuses on high-intermediate reading and writing skills. They also developed a new grammar class, ESL 044, for students at this high-intermediate level. The new curriculum also includes ESL 099E, an advanced reading and writing course, which is the equivalent of English 099, but is designed specifically for second language learners. In fall 2013, ESL faculty began teaching this new curriculum at all Cuesta sites.

In spring 2015, faculty will begin revising our intermediate and high-intermediate courses to convert them to academic non-credit ESL courses. Because of the rising costs of tuition for credit courses and also because of Student Success Mandates which limit repeatability and financial aid access, we feel our students will be better served if these courses can be taught as non-credit bearing courses. However, the curriculum will be offered with the level of rigor as our credit courses and these courses will still be designed to transition our students to mainstream and college-level coursework.

Beginning in fall 2015, the credit and non-credit ESL programs will begin working together under the Student Development and Success Division. For fall 2015, we will no longer offer ESL 001, 002 and 015; these courses will be deactivated. Instead, we will begin offering the non-credit ESL courses as prerequisite courses for our intermediate, high-intermediate, and advanced credit courses.

English as a Second Language Program Sequence (fall 15-spring 16)

