

Course or Program Assessment

Summary http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa/docs/Course_and_Program_Assessment_Summary_F_2011.docx

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **ESL**

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 ☒ 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

		<p>upon rubric for the writing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>ESL 1:</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>ESL 2:</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>ESL 3:</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>ESL 15:</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.

		<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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 http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa/docs/Course_and_Program_Assessment_Summary_F_2011.docx

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **ESL**

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers can continue to develop the following reading skills: vocabulary in context, dictionary skills, identifying detail and

	Implementation of Improvements	<p>main idea. In addition, listening and video can be incorporated to supplement the reading material.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa/docs/Course_and_Program_Assessment_Summary_F_2011.docx

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **ESL**

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 ☒ No ☐

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements X Program	Produce paragraphs that communicate ideas clearly.
---	--	--

	<input type="checkbox"/> Course	
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	<p>ESL 4: Three teachers met to create a common writing exam. Teachers agreed upon a writing rubric.</p> <p>ESL 5: Two instructors collaborated on a writing exam for fall 2010 and again in spring 2011.</p> <p>ESL 6: Two instructors collaborated on a final essay prompt with the same grading rubric.</p> <p>The criterion for success was defined as a score of 70% or higher in all classes.</p>
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	<p>ESL 4</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>ESL 5</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>ESL 6</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>ESL 4</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>ESL 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fall '10: 19 out of 24 passed Spring '11: 30 out of 34 passed <p>ESL 6</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	<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.

	Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa/docs/Course_and_Program_Assessment_Summary_F_2011.docx

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **ESL**

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>ESL 25:</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>ESL 35:</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>ESL 25:</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>ESL 35:</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 http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa/docs/Course_and_Program_Assessment_Summary_F_2011.docx

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **ESL**

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 X 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.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

- Identify and describe any budget requests that are related to student learning outcomes assessment results or institutional/programmatic objectives.

The following budget requests are directly related to our Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment results and have been identified in our Unit Plan:

Designated ESL Language Lab Facility and Replacement Computers: Beginning in fall 2012, the ESL Division began offering the ESL Language Lab as an official .5 to 1.0 unit course. The Learning Resource Center in the North County currently provides an ESL computer lab where the Language Lab can be held without classroom scheduling conflicts. However, in SLO we do not yet have a designated ESL lab space in which to offer this course. ESL currently shares the 3411 and 6103 computer classrooms with English and Languages and Communications, but we do not have first call for these labs, and they are sometimes occupied by English classes during the times that we will need to provide the labs. Therefore, we have a strong need for this facility. Furthermore, the computers in 3411 need to be replaced as they are old and slow and frequently malfunction.

Class Sets of ESL Readers: When the Department's new reading and writing curriculum is in place, our classes will need to add to its library of adapted as well as non-adapted readers. Our new curriculum will be designed to accelerate student learning primarily by increasing critical reading, thinking, and writing skills. So to help students afford the cost of all of their textbooks and to ensure that all students will have access