

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English as Second Language	165	ESL 165 06/05/2016-Advanced ESL Speaking and Listening
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English/Writing	Heather Zettelmaier
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Listen to an academic lecture, take notes, and pass an open-note exam on the lecture material.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: departmentally-approved exam
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2018
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: all students
 - How the assessment will be scored: departmentally-developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will demonstrate mastery at the 70% level or higher.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: departmental faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2016	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
11	10

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Out of the 11 students registered for the class, 1 stopped attending. The remaining 10 students were assessed.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

The only section of this class was assessed. All students were included.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

On DVD, students watched three separate college-level lectures from appropriate level ESL textbooks. During the lectures, the students were asked to take notes using the strategies that were taught during the semester. Students were then given the comprehension questions for the lectures that they viewed. They were permitted to use their notes from the lectures to answer the questions. The exam questions were multiple-choice, fill-in, and true/false. The questions targeted both main ideas and details from the lectures.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

8 out of the 10 students who took the exam achieved 70% or higher. The average score in the class was 82.8%, well above the 70% passing score. The standard of success was met for this outcome.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The students listened to a variety of topics from lecturers with a variety of accents and mannerisms. There was no one particular area of weakness, and students had success with both the main idea and the detail questions.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Note-taking was the key to success on this exam. Students in ESL 165 should continue to implement effective note-taking strategies. Students who did so in this assessment scored well on the listening exam.

Outcome 2: Give a short, comprehensible oral presentation on an academic topic.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Audience (student) responses to student presentation is recorded on standard form.
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2018
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: all students
 - How the assessment will be scored: departmentally-developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will demonstrate mastery at the 70% level or higher.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: departmental faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2016	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
11	10

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Out of the 11 students registered for the class, 1 stopped attending. The remaining 10 students were assessed.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

The only section of this class was assessed. All students were included.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Students gave argumentative presentations on academic topics. Students used PowerPoint to clarify their speech but were not permitted to read word-for-word. The presentations were videotaped. Assessment was conducted using a simple rubric that scored comprehensibility and academic vocabulary and content.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No

6 out of the 10 students who gave presentations scored 70% or higher. The average score in the class was 76%. The standard of success was not met for this outcome.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students seemed very prepared and generally well-read about their academic topics. The students used their research well while presenting their information and arguments. They made good eye contact and delivered their presentations confidently with an easy manner in front of the class and camera. They generally made good use of the PowerPoint slides. The main idea of most speeches was easy to understand.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Pronunciation should be the focus for improvement. Students at this level of speaking mostly need to improve the pronunciation of high-level, multi-syllable vocabulary words and work on suprasegmentals. (Currently, these aspects of speaking are not part of the 165 master syllabus.)

II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results

1. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

The listening component of this course involves rigorous preparation for listening to college-level lectures and gives students very useful notetaking skills. The

materials available to teach this outcome are very appropriate and relevant for students who will attend an American college or university.

This course prepares students to develop appropriate content for college-level presentations. However, the lack of a pronunciation component led to unsatisfactory results for some students who need further coaching. It has been assumed that students at this level enter the class with advanced level pronunciation skills; this has not consistently been the case.

- Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

The results will be shared at the English/Writing January In-service.

-

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Objectives	Based on this assessment, it is clear that students would benefit from focused pronunciation work. The course needs objectives in selected phonemes and suprasegmentals. It should assist students with the pronunciation and use of advanced English academic vocabulary words. Additional instruction is necessary for the use of this academic language in a variety of presentation settings.	There was a disconnect between the content and organization of the final presentations, which was satisfactory, and the delivery and comprehensibility of the content. Students at this level still need coaching and remediation of pronunciation skills. Until now, this has not been a required part of this course.	2017

Other: change course credit hours	ESL 165 should become a 4-credit course.	<p>First, adding a credit hour will allow instruction time to make up for the deficits that we see in student performance and learning. The master syllabus will reflect an additional outcome and several objectives related to English pronunciation. More class time is needed to fulfill these requirements.</p> <p>Furthermore, this additional credit hour will complete our new ESL Certificate and fulfill the need for a full-time credit load for F-1 students on the certificate. These F-1 students will benefit from a more rigorous and complete advanced speaking and listening curriculum.</p>	2017
-----------------------------------	--	--	------

4. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

5.

III. Attached Files

[Outcome 2 Results](#)
[Outcome 1 Results](#)

Faculty/Preparer:

Heather Zettelmaier **Date:** 11/21/2016

Department Chair:	Carrie Krantz	Date: 11/22/2016
Dean:	Kristin Good	Date: 11/22/2016
Assessment Committee Chair:	Ruth Walsh	Date: 01/29/2017