

ESL program Assessment Report 2016-17

Revised February 9, 2017

1. Which Program Student Learning Outcome(s) did you assess this academic year?

Students will communicate effectively in academic writing by demonstrating appropriate syntax, verb tense usage and grammatical structures.

2. Check the Institutional Outcome(s) tied to this assessment:

Effective Communicator

3. Describe the population of students that was assessed.

Students in the final writing/reading course in the ESL program sequence, ESL 054, Composition and Reading, were assessed.

4. Describe how you measured whether the students achieved this outcome.

Each student, in every section of the ESL 054 course, wrote a final in-class essay. Student names were removed from the essays prior to them being read and graded holistically in norming sessions which included each of the ESL 054 instructors (An evening instructor was not included in the session because of schedule conflicts). Instructors discussed whether each piece of student work demonstrated sufficient mastery of content, syntax and grammatical structures to move into CCR 094 and ENG 121. After the initial norming session, instructors met to discuss individual student performance and grades and how those compared to the results of the norming discussions (readiness to move in to CCR and ENG).

5. What did you learn/discover from the assessment?

We discovered, for one, that the assessment tool itself needed some revision. We found that writing prompts using compare and contrast and argument topics were effective in demonstrating whether students were successful in writing academic essays while the narrative writing prompt did not effectively demonstrate student ability to produce more academic types of written work. We also found, because we compared results of the norming session and final grades, that our predictions about student readiness for CCR and ENG 121 classes, based on the writing sample and final grades earned, were mostly the same. When we assessed that a student wasn't ready for CCR and ENG, that was usually reflected in a grade of D or F. We had productive discussions about these few outliers and the reasons they might have occurred.

6. What changes will be made as a result of this data?

The narrative prompt has been removed from the choices of rhetorical modes for the final in-class writing assignment.

ESL faculty have participated in norming sessions with CCR and ENG faculty. We'd like to follow up by tracking success of these students in CCR 094 and ENG 121 classes this fall. Also, we will try to involve CCR and ENG faculty in our norming sessions for the fall. Finally, we have learned that many CCR and 121 instructors allow students to receive the writing prompt before the in-class assessment, so we will consider making this adjustment to our assessment. We will also collaborate to create a common rubric to be used for assessment in the norming sessions.

8. How will this assessment affect your overall Program Assessment Plan?

This plan will continue to be a part of the program assessment plan. We will also include ESL 052, Intermediate Composition, students and instructors in a similar plan in spring 2017.

9. Which Program Student Learning Outcome will you assess next year?

We will continue to assess this PSLO, and we may include PSLOs two and three in spring 2017 (See discussion below). These are:

- Students will analyze and evaluate diverse viewpoints and perspectives in all four language modalities, reading, writing, listening and speaking.
- Students will investigate examine and revise career and financial goals in order to make realistic, personally responsible career decisions.

10. Include any additional comments or questions.

The program intended to complete a portfolio research project which included results of academic advisor and/or career representative interviews, and a research reflection paper based on the results of student research into academic and career goals. However, faculty who were well-versed in the project weren't available to teach these courses in the spring and fall, so new faculty were assigned and needed to be trained. Also, the academic advising model at CCD changed, and it was unclear with whom students should make appointments to discuss career goals. For these reasons, the program shifted the focus from the career portfolio to the final in-class assessment.

Discussions are being held this semester about the viability of including the career assessment portfolio into the assessment plan in the spring 2017 semester.