

**Course Assessment Report  
Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English as Second Language	165	ESL 165 07/12/2021-Advanced ESL Speaking, Listening and Pronunciation
College	Division	Department
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English & College Readiness
Faculty Preparer		Elizabeth Foss
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		01/30/2017

**I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.**

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

Yes

The Winter 2016 offering was assessed in January, 2017.

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

The listening outcome standard of success was achieved. The presentation outcome standard of success was not achieved. The speaking (pronunciation) aspect was identified as the source of the substandard results, not the students' ability to present academic information.

3. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

A recommendation was made to add a fourth credit hour to provide time to work on pronunciation, which was the source of the substandard grades in the presentation outcome. This addition also allowed F-1 students to include the course in their curriculum, as those students needed four-credit-hour classes to fulfill the requirements of their visas. This change was implemented in the Fall 2018 semester.

**II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome**

Outcome 1: Utilize listening and note-taking skills to demonstrate comprehension of an academic lecture.

- 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)
2020		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
7	7

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.

All 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.

All students enrolled in the only section of this course were assessed.

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

On DVD via Zoom, students watched two 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-the-blank, short answer, 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: No

4 of the 7 students (57%) who took the listening test scored at 70% or higher. The average (mean) score in the class was 70.46%; the median score was 71.15%. 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.

Among the five students who did not achieve 70% or better when listening for main ideas, four scored at the 67% level, which is close to meeting the standard. The results of the details were more divided, with students who met the standard scoring well and those who did not meet the standard scoring in the 50-60% range.

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.

Continued focus on notetaking skills is necessary. Additional practice quizzes may help prepare the students for the higher-stakes tests.

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

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Faculty evaluation of presentation content, organization, and academic appropriateness.
  - Assessment Date: Winter 2020
  - 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)
2020		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
7	7

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.

All students enrolled in the course 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.

All students in the only section of the course were assessed.

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

Students gave a 5-8 minute presentation on an academic topic on Zoom. Students were assessed using a 4-point scale (detailed on the attachment) on the appropriateness of the topic for an academic presentation, the use of academic vocabulary, and the organization and logic of the presentation.

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  
 All 7 of the students scored above the standard. The mean score was 3.57/4 (89%); the median score was 3.5/4 (87.5%).

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

Students selected relevant, credible sources for support following the guidance of a librarian and used the technical or specialized vocabulary related to their topics. The presentation was workshopped with the instructor and one or two other

students before it was presented to the whole class; all students were prepared for each step of the process. The resulting presentations were well organized, credible, and appropriate for an academic audience.

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.

This final presentation was given the greatest attention because of the challenging content and greater length of the assignment. Adding more opportunities to workshop speeches with other students and the instructor to formal presentations throughout the semester would give the students more opportunities to learn from others' work and to improve their own presentations.

Outcome 3: Pronounce academic vocabulary in a short oral presentation so that it can easily be understood by an unsympathetic listener.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Faculty evaluation of student pronunciation based on pronunciation rubric.
  - Assessment Date: Winter 2020
  - 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)
2020		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
7	7

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.

All students enrolled in the course 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.

All students in the only section of the course were assessed.

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

Students presented a 5-8 minute presentation on an academic topic on Zoom. The students' pronunciation was assessed on a 4-point scale, detailed in the attachment. Pronunciation quality was assessed by ESL faculty.

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

5 of the 7 students scored above the standard for success (71%). The mean score was 3.14/4 (78.5%); the median score was 3.5 (87.5%).

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

Students engaged in one-on-one pronunciation coaching via Zoom or FlipGrid. Marked improvement from early speeches to this one was evident.

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.

The additional credit hour dedicated to improving pronunciation provided time for group work and individual work on pronunciation. As pronunciation is an idiosyncratic skill—each student presents a unique set of abilities and challenges—continued one-on-one coaching, both in class and through recording, is the most significant key to pronunciation improvement.

### III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

The statistics gathered for this report do not demonstrate an improvement in student learning with respect to listening skills. However, the semester being evaluated was a COVID semester, with the class taking place via Zoom. This is not an ideal format for a speaking/listening class. Two out of seven of the students experienced frequent Internet interruptions, which impacted their ability to hear clearly and communicate with the class. Additionally, the enrollment was only seven students, a very small sample on which to base global conclusions.

The fact that the standard of success for student pronunciation was achieved demonstrates the value of the additional credit hour. Previously, students who entered the program at the advanced level often displayed pronunciation difficulties, despite having advanced grammar, reading and writing ability. Students in this class showed positive development of their pronunciation ability.

2. 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?

This course remains an important course in the development of non-native speakers' language skills and preparation to take part in non-ESL courses. Returning to an in-person format should lead to improved learning outcomes.

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

The information will be shared at the Fall In-Service meeting with ESL instructors.

4. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Course Assignments	Increase time in class dedicated to listening skills and add further assessments for this skill.	Listening skills are most often the reason that students do not succeed in this course, not only during the assessment semester but in all semesters.	2022

		Students need constant listening practice and skill work throughout the semester. A portion of each class period should be dedicated to global and intensive listening skills.	
Other: Enforce requirement to take the course	Explore ways to more effectively enforce the requirement to take the course for speakers who have not achieved an E5 level on the ESL placement test.	Ensure students who need this course are taking it to further develop their listening, speaking and pronunciation skills.	2021
Other: Develop a co-requisite course	Explore the possibility of developing a co-requisite course with COM faculty.	As COM 101 offers many of the same skills as ESL 165, students may be able to take a course that offers focused pronunciation and listening practice as well as transferable college credit.	2021

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

Enrollment in this course is an ongoing concern. Many students bypass this course out of a desire to move from ESL courses to courses that contribute to their degree or certificate programs, so they opt not to take it, despite a need for further development of their listening, speaking, and pronunciation skills. This has a negative impact not only on those students' skills but also on the students who take the course, as low enrollment means a smaller number of combinations of speakers for group work and less diversity in the class.

ESL full-time faculty will study options for delivering these skills. Options include, but are not limited to, the following possibilities:



1. More effectively enforcing the requirement to take the course for speakers who have not achieved an E5 level on the ESL placement test.

2. Exploring the possibility of a partnership with the Communication faculty. COM 101 offers many of the same skills as ESL 165. Developing a co-requisite course for ESL students may be a way to offer focused pronunciation and listening instruction in a course that will earn transferable college credit. Students may be more willing to register if they know that COM 101 will contribute to their overall college plan. There are many questions to be explored with this model. Action steps include:

a) Approaching COM faculty to determine their interest in and willingness to explore a co-req model for non-native speakers.

b) Proposing a new course, which includes changing the number of credit hours (1 or 2 hours for the co-req component of the course).

There is no implementation date as this possibility has not yet been discussed with the COM faculty. However, the ESL faculty will work a proposal for discussion during the Fall 2021 semester.

### III. Attached Files

[Scoring Rubric and Results for Outcome 1](#)

[Scoring Rubric and Results for Outcomes 2 and 3](#)

**Faculty/Preparer:** Elizabeth Foss **Date:** 07/15/2021

**Department Chair:** Carrie Krantz **Date:** 07/20/2021

**Dean:** Scott Britten **Date:** 07/21/2021

**Assessment Committee Chair:** Shawn Deron **Date:** 10/26/2021

**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

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