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Goal 3: Knowledge and skills of language instruction – Knowledge of curriculum frameworks, teaching methods, and proficiency assessment instruments for teaching English as a non-native language

3D Demonstrate an understanding of the theory and practice of needs analysis, curriculum design, and assessment techniques.
3E Develop ESL curriculum for diverse target groups by synthesizing the objectives of goals 1 and 2 and the teaching strategies in objective 3A.
3F Design supplementary materials for use with particular instructional strategies.
3G Develop language tests and assessment instruments.

Initial Evidence of Student Learning:

Fall 2011

The following methods were used to assess student learning outcomes:

- Class participation and presentation
- Three problem-solving tasks
- Curriculum design project

A brief explanation of these assignments is in order. Class participation is aimed at eliciting student comprehension of basic concepts governing curriculum, teaching and testing. The three, data-based
problem-solving tasks, in turn, relate to three important aspects of the course: needs analysis, materials, and testing.

Designing a useable curriculum is the central part of this class. It is literally a “term” project, meaning, it is carried out all through the semester. It is an on-going, comprehensive, multi-layered project requiring students to draw upon the theoretical knowledge they gain through readings, class discussions and successful completion of problem-solving tasks. For this project, students (a) identify a client, (b) conduct needs analysis, (c) determine general goals and specific learning outcomes, (d) design an appropriate curriculum for a short course, (e) design sample materials, and (f) make suggestions for implementing the curriculum in terms of teaching and testing strategies. These activities are taken up one by one at different stages of the course, each activity (or a cluster of activities) leading to the next. At the end, students write a detailed report and also give a brief oral presentation in class.

The table below presents details on how students fared in the assignments (N=8):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>A (37.5%)</th>
<th>A- (25%)</th>
<th>B+ (25%)</th>
<th>B (12.5%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class participation and presentation</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving Task 1</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving Task 2</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving Task 3</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall grade</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change(s) to Curriculum or Pedagogy:

Spring 2012

1) A main challenge faced by the students was to select and work with a client institute in the Bay area. In the absence of any institutionalized assistance from the department or the college, the students had to spend extraordinary time and effort to fulfill the requirements of the course. Given these constraints, what the students were able to accomplish was much more than expected at the beginning the semester. With greater institutional help, this class can be made more useful and usable.

2) If grades are taken to reflect student learning outcome, it appears that most of the students have learned most of what they are expected to learn in this class. Student performance and classroom observations lead to these (and other) reflections:

   a. Students were given a full-page, step-by-step guideline for the term project particularly explaining in detail all they have to do at every stage. Still, several of them needed further clarifications as they progressed with their project. How best do we revise our guidelines so that the students are able to understand what needs to be done and how?

   b. The students are very much dependent on the availability and willingness of administrators, teachers, and learners in the selected institutes. A formal, institutionalized arrangements between LLD and selected institutes in the Bay area (Community Colleges, Adult Ed centers, and, more importantly, SAL) can make a challenging and time-consuming project like this much more doable.

   c. The project, as designed, demands a lot of the instructor’s and the students’ time. Instructors find it challenging to devote more quality time to individual students, guiding
them at every stage of their project. **How do we (and our students) deal with the time constraint?**

3) Changes based on the above reflections were implemented in Spring 2012. Among the proposed changes were:

   a. Develop formal ties with Studies in American Language (SAL) so that students can complete projects in collaboration with them.

   b. Revise guidelines based on student feedback to make project expectations more understandable.

   c. Develop strategies to address the time constraints of the curriculum project.

**Evidence of Student Learning after Change.**

Data from Spring 2012, reflecting the results of these changes, are forthcoming.
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Goal 4: Skills and attitudes necessary to understand, analyze, and synthesize goals 1-3 in actual language teaching

- 4 A Demonstrate the ability to transfer theoretical knowledge of second language acquisition into second language teaching procedures.
- 4 B Demonstrate an ability to handle written and spoken interlanguage data.
- 4 C Demonstrate the comprehension and the connection between classroom input and interaction and learning outcomes.
- 4 D Complete a one-semester practicum in which, under the direct supervision of an M.A.TESOL faculty member, they plan lessons and teach English to an actual ESL class.

---

**Initial Evidence of Student Learning:**

Spring 2011

The following methods were used to assess student learning outcomes:

- Peer teaching and self evaluation
- Written observations of other classrooms and evaluations of those lessons;
- Lesson plans and self evaluations after teaching;
- Instructor observation of students' teaching, both live and via video recordings (every student is observed at least once live at their teaching site, for an hour or more);
- Evaluations of tutoring experience;
Reflective journals about field experiences.

The course in which these student learning outcomes were assessed is Credit/No-Credit. This policy is based on the rationale that some students arrive in our program already possessing considerable teaching experience, whereas others have never taught before. Assigning a letter grade to student teachers would almost certainly privilege those with teaching experience – yet the program doesn’t require teaching experience prior to enrolling in the Practicum, so letter grades would unfairly disadvantage those with little or no teaching experience.

The table below presents details on how students fared in the assignments:
(N=11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>NCR</th>
<th>INC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer teaching and self evaluation</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written observations of other classrooms and evaluations of those lessons</td>
<td>9 (82%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans and self evaluations after teaching</td>
<td>8 (73%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor observation of students’ teaching</td>
<td>8 (73%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations of tutoring experience</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective journals about field experiences</td>
<td>9 (82%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change(s) to Curriculum or Pedagogy:**

**Fall 2011**

1) Prior to 2006, not enough weight was given to the actual student teaching. In 2006, the percentage weight for the teaching was raised to 50%. This was clarified in Fall 2011 to indicate that of this 50%, 40% comes from the instructor evaluation and 10% for the lesson plans and self-evaluations.

2) The amount of instructor time that is needed for this course is excessive, especially since there is a lot of paperwork (in one semester 767 individual documents needed to be read and assessed) as well as the actual observations in the field and 1-1 consultations with students. To deal with excessive workload, we decided to try writing global comments on each set of assignments (e.g., student A turns in 5 observations and 5 evaluations, plus two journals; one comment is written on the collected set, rather than comments on each piece).

3) It was suggested in 2006 that students coming in to the Practicum should already have lesson planning and unit planning skills (some students do not seem to have acquired these skills yet). In Spring 2011 and in recent semesters, Practicum students who have taken LLD 280 (and often 283 as well) are better prepared in the area of curriculum design and pedagogical strategies. The instructors of those courses are to be commended for this!

**Questions to consider:**

Based on these reflections, we raise the following questions for us to consider as we go forward:

1) How can we respond to the shortage of student teaching situations amid massive cuts to public education? If students do not find teaching placements, their graduation is delayed and more
work is shifted onto the following semester as the instructor must then supervise the Incompletes. The students finishing Incompletes also then compete with the incoming Practicum students for the limited number of student teaching placements.

2) How can the Practicum instructor workload be reduced to a more reasonable amount, without compromising the integrity and quality of the course?

3) How can we do a better job of addressing weak teaching skills before students reach the end of the Practicum and are ready to graduate?

4) Should we reconsider our position on not allowing student teaching to be done outside of the local South Bay region? We continue to get requests to allow student teaching in other countries.

5) Who else will teach the Practicum in the future? We need more than one faculty member to teach this course from time to time.

Evidence of Student Learning after Change.

Fall 2011

1) The new weighting of student teaching revised in 206 has proven to effective in emphasizing to students that in order to pass the course, they must demonstrate real teaching skills (not just submit good written work).

2) Writing global comments on each assignment was tried, but unfortunately the results are almost identical. Additional solutions to the workload problem will need to be uncovered in the future.

3) Students who have taken LLD 280 and 283 prior to enrolling in the practicum consistently are better prepared. Thus, we plan to continue to insist on LLD 280, at least, as a pre or co-requisite to the Practicum.