Listening Assessment
Intensive English Language Institute

During August 26, 2015 IELI Faculty Retreat, IELI faculty evaluated 26 sets of notes by Level 4 Listening to Academic Lecture students as part of the faculty’s on-going assessment of how well Level 4 students meet the program exit criteria for Listening.

Procedures
Faculty analyzed student notes taken while listening/viewing a to a 22-minute lecture segment of a video-taped lecture, which was played twice, in a sample of 26 students who had completed the IELI program in school year 2014-2015 (either in Fall Semester 2014 or Spring Semester 2015).

The exit goals of the course are given in Table 1. Faculty developed these goals in 2013 when a major revision of curriculum goals was done.

Table 1
IELI Program Listening Goals – 2015

Course Goals
Students will . . .

• learn how academic lectures are typically structured and how lecturers signal structure
• listen to lectures and use knowledge of structure to take notes on content
• understand lecture content

Expected Learner Outcomes
After listening to a videotaped recording of a university lecture, students will demonstrate . . .

1) recognition of various organizational features and discourse structures of the lecture including:
   • discourse markers (e.g., topic & subtopic announcements, examples, supporting information, returns to topic after digression)
   • organizational sequences (e.g., definition, classification, concept explanation, problem/solution)
   • discourse features to be ignored (e.g., digressions, postponements)

2) ability to take notes that reflect organization and content of the lecture. Notes may employ . . .
   • key word outlines
   • bulleted lists
   • visual representations
   • other self-developed systems

3) understanding of lecture content by completing tasks such as . . .
   • filling in and making concept maps
   • answering questions
   • applying the content to situations
   • summarizing the content
Faculty worked in pairs. Each pair rated five sets of notes papers for the extent the notes reflected achievement of listening goals. The rating scale is shown in Table 2. Only one pair read each paper.

Table 2
Rating Scale for Goal Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Both faculty members agreed that the paper showed evidence that the student met the goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The two faculty members disagreed as to whether or not the goal was met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Both faculty members agreed that the goal was not met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results
Table 3 shows the extent to which goals were met. For example, 21 papers were rated at “2” on the second criterion Identify examples. One received a “5,” and none received a rating of “0” on this particular criterion.

Table 3
Number of Papers at each Rating on each Criterion. (The number following the category in parentheses indicates the number of the Expected Learner Outcomes listed above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating:</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify topic announcements (subtopic announcements) (1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identify examples (1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identify supporting information (1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identify organization of information in academic lectures (definition sequences, classification sequences, concept explanation, and problem solution, etc.) (1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identify discourse features of lectures to be noted or ignored such as out of order information, return to topic, digression, postponement, etc...Identify salient information from interaction. (1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Identify effective, personal type of note taking from demonstrated types such as key word outlines, bulleted, mapping or a self-organized system. (1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ability to go back and understand information to review (notes organized, legible, etc.) (1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the faculty ratings indicate that (with disagreements for certain individuals on certain goals) nearly all of students met the listening goals of the IELI program. In items 1-6, there is robust agreement between faculty. In item 7 there is more somewhat mixed agreement which may mean student notes reflect their personal style (s) of notation, which faculty members may not find transparent for their own purposes. Reviewing content for students could include notes as well as a textbook, possible professor’s notes on Canvas, possible reviewing with a partner, etc., so it is difficult to infer from students’ notes if they can used them for review.