ED 313 059   JC 890 535

AUTHOR   Harper, Jane; Lively, Madeleine
TITLE   Strategies for Proficiency in Second Language
                Acquisition: Tarrant County Junior College, Northeast
                Campus. Final Project Evaluation Report, 1989.
INSTITUTION   Tarrant County Junior Coll., Hurst, Tex. Northeast
                Campus.
PUB DATE   89
NOTE   51p.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) --
                Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Classroom Techniques; *College School Cooperation;
                Community Colleges; Educational Innovation; High
                Schools; Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional
                Materials; *Language Teachers; Oral Language; Program
                Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Secondary School
                Teachers; *Second Language Instruction; *Speech
                Communication; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher
                Workshops; *Teaching Methods; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT
                In response to the needs of teachers for assistance
in developing second language speaking and instructional skills,
Tarrant County Junior College, Northeast Campus, designed a series of
10 16-hour workshops for teachers of foreign languages for summer
1989. The "Strategies for Proficiency Workshops" were intended
primarily as in-service training for secondary foreign language
teachers and secondarily as retraining for secondary teachers who
specialized in areas other than languages, but who would be teaching
languages during the coming year. The workshops focused on improving
oral proficiency, confidence in speaking, instructional skills, test
development, and such innovative techniques as teaching higher order
thinking skills, creative evaluation techniques, visual-based
curricula, computer-assisted materials design, and the Color
Connection system of materials development. Participants were
recruited through personally addressed letters sent to all foreign
language teachers in the Dallas/Fort Worth area and to all
participants in prior workshops. A special effort was made to recruit
and admit minority teachers throughout Texas. Evaluation of the
workshops involved a comparison of pre- and post-test self-assessment
questionnaires and in-class observations of a sampling of teachers
during the following fall term. Participants in both French and
Spanish language workshops perceived gains in both their speaking and
understanding abilities and their instructional skills. Evaluation
materials are appended. (AYC)

STRATEGIES FOR PROFICIENCY IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE NORTHEAST CAMPUS

FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT, 1989

Jane Harper
Humanities

Madeleine Lively
Foreign Languages

Tarrant County Junior College
828 Harwood Road
Hurst, Texas   76054

(817) 656-6680

STRATEGIES FOR PROFICIENCY IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE NORTHEAST CAMPUS

FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT, 1989

Based on our national need for individuals who can function
effectively in a second language, not merely know how the language
functions, the Texas essential elements in foreign language teaching
and learning heavily emphasize the development of oral proficiency
skills of students.

Psycholinguistic research and common sense both tell us that, if
students are to become proficient in a new language, they must hear the
language extensively before attempting to speak it, they must receive
accurate and comprehensible input, and they must feel secure enough to
risk trying to produce language. Unfortunately, many teachers are not
proficient enough themselves to provide the quality of instruction
needed. Many have never possessed good speaking skills; some have lost
much of their oral facility while teaching beginners during several
years without travel or study opportunities for themselves; others
cannot provide a secure environment in the classroom because of their
own insecurity in speaking the language.

In addition to their limited oral proficiency, teachers are also
limited in their instructional repertoire. Contemporary professional
interest in the development of higher order thinking skills through the
teaching of languages necessitates the use of new instructional
strategies. Teachers need information, methodologies, supervised
practice, evaluation techniques, and time to develop supportive
materials in order to incorporate these new strategies into their
curriculum.

WORKSHOP GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

In response to the needs of teachers for assistance in developing language and instructional skills, Tarrant County Junior College Northeast Campus designed a series of ten 16-hour workshops for teachers of foreign languages for the summer of 1989. These Strategies for Proficiency Workshops were intended primarily as in-service training for secondary school foreign language teachers and secondarily as retraining for secondary teachers who specialized in areas other than languages but who would be teaching languages during the following academic year.

Tarrant County Junior College worked with representatives from the foreign language curriculum administrative staff of the Fort Worth and Birdville Independent School District in the design of the workshop curriculum, staffing, and schedule for the 1989 offerings.

The Strategies for Proficiency Workshops had as the primary objectives that the participating teachers would:

1. Improve their own oral proficiency in the language that they teach;

2. Increase their security and confidence in speaking that language;

3. Develop skills in current foreign language instructional methodologies appropriate for novice and intermediate students;

4. Develop an enhanced repertoire of instructional activities and materials which encourage students' involvement in the language acquisition process;

5. Develop evaluation instruments which reflect the instructional process.

The development or improvement of teachers' oral skills and their increased facility at designing instructional materials were planned to enhance their effectiveness in the classroom. With increased listening opportunity and supportive materials which provide meaning to the spoken language, students should develop speaking skills more readily. Furthermore, more effective teaching materials will be beneficial in gaining and holding student attention, thus providing an improved teaching/learning environment. Improved testing procedures will emphasize positive rather than punitive evaluation strategies, thus increasing the students' security and confidence in language use.

Innovative techniques presented in the workshops included teaching higher order thinking skills, teaching strategies for oral and written communication, creative evaluation techniques, the visual-based curriculum, computer-assisted materials design, and the Color Connection system of materials development.

GRANT INFORMATION

During the fall and spring semesters since 1983, TCJC Northeast Campus has offered conversation classes to teachers of French and of Spanish, each class usually enrolling eight to fifteen teachers. During the summer of 1985, the Campus offered one workshop for teachers of foreign languages, the Color Connection, to ten teachers. During the summer of 1986, the program was expanded to include six workshops, enrolling 34 teachers for a total of 104 workshops.

Supported by funding from EESA Title II during the summer of 1987, TCJC Northeast Campus offered ten workshops for secondary foreign language teachers, enrolling 79 teachers for a total of 219 workshops. During the summer of 1988, the College offered eleven workshops, enrolling 143 teachers in 453 workshops.

Again, in 1989, Tarrant County Junior College acquired funding through the Education for Economic Security Act, Title II, to support its summer project for teachers. Monies were allocated for methodology specialists; for tuition, materials, and travel stipends for participants; and for publicity, instructional materials, and evaluation. TCJC received a total of $37,863 from EESA for these project costs.

COOPERATING LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY

The two cooperating local education agencies for the project were Fort Worth Independent School District and Birdville Independent School District. Both districts had pledged to support the project financially, providing tuition and/or material stipends to their teachers. Birdville paid $1000 in tuition, up from $595 in the 1988 project. In 1988 Fort Worth had paid $2500 in tuition and materials stipends and had pledged the same amount for 1989. However, the committed funds were reallocated during the academic year within the school district, leaving no monies available for foreign languages.

RECRUITMENT OF PARTICIPANTS

Once the project was funded by EESA, the directors implemented the publicity and recruitment campaign. The most effective recruitment activity was the distribution of invitation letters and application forms by mail. Personally-addressed letters were sent to all foreign language teachers in the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex school districts and to all participants in prior TCJC workshops. Packets of materials

were sent to the foreign language consultants and progra- directors in the major cities of Texas. Similarly, letters were sent to the department of foreign language in every secondary school in Texas with an enrollment of 150 or more students.

In an effort to reach and recruit minority teachers and teachers assigned to schools with high minority student populations, the directors requested from all Regional Service Centers in Texas a list of these teachers in their service areas. About fifty percent of these centers responded to this request. Personal letters encouraging workshop participation were sent to these teachers. In addition, Fort Worth and Arlington ISD's provided TCJC with lists of their minority teachers and their minority-populated schools. Personal letters were also sent to these teachers.

Furthermore, the directors contacted the Fort Worth and Dallas Catholic Dioceses who in turn delivered packets of letters and applications to every school in their dioceses.

In addition to the direct-mail campaign, other recruitment efforts were made. Brochures, letters, and application forms were distributed at:

- the spring conference of the Texas Foreign Language Association,
- the spring meeting of the Lone Star Chapter of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese.

Announcements were placed in the bulletin of TFLA and AATSP. Inquiries and enrollments by interested teachers resulted from each publicity activity.

Since more applications were received than there were funded places available in the workshops, priority for registration was given to (1) teachers who had assignments in minority-populated schools, (2) teachers identified as belonging to historically-underrepresented groups, (3) teachers from Fort Worth, Arlington, Birdville, and Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School Districts, (4) teachers who had not studied or traveled in a country where their language of instruction is spoken natively, (5) teachers with less than five years experience, (6) teachers from other disciplines who had been assigned a language class. All applicants from these categories received full funding from the grant. After these recipients had been named, the other applications were processed in order of date received.

Of the 256 total workshop enrollments by 81 participants, 246 were paid by funding agencies (EESA--218; Birdville--28). In addition, three other independent school districts chose to support their teachers in this professional development activity by paying their tuition totally in the amount of $280. The remaining teachers paid their own tuition, for a total of $1900. However, reimbursement of $1440 of this amount was made possible from previously committed funds due to last-minute cancellations.

EESA allocated a total of $6180 to be disbursed to defray the participants' travel expenses. Of the 69 participants funded by EESA, 24 came from outside a 35 mile radius of the TCJC-NE Campus. Six eligible participants lived within the 35-75 mile range and received funds for a round trip to and from the campus for each day of the workshop. Eighteen eligible participants lived outside the 75 mile range and thus received expenses for a round trip for each week they attended a workshop.

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE AND CURRICULUM

The workshops were designed to support the theme of Strategies for Proficiency in Second Language Acquisition. They were developed both to improve oral communication skills and to teach contemporary instructional methodologies. The titles and topics were:

1. Integrating Higher Order Thinking Skills into a Content-Based Curriculum

2. Teaching Listening and Reading Strategies

3. Write from the Beginning: Integrating Writing Skills into a Proficiency-Based Classroom

4. Testing the Way We Teach

5. Reality Building through the Color Connection

6. French Conversation Strategies for Teachers

7. Spanish Conversation Strategies for Teachers

8. Spanish Conversation Strategies, Session II

9. Materials Development

The workshops were scheduled over a period of four weeks with sessions offered between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. They were scheduled so that participants could choose to attend all day, mornings only, afternoons only, from one to four weeks, taking from one workshop of 16 hours to eight workshops totaling 128 hours.

Week 1   8:00-11:50 Reality Building through the Color Connection

Instructors:

Carol Stacy, Carrollton-Farmers Branch I.S.D.

and Laurie Nesrala, Birdville I.S.D.

1:00- 2:50 Materials Development

Instructors:

Carol Stacy and Laurie Nesrala

3:00- 4:50 French/Spanish Conversation Strategies for Teachers.

Instructors:

(French) Madeleine Lively, TCJC, and

Dr. Mary Williams, TCJC

(Spanish) Carol Stacy and

Gilberto Hinojosa, TCJC

Week 2 8:00-11:50 Write from the Beginning: Integrating Writing Skills into a Proficiency-Based Classroom

Consultant: Dr. Robert M. Terry

University of Richmond

Richmond, Virginia

1:00- 2:50 Materials Development, continued

3:00- 4:50 French/Spanish Conversation, continued

Week 3 8:00-11:50 Integrating Higher Order Thinking Skills into a Content-Based Curriculum.

Consultant: Dr. Miriam Met

Montgomery County Schools, Maryland

1:00- 2:50 Testing the Way We Teach

Consultant: Dr. Miriam Met

3:00- 4:50 Spanish Conversation Strategies for Teachers, Session II

Instructor: Jim Palmer, TCJC

Week 4 8:00-11:50 Teaching Listening and Reading Strategies

Consultant: Dr. June Phillips

Tennessee Foreign Language Institute

1:00- 2:50 Testing the Way We Teach, continued

Consultant: Dr. June Phillips

3:00- 4:50 Spanish Conversation Strategies, continued

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

The 81 participants in the workshops represented a variety of grade levels and ethnic groups as indicated in the following tables:

TABLE I

TEACHING GRADE LEVEL OF PARTICIPANTS

Teaching Grades K - 5	4
Teaching Grades 6 - 12	81

(Some teach at both levels)

TABLE II

RACE/ETHNICITY OF PARTICIPANTS

Black	2
Hispanic	8
Asian or Pacific Islander	0
American Indian	0
Anglo	71

TABLE III

RACE/ETHNICITY OF STUDENTS OF PARTICIPANTS

Black	811
Hispanic	957
Asian or Pacific Islander	352
American Indian	20
Anglo	6,330

TABLE IV

PUBLIC/PRIVATE SCHOOL AFFILIATION OF PARTICIPANTS

Public Schools   72

Private Schools   13

     (Some teach at both)

EVALUATION

Evaluation of the workshops was based on two distinct procedures: (1) a comparison of pre- and post-assessment questionnaires on each of the workshops completed by each participant and (2) in-class observation of a sampling of teachers during the fall semester following the workshops.

A number of factors must be considered in the evaluation of the project, the focus of which can be considered as three-fold:

1. the language proficiency development of the participants;

2. the acquisition of information about current foreign language methodologies; and

3. the development of materials for use in raising their own students' language proficiency.

Language Proficiency Development of the Participants

A major set of objectives centered around the development of the participant's own language proficiency. In order to provide proper oral language modeling and comprehensible input in the classroom, teachers must themselves feel secure in their speaking ability. It is reasonable to assume that if a teacher perceives a personal gain in speaking ability, then an increased ability will follow, usually due to more practice and risk-taking. As the teacher's oral proficiency increases, the students receive improved modeling and comprehensible

input, subsequently enhancing the environment necessary to produce higher oral skills in the students.

Language development workshops were offered in French a..d Spanish. Each workshop consisted of sixteen hours of instruction, two hours per day for two four-day weeks. A second two-week wo.kshop was offered in Spanish, giving participants an opportunity for thirty-two classroom hours over a four-week period.

Instructional activities included focus on higher order thinking skills and incorporation of culture into daily teaching strategies and sustained discourse.

Since there were no oral proficiency pre- or post-workshop interviews conducted in order to measure the participants' gain in proficiency level, the evaluation instruments were based on the participants' perception of their own gains. Participants completed two separate assessment instruments before and after the language development workshops. The first of these was based on descriptors drawn from the speaking and understanding categories of the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. Table V shows the participants perceived gains in speaking and understanding in each language. Appendix A contains the evaluation documents with pre- and post-workshop scores on each item.

TABLE V

PERCEIVED LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

SPEAKING

Language	Pre	Post	Difference
French	3.39	3.91	+.52
Spanish, Session I	3.54	4.08	+.54
Spanish, Session II	3.91	4.34	+.43

UNDERSTANDING

Language	Pre	Post	Difference
French	3.29	3.98	+.69
Spanish, Session I	3.59	4.16	+.57
Spanish, Session II	3.95	4.42	+.47

The second document was a Communication Skills Oral Self-Rating completed by the participants at the beginning and end of these workshops. This instrument measured the participants' confidence in speaking as well as their perceived strengths and weaknesses in specific areas of language use. Table VI shows the gains made by participants in each language. Appendix B contains the evaluation documents with pre- and post-workshop scores on each item.

TABLE VI

CONFIDENCE IN SPEAKING

Language	Pre	Post	Difference
French	2.59	3.43	+.84
Spanish, Session I	3.00	3.78	+.78
Spanish, Session II	3.34	4.18	+.84

PERCEIVED LANGUAGE ABILITY IN SPECIFIC AREAS

Language	Pre	Post	Difference
French	2.50	3.26	+.76
Spanish, Session I	2.93	3.44	+.51
Spanish, Session II	3.12	3.57	+.45

Observations

1. Spanish teachers rated themselves higher at the outset, possibly reflecting

   a. more opportunity to practice Spanish in Texas

   b. the presence of some native speakers in the group.

2. The French teachers generally perceived greater gains, possibly because their initial rating was lower and progress advances faster at the lower levels.

3. In Session II of Spanish, the perceived amount of growth in speaking and understanding and confidence was lower than in Session I, possibly because Session II included some participants from Session I who had already indicated a growth rate and because the initial pre-test average was higher in Session II with growth being more difficult to perceive at higher levels.

4. An item analysis of the documents in Appendix B from which the summary data has been drawn reveals that the areas of greatest perceived growth in Spanish are casual conversation vocabulary, slang, and current events/political vocabulary.

5. An item analysis of the documents in Appendix B from which the summary data has been drawn reveals that the areas of greatest perceived growth in French are classroom vocabulary, casual conversation vocabulary, and slang vocabulary.

Conclusions

1. Participants in both languages showed increases in perceived abilities in speaking and understanding.

2. Participants in both languages showed increased confidence in speaking.

3. Participants in both languages showed growth in perceived language ability in the following specific areas: casual conversation vocabulary, slang, current events/political

vocabulary, literary vocabulary, and classroom vocabulary. The Spanish showed a slight perceived decline in grammar skills.

Acquisition of Information about Current Methodologies

A second major set of objectives of the project centered around the acquisition of information about current foreign language methodologies appropriate for communication-based classrooms.

The workshops provided to meet these objectives were Reality Building through the Color Connection, taught by Carol Stacy and Laurie Nesrala; Write from the Beginning, taught by Dr. Robert M. Terry; Higher Order Thinking Skills, taught by Dr. Miriam Met; Teaching Listening and Reading Strategies, taught by Dr. June Phillips; and Testing the Way We Teach, taught by Dr. Met and Dr. Phillips, each in conjunction with their respective topics.

Pre- and post-assessment instruments which provided ratings on a scale of 1 to 5 were used in the workshops on Reality Building, Writing, and Listening and Reading. Table VII shows the gains in information made by the participants in each of these workshops. Appendix C contains the evaluation documents with the pre- and post-workshop scores on each item.

TABLE VII

Workshop	Pre	Post	Difference
Reality Building	3.53	4.77	+1.24
Writing	2.50	4.09	+1.59
Listening and Reading	2.15	4.19	+2.04

An additional scale was used in the Reality Building and in the Listening and Reading workshop to determine gains in ability to utilize the methodological concepts treated. This second scale was developed by the consultants and directors who have worked in the TCJC projects for five consecutive years. It had become apparent that although many language teachers may have been exposed to some current foreign language methodologies, many have not yet had enough training in order to be able to utilize those methods in their own classrooms. Table VIII shows those gains.

TABLE VIII

Workshop	Pre	Post	Difference
Reality Building	3.21	4.59	+1.38
Listening and Reading	1.91	4.20	+2.29

Observations

1. The greatest gains, both in information acquired and in degree of utilization, were made in the Listening and Reading workshop. Participants' initial ratings on this topic were the lowest of all the workshops but ultimately showed the greatest gain. A possible explanation for the low starting point is the comparative lack of attention to the receptive skills for the last several years during which time greater professional emphasis has been placed on the development of oral proficiency. The dramatic gain may be indicative of the participants' need for and receptiveness to the topic.

2. The pre-assessment scores for the Reality Building workshop were dramatically higher, possibly due to the fact that the workshop has been so popular that it draws "repeat participants" who came into the workshop with more previous knowledge.

3. The amount of gain was lower for the Reality Building workshop, possibly because the initial ratings started at a significantly higher point and progess advances more slowly at higher levels.

4. Despite the lower degree of gain, the final ratings for the Reality Building workshop were the highest on both scales, indicating that participants perceived themselves to be adept both in their knowledge of the methodology and in their ability to utilize it.

5. The gains perceived by the participants were significantly greater in methodology workshops than in language development workshops, possibly because (a) language learning takes many hours of exposure and practice to register gain, (b) progress advances more slowly at a higher level, and foreign language teachers have been studying their language longer than their methodologies, and (c) current methodologies in foreign language teaching were relatively new to the participants and therefore the room for gain was greater.

6. Pre- and post-assessments in the Higher Order Thinking Skills and in the two Testing workshops were not developed on the 1 to 5 scale and, therefore, cannot be considered in this analysis of data. Those assessments were in the form of open-ended questionnaires which do not lend themselves readily to comparative analysis. In general, exceptionally low pre-assessment responses and remarkable gains in both information and utilization were noted.

Conclusions

1. In all the workshops teaching methodology, gains in perceived acquisition of information were evidenced by participants.

2. In the workshops polled for gain in ability to utilize the
    methodologies in the classroom, participants evidenced a
    perceived gain.

Development of Materials to Increase Communication in the Classroom

A third major set of objectives centered around the development of
activities and materials to increase the comprehensible input necessary
for developing communication skills. Teachers often express frustration
with inservice workshops that present theory and methodology but that
leave them without the fundamental physical tools necessary to
implement the newly-gained techniques in the classroom.

The two workshops dealing with materials development were Reality
Building and Materials Development. The Reality Building workshop
consisted of the explanation and demonstration of learning theories and
the visuals and props to implement those theories while the Materials
Development workshop allowed the participants time to actually develop
their own personal sets of supplies.

In the Materials Development workshop dramatic results were noted
in the participants' reporting of their increased supply of materials,
both in terms of subject content addressed and in medium. (See
Appendix D for item analysis.)

TABLE IX

PARTICIPANTS REPORTING AVAILABILITY OF ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

Vocabulary   100%

Subject-Verb Agreement   82.76%

Noun-Adjective Agreement   93.33%

Verb Conjugations   86.67%

Pronoun Cases   85.19%

Culture   90.32%

Geography   77.42%

Conversation   96.55%

Participants noted their increase in pedagogical materials by medium on a scale of 1 to 5, "not at all" to "significantly."

TABLE X

INCREASE IN SUPPLY OF PEDOGOGICAL MATERIALS BY MEDIUM

Slides   1.31

Visual Aids   4.84

Computer-Generated Art   3.83

Audio Tapes   2.63

Teaching Games   4.26

Posters and Signs   4.77

Observations

1. It is worth noting that most participants show that they developed materials to enhance their teaching of culture, geography, and conversation as well as the more traditional grammatical concepts.

2. Most teachers appear to have produced a broad range of materials, both in terms of subject content and media.

3. The low score in the slides category can be attributed to the short time span of the workshop.

Conclusion

Teachers left the workshops with noticeably increased supplies to take back to their classrooms. In addition, the instructors reported an atmosphere of enthusiastic production and sharing on the part of the participants.

Post-Workshop Classroom Visits

The evaluation process also included classroom observations of a sampling of the participants. Twenty-four French and Spanish secondary teachers were visited and observed while teaching a typical class in their own school setting. These teachers were selected on the bases of their accessibility to the evaluating personnel (in the Dallas-Ft. Worth metropolitan area), their willingness to receive an evaluator, their having attended a representative number of workshops in the project, and their role in achieving a balance in representation of priority groups targeted by the project. The observation instrument used was a modified version of the form provided in 1988 by the Coordinating Board. Appendix E contains some sample observation instruments.

Evaluators of 1989 participants were Carol Stacy, Carrollton-Farmers Branch I.S.D.; Laurie Nesrala, Birdville I.S.D.; Robert Adams, Fort Worth Country Day School; Elias Rodriguez, Dallas I.S.D. and Tarrant County Junior College Northeast Campus; and Dr. Jane Harper, Madeleine Lively, and Dr. Mary Williams of Tarrant County Junior College Northeast Campus.

The teachers visited were observed in consideration of the type(s) of workshops (language development, methodology, materials development) they attended. Their comments in the post-visit interview were also noted in order to get a summative report of the most helpful aspects of their summer experience that are manifesting themselves now in the classroom three months into the school year. (See Appendix E for sample Observation Reports.)

Observations

1. Teachers in the language development workshops report and show evidence of added self-confidence and subsequently more extensive use of the target language in the classroom.

2. Methodology participants show greater variety of classroom activities, and their students show more motivation and involvement. Some do, however, still show a certain reliance on former more traditional methods while incorporating selected new activities as time for preparation permits.

3. Materials development participants are immediately identified by the physical decor of their classrooms, having created a "cultural island" for their students. The use of manipulatives and props for contextualization was observed as widespread and was enthusiastically received by students. Evaluators noted that classes using support materials stayed more consistently in the target language.

4. All teachers visited report a renewed sense of self-confidence, preparedness, and job satisfaction as a direct result of their participation in the summer workshops.

APPENDIX A

DEVELOPMENT OF PARTICIPANTS' LEVEL OF
LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

Language Development Workshop - French

Language Development Workshop - Spanish, Session 1

Language Development Workshop - Spanish, Session 2

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP – FRENCH

Indicate the degree to which you can display the following skills in the target language:

SPEAKING:

	Pre	Post	Difference
1. Can speak isolated words and a few high-frequency phrases.	4.57	4.86	+.29
2. Can speak basic courtesies.	4.14	4.43	+.29
3. Can ask and answer simple questions dealing with basic objects, places and family.	4.29	4.57	+.28
4. Can initiate, minimally sustain, and close basic communicative tasks; can ask and answer questions.	4.14	4.43	+.29
5. Can introduce self, order a meal, ask directions, and make purchases.	4.00	4.43	+.43
6. Can talk simply about self, family members, personal history and leisure activities.	3.71	4.43	+.72
7. Can maintain connected discourse for simple narrative and/or description.	3.00	3.86	+.86
8. Can satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.	3.00	3.86	+.86
9. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence, support opinions, explain in detail and hypothesize.	2.43	3.14	+.71
10. Can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional and abstract topics.	2.00	2.86	+.86
11. Can support opinions and hypothesize using native-like discourse strategies.	2.00	2.14	+.14
Overall Average	3.39	3.91	+.52

UNDERSTANDING:

	Pre	Post	Difference
12. Can understand occasional isolated words such as cognates and borrowed words.	4.14	4.71	+.57
13. Can understand words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae.	4.14	4.57	+.43
14. Can understand main ideas and/or some facts dealing with basic personal and social needs.	3.86	4.29	+.43
15. Can understand sentence-length speech on lodging, transportation and shopping.	3.86	4.43	+.57
16. Can understand short routine telephone conversations, simple announcements and reports over the media.	2.86	3.71	+.85
17. Can understand main ideas of description and narrative in different time frames (present, past, habitual, or imperfect).	3.17	3.86	+.69
18. Can understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect.	2.43	3.86	+1.43
19. Can understand technical discussions in a academic/professional settings, in lectures speeches and reports.	1.86	2.43	+.57
Overall Average	3.29	3.98	+.69

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP - SPANISH, Session 1

Indicate the deg.ee to which you can display the following skills in the target language:

SPEAKING:	Pre	Post	Difference
1. Can speak isolated words and a few high-frequency phrases.	4.56	4.80	+.24
2. Can speak basic courtesies.	4.20	4.84	+.64
3. Can ask and answer simple questions dealing with basic objects, places and family.	4.24	4.52	+.28
4. Can initiate, minimally sustain, and close basic communicative tasks; can ask and answer questions.	4.08	4.52	+ 44
5. Can introduce self, order a meal, ask directions, and make purchases.	3.96	4.48	+.52
6. Can talk simply about self, family members, personal history and leisure activities.	3.84	4.44	+.60
7. Can maintain connected discourse for simple narrative and/or description.	3.40	4.08	+.68
8. Can satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.	3.40	3.96	+.56
9. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence, support opinions, explain in detail and hypothesize.	2.76	3.40	+.64
10. Can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional and abstract topics.	2.44	3.16	+.72
11. Can support opinions and hypothesize using native-like discourse strategies.	2.04	2.72	+.08
Overall Average	3.54	4.08	+.54

UNDERSTANDING:	Pre	Post	Difference
12. Can understand occasional isolated words such as cognates and borrowed words.	4.56	4.88	+.32
13. Can understand words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae.	4.40	4.76	+.36
14. Can understand main ideas and/or some facts dealing with basic personal and social needs.	4.04	4.64	+.60
15. Can understand sentence-length speech on lodging, transportation and shopping.	3.80	4.36	+.56
16. Can understand short routine telephone conversations, simple announcements and reports over the media.	3.54	3.96	+.42
17. Can understand main ideas of description and narrative in different time frames (present, past, habitual, or imperfect).	3.28	3.88	+.60
18. Can understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect.	3.08	3.84	+.76
19. Can understand technical discussions in a academic/professional settings, in lectures speeches and reports.	2.04	2.96	+.92
Overall Average	3.59	4.16	+.57

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP — SPANISH, Session 2

Indicate the degree to which you can display the following skills in the target language:

SPEAKING:	Pre	Post	Difference
1. Can speak isolated words and a few high-frequency phrases.	4.67	4.75	+.08
2. Can speak basic courtesies.	4.58	4.75	+.17
3. Can ask and answer simple questions dealing with basic objects, places and family.	4.58	4.75	+.17
4. Can initiate, minimally sustain, and close basic communicative tasks; can ask and answer questions.	4.33	4.75	+.42
5. Can introduce self, order a meal, ask directions, and make purchases.	4.33	4.75	+.42
6. Can talk simply about self, family members, personal history and leisure activities.	4.17	4.67	+.50
7. Can maintain connected discourse for simple narrative and/or description.	3.83	4.42	+.59
8. Can satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.	3.92	4.33	+.41
9. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence, support opinions, explain in detail and hypothesize.	3.08	3.50	+.42
10. Can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional and abstract topics.	2.92	4.17	+1.25
11. Can support opinions and hypothesize using native-like discourse strategies.	2.58	2.92	+.34
Overall Average	3.91	4.34	+.43

UNDERSTANDING:	Pre	Post	Difference
12. Can understand occasional isolated words such as cognates and borrowed words.	4.67	4.75	+.08
13. Can understand words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae.	4.50	4.67	+.17
14. Can understand main ideas and/or some facts dealing with basic personal and social needs.	4.17	4.67	+.50
15. Can understand sentence-length speech on lodging, transportation and shopping.	4.18	4.67	+.49
16. Can understand short routine telephone conversations, simple announcements and reports over the media.	4.00	4.58	+.58
17. Can understand main ideas of description and narrative in different time frames (present, past, habitual, or imperfect).	3.75	4.33	+.58
18. Can understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect.	3.42	4.25	+.83
19. Can understand technical discussions in a academic/professional settings, in lectures speeches and reports.	2.92	3.42	+.50
Overall Average	3.95	4.42	+.47

APPENDIX B

DEVELOPMENT OF PERCEIVED LANGUAGE ABILITY IN
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS

Communication Skills Oral Self-Rating – French

Communication Skills Oral Self-Rating – Spanish, Session 1

Communication Skills Oral Self-Rating – Spanish, Session 2

COMMUNICATION SKILLS ORAL SELF-RATING — FRENCH

1. How would you describe your current oral abilities in French?

	Pre	Post		Pre	Post
Novice Low	0	0			
Novice Mid	3	0	Advanced	3	5
Novice High	2	4	Advanced Plus	1	1
Intermediate Low	8	2	Superior	1	1
Intermediate Mid	7	6			
Intermediate High	7	12			

2. How confident of your abilities in French do you feel in each of these situations?

	Pre	Post	Difference
a. In your classes	3.57	4.57	+1.00
b. With students outside of class	3.43	3.57	+.14
c. With colleagues	2.57	3.71	+1.14
d. With other teachers from other schools	2.43	3.57	+1.14
e. In formal situations with predetermined topics	2.43	3.43	+1.00
f. In social situations with native speakers	1.86	2.71	+.85
g. With native speakers in their country	1.86	2.43	+.57
Totals	2.59	3.43	+.84

3. Indicate your strengths and weaknesses in each area.

	Pre	Post	Difference
a. Grammar	3.71	4.14	+.43
b. Classroom vocabulary	3.57	4.57	+1.00
c. Casual conversation	2.71	3.71	+1.00
d. Current events/political vocabulary	1.86	2.29	+.43
e. Literary vocabulary	1.86	2.57	+.71
f. Slang	1.29	2.29	+1.00
Totals	2.50	3.26	+.76

COMMUNICATION SKILLS ORAL SELF-RATING - SPANISH, Session 1

1. How would you describe your current oral abilities in Spanish?

	Pre	Post		Pre	Post
Novice Low	0	0			
Novice Mid	1	0	Advanced	0	0
Novice High	1	1	Advanced Plus	2	1
Intermediate Low	0	2	Superior	0	0
Intermediate Mid	3	1			
Intermediate High	0	1			

2. How confident of your abilities in Spanish do you feel in each of these situations?

		Pre	Post	Difference
a.	In your classes	3.67	4.44	+.77
b.	With students outside of class	3.44	4.33	+.89
c.	With colleagues	3.06	3.78	+.72
d.	With other teachers from other schools	2.82	3.61	+.79
e.	In formal situations with predetermined topics	3.06	3.89	+.83
f.	In social situations with native speakers	2.56	3.22	+.66
g.	With native speakers in their country	2.39	3.17	+.78
	Totals	3.00	3.78	+.78

3. Indicate your strengths and weaknesses in each area.

		Pre	Post	Difference
a.	Grammar	4.94	4.35	-.59
b.	Classroom vocabulary	4.17	4.50	+.33
c.	Casual conversation	2.83	3.89	+1.06
d.	Current events/political vocabulary	1.94	2.72	+.78
e.	Literary vocabulary	2.28	2.67	+.39
f.	Slang	1.44	2.50	+1.06
	Totals	2.93	3.78	+.85

COMMUNICATION SKILLS ORAL SELF-RATING — SPANISH, Session 2

1. How would you describe your current oral abilities in Spanish?

	Pre	Post			Pre	Post
Novice Low	0	0				
Novice Mid	1	0	Advanced		2	2
Novice High	0	1	Advanced Plus		4	2
Intermediate Low	5	1	Superior		0	2
Intermediate Mid	2	3				
Intermediate High	1	4				

2. How confident of your abilities in Spanish do you feel in each of these situations?

		Pre	Post	Difference
a.	In your classes	4.29	4.71	+.42
b.	With students outside of class	3.77	4.57	+.8
c.	With colleagues	3.21	4.31	+1.1
d.	With other teachers from other schools	3.15	4.14	+.99
e.	In formal situations with predetermined topics	3.43	4.29	+.86
f.	In social situations with native speakers	2.77	3.71	+.94
g.	With native speakers in their country	2.77	3.50	+.73
	Totals	3.34	4.18	+.84

3. Indicate your strengths and weaknesses in each area.

		Pre	Post	Difference
a.	Grammar	4.17	4.14	-.03
b.	Classroom vocabulary	4.50	4.64	+.14
c.	Casual conversation	3.50	4.43	+.93
d.	Current events/political vocabulary	2.62	3.29	+.67
e.	Literary vocabulary	2.38	2.93	+.55
f.	Slang	2.00	2.64	+.64
	Totals	3.12	3.57	+.45

APPENDIX C

ACQUISITION OF INFORMATION ABOUT
CURRENT METHODOLGOIES

Reality Building, Scale A

Reality Building, Scale B

Writing

Listening and Reading, Scale A

Listening and Reading, Scale B

COLOR CONNECTION - BUILDING AN ARTIFICIAL REALITY
Scale A: Degree of Awareness

	Pre	Post	Difference
1. Increasing a student's involvement (both physically and mentally) in the learning situation increases his comprehension and retention.	4.30	4.82	-0.52
2. An Artificial Reality can be created that makes language production the logical outcome of the situation.	3.48	4.82	+1.34
3. Manipultives (supplies for hands-on activities) can teach both vocabulary and grammar.	3.97	4.91	+0.94
4. Associating a word with an object or person facilitates comprehension and retention (Paired Associative Learning).	3.61	4.88	+1.27
5. Creating a "Group Memory," makes language real.	2.61	4.76	+2.15
6. Vocabulary words can be presented in a visual way, so that their meanings are obvious, allowing instant comprehension and communication.	3.91	4.91	+1.00
7. Mental maps for grammar concepts can be artificially created by using color, symbols, physical forms, and locations.	3.00	4.76	+1.76
8. Physical reactions or symbols can replace technical grammatical terminology.	2.76	4.67	+1.91
9. A logically connected series of utterances is easier to learn than disconnected phrases (Gouin series).	3.70	4.45	+0.75
10. Relating new grammatical and lexical items to prior knowledge facilitates learning.	4.00	4.73	+0.73
Overall Average	3.53	4.77	+1.24

COLOR CONNECTION - BUILDING AN ARTIFICIAL REALITY
Scale B: Degree of Ability to Utilize

		Pre	Post	Difference
1.	Increasing a student's involvement (both physically and mentally) in the learning situation increases his comprehension and retention.	3.76	4.70	+0.94
2.	An Artificial Reality can be created that makes language production the logical outcome of the situation.	2.18	4.64	+2.46
3.	Manipultives (supplies for hands-on activities) can teach both vocabulary and grammar.	3.76	4.72	+0.96
4.	Associating a word with an object or person facilitates comprehension and retention (Paired Associative Learning).	3.52	4.76	+1.24
5.	Creating a 'Group Memory," makes language real.	2.78	4.52	+1.74
6.	Vocabulary words can be presented in a visual way, so that their meanings are obvious, allowing instant comprehension and communication.	3.76	4.76	+1.00
7.	Mental maps for grammar concepts can be artificially created by using color, symbols, physical forms, and locations.	3.03	4.45	+1.42
8.	Physical reactions or symbols can replace technical grammatical terminology.	2.58	4.36	+1.78
9.	A logically connected series of utterances is easier to learn than disconnected phrases (Gouin series).	3.21	4.33	+1.12
10.	Relating new grammatical and lexical items to prior knowledge facilitates learning.	3.63	4.49	+0.86
	Overall Average	3.21	4.59	+1.38

INTEGRATING WRITING SKILLS INTO A
PROFICIENCY-BASED CLASSROOM

How would you evaluate your knowledge of the following aspects of teaching and testing writing?

		Pre	Post	Difference
1.	Writing as a support skill	2.71	4.06	+1.35
2.	Writing as a communicative skill	2.73	4.15	+1.42
3.	Creating realistic, contextualized writing activities	2.36	4.06	+1.70
4.	Developing realistic writing tasks appropriate to the level of linguistic sophistication of the students	2.30	3.91	+1.61
5.	Techniques of evaluating open-ended writing tasks	2.12	4.00	+1.88
6.	Fair evaluation of the work of students who take the risk to go beyond what is asked for in writing	2.39	4.12	+1.73
7.	Providing helpful feedback to students on their samples of writing	2.67	4.06	+1.39
8.	Why you ask students to write in your classroom	2.94	4.39	+1.45
	Overall Average	2.50	4.09	+1.59

TEACHING READING AND LISTENING STRATEGIES
Scale A: Theoretical Background

	Pre	Post	Difference
1. I am aware of definitions and concepts associated with the "processes" of reading.	2.21	4.32	+2.11
2. I am able to cite similarities and differences in reading L1 and L2.	1.68	4.32	+2.64
3. I know why listening and reading are currently referred to as "receptive" skills rather than "passive."	2.53	4.68	+2.15
4. I understand how concepts such as "advanced organizers" and "schemata" might apply to second language listening and reading.	1.69	4.16	+2.47
5. Reading and listening materials require that students comprehend the majority of language forms and words contained in them.	1.95	3.63	+1.68
6. Reading and listening in a proficiency orientation are primarily matters of text choice.	2.00	3.84	+1.84
7. What the learner brings to a reading or listening passage is an important factor.	3.26	4.47	+1.21
8. I understand the interactive process as it applies to the receptive skills.	1.74	4.11	+2.37
Overall Average	2.15	4.19	+2.04

34

TEACHING READING AND LISTENING STRATEGIES
Scale B: Classroom Practices

		Pre	Post	Difference
1.	I use and can design effective pre-reading and pre-listening activities.	2.05	4.47	+2.42
2.	I know how to "edit the task and not the text."	1.68	4.32	+2.64
3.	I can create skimming/scanning activities for authentic texts.	1.79	4.47	+2.68
4.	I use a lot of different techniques for teaching decoding skills.	1.56	4.16	+2.60
5.	I use comprehension checking procedures which do not mix in speaking/writing skills.	1.95	3.68	+1.73
6.	I pitch the receptive materials above my students' speaking/writing abilities.	2.21	4.00	+1.79
7.	I know how to help students access authentic reading/listening passages.	1.95	4.32	+2.37
8.	I can test receptive skills without unduly relying on recall.	2.05	4.32	+2.27
9.	I use receptive skills effectively as springboards to other language activities.	2.00	4.05	+2.05
10.	I draw receptive skills materials from the spectrum of what native speakers read and hear.	1.85	4.21	+2.36
	Overall Average	1.91	4.20	+2.29

36

APPENDIX D

ACQUISITION OF MATERIALS

Materials Development

Materials Development Workshop *

1. I now have at my disposal these **additional** pedagogical materials for use in my classroom that will aid in teaching in the following areas:

		yes	% yes	no
a.	vocabulary	31	100.00	0
b.	subject-verb agreement	24	82.76	5
c.	noun-adjective agreement	28	93.38	2
d.	verb conjugation	26	86.67	4
e.	pronoun cases	23	85.19	4
f.	culture	28	90.32	3
g.	geography	24	77.42	7
h.	conversation	28	96.55	1

2. I feel that I have increased my supply of the following pedagogical materials :

		% of Increase
a.	slides	1.31
b.	visual aids	4.84
c.	computer-generated art	3.83
d.	audio tapes (excluding text-accompanied)	2.63
e.	teaching games	4.26
f.	posters and signs	4.77

* these calculations are <u>only</u> from Post-Assessment

APPENDIX E

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION EVALUATION SAMPLES

POST ASSESSMENT EVALUATION VISIT

Name of Teacher - Participant:

__Anna Wood_____

Date of Evaluation: __18 October 1989_____

Participant's School __L. D. Bell High School, HEB ISD_____

Class Observed: (Example - Spanish I)

__French II_____

1989 EESA Workshops Attended:

__Materials Development, 1989_____

__Higher Order Thinking Skills, Fall, 1989_____

Color Connection, 1989

Name of Evaluator:

__Jane Harper_____

General goals of the summer workshops

	Abundant source of comprehensible input Ⓨ/ N / NA	Richly contextualized (visuals, realia, manipulatives) Ⓨ/ N / NA	Oriented to communication Ⓨ N / NA
1. Teacher's presentation	-General classroom comments in French (high frequency) -Presentation of "shopping places and owners" was done in English; it could have been done in French.	Exceptional in quality & quantity & variety: banners of shopping places "strip" vocabulary ascend walls	-Little actual presentation; mostly activity based on previous presentations -Communication basis for all activity
2. Activities, classroom practice	-Excellent! "Teacher talk" for student response by standing and trading cards. -Extra activity for restricting manipulatives. -All activities evidence of skills acquired in workshops	-Exceptional! -laminated food cards -"Hole for face" placards used by students in mini-skits. -Slides&cards & banners and classroom materials posted on walls were made during or after workshops.	Communication goal of activities. -Classifying activity related to "HOTS" workshop
3. Assignments, tests	Assignment of skit using vocabulary	- "Face" placards to represent places - Assignment for costumes for roles - Price lists	-Goal-communication in real-life situations

Post observation interview comments:

POST ASSESSMENT EVALUATION VISIT

Name of Teacher - Participant:

_____ Par Wieland _____

Date of Evaluation: _____ 19 October 1989 _____

Participant's School _____ L. D. Bell High School _____

Class Observed: (Example - Spanish I)

_____ Spanish II . _____

1989 EESA Workshops Attended:

_ Write from the Beginning, Higher Order Thinking skills, Teaching

_ Listening and Reading Strategies _____

Name of Evaluator:
    Jane Harper
_____

General goals of the summer workshops

	Abundant source of comprehensible input Y / (N) / NA	Richly contextualized (visuals, realia, manipulatives) (Y) / N / NA	Oriented to communication Y/ (N) / NA
1. Teacher's presentation	Presentation phases were in English <u>about</u> language (Review for test that day)	Extensive use of visuals in test review & presentation: –representations of sentence structure on board; –magnetic accent marks; –posters-drawings & words –song on the tape with worksheet	No for testing Yes for some of the activities. concern: use of English; use of English/ Spanish pure vocabulary
2. Activities, classroom practice	(y) –Excellent vocabulary review in language, reviewing days, months, colors, numbers, clothes, countries, family, cities, foods, <u>etc.</u> –TPR activity	(y) Rich collection and use of visual materials and taped materials: picture cards, mini flash cards, chalkboard displays.	(y) & (n) –Vocabulary review in pairs. "Pesetas" given to groups based on evaluation of their cooperative activity from the day before-(direct use of techniques form Met & Lively) Pure TPR (1988 workshop)
3. Assignments, tests	(y) –Publisher's test: written and taped.	"Visualized" assignments: use of placards to call attention to various parts of assignments.	(n) More vocabulary memorization than anything else-Eng/Spn

Post observation interview comments·
   Super use of display of materials: piñatas covering ceiling , flags, alphabet
serapeS , mailbox, computer-generated banner (direct workshop impact)

POST ASSESSMENT EVALUATION VISIT

Name of Teacher - Participant:

Rachel Toom

Date of Evaluation: 17 October 1989

Participant's School Richland High School

Class Observed: (Example - Spanish I)

French I

1989 EESA Workshops Attended:

Conversation Strategies. Write from Beginning Higher Order Thinking Skills
Testing the Way We Teach I & II   Listening & Reading Strategies

Name of Evaluator:

Mary Williams

General goals of the summer workshops

	Abundant source of comprehensible input Y / N / NA	Richly contextualized (visuals, realia, manipulatives) Y / N / NA	Oriented to communication Y / N / NA
1. Teacher's presentation	Y	NA	Y

Instruction was about half and half French and English for this first-year class. Students were repeatedly exhorted to use French for everyday politeness formulae, such as: Pardon & Merci.

2. Activities, classroom practice	N	N	N

These were traditional workbook exercises, writing sentence drills. These sentences were grammar oriented, not only uninteresting in content, but also somewhat unlikely as natural utterances, For example, Paul et Alain icoutent la radio pance quils aiment écouter la radio.

3. Assignments, tests
see above #2

Post observation interview comments·
This teacher indicated that she found all the workshops she did to be useful, mentioning Dr. Mimi Met in particular. But since she will have leadership responsibilities working with her colleagues integrating higher order thinking skills into their foreign language instruction this year, she found those aspects of the workshops of immediate importance.

POST ASSESSMENT EVALUATION VISIT

Name of Teacher - Participant:

_____ Kathy Sales _____

Date of Evaluation: ____October 17, 1989_____

Participant's School __Richland High School_____

Class Observed: (Example – Spanish I)

_____ . ____German I_____

1989 EESA Workshops Attended:

____Color.Connection Materials Development Write from the Beginning,

____Higher Order Thinking Skills. Testing the Way We Teach I & II ,

    Listening & Reading Strategies
Name of Evaluator:
    Mary Williams

<u>General goals of the summer workshops</u>

	Abundant source of comprehensible input Y / N / NA	Richly contextualized (visuals, realia, manipulatives) Y / N / NA	Oriented to communication Y, N NA
1. Teacher's presentation	Y	Y	Y

   Presentation was mostly in German well-supported by visual aids created during the Materials Development workshop. Based on models provided by the Color Connection workshop.

2. Activities, classroom practice	Y	Y	↘

Activities were varied and fast paced. Gender of ar cles was reviewed using visuals mentioned above, they're tied to vocabulary using (often clever) manipulatives. For example, a light bulb symbolized <u>die idee</u> "the idea", and a rubber spider <u>die Angst</u> "the fear" (The latter with frequent reminders that <u>Angst</u> was not "spider") These items were given to individual students who were then associated with them. Ms. Sales clearly uses a good deal of this associative learning; a couple of review activities were based on the students answering such questions as "What color did Melissa have?" "Which two people put up (the plural noun) <u>sie</u>?"
   <u>Singlingual</u> songs were used to practice phrases and sentences. Ms. Sales took some pains to make her students aware of the learning value of her methods.

3. Assignments, tests	Y	Y	Y

   A non-threatening "quiz" was done over the article/noun material, the teacher holding up the manipulative or indicating (in German) the student who had the item (see manipulative at 2 above) for students to write down the article and noun. Students checked their own work.

Post observation interview comments: This is the second summer for Ms. Sales to have done the workshops at TCJC. She condiders this opportunity along with EESA grants tantamount to having "Christmas in July' She identified the Color Connection workshop as the "most useful." Although she has a Masters degree in reading, she found June Philips' suggestions helpful in teaching reading in a foreign language. The opportunity to use computers to produce some materials was her first experience with computers and helped her overcome any apprehension she had about them.

Summarily, Ms. Sales relates that all she has learned in the workshops has made her more interested in teaching and, she believes, her students are more interested in learning. (This observer must note that Ms. Sales is certainly enthusiastic about teaching.) 4 7

Summarily, Ms. Sales relates that all she has learned in the workshops has made her more interested in teaching and, she believes, her students are more interested in learning. (This observer must note that Ms. Sales is certainly enthusiastic about teaching.)

POST ASSESSMENT EVALUATION VISIT

Name of Teacher - Participant:

_____ Marilyn Mathews _____

Date of Evaluation: __October 18, 1989_____

Participant's School __Richland High School_____

Class Observed: (Example - Spanish I)

_____. Spanish I _____

1989 EESA Workshops Attended:

__Color Connection, Materials Development, Conversation Strategies I & II,

__Write from the Beginning, Higher Order Thinking Skills, Testing the Way We

Teach I & II, Listening & Reading Strategies

Name of Evaluator:

_____ Mary Williams _____

General goals of the summer workshops

Abundant source of comprehensible input	Richly contextualized (visuals, realia, manipulatives)	Oriented to communication
Y / N / NA	Y / N / NA	Y / N / NA

1. Teacher's presentation

    Y   Y   Y

This first year Spanish class was conducted almost entirely in the target language. Ms. Matthews used (fairly) short sentences, familiar vocabulary, large colorful visuals, and repetition to facilitate comprehension. Her speech was conversationally paced. Sparing her students the misleading impression that native speakers can be expected to spea slowly and deliberately, pronouncing each word clearly.

2. **Activities, classroom practice**

    Y   Y   Y

1) Q's and A's about food preferences. The focus was on communicating (likes and dislikes) Certain preferences were associated with individuals.

2) Color connection visuals and TPR methods were used to practice masculine/feminine, singular/plural pronouns.

3) listening practice with taped conversation. Ms. Matthews guided the students through multiple listenings with directions on advance of each listening as to what kind of information to listen for.

3. Assignments, tests

Post observation interview comments·
When asked what about the workshops she found most useful, this teacher replied the practical methods presented in the Color Connection workshops, tips offered by Jim Palmer, and the approach to listening activities introduced by June Phillips.

The activity which is the subject of this report was produced under a grant from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and the U.S. Education Department under the auspices of the Education for Economic Security Act (Title II).