:    Sheri Anderson-Gutierrez

:    Arts & Sciences

:    Languages, Literatures 90.5D613.05 90.dlturol

The benefits and objectives of this project were: 1) to

*1.4 Project Objectives Met (2 point scale)*

*Completely Satisfied = 2*
*Somewhat Satisfied = 1*
*Did not Satisfy = 0*

*1.5 Project Evaluation (4 point scale)*

The project expectations were clearly stated and I understood what was expected of me for this project.

Another comparison to look at is the reported gains in cultural knowledge over language skill through this project. While both averages are high (3.44 vs. 3.24) on a 4 point scale, the cultural reflection and learning seems to resonate more with students through this project than the linguistic practice or learning. From a language teaching perspective, both linguistic skill and cultural knowledge or experience are very important aspects of language learning; however, teaching and assessing cultural knowledge and experience is generally seen as harder. I feel that this project really tapped into an important piece that has been missing in the SLU Spanish curriculum, which is to provide access to meaningful cultural learning opportunities.

Overall, this project worked as I anticipated and was a success from both the student and instructor perspectives. It was very powerful to see the impact this project had on student learning; they demonstrated a deeper understanding and reflection on language and culture through making and watching these videos. Here are a few comments in their own words from the post-project evaluation.

The best part about this project was…
> "That it took the place of an exam and allowed us to work with other classmates."
> "I liked that I got to reflect on how Spanish will actually affect me in my field."
> "Learning about the native speaker's culture."
> "I was able to use what I learned to actually communicate rather than just write about what I know on a test."
> "Comparing my level of Spanish to a native speaker and understanding his cultural background."

I feel that the rubrics developed through this project were really helpful in articulating the goals to both the instructors and students across the different sections. The implementation was realistic and the instructors enthusiastically guided the students as they planned for and then made the videos. While the students had flexibility in their options for the video content, they were able to tailor the experience to their comfort level, while still producing good speech samples, and practicing Spanish in a new context. There was also a wide range of technical ability in making the videos; however all the students were able to be successful in producing the video and practicing Spanish despite their previous experience in video making and editing.

I feel that one of the greatest lessons learned through this project was by the level instructors who have not had the opportunity to use alternative assessment techniques in their classrooms. This alternative

While this project was overall a success, there were some pitfalls and areas for improvement. At the outset I imagined that technology would be one of the key challenges or obstacles for students in completing this project. However, students reported few problems with the technology itself or access to technology. The primary challenge for students was time. On the evaluation form students reported:

The worst part about this project was…
"The amount of time I had to spend."
"Watching your own video during class."
"Getting the group together and editing the video."
"Knowing how to make a film, iMovie helped but I am extremely bad at technology and had a steep learning curve."
"Deciding which questions to ask and the pronunciation of new words."
"Working outside of class time and finding time to interview the person for the video."

From these comments, it seems that I did not allot enough classroom time to this project and had too high an expectation for students to work outside of class to complete the video project. Students are all very busy, and they needed more scheduled time together in order to plan and execute this project. In addition, the instructors reported that they were rushing to complete this project by midterms and the schedule did not allow them enough time in class to guide students, nor the students enough time to meet. In the future, we will consider using this project as a final course evaluation instead of a midterm in order to facilitate more interaction and planning time.

There were some students who were overwhelmed by the technology needs to complete this project; specifically using iMovie or other editing programs as mentioned above. Several students in my own classes reported that one person in the group ended up doing all the editing because she or he had the technology and the knowledge to complete the editing. While knowing how to use iMovie is not a requirement for the course, it was necessary for many students to complete the project. A number of students reported spending excess amounts of time editing, or learning how to edit, the videos. In the future I hope to offer a workshop or other resources on editing either through the LRC or the IT department to give students more instruction in this area so that they can feel confident in completing this project.

Finally, there were two parts of this project that I hoped to achieve which were not accomplished. First, I had planned to create a website or resource page with information on how to use the iPod Touch5 and other recording devices. Unfortunately, due to time constraints I was not able to complete this resource for our students. I did begin this part of the project with a graduate student in the LRC, however, since the project took place in only the first half of the semester in Fall 2015, I was not able to get the information together in time and then make it available in a timely manner to be of use to the students. I tried again in the Spring 2016, but the graduate assistant was very overwhelmed with other responsibilities and this part of the project was not completed.

This leads to the second unfortunate part about this project, which is that no students from the SPAN 2010 classes used the iPods that we purchased for the project in either the fall or spring semesters. In getting this grant, I thought it would be important to provide the technology to complete this assignment. The reality is that almost all the students have one or more devices that they can use to complete a video recording and they prefer to use their own equipment. Hence, the resource page would not have been very useful or needed because the students used their own equipment. I believe

now that instead of a technology resource page, it would be more beneficial to offer some training on good video making and editing techniques, using the technology they already have. I can happily report however that after giving a presentation to our department about this grant and project, one of my French colleagues did use the iPod Touch5 devices for her French lab during the Spring semester. I will discuss this more below, but I do feel that having this technology available for our language teachers students is a great resource.

From the completion of this project I have learned the following lessons. First, I have a deep belief in the power of assessment and that when assessments are appropriately aligned with goals and objectives this can guide both teaching and learning practices. While I learned this theoretically in my graduate course work, through this project I experienced personally the real transformative power of well-designed assessment! By having the time over the summer, and by being intentional in creating this project through the grant, I was finally able to put into practice a sound assessment plan in my classroom and the 2010 Spanish program. In addition, I was able to share this experience with my colleagues and the students benefitted tremendously through this alternative assessment opportunity.

Secondly, this project has helped me to reflect on the specific student population we have here at SLU. This is my fifth university where I have taught and each school is unique in its goals, mission, resources and student population. I was very surprised to learn how much access our students have with technology and that by and far they are quite proficient in using this technology to produce videos. I hope to implement this project in future classes and will spend less time focused on access to the technology, but rather better use and presentation of materials using the technology.

Another challenge that presented itself during this project was the lack of access that students at SLU have to Spanish speakers and Hispanic cultures. In previous institutions I have not had difficulty in finding interview partners or native speakers to participate in class activities and cultural events. Saint Louis is rather unique across the United States that it does not have a very large Hispanic population. My third lesson through this project has been how important it is to reach out and find resources in the community to help our students have authentic cultural experiences, even here in the United States. Through this project I have made some important contact with community partners such as the Saint Louis Spanish Immersion School, where I hope to foster opportunities for SLU students to engage with Spanish speakers and Hispanic cultures. Reaching out into the city to explore opportunities for our students can be time consuming and challenging, however, this project has reaffirmed for me the very great need and importance of community contact and intercultural opportunities for college students. I hope to build upon my experience through this project and find more ways to incorporate community connections in the classroom as I teach here at SLU.

I was very fortunate to be able to present this project and results to the Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures in Spring 2016 (see attached presentation). During the presentation I expected to present the results from the project and conduct a workshop on alternative assessment with my colleagues. However, as can happen during presentations, the session became more of a question-answer event rather than a presentation and I spent most of the talk discussing how to implement this project into other classes, at other levels and for all languages. At the very outset of my presentation my colleagues immediately saw the benefits of this type of assessment and project for their own classrooms and wanted to be able to implement something this same year. I was very pleased to be able to spark such an important conversation in the department, and to demonstrate that assessment does not have to be intimidating or daunting, but rather can be a source of inspiration and innovation in the classroom.

Following the talk, one of my French colleagues immediately changed her lesson plans for the French lab and created a video project for the final exercise in the Spring semester. She was able to use the iPod

| What kind of vocabulary do I use in the video? | I use a wide range of vocabulary appropriate to the topic most of the time. I Understand and use idiomatic expressions. | I use a range of vocabulary that accomplishes the task. However, occasionally I may use the wrong word or expression. I show some understanding and use of common idiomatic expressions. | I use basic vocabulary and resort to English when I am unable to communicate my message. I do not demonstrate any knowledge of idiomatic expressions. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| How well am I understood in the video? | I am generally understood by | | |

# APPENDIX II
## Midterm Video Project Rubric

| CRITERIA | EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS | MEETS EXPECTATIONS | | DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | STRONG | MINIMAL | |
| 150 points total | A | A- | B | C |
| Project Mechanics: 10 points | 10-12 minutes in length, each person speaks at least 4 minutes. Uses strong technology skills that enhance the presentation. Maintains audience attention throughout. | 8-12 minutes in length, each person speaks at least 3 minutes. Uses strong technology skills that enhance the presentation. Mostly maintains audience attention throughout. | 8-10 minutes in length each person speaks at least 3 minutes. Uses some technology skills that enhance the presentation. Does not always maintain audience attention throughout. | <8 minutes in length, and/or each person does not speak at least 3 minutes. Technology skills do not enhance the presentation. Does not maintain audience attention. |
| Text Type: 10 points Quantity and organization of language discourse | Uses connected sentences and paragraph-length discourse. | Uses mostly <u>connected sentences and some paragraph-like discourse</u>. | Uses strings of sentences, with some complex sentences (dependent clauses). | Uses simple sentences and some strings of sentences. |
| Comprehensibility: 10 points Who can understand this language level? | Is understood by fluent speakers, even those unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although this may require some additional effort. | Is generally <u>understood by those unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives</u>, although interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may occur. | Is generally understood by those accustomed to the speaking of non-natives. | Is generally understood by those accustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although additional effort may be required. |
| Language Function: 20 points Language tasks the speaker is able to handle speech in a consistent, comfortable, sustained, and spontaneous manner.<br><br><u>INTERVIEW</u>: Maintains conversation with fluent speaker <u>SERVICE</u>: Entirely explains and reflects upon experience <u>CONNECTIONS</u>: Fully details life connections and reflects on Spanish language use | Consistently narrates and describes in all major time frames. Able to communicate on familiar topics, which may include current events, employment, and matters of public interest and cultural topics. | Handles successfully uncomplicated tasks and social situations requiring exchange of basic information. <u>Narrates and describes in all major time frames</u> (present/past/future), although not consistently. | Creates with language by combining and recombining known elements; ability to express own meaning expands in quantity and quality. Handles successfully a variety of uncomplicated communicative tasks and topics. | Creates with language by combining and recombining known elements; is able to express personal meaning in a basic way. Handles successfully a number of uncomplicated communicative tasks primarily in concrete exchanges and topics. |

| CRITERIA | EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS | MEETS EXPECTATIONS | | DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | STRONG | MINIMAL | |
| 150 points total | A | A- | B | C |
| Language Control: 20 points Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary | Demonstrates significant quantity and quality of language. When attempting to perform Advanced-level tasks, there is breakdown in one or more of the following areas: the ability to narrate and describe, use of paragraph-length discourse, fluency, breadth of vocabulary. | Demonstrates significant quantity and quality of language. When attempting to perform Intermediate-level tasks, there is breakdown in one or more of the following areas: the ability to narrate and describe, use of paragraph-length discourse, fluency, breadth of vocabulary. | Demonstrates minimal fluency and some control of aspect in narrating in present, past and future time. Vocabulary may lack specificity. Language decreases in quality and quantity when attempting to perform functions or handle topics associated with the intermediate level. | Is most accurate when producing simple sentences in present time. Pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax are strongly influenced by the native language. Accuracy decreases as language becomes more complex. |
| Fluency: 20 points Degree of fluency and appropriate presentational strategies used | Does not read from visuals or notes. Presented with systematic and sustained fluency and does not halter during presentation. Clearly well prepared and practiced speech at the paragraph level. | Does not read from visuals or notes. Presented with significant fluency and halters little during presentation. Clearly well prepared and practiced speech at the paragraph level. | Does not read from visuals or notes. Presented with fluency but may halter some during presentation. Clearly well prepared and practiced speech at the sentence level speech. | Reads from visuals or notes. Presentation is not fluid and/or maintains significant haltering throughout presentation. Does not appear to be well prepared and/or speaks only at the sentence level throughout entire presentation. |
| Impact: 20 points Clarity, organization, and depth of presentation; degree to which presentation maintains attention and interest of audience | Presented in a clear and organized manner. Presentation illustrates originality, rich details, and an unexpected feature that captures interest and attention of audience. | Presented in a clear and organized manner. Presentation illustrates originality and features rich details, visuals, and/or organization of the text to maintain audience's attention and/ or interest. | Presented in a clear and organized manner. Some effort to maintain audi-ence's attention through visuals, organization of the text, and/or details. | Presentation may be either unclear or unorganized. Minimal to no effort to maintain audience's attention. |
| Cultural Reflection: 20 points Cultural understanding of Hispanic peoples and comparison to one's own culture and norms | Clearly demonstrates awareness of Hispanic cultural products and practices. Makes meaningful and thoughtful comparisons between own culture and others'. | Demonstrates awareness of Hispanic cultural products and practices. Makes a few comparisons between own culture and others'. | Demonstrates simple or stereotypical awareness of F5 9.96 BT/F9 9 Tf1 ( | |

SPAN 2010 FALL 2015
Midterm Video Project Grading Rubric

| CRITERIA | EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS | MEETS EXPECTATIONS | | DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | STRONG | MINIMAL | |
| 150 points total | 150-144 | 140-135 | 131-120 | 111 - <104 |
| Project Mechanics: 10 points | 10 10-12 minutes in length, each person speaks at least 4 minutes. Uses strong technology skills that enhance the presentation. Maintains audience attention throughout. | 9.5 – 9 8-12 minutes in length, each person speaks at least 3 minutes. Uses strong technology skills that enhance the presentation. Mostly maintains audience attention throughout. | 8.5 – 8 8-10 minutes in length each person speaks at least 3 minutes. Uses some technology skills that enhance the presentation. Does not always maintain audience attention throughout. | 7 – <7 <8 minutes in length, and/or each person does not speak at least 3 minutes. Technology skills do not enhance the presentation. Does not maintain audience attention. |
| Text Type: 10 points Quantity and organization of | 10 Uses connected sentences and paragraph-length | 9.5 – 9 Uses mostly | | |

APPENDIX III

Midterm Peer Evaluations          GROUP #:_____          TOTAL SCORE:_____

| CRITERIA | AMAZING! BEST PRESENTATION | VERY STRONG PRESENTATION | | LESS THAN EXCITING PRESENTATION | NOT AN ACCEPTABLE PRESENTATION |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | GREAT | GOOD | | |
| Points | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| ORGANIZATION: How well was the presentation organized and presented? | | | | | |
| CONTENT: How well were the ideas and content expressed? | | | | | |
| LANGUAGE USE: How fluent and accurate was the Spanish used in the presentation? | | | | | |

IMPACT: How much did this
presentation impact you as
an audience member?

APPENDIX IV

Fall 2015 Midterm Video Project Evaluation                    SECTION: SPAN 2010-_____

PROJECT OPTION CHOICE:        INTERVIEW      SERVICE        CONNECTIONS

# GROUP MEMBERS:     1        2        3

LENGTH (in minutes):   <5      5      6      7      8      9      10      11      12      12+

TECHNOLOGY USED:   Please indicate all the devices and programs you used to complete this project.
(Circle all that apply)

iPod touch (lab)        iPod/iPhone (own)        iPad (own)

SLU computer (lab)      Mac laptop (own)         PC laptop (own)

Android phone (own)     Other tablet (own)       Camera/recorder (own)

iMovie                  Final Cut Pro            Quicktime Editor

VideoPad Editor         MovieMaker               Movavi

Other device or program used:_____

TIME COMMITMENT: Please estimate how much time you spent on each step of the midterm project.

|                          | <1 hour | 1-2 hours | 3-4 hours | 5+ hours |
|--------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Project proposal         |         |           |           |          |
| Pre-taping preparations  |         |           |           |          |
| Video taping             |         |           |           |          |
| Video Editing            |         |           |           |          |
| Group meetings/conversations |     |           |           |          |

EVALUATION: Please respond to each statement with your reaction and feelings about the project.

| EVALUATION STATEMENTS | STRONGLY AGREE | SOMEWHAT AGREE | SOMEWHAT DISAGREE | STRONGLY DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The project expectations were clearly stated and I understood what was expected of me for this project. | | | | |
| I like having options for the project topic and found a topic I wanted to present. | | | | |
| I feel this project was fair in evaluating my Spanish language skills. | | | | |
| Adequate technology support and resources were provided to successfully complete this project. | | | | |

I like participating in this type of midterm evaluation project.