

## STUDENT LEARNING GOALS/OBJECTIVES DEVELOPMENT GUIDE

Grade: 9-12  
Content Area: French

Component	Guiding Questions	Descriptors									
<b>Baseline/Trend Data</b>	<i>What data were reviewed to assist in establishing the student learning goal/objective?</i>	<p><b>Area of Concern 1:</b> In the area of presentational writing, students in French 3 do not demonstrate proficiency with paragraph length writing and use of cohesive devices (transition words and connectors) in L2. In addition, students do not utilize elaboration or supporting details in their writing.</p> <p><b>Area of Concern 2:</b> In the area of presentational speaking, students in French 3 also struggle with connecting ideas through the use of transition words and cohesive devices in L2. As also evidenced by the presentational writing, elaboration and supporting details are two areas of pervasive weakness for students.</p> <p>Students completed a formative writing assessment (diagnostic), in which they described themselves, family members, interests/hobbies, and other important aspects of their lives. The majority of the student work contained little evidence of paragraph formation with connected ideas and/or transitions between them. In addition, students' samples lacked mastery of basic grammatical structures necessary to communicate clearly and effectively in order to be understood by a native speaker. If using the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines (2012), most writing samples would score in the Novice Low sublevel because students "reproduced from memory a very limited number of isolated words or familiar phrases. A few samples did peak into the Novice Mid sublevel as a result of a generally "high degree of accuracy when writing well-practiced, familiar topics using limited formulaic language."</p> <p>In order to better understand students' overall skill set in writing, an analysis of students' performance on the Connecticut Mastery Test (8th grade) was conducted. The data for the cohort was found to be as follows:</p> <table style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>Average Direct Assessment of Writing Score:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">9.5</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Range: 2-12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average Scale Score:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">290</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Range: 100 – 400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average Performance Level:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Range: 1-6</td> </tr> </table> <p>The cohort consistently scored in either the Goal or Advanced ranges for writing. This data suggest that students can "produce fluent papers that take a position and provide adequate elaboration with general and specific details. These papers show an adequate awareness of audience, a satisfactory to strong organizational strategy and use some transitional language."</p>	Average Direct Assessment of Writing Score:	9.5	Range: 2-12	Average Scale Score:	290	Range: 100 – 400	Average Performance Level:	5	Range: 1-6
Average Direct Assessment of Writing Score:	9.5	Range: 2-12									
Average Scale Score:	290	Range: 100 – 400									
Average Performance Level:	5	Range: 1-6									

(<http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/curriculum/cali/2010cmtinterpretiveguidefinal.pdf>) While this may be true in the students' L1, transference of these skills cannot be assumed in all cases as evidenced by their performance on the "Profil Personnel" (formative writing assessment).

Using the below rubric to score students' assessments, the students' work received a median score of 3.08 in the areas of Task Completion, Comprehensibility, Level of Discourse and Vocabulary. The median score for Language control was lower at 2.9. The average scores would indicate that students are as a whole where they need to be in regards to their writing skills. However, an analysis of the quartile distributions would contradict this assumption. Among the cohort, there exists a group of high performers (6 with a score of  $18 \geq$ ), a group of low performers (6 with a score of  $13 \leq$ ), and an almost non-existent middle group (1 with a score between 17 - 14).

This data suggests that the low performing group requires direct instruction and re-enforcement activities centered on the core elements of writing (basic grammar structure, paragraph formation and transitional elements). Those students in the high performing group could benefit also however since many have acquired the majority of these skills, they will require extension/differentiated activities in order to advance their writing skills to the next level (Novice High). Efforts in both these areas (remedial/advanced writing skills) will improve students' overall writing and advance their performance level to a consistent Novice Mid level for the group with peaking in the Novice High level for those in the high performing group.

Writing Rubric

	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Below Standard</b>
<b>Task completion</b>	Completion of the task. Ideas are well developed and well organized.	Completion of the task. Ideas are adequately developed and organized.	Partial completion of the task. Ideas are somewhat developed with some organization.	Minimal completion of the task.
<b>Comprehensibility</b>	Text is readily comprehensible, requiring no interpretation on the part of	Text is comprehensible, requiring minimal interpretation	Text is mostly comprehensible, requiring interpretation on the part of the	Text is barely comprehensible.

		the reader.	on the part of the reader.	reader.		
		<b>Level of discourse</b>	Use of paragraphs with some transition words.	Use of paragraphs with 1 or 2 transition words.	List of sentences with 1 or 2 transition words.	Lists of sentences, no transition words.
		<b>Vocabulary</b>	Rich use of vocabulary and idiomatic expressions.	Adequate and accurate use of vocabulary, which is level appropriate.	Somewhat inadequate or inaccurate use of vocabulary that is not level appropriate.	Inadequate or inaccurate use of vocabulary.
		<b>Language control</b>	Good control of basic language structures.	Fair control of basic language structures.	Poor control of basic language structures.	Little to no control of basic language structures.

<b>Student Population</b>	<i>Who is included in this student learning goal/objective? Why is this target group/class selected?</i>	
<b>Standards And Learning Content</b>	<i>Which standards are connected to the learning content?</i>	
<b>Student Learning Goal/Objective Statement</b>	<i>What is the expectation for student growth and development?</i>	Students will grow as knowledgeable and skilled critical thinkers capable of resolving complex problems by working individually and in community and by communicating effectively

<p><b>Indicators Of Academic Growth And Development (IAGDs)</b></p> <p><b>Growth Targets</b></p>	<p>A. <i>How will you measure progress toward your student learning goal/objective?</i></p> <p>B. <i>What targets will you establish to demonstrate attainment of your student learning goal/objective?</i></p> <p><b>NOTE: If teacher sets only one goal/objective then there MUST be at least two IAGDs</b></p>	<p><b><u>IAGDs:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>A. ASSESSMENTS/MEASURES OF PROGRESS</u></b></p> <p>1. Writing Assessment- using district developed Writing rubric 2. Speaking Assessment- using district developed Speaking rubric</p> <p><b><u>B. GROWTH TARGETS</u></b></p> <p>- Of 100% of the students in French 3, 80% of students will attain a score of 13 or better on the Writing Rubric. Of these 80%, 50% will attain a score of 17 or better on the Writing Rubric.</p> <p>- Of 100% of the students in French 3, 93% of students will attain a score of 13 or better on the Speaking Rubric. Of these 93%, 50% will attain a score of 17 or better on the Speaking Rubric</p>
<p><b>Instructional Strategies/Supports</b></p>	<p><i>What methods will you use to accomplish this student learning goal/objective? How will progress be monitored? What professional learning/supports do you need to achieve this student learning goal/objective?</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Design a baseline assessment (Profil Personnel - Writing) for presentational writing that is the culmination of the IPA unit on Qui suis-je?</li> <li>2. Examine student work with colleague in an effort to calibrate our grading.</li> <li>3. Create a variety of activities that reinforce and build foundational skills including Loto, mini-white board games, Jeopardy, Rassias , etc. (samples available upon request)</li> <li>4. Administer another formative speaking assessment to ascertain progress towards goal.</li> <li>5. Conduct formative in-class speaking assessments similar to the summative in order to assess progress of students.</li> </ol>