PEOPLE MEETING IN NORWAY 2014
CEPER "MIGUEL HERNÁNDEZ"
(Torredonjimeno, Spain)
EVALUATION OF COURSE RESULTS

1-. TITLE:

ENGLISH A2 LEVEL EXAMS PREPARATION COURSE..

2-. ADDRESSEES:

20 STUDENTS INITIALLY (3 LEFT THE COURSE AND 1 IS IN TEMPORARY SICK ILLNESS).

3-. GOAL:

PREPARE STUDENTS TO PASS A2 ENGLISH EXAMS AT OFFICIAL LANGUAGE SCHOOL.

COURSE TOOLS

4-. SELECTED TOOLS:

(A) Facebook site:

https://www.facebook.com/ceper.miguelhernandez

- Initially a personally managed site. It required students to apply to sign in.

- Then changed to a corporate site. Open registration (simply click "I like" and you receive every update). **OPEN TO EVERYBODY.**

- Supplied information: Course development and cultural events information.

COURSE TOOLS

(B) Youtube: *Cultural events, songs with lyrics, vocabulary glossaries…*

(C) Google Earth / Maps: *Location of important places…*

(D) Internet images: *Realia, Warming-up / Contextualization, …*

(E) Online sites: *Interactive activities with self-correction.*

MODALITY:

- Presential + Online extension

(This allowed to get to almost 100 people in different centre sub-sections and even people not inscribed in the centre).

COURSE PLANNING:

- Initially intended for one academic course, it was split for two due to academic reasons.

- Students with average command of grammar and vocabulary / average at written skills.

- High difficulty in oral skills (due to very traditional teaching in former years).

- Focus on listening / speaking; reinforce pronunciation competence.

- Draw attention to the importance of learning phonetics at basic level as a way to improve pronunciation (familiarity with phonetic symbols, work minimal pronunciation pairs, work with adapted transcriptions).

RESULTS ANALYSIS (I):

(A) LISTENING:

- 68,75% of students (11) could understand oral messages on first listening.

- **18,75%** of students (3) could understand oral messages on a second / thirds listening.

- **12,50%** of students (2) had difficulties in understanding oral messages unless rephrased by

the teacher.

(B) SPEAKING:

- **87,5%** of students improved at the desired level.

- **12,5%** of students are still below the desired level

RESULTS ANALYSIS (II):

(C) READING (Aloud):

* 100% of students (16) improved reading aloud.
* 81,25% of students (13) could read with constintent intonation patterns.
* 56,25% of students (9) were aware of phonetic processess as linking.

(D) WRITING:

* 100% of students (16) improved writing and writing strategies.
* 62,5% of students (10) can use appropiate connectors to structure text (temporal sequence, consequence, finality…) and structure a coherent discourse.

(E) VOCABULARY:

* 100% (16) students improved and extended their lexical knowledge of the topics proposed.

RESULTS ANALYSIS (III):

(F) CULTURAL AWARENESS:

* 100% (16) students learnt about *common places, cultural aspects and singularities of English speaking countries* and how this is reflected in language (*vocabulary*).

(G) ATTITUDINAL ASPECTS:

* 100% (16) of students, *showed willingness to communicate in the foreign language (classroom language, communicational roleplays…) and increase the capacity to answer in L2 rather than in L1 when required.*

ADVANTAGES OVER TRADITIONAL TEACHING EXPERIENCES (I).

(1) **Load of work:**

It can be extended beyond the time limits of the ordinary presential class.

(2) **Corpus of materials:**

Available for anyone forever after its elaboration. Accessible for everybody.

(3) **Learning authonomy:**

Students can work at their own pace. Can follow up the class   when they miss it.

CHALLENGUES OVER TRADITIONAL COURSE DELIVERY STRATEGIES.

* **The ONLINE FEEDBACK is a bit poor in terms of interaction. They prefer to ask the teachers face to face instead of online questions.**

* **It constituted a good pilot experience which can be extended in the future or future projects.**

THE END

THANK YOU ALL FOR YOUR ATENTION