

---

**AN ALIGNMENT OF THE CANADIAN  
LANGUAGE BENCHMARKS TO THE BC  
ESL ARTICULATION LEVELS**

**Final Report - January 2007**

*PREPARED BY: ROSS BARBOUR, CATHERINE OSTLER,  
ELIZABETH TEMPLEMAN, ELIZABETH WEST*

---



## **AN ALIGNMENT OF THE CANADIAN LANGUAGE BENCHMARKS TO THE BC ESL ARTICULATION LEVELS - FINAL REPORT**

© Copyright 2007 by the British Columbia Council on Admissions and Transfer. BCCAT is the official mark of the BC Council on Admissions and Transfer, as published by the Registrar of Trade-marks of the Canadian Intellectual Property Office.

This publication is also available in Adobe Acrobat Portable Document Format (pdf), from BCCAT Online, the Internet service of the BC Council on Admissions and Transfer: [www.bccat.bc.ca](http://www.bccat.bc.ca). Photocopying and further distribution of this document is permitted. Please credit source.

Prepared by: Ross Barbour, Catherine Ostler, Elizabeth Templeman, Elizabeth West

709 – 555 Seymour Street  
Vancouver BC Canada V6B 3H6  
[bccat.bc.ca](http://bccat.bc.ca) | [admin@bccat.bc.ca](mailto:admin@bccat.bc.ca)

t 604 412 7700 | f 604 683 0576

# **An Alignment of the Canadian Language Benchmarks to the BC ESL Articulation Levels**

December 2006

Prepared by:

Ross Barbour, Catherine Ostler, Elizabeth Templeman, Elizabeth West

Prepared for and Funded by the British Columbia Council on Admissions and  
Transfer

## Acknowledgements

We would like to express our appreciation to the following people whose support and valuable input made this project possible:

- Jennifer Orum and Finola Finlay, BCCAT
- John Boraas, Dean, School of Access, Camosun College and System Liaison Person, BC ESL Articulation Committee
- Gail Baxter, Dean's assistant, School of Access, Camosun College
- Sandy Fehler and Carol Anne Sargeant, Administrative Assistants, School of Access, Camosun College
- Lyn Lennig, Vancouver Community College
- Lucy Epp, Cathy Lewis and Shelley Bates, Red River College
- Jane Steiger, Noreen Walker, Kathy Felton, Nancy Killick, ESL instructors, Thomson Rivers University
- Cheryl Howrigan and Karen Jane Hills, ESL instructors, Vancouver Community College
- Anne Brix, Rowena Hill, Diana Kohl, Karyn Marczak, Mary Ruth Martell, Laurie O'Dowd, Lisa Robertson, Bev Robson, Mavis Smith, ESL Instructors, Camosun College
- ESL Articulation Committee Members

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Background</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>A. Background of BC ESL Articulation and the Canadian Language Benchmarks</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Results and Analysis</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>A. Method of Analysis</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>B. Results for EAP</b> .....	<b>7</b>
i. Analysis and Discussion.....	8
ii. Consultation.....	9
<b>C. Results for Access</b> .....	<b>9</b>
i. Analysis and Discussion.....	10
ii. Consultation.....	11
<b>3. Assessment</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>4. Implications of the CLB Alignment within the BC Transfer ESL System and Beyond</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>A. Implications for EAP</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>B. Implications for Access and Work</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>C. Further Implications</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>5. Recommended Actions for the BC ESL Articulation Committee</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>Glossary of Acronyms</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Appendices</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix I: Benchmark Alignments for EAP IV for Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix II: Benchmark Alignments for EAP III for Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing</b> .....	<b>32</b>
<b>Appendix III: Benchmark Alignments for EAP II for Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing</b> .....	<b>46</b>
<b>Appendix IV: Benchmark Alignments for EAP I for Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing</b> .....	<b>55</b>
<b>Appendix V: Responses from Colleges that List Courses in Access</b> .....	<b>68</b>
<b>Appendix VI: Recommendations for Revisions to wording of EAP Course Outcomes</b> .....	<b>72</b>
<b>Appendix VII: Recommendations or Queries to Canadian Language Benchmarks 2000</b> .....	<b>73</b>

## 1. Background

The BC ESL Articulation Committee's Canadian Language Benchmarks project was precipitated by ESL instructors' desire to address transfer difficulties of ESL students within the BC transfer system and to respond to the recognition that the Canadian Language Benchmarks, a descriptive scale of ESL proficiency expressed as twelve benchmarks, is now a national standard of levels of second-language proficiency. To this end the Articulation Committee for ESL programs in the BC Transfer System examined the correlation between the Canadian Language Benchmarks (CLB) and the levels and outcomes described in the *Articulation Guide for English as a Second Language Programs in the British Columbia Public Post-Secondary System* (Fifth Edition 2005/2006). This report is the result of that work.

Currently, ESL students enter individual institutions and are assessed for their language proficiency. The assessment tests vary across the system; some are standardized tests while others are locally developed. ESL learners then enter the individual institution's English as a second language program at the level for which they have been assessed. This works very well within the institution but can create challenges when the student transfers to another institution within the BC transfer system. While the students have successfully completed a course or a sequence of articulated courses, they are all too often required to do another assessment test when they apply to another college within the provincial system.

The problem is further compounded when students move out of the ESL stream and into mainstream college and university-level courses. English for Academic Purposes (EAP) Level IV, for example, meets the English language requirement for university transfer level courses in most BC colleges; however, students transferring to another college or university must often produce yet another proof of their language proficiency. In the fall of 2005, the ESL Articulation Committee conducted an initial survey of Registrars across the institutions to see if ESL students would be accepted into UT or other non-ESL courses based on their successful completion of EAP Level IV. Responses varied; some institutions would accept students with consultation from the ESL departments while others would not. This inconsistency creates challenges for students and for the provincial ESL articulation process. In short, EAP Level IV is not universally transferable.

An additional complication is the difficulty ESL students have when they enter the BC transfer system from another province. Since there is no agreement or understanding of the various ESL levels and courses among provincial systems, students are required to take an assessment test when they enter a BC college. The same is true if an ESL student leaves BC for another province.

## **A. Background of BC ESL Articulation and the Canadian Language Benchmarks**

In 2000, the ESL Articulation Committee attempted an initial alignment of the BC levels with the levels in the Canadian Language Benchmarks. However, as ESL professionals gained expertise and experience with the CLB, it became apparent that the alignment was inaccurate, so the ESL Articulation Committee agreed to review the initial alignment and proposed a re-alignment. This re-alignment is crucial since the benchmarks are becoming, and in many cases already have become, an integral tool in analyzing language levels in BC and across Canada. *The Canadian Language Benchmarks 2000* is the national standard for “describing, measuring and recognizing second language proficiency of adult immigrants and prospective immigrants for living and working in Canada.” The benchmarks are used “in educational, training, community and workplace settings” (CLB website).

The number of projects that are CLB-related in BC alone illustrates this. Two recent projects funded by the International Qualifications Unit in the Ministry of Economic Development are the Engineering and Applied Technologies Project for Internationally-trained Engineers and Technologists (through Vancouver Community College with Camosun College) and the Five Occupational Sectors Curriculum Project (through Camosun College). Also, individual colleges such as Vancouver Community College and Camosun College are engaged in aligning benchmarks to ESL courses and Applied Programs. They are also helping to build the capacity within the post-secondary system by offering training workshops to other institutions. In addition, across the country a number of post-secondary institutions, such as Red River College and Southern Alberta Institute of Technology are using the CLB. Tests have been developed using the CLB of which the most commonly used for ESL programs is the Canadian Language Benchmarks Placement Test. In addition, the Canadian English Language Benchmark Assessment for Nurses (CELBAN) for internationally-trained nurses has recently been accepted by the licensing body of BC nurses as well as other provincial licensing bodies. Also, training funding for internationally-trained professionals is increasingly being tied to the CLB, so the ESL Articulation Committee needs to respond to this recent need as these professionals enter the BC public transfer system.

This wide-ranging work with the CLB across Canada has facilitated a common language to describe language proficiency, thus increasing the understanding of second-language proficiency in educational, community and work settings. The work of the ESL Articulation Committee to re-examine the correlations with the CLB adds to this body of work and further clarifies the levels of second-language programs within the BC transfer system.

## 2. Results and Analysis

### A. Method of Analysis

The method used to align the outcomes was an adaptation of the method outlined for Applied Program Benchmarking, first developed at Red River College and adapted and written up in the Applied Benchmarking Training Kit by Vancouver Community College. In that process, course material and outlines, exams, and observations of lectures and labs comprise the primary source material which is described using the *Canadian Language Benchmarks 2000* (CLB 2000) document. In the present study, four researchers from the ESL Articulation Committee used the EAP and Access *outcomes* as listed in the Articulation Guide and supplemented this with consultation with practitioners and some review of course materials. Initially, the four main researchers worked collaboratively to align the EAP III and IV outcomes with the CLB 2000 document. They then worked with colleagues at their separate institutions on EAP I and II and Access alignment, with at least two institutions working independently on the same levels and skill areas.

In the ESL Articulation Guide there are eight Access and four EAP levels covering four skills in each. Researchers first located approximate levels for each of these in the 12-level CLB 2000 document, a corpus of over 1800 relevant language descriptions in four skills. Once approximate CLB equivalents for the Access or EAP levels were determined, multiple CLB descriptive phrases were found and tabulated for each of 263 Access and 138 EAP descriptors. During this process, many ambiguities, gaps, and possible errors were discovered in all three primary sources. To resolve these problems, the researchers consulted with practitioners, course outlines and other secondary sources.

Finally, the results from each of the separate work groups were compared and adjusted in order to achieve a certain degree of reliability and validity in the findings.

Out of this work, they consolidated and summarized the EAP results and made a separate set of recommendations for the Access results.

The researchers divided the results and analysis into two parts: English for Academic Purposes and English for Access. These results differ somewhat from the proposed outcome to align the Canadian Language Benchmarks with all the BC ESL Articulation Levels. The two streams have very different goals, with EAP students transferring into mainstream college and career programs and Access students moving into EAP programs, Canadian society, vocational/career programs or the workforce. Therefore, the task of aligning the Canadian Language Benchmarks to the outcomes of both streams differed substantially, and as a result, the conclusions differ. The EAP outcomes, with some small modifications, were aligned to the relevant descriptors in the Canadian Language Benchmarks. This was not the case with the Access outcomes. The



researchers spent many hours trying to align the Access outcomes to the CLB, individually and in consultation with Access instructors. It became increasingly clear that this was not a workable solution. The better informed solution, one which sits on top of a monumental amount of detailed work on the researchers' part, is to revise the Access outcomes using the Canadian Language Benchmarks.

## **B. Results for EAP**

The researchers determined the following alignments of the Canadian Language Benchmarks to the EAP articulation grid by examining the outcomes for each EAP level in the ESL Articulation Guide, by analyzing a sample of articulated EAP courses, and by looking at course outlines, texts, sample assignments and some student writing samples. The researchers compared these to the relevant academically related descriptions in *The Canadian Language Benchmarks 2000*. In addition, they confirmed these alignments through consultation intra-provincially as well as inter-provincially.

### **EAP IV                  CLB**

- Speaking 8
- Listening 8
- Reading 9
- Writing 9

### **EAP III**

- Speaking 7/8
- Listening 7/8
- Reading 8
- Writing 8

### **EAP II**

- Speaking 7
- Listening 6
- Reading 7/8
- Writing 7

### **EAP I**

- Speaking 5/6
- Listening 5/6
- Reading 6/7
- Writing 5/6

**See Appendices I – IV for the detailed alignments of each articulation outcome.**

***i. Analysis and Discussion***

In general, for EAP, that is, for programming with academic preparation as the central objective, the ESL Articulation outcomes reveal distinctions very well between levels, often more so than the CLB descriptors. Because the Canadian Language Benchmarks address a very wide range of language types and tasks found “in educational, training, community and workplace settings” (CLB website), the descriptors cover a wide range, yet only those descriptors addressing academic language are appropriate for the EAP alignment. The CLB alignment only describes the best approximation of a very narrow band of the EAP skills, and conversely, the EAP outcomes only overlap with a small portion of the skills and contexts addressed by the Benchmarks. This is in part because EAP courses and programs focus upon college readiness and academic contexts and so better reflect the unique competencies required for the challenge of making this transition and the tasks appropriate to build those competencies.

For example, in EAP, critical thinking is integral to the outcomes, as is a growth in academic vocabulary. However, these considerations are addressed only peripherally in the CLB, often only in the overviews of what needs to be taught for each stage (with each stage representing four benchmark levels), and so are not particularly useful in discerning differences from one benchmark to the next. Therefore, despite the alignment at the four EAP levels, students could have difficulty parachuting into EAP programming, particularly at the upper levels, without some background in critical thinking and a reasonable academic vocabulary. Another consideration not addressed by the CLB is the socio-cultural competencies around the unique culture of college or university life. This includes issues such as plagiarism and grading. An introduction to integrity in research and the culture of grades is introduced within EAP courses.

Another distinction between EAP and the CLB is apparent in considering the EAP IV alignment: EAP skews the emphasis on skills toward reading and writing, with speaking and listening becoming secondary. This is reflected in the reading (Benchmark 9) and writing (Benchmark 9) benchmarks which are higher than listening (Benchmark 8) and speaking (Benchmark 8). With a solid Benchmark 8 in listening and speaking, a learner is able to handle the academic listening and speaking tasks required for first year University Transfer courses or university courses. In reading and writing, according to the EAP outcomes for Level IV, the requirements are one benchmark higher. This indicates the greater emphasis on reading and writing skills for EAP IV in the BC ESL system.

EAP Articulation has been the subject of great scrutiny over the years, at least in part because of the high stakes for students, in terms of making a seamless transition from EAP into university and college programs. Therefore it has been

critically important that EAP courses maintain their credibility not only *within* ESL, but in the academic world *beyond* ESL. As a result, within ESL, the EAP articulation has been vigorous and so its descriptors rigorously scrutinized. This is due to the relatively high demand for student transfer within EAP, from institution to institution. In short, the EAP outcomes have been highly used. They accurately reflect the realities of EAP programming, and have become a common language that has engendered a level of trust among institutions. The alignment of the Canadian Language Benchmarks to these already well-established outcomes will, it is hoped, enhance and strengthen them.

## ***ii. Consultation***

In order to validate the researchers' recommended levels at EAP III and IV, the researchers consulted Lucy Epp and Cathy Lewis at Red River College. In general, the alignments for EAP IV are confirmed by the Benchmark requirements for the Academic English Program for University and College Entrance (AEPUCE) at Red River College in Winnipeg, Manitoba. This program provides a very good comparison since Red River College has a very well established program incorporating the Canadian Language Benchmarks into its academic preparation program. According to the AEPUCE outlines, "AEPUCE students must demonstrate that they are performing at a Benchmark 8 or higher in order to pass AEPUCE." By successfully completing AEPUCE, students meet the language requirements for the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg. While a solid benchmark 8 is a requirement in all four skills, Lucy Epp and Cathy Lewis, noted that in their AEPUCE program (a combination of BC EAP levels III and IV), at the end of the program students should be approaching a benchmark level of 9 in reading but that with writing, they should be at a solid benchmark level of 8. Reading corresponds to our alignment, but the writing is one benchmark lower. Both Lucy Epp and Cathy Lewis felt that benchmark 9 was somewhat high for writing. This is perhaps one area that the ESL Articulation Committee could review. In listening, students at Red River College work on benchmark 8 and 9 tasks. For entrance into the University of Manitoba, students should be at a solid 8 (Note, the University of Manitoba does not accept benchmark levels; they only accept letter grades from the AEPUCE program). In addition to consulting experts outside the province, researchers also consulted Karyn Marczak and Mavis Smith, two experienced instructors at these levels who are familiar with the Canadian Language Benchmarks. They confirmed the alignments of EAP III and IV.

## **C. Results for Access**

After many hours committed in efforts to align the CLB to the Access Outcomes, in consultations with colleagues as a part of this effort, and to discussions of and deliberations over the data, the researchers realized that a CLB alignment to the

eight levels of Access was an unproductive endeavor, and any result accomplished by persevering in that direction would be untenable. Instead, the researchers recommend that the Access Committee rewrite the Access outcomes using Canadian Language Benchmark language and levels.

### ***i. Analysis and Discussion***

As has already been noted, in working with EAP, the source of language which would most clearly delineate one level from the next was the *ESL Articulation Guide*. With Access the reverse was true. The researchers and also other ESL faculty consulted found, in nearly every instance, the clearest source of language which most clearly distinguished one level of language competency from the next was the CLB.

It became evident from the work that the CLB alignments with Access were highly subjective, in many cases dependent upon the rewriting and expanding of the Access Outcomes to fill gaps and add clarity. In other words, the researchers were aligning what was *assumed* to be the intent, or practice, of those teaching courses articulated at particular levels, rather than the actual descriptors.

Furthermore, the Access outcomes have not been subject to the same level of scrutiny or usage as those for EAP. Several reasons exist for this, the simplest perhaps being a very low level of transfer activity. EAP programming has been on the rise, demanding a good deal of the time and effort of Articulation members, for reasons highlighted above. Moreover, the energies and resources of Access level ESL educators have increasingly been diverted to CLB initiatives. In fact, since the CLB has been a focus for ESL practitioners of Access level courses, it seems that some have abandoned Access for the CLB, in addressing any issues of transfer. Taking into account this array of factors, the researchers realized that it made great sense for Access to adopt the CLB as the basis for aligning and articulating its courses.

Initially, the researchers gathered recommendations for the reworking of the Access levels and outcomes. The descriptors were too general and also not sufficiently complete to distinguish between levels. This became clear from instances where the researchers, working independently and collaboratively with colleagues, had arrived at greatly different benchmarks for the same descriptor, with discrepancies of as much as four benchmarks regularly occurring.

When the researchers sought clarity from the courses articulated at these Access levels, it learned that, while a course had been articulated at this particular level, the course had evolved and its outcomes, in fact, no longer matched the ones described at that level. Also it was disheartening to discover courses listed as Access which no longer existed in any form. A further area of confusion has been the laddering between Access and EAP. This reflects the fact that in some

cases different institutions comprehend the levels differently, which means the very purposes of articulation are being defeated. For example, Vancouver Community College Access 8 feeds into EAP II while Camosun Access 8 feeds into EAP III.

Taken together, these realizations highlighted the fact that the outcomes for Access have largely fallen into disuse, replaced in practice by reference to the CLB. Therefore, it would be a misdirected effort to revise one set of criteria for articulating the Access courses, using a second set as reference. The *Canadian Language Benchmarks 2000* and its detailed descriptions of communicative competency in a wide variety of contexts fits very well with the broad purposes and contexts of Access, unlike EAP which is narrowly defined to meet the needs only of academic programs.

Only after the researchers had outlined this array of factors, could they recognize the conclusion: that Access should adopt the CLB as the basis for aligning and articulating its courses.

## **ii. Consultation**

Extensive consultations with ESL professionals in the Access levels at Camosun College, Thompson Rivers University and Vancouver Community College informed the recommendation that Access adopt the CLB descriptors as outcomes rather than the existing articulation ones. In consultations, ESL instructors compared practice with the articulation outcomes and the CLB levels and noted discrepancies. For example, they noted that some of the wording in the articulation outcomes was unrealistic and that the CLB descriptor at a particular level more accurately reflected the competency at the level under discussion.

Further, in order to be absolutely certain, the researchers sought input from representatives from all the colleges that currently have Access courses in the ESL Articulation Guide. All twelve institutions responded. Representatives were asked four questions:

1. Do you use the Access descriptors in the Articulation Guide? If so, how do you use them?
2. What are your transfer issues at the access level and how do you resolve them?
3. Where is your link from access to EAP?
4. Do you use benchmarks and if so how extensively?

Six institutions simply do not use the Access descriptors at all, two institutions use them sometimes, one institution uses them when a student transfers from another institution but still gives their own internal assessment test, and one institution uses them to articulate courses. Transfer issues are very rare at the Access levels for all institutions. In four institutions there is no link from Access

to EAP. For two institutions Access 8 is equivalent to EAP II and feeds into EAP III while for another Access 7 feeds into EAP III with a gap at Access 8 and in yet another Access 7 feeds into EAP 1. Eight institutions are using the Canadian Language Benchmarks in varying degrees. One institution uses them in their course outcomes while other institutions use them to identify levels, inform curriculum development and review or as a resource for course development. In the cases where they are used as resources some comments point to their usefulness: “The CLBs are used as a tool. They are looked at for entry descriptors to higher levels, but are used as a tool not a Bible” In one case where the CLBs are not used the respondent remarked that when she was working to articulate or to write a particular course, she used the CLB to do this because of “the really excellent descriptors there,” as opposed to the rather vague Access language. Another noted that Benchmarks are used “very extensively as the institution is moving quickly to integrate CLB.” In this institution the CLBs are used in “placement, term planning, teaching, unit development, assessment and outcomes.”

**See Appendix V for College Responses.**

### 3. Assessment

To date, some data from the Canadian Language Benchmarks Placement Test (CLBPT) has been collected. In the fall of 2005, a sub-committee of the CLB Steering Committee at Vancouver Community College began a study to describe the skills of Vancouver Community College ESL students in terms of scores on three forms of the CLBPT. The test was administered to 147 students. Because the students came from several different levels, the analysis to date has focused on the largest subset of those students, Upper Intermediate, which is presently articulated at Access Level 6 and is the pre-requisite for Advanced, which is articulated at EAP level 1. To facilitate interpretation, the analysis was narrowed even further to look only at the students who successfully completed this course (68), that is, to students who have achieved the pre-requisites necessary for entry to EAP level 1.

The results showed a range of at least three CLBPT levels in each skill. The following table provides a summary of the percentage of the students who scored at each level. The median in each is bolded and only proportions above 10% have been included.

	CLB 4	CLB 5	CLB 6	CLB 7
Listening	-	<b>50%</b>	25%	-
Speaking	18%	<b>42%</b>	33%	-
Reading	-	26%	<b>34%</b>	22%
Writing	27%	<b>41%</b>	25%	-

Further data is being gathered presently (Fall, 2006) and Vancouver Community College hopes that similar CLBPT profiles can be described for higher EAP levels and lower Access levels. As yet, no attempt has been made to interpret these results. However, a comparison can be drawn between the CLB alignments for EAP 1 and the CLBPT assessments. The majority of those successfully completing Access Level 6 are at CLB 5 in listening, speaking and writing and at CLB 6 for reading. This fits with the newly aligned outcomes for EAP I which are one benchmark higher than this. Nevertheless there is still a large minority of students at CLB 6 for listening, speaking and writing and at CLB 7 for reading. More data such as this is needed to see how it fits with the articulation outcomes.

## **4. Implications of the CLB Alignment within the BC Transfer ESL System and Beyond**

### **A. Implications for EAP**

The researchers have made recommendations for the alignment of Canadian Language Benchmarks with the English for Academic Purposes levels 1-4 in the BC ESL Articulation Guide. However, the members of the BC Transfer system will continue to articulate and discuss transfer issues within BC using the ESL Articulation Guide descriptors. They are a better fit for EAP than the CLB descriptors, and are a language created, understood, and well-used by Articulation members. However, because the EAP levels are now clearly aligned to the CLB, with the alignments to be published in the upcoming seventh edition of the ESL Articulation Guide, discussions with reference to the CLB can also take place. In addition, since each outcome for all EAP skills has a corresponding description from the CLB (Appendix I - IV), when articulating courses, Articulation Committee members can also refer to these correspondences.

The exercise of alignment has revealed several specific outcomes which could be revised, and the discussion of these minor revisions will serve to improve the present articulation of EAP. Even though the CLB will not replace the EAP descriptors, the alignments should be useful in articulating students' coursework from institutions outside BC. Also, as academic and vocational programs in BC and elsewhere become more widely benchmarked with the CLB, the alignments will provide useful information as to which courses could serve as prerequisite entrance requirements to specific programs and courses.

Finally, the CLB alignments for the EAP levels, especially EAP IV, will have an impact on and inform future work the ESL Articulation Committee is planning: to study and determine the minimum language competencies in CLB terms for first year college and university students.

## **B. Implications for Access and Work**

The recommendation from the researchers to move to the use of the CLB for articulation of courses presently categorized under “English for Access” and “English for Work” is a radical shift. It will necessitate the review of all courses presently in these categories, and subsequently, all courses will have to be benchmarked/articulated using the CLB. Given that the CLBs are not widely used within the BC Transfer System (in ESL as well as University Transfer and Applied programs) at present, the members of the ESL Articulation Committee will require some training in the use of the CLB before they can re-articulate their courses.

However, the timing is right for this shift in approach. Although Access and Work have not been as active as the EAP branch of Articulation, the recent attention given to the benchmarking of vocational programs (e.g., at Vancouver Community College) and the creation of exciting new English for specific professional purposes programs (e.g., Camosun’s Five Sectors Project and Vancouver Community College’s communication for Engineering and Technology) have indicated a need to revive Access and Work. These new courses have also introduced a dilemma with the present system, which is, where to place them. In the present ESL Articulation Guide, they would simply be listed and described as “English for Work” courses. If they were benchmarked, however, they could be articulated and would thus be transferable with other courses or programs in the system, providing better information to help students make their academic and career choices.

In addition, at this time an interest in the Canadian Language Benchmarks is building in BC, due to the progressive work being done by certain colleges and discussed in articulation meetings, provincial and national conferences and workshops. The re-articulation of all Access and English for Work courses will introduce more BC transfer system members to the CLB. Increasing the use of the CLB in BC will allow us to be more involved nationally and to access the wealth of resources now available to better understand ESL learners’ needs and achievements. Ultimately, this increased knowledge will help educators, administrators and admissions personnel better advise ESL students and improve the transfer process.

## **C. Further Implications**

Increasingly, the Canadian government is recognizing the crucial importance of immigration in the economic development of the nation. The British Columbia government is also very aware of this. In a recent letter from the British Columbia College Presidents to the Honourable Murray Coell, Minister of Advanced Education on October 25, 2006, they say:



Immigration is identified as one of the solutions to the present and future shortages of skills and labour in British Columbia. Research is clear that the two primary barriers to labour force integration are adequate language skill development and experience/knowledge within the Canadian workplace. It is also known that fully 50% of Canadian employers do not consider applicants without Canadian workplace experience. In a study of immigration experiences, 26% of immigrants report that a lack of Canadian "work experience" stops them from entering employment, and an almost equal number of 24% of immigrants report transferability of foreign credentials as a barrier to employment. Twenty-two percent of immigrants indicate that language level is a primary barrier to employment.

The BCCP therefore recommend that MAVED work to have government design mechanisms that allow for:

- provincial recognition of language skills required to enter college programs, specifically the Canadian Language Benchmarks;
- alignment of language benchmarks with national occupational codes;
- training to help educators understand the language needs of the employment sector and to analyze the language skills being used.

Also in a recent article in the Vancouver Sun (September 20, 2006), Murray Coell outlined the Ministry of Advanced Education's commitment to language training within the post-secondary institutions of BC. In this article, he pointed out that the language training already offered is varied ranging from basic ESL to specialized courses for internationally educated professionals. He states: "As a government, our goal is to make the most of British Columbians' potential, no matter where they were born, and no matter what level of education they have attained." He also says:

Our government considers this [funding of language programs] a vital investment in our future. As baby boomers reach retirement age and more and more jobs open up, B.C.'s economic success will depend on having the skilled workers to fill those jobs. The varied and innovative ESL programs at our post-secondary institutions are helping our province tap into a pool of resources -- and helping immigrants improve their lives.

The government funding Murray Coell refers to from the Ministry of Advanced Education and the International Qualifications Unit in the Ministry of Economic Development is increasingly being tied to the Canadian Language Benchmarks. This is also true of federally funded projects. When colleges submit proposals for new courses or curriculum development, the Canadian Language Benchmarks are integral to these proposals because they identify target language levels and

the types of language skills for the projects. Courses stemming from the various projects can be offered by the colleges and can thus be articulated as part of ESL Articulation.

A recent initiative that can also be tied to the ESL Articulation process is the newly formed National Working Group for Benchmarking Applications. For a number of years, ESL professionals in B.C. and other provinces have been analyzing the language demands using the Canadian Language Benchmarks in a variety of college programs and occupations, so at the recent TESL Canada Conference (November, 2006), representatives from this group met to form a collaborative working group so that experience and expertise can be shared on a national level. This has implications for ESL articulation because once the language demands of a particular program or occupation have been analyzed or benchmarked, the benchmark for entry into the program or occupation has been identified. ESL professionals can then design language courses and programs to prepare learners for these programs or occupations. These courses then become part of the BC ESL system and, as a result, can be articulated within the BC transfer system.

By aligning the Benchmarks to the EAP levels and writing the Access and Work outcomes using Benchmarks, the ESL Articulation Guide can become more accessible and relevant and thus more widely used within the BC transfer system and beyond.

## **5. Recommended Actions for the BC ESL Articulation Committee**

Ongoing review and development is crucial for any articulation process, but is particularly important with this project since the shift to a systematic alignment and use of the Canadian Language Benchmarks necessitates examination of the benchmarks and training required to do so. The recommendations for the ESL Articulation Committee are to:

### **1. EAP**

- Make minor revisions to EAP course outcomes descriptors. See Appendix VI.
- Incorporate the CLB alignments into the Seventh Edition of the *ESL Articulation Guide*.
- Learn how to use the CLB to assist in articulating EAP courses using the existing EAP outcomes

### **Access & English for Work**

- Update the Articulation Guide as to currency of courses listed
- Learn how to use the CLBs to articulate courses
- Re-articulate all Access and Work courses using CLBs

Note: The researchers have extensive notes to assist with this work.

2. Combine an annual review of the EAP descriptors and the CLB alignments with on-going workshops on comparison of tasks, outcomes and scoring procedures within the EAP context. Where practical, use nationally developed rubrics adapted for provincial & local use. The ongoing review and workshops will normally take place in conjunction with the annual two day articulation meeting in May.
3. For Access programs, promote and facilitate the benchmarking of courses by providing, at annual articulation meetings, regular workshops on how to benchmark existing courses, workshops on task development and on inter-institutional comparison of course content and scoring procedures. The function of these workshops would be to describe, as far as possible, existing courses in benchmark terms and to foster a common understanding of the benchmarks as a language to facilitate transferability.
4. Become actively involved in looking at CLB assessment instruments that are aimed at students with skill levels equivalent to the present BC Access levels and determine the suitability of the tests for use as placement tests.
5. Become actively involved in the review (and possible revision) of the Canadian Language Benchmarks (so that our process of review can inform their revision and the revision can more immediately inform our review.) See Appendix VII.

The researchers realize that the results and recommendations will have broader implications for BC ESL Articulation and recognize that a great deal of work lies ahead. Nevertheless, the alignment of the Canadian Language Benchmarks to the English for Academic Purposes levels and the rewriting of the Access outcomes using the Canadian Language Benchmarks should position the BC Articulation transfer work very nicely into a broader context where great growth and potential for ESL programming is occurring with reference to the Canadian Language Benchmarks. At the same time, the Committee also recognizes that the English for Academic Purposes outcomes, while needing some reworking, have suited the BC context very well, preparing students for the challenges of the academic programs they will be entering. Ultimately, by aligning the ESL programs in BC to the Canadian Language Benchmarks and incorporating these alignments into the ESL Articulation Guide, transfer within the BC transfer system will be facilitated more seamlessly than in the past.

## Glossary of Acronyms

AEPUCE	Academic English Program for University and College Entrance
BCCP	British Columbia College Presidents
CELBAN	Canadian English Language Benchmark Assessment Test for Nurses
CLB	Canadian Language Benchmarks
CLB 2000	<i>Canadian Language Benchmarks 2000</i>
CLBPT	Canadian Language Benchmarks Placement Test
EAP	English for Academic Purposes
ESL	English as a Second Language
MAVED	Ministry of Advanced Education
TESL	Teachers of English as a Second Language
UT	University Transfer

# Appendices

All CLB descriptions are from  
Pawlikowska-Smith, G. (2002). *Canadian Language Benchmarks 2000*. Ottawa:  
Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.  
(Free download available from: [www.language.ca](http://www.language.ca) )

## Appendix I: Benchmark Alignments for EAP IV for Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing

### EAP IV: Speaking: CLB 8

#### Articulation Outcomes for Speaking Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors

- a. Participate in a variety of complex academic activities or situations involving multiple purposes and participants (e.g. group work, discussions, debates, seminars, meetings, presentations).**

What the person can do Benchmark 8  
Information  
Presentations

- Give a presentation to describe and explain a complex structure, system or process based on research. Use a diagram to support the explanations.
- Tell a story, which includes an anecdote.
- Ask for and/or provide detailed information related to personal needs, varied daily activities and routine work requirements.
- Discuss options.

Interaction in a group

- Participate in a debate/discussion/meeting on an abstract familiar topic or issue.
- Express and analyse opinions and feelings
- Express doubts and concerns; oppose or support a stand or a proposed solution

- b. Respond to questions and feedback, and maintain or extend an exchange.**

What the person can do Benchmark 8  
Conversational Management

- Manage conversation. Check comprehension
- Use a variety of strategies to keep conversation going
- Encourage others to participate

Information

Interaction one-on-one

- Ask for and/or provide detailed information related to personal needs, varied daily activities and routine work requirements
- Discuss options

**c. Demonstrate the appropriate use of conversation management skills (e.g. body language, timing, spatial relationships, turn-taking, eye contact) required in most academic, formal and informal situations.**

What the person can do Benchmark 8

Conversational Management

- Manage conversation. Check comprehension
- Use a variety of strategies to keep conversation going
- Encourage others to participate

**d. Express and support abstract, theoretical, or philosophical ideas in own academic or technical field.**

What the person can do Benchmark 8

Information

Interaction in a group

- Express doubts and concerns; oppose or support a stand or a proposed solution

Performance Indicators Benchmark 8

Information

Interaction in a group

- Opposes or supports a stand, idea, proposed solution

**e. Use a wide range of vocabulary, idioms and colloquial expressions to handle most social or study situations typical of academic environments.**

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- In social interaction, learner demonstrates increased ability to respond appropriately to the formality level of the situation
- Can use a variety of sentence structures including embedded and report structures, and an expanded inventory of concrete, idiomatic and conceptual language
- Grammar and pronunciation errors rarely impede communication

Performance Indicator Benchmark 8

- Demonstrates adequate vocabulary for the topic, including sufficient technical language to describe a process

**f. Use a range of abstract, technical, and conceptual and idiomatic language with some manipulation of tone, nuance and register.**

Performance Indicator Benchmark 8

- Adjusts conversation to appropriate formality level

**g. Express critical judgments appropriately.**

What the person can do Benchmark 8

Interaction in a group

- Participate in a debate/discussion/meeting on an abstract familiar topic or issue.
- Express and analyze opinions and feelings.
- Express doubts and concerns; oppose or support a stand or a proposed solution.

Performance Indicators Benchmark 8

Information

Interaction in a group

- Participates in a seminar-style or business meeting (e.g., debate/discussion/meeting)
- Expresses opinions, feelings, doubts and concerns
- Qualifies opinions, adds information, elaborates
- Opposes or supports a stand, idea, proposed solution
- Uses appropriate non-verbal behavior

**h. Use a wide range of structures fluently and appropriately with very few errors which interfere with meaning.**

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- Can use a variety of sentence structures including embedded and report structures, and an expanded inventory of concrete, idiomatic and conceptual language
- Grammar and pronunciation errors rarely impede communication

**i. Produce fluent, extended speech with few errors in pronunciation.**

Performance Indicators Benchmark 8

Information

Presentations

- Speaks with adequate fluency and intelligibility

### Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- Grammar and pronunciation errors rarely impede communication
- Discourse is reasonably fluent



## **EAP IV: Listening CLB 8**

### **Articulation Outcomes for Listening Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors**

- a. Understand conversations, discussions, instructions, speeches or lectures at a normal to high rate (take this out?) of speech, despite unfamiliar and low frequency vocabulary.**

#### Global Performance Descriptor B8

- can follow most formal and informal conversations, and some technical work related discourse in own field at a normal rate of speech

#### Performance Conditions Benchmark 8

- Listening texts are monologues/presentations and dialogues (five to ten minutes), within familiar general topics and technical discourse in own field

#### Performance Conditions Benchmark 8

- Listening texts are monologues/presentations and dialogues (five to ten minutes), within familiar general topics and technical discourse in own field
- Presentation/lecture is informal or semi-formal with the use of pictures/visuals (10 to 15 minutes)

#### Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 9

- Can follow a broad variety of general interest and technical topics in own field, including unfamiliar topics on abstract conceptual or technical matters, when discourse has clear organizational structure and clear discourse transition signals, and is delivered in a familiar accent

- b. Understand information delivered through a variety of broadcast media (e.g. radio, television, film and CD-ROM).**

#### Performance Condition Benchmark 8

- Communication is face-to face, observed live, or video- and audio-mediated (e.g., tape, TV, radio)

- c. Distinguish between formal and informal register in a wide variety of listening situations.**

#### Performance Indicators Benchmark 8

Identifies some attitudinal nuance, emotional tone and register of the text  
(Note: register at B9 too high)

**d. Understand natural speech incorporating changes in rate of delivery and a full range of structures.**

This is not included as a competency outcome and standard; rather, it is described in the “What may need to be taught or learned” section for achieving benchmark competencies at Stage II.

Strategy to develop:

- recognition of extralinguistic and paralinguistic signals (e.g., loudness, pitch, speech rate, body language, other visual clues); using the clues for inferencing, hypothesizing, guessing and predicting in interpreting oral discourse

**e. Understand a range of vocabulary, idioms, colloquial expressions and technical terminology to handle most social or study situations typical of an academic environment.**

This is not included as a competency outcome and standard; rather, it is described in the “What may need to be taught or learned” section for achieving benchmark competencies at Stage II.

Strategies to develop:

- recognition of words and expressions relating to topic areas (e.g., general content and academic areas; occupational and vocational areas; social participation areas); recognition of an expanded range of simple concrete, abstract, idiomatic and technical language relating to familiar everyday facts, opinions, feelings and ideas, basic concepts and applications of numeracy, science, technology, social science and Canadian citizenship, cross-cultural and multicultural issues, literature and the media; health, education, jobs and occupations, financial and consumer services;
- recognition of grammar structures, cohesion links across utterances and discourse indicators signaling such meanings as contrast or illustration by example (P. 75)

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- Can comprehend an expanded range of concrete, abstract and conceptual language

**f. Understand explanations of abstract, theoretical and philosophical ideas.**

#### Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- Can follow discourse about abstract and complex ideas on a familiar topic

#### Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 9

- can follow a broad variety of general interest and technical topics in own field, including unfamiliar topics on abstract conceptual or technical matters, when discourse has clear organizational structure and clear discourse transition signals, and is delivered in a familiar accent

#### **g. Understand extended exchanges or discourse (e.g. be able to discern major and minor points, rhetorical discourse patterns, style, attitude, purpose and to make critical judgments).**

##### Performance Indicators Benchmark 8 (P. 83)

- Identifies the component parts of the presentation (e.g. introduction, etc.)
- Identifies phrases and sentences that mark topic introduction, topic development, topic shift and conclusion
- Identifies main idea, which is not explicitly stated, and extracts detailed information from the text
- Identifies, facts, opinions and attitudes in conversations about abstract ideas

#### **h. Take effective notes from oral academic discourse (e.g. lectures, presentations, videos).**

See performance indicators at Benchmark 8 for g

#### Examples of Tasks and Texts Benchmark 9

- In a lecture or presentation, identify phrases and sentences that mark: introducing topic, listing and naming of points to come, restating, examples to illustrate a point, summarizing or connecting examples to a point, transitioning to the next point and concluding.

This is also addressed under writing: reproducing information

## EAP IV: Reading: CLB 9

### Articulation Outcomes for Reading Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors

- a. **Comprehend a wide variety of lengthy, complex material (e.g. academic and literary writing, technical manuals, research papers, journal articles, formal and informal reports).**

#### Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 9

- Learner can read authentic multipurpose texts: daily newspaper items, short stories and popular novels; academic materials, sections of textbooks, manuals; simple routine business letters and documents

#### Performance Conditions Benchmark 9

- Texts are descriptive, narrative, evaluative; reports, expository and argumentative essays, problem-solution papers, research papers

#### What the Person Can Do Benchmark 9

##### Social Interaction Texts

- Identify and explain point of view, personal attitudes and emotions (where obvious from stated and unspecified clues in the text) in editorials, letters (e.g., letters to the editor), personal essays and fictional writing. (9)

- b. **Analyze extended texts (e.g. to discern major and minor points, discourse patterns, style, attitude, writer's purpose and bias, and to make critical judgments).**

#### What the Person Can Do Benchmark 9

##### Social interaction texts

##### Performance indicators

- Identifies/explains point of view and personal attitude of the writer
- Identifies the emotional tone of the text, infers emotions from a few clues
- Identifies communicative value and writer's intent in whole text and its parts
- Makes inferences and states implicit details

#### Overview Stage III

#### What may need to be taught or learned to achieve Reading Benchmark

#### Competencies at Stage III

#### Strategies to develop:

- Using context clues (e.g., paraphrasing, summarizing, applying previous knowledge, recognizing stylistic and rhetorical features of the text); using

interpretive skills (e.g., inference, reading between the lines, drawing conclusions, predicting outcomes); using critical skills (e.g., evaluation, judging)

What the person can do Benchmark 9

Informational texts

- Identify main idea(s) and identify ways in which the supporting details develop the main idea(s) in complex texts by reorganizing the text into an outline format.

Performance Indicators Benchmark 9

Informational texts

- Identifies factual details and inferred meanings in text as required (70 – 80%)
- Identifies main idea, which may not be explicitly stated, and supporting details
- Separates relevant from irrelevant information

**c. Use the resources of a library (e.g. catalogues and indexes) and/or the Internet and other electronic media to gather information for research purposes.**

What the person can do Benchmark 9

Information literacy/reference and study skills competencies

- Access a single piece of information involving a complex search in on-line electronic reference sources

Performance Indicators Benchmark 9

- Transfers complex textual information to an alternate form
- Accesses information involving a complex electronic or traditional library search; uses effective search strategy

**d. Take effective study notes from readings**

Global Performance Descriptors Benchmark 9

- Can sufficiently grasp the meaning of text to paraphrase or summarize key points

**e. Demonstrate increased facility in adjusting reading rate according to level of materials and purpose for reading.**

This is not addressed in the CLB

**f. Comprehend a complete range of structures to be able to fully interact with a text.**

Performance Conditions Benchmark 9

- Topics and language may be abstract, conceptual or technical

**g. Comprehend a wide variety of conceptual and symbolic language and high frequency idiomatic expressions.**

Performance Conditions Benchmark 9

- Topics and language may be abstract, conceptual or technical

**h. Apply decoding skills to unfamiliar, low frequency words and expressions.**

Overview Stage III

What may need to be taught or learned to achieve Reading Benchmark Competencies at Stage III

Strategies to develop:

- Understanding the range of concrete, abstract, idiomatic and technical language; content knowledge; and academic discourse relating to complex concepts and applications of sciences, technology, social sciences, humanities and other academic and professional and occupational domains

**Note:** At Benchmark 9, this is just the beginning of Stage III, so the teaching of strategies will reflect this.

## **EAP IV: Writing: CLB 9**

### **Articulation Outcomes for Writing Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors**

- a. Draft, revise and edit extended texts such as a sustained series of paragraphs comprising a college-level essay or report.**

#### Global Performance Descriptor 9

- Can write a coherent essay, paper or report (three to five double-spaced typed pages; descriptive, narrative, expository, argumentative/persuasive) in order to present information and state a position on a previously researched topic.

#### What the Person Can Do Benchmark 9

##### Presenting Information and Ideas

- Write a paper, essay, report or story to narrate a sequence of events from the past.
- Write a paper, essay, report to describe and compare complex ideas, phenomena or processes.
- Write a personal response essay to a text or another stimulus.

#### What the Person Can Do Benchmark 10

##### Presenting Information and Ideas

- Write an expository paper, report or essay to explain causal and logical relationships between facts, phenomena and events.

- b. Identify and correct to eliminate all but occasional grammatical and lexical errors.**

#### Performance Indicators Benchmark 9

##### Reproducing Information

- Presents information with only minor errors in grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and punctuation; document layout /format

- c. Use a wide range of complex structures and demonstrate a good control over sentence patterns.**

#### Performance Indicators Benchmark 9

##### Presenting Information and Ideas

- Uses a range of complex and diverse structures and vocabulary with an occasional error in grammar and spelling

See Examples of texts and tasks in the CLB 200 (p. 173) to see how this depends on the complexity of the task

- d. Use a wide range of vocabulary pertinent to the formality level, subject area, topic, and task.**

Performance Indicators Benchmark 9

Presenting Information and Ideas

- Uses a range of complex and diverse structures and vocabulary with an occasional error in grammar and spelling
- See Examples of texts and tasks (173) to see how this depends on the complexity of the task

- e. Write an argumentative text (e.g. essay, report, article) which presents, explains, argues and defends one's own viewpoint and evaluates the views of others.**

What the Person Can Do Benchmark 10

Presenting Information and Ideas

- Write a paper that poses a problem and presents arguments for a solution.

**Note:** This is a benchmark 10 task but the performance conditions are 9, that is it is guided with substantial support.

- f. Gather, select, organize and synthesize information to produce a research paper with an appropriate style guide, format, and documentation (references and citations).**

What the Person Can Do Benchmark 9

Reproducing Information

- Write summaries and summary reports of longer texts. (9)

Performance Indicator Benchmark 9

Reproducing Information

- Reduces the information to main points with accurate supporting details, with no major factual omissions or errors

- g. Write a literary essay which demonstrates a good understanding of specific characteristics of a particular literary genre.**

What the Person Can Do Benchmark 9

Presenting Information and Ideas

- Write a paper, essay, report to describe and compare complex ideas, phenomena or processes. (9)



- Write a personal response essay to a text or another stimulus. (9)

**h. Write a report which demonstrates a thorough understanding of audience and purpose.**

Performance Indicator Benchmark 9

Presenting Information and Ideas

- Addresses the purpose of the task with an appropriate sense of audience.

**i. Set and adjust goals according to audience, purpose, form and organization.**

Stage III Overview: Writing

What may need to be taught or learned to achieve Writing Benchmark

Competencies at Stage III

Background knowledge required for successful performance of a writing task

- Knowledge of text purpose, audience, context, content/topic and related vocabulary and of the appropriate text format
- Knowledge of language and discourse type (including formal writing conventions and standard phrases) for the task; and
- Knowledge of the formality requirements of conveying a message (e.g. , for workplace memoranda, other internal workplace correspondence, letters of request, work record, formal business/job search correspondence, letters of request, work record, formal business/job search correspondence, e-mail; social messages)

**j. Use writing to support and explain concrete, abstract, and theoretical topics in depth.**

What the Person Can Do Benchmark 10

Presenting Information and Ideas

- Write an expository paper, report or essay to explain causal and logical relationships between facts, phenomena and events.

**Note:** This is a benchmark 10 task but the performance conditions are 9 since the learner text is “up to five double-spaced typed pages long” (Benchmark 9) not “up to 10 double-spaced typed pages long” (Benchmark 10).

## **Appendix II: Benchmark Alignments for EAP III for Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing**

### **EAP III: Speaking: CLB 7/8**

#### **Articulation Outcomes for Speaking Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors**

- a. Participate in a variety of academic activities or situations involving multiple purposes and participants (e.g. group work, discussions, debates, oral presentations).**

What the person can do Benchmark 8

Information

Presentations

- Give a presentation to describe and explain a complex structure, system or process based on research. Use a diagram to support the explanations.

What the person can do Benchmark 8

Information

Interaction in a group

- Participate in a debate/discussion/meeting on an abstract familiar topic or issue.
- Express and analyze opinions and feelings.
- Express doubts and concerns; oppose or support a stand or a proposed solution.

- b. Respond to questions and feedback and maintain or extend an exchange with some rewording or rephrasing to clarify meaning.**

What the person can do Benchmark 7

Conversation management

Social interaction

- Confirm own comprehension
- Use a number of strategies to keep the conversation going
- Change topic

Performance Indicators Benchmark 7

Conversation management

- Confirms own comprehension of details by repeating and paraphrasing
- Maintains conversation by various strategies (e.g., asking follow-up information questions)

- Resumes after interruption
- Changes topic

What the person can do Benchmark 8

Social interaction

Conversation management

- Manage conversation. Check comprehension
- Use a variety of strategies to keep conversation going
- Encourage others to participate

Performance Indicators Benchmark 8

Social interaction

Conversation management

- Manages conversation
- Checks if listener can follow
- Keeps conversation going by a range of strategies, including follow-up questions
- Includes others

**c. Demonstrate the use of a range of conversation management skills (e.g. body language, timing, spatial relationships, turn-taking, eye contact) in some formal settings and most informal settings.**

Performance Conditions Benchmark 7 and 8

- Interaction is formal or semi-formal

Also see B

**d. Express and support ideas, opinions and feelings about familiar topics fluently; express and support feelings and opinions about less familiar topics and abstract ideas about familiar topics with some effectiveness.**

Performance Conditions Benchmark 8

- Topic is familiar, concrete and abstract

Performance Indicators Benchmark 8

Information

- expresses main ideas and supports them with details

Interaction in a group

- expresses opinions feelings doubts and concerns

**e. Express critical judgments appropriately.**

What the person can do Benchmark 8

Information

Interaction in a group

- Participate in a debate/discussion/meeting on an abstract familiar topic or issue.
- Express and analyze opinions and feelings.
- Express doubts and concerns; oppose or support a stand or a proposed solution.

Performance Indicators Benchmark 8

Information

Interaction in a group

- Participates in a seminar-style or business meeting (e.g., debate/discussion/meeting)
- Expresses opinions, feelings, doubts and concerns
- Qualifies opinions, adds information, elaborates
- Opposes or supports a stand, idea, proposed solution
- Uses appropriate non-verbal behavior

**f. Use a range of vocabulary, idioms and colloquial expressions to participate in classroom discussions on some academic or technical topics.**

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 7

- Can use a variety of sentence structures (including compound and complex sentences) and an expanded inventory of concrete and common idiomatic language

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- Can use a range of sentence structures, including embedded and report structures, and an expanded inventory of concrete, idiomatic and conceptual language

**g. Use some abstract, technical, conceptual and idiomatic language (required in some formal, academic settings) with some rewording or rephrasing to clarify meaning.**

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 7

- Can use a variety of sentence structures (including compound and complex sentences) and an expanded inventory of concrete and common idiomatic language

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- Can use a range of sentence structures, including embedded and report structures, and an expanded inventory of concrete, idiomatic and conceptual language

**h. Use a wide range of structures with a limited number of errors that interfere with meaning.**

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 7

- Can use a variety of sentence structures (including compound and complex sentences) and an expanded inventory of concrete and common idiomatic language
- Grammar and pronunciation errors are still frequent but rarely impede communication

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- Can use a range of sentence structures, including embedded and report structures, and an expanded inventory of concrete, idiomatic and conceptual language
- Grammar and pronunciation errors rarely impede communication

**i. Produce reasonably fluent speech with a limited number of pronunciation errors, none of which prevent communication.**

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 7

- Grammar and pronunciation errors are still frequent but rarely impede communication
- Discourse is reasonably fluent, with frequent self-corrections and/or rephrasing

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- Grammar and pronunciation errors rarely impede communication
- Discourse is reasonably fluent

## EAP III: Listening: CLB 7/8

### Articulation Outcomes for Listening Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors

- a. Understand discussions, speeches, instructions, or lectures at a normal rate of speech, despite some unfamiliar or low frequency vocabulary.**

#### Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 7

- Learner can comprehend main points and most important details in oral discourse in moderately demanding contexts of language (page 80)

#### Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- Learner can comprehend main points, details, speaker's purpose, attitudes, levels of formality and styles in oral discourse in moderately demanding contexts (page 82)
- Can follow most formal and informal conversations, and some technical work-related discourse in own field at a normal rate of speech.

#### Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 9

- Can follow a broad variety of general interest and technical topics in own field, including unfamiliar topics on abstract conceptual or technical matters, when discourse had clear organizational structure and clear discourse transitions signals, and is delivered in a familiar accent (page 132)

#### Performance Conditions Benchmark 8

- Speech is clear, at a normal rate (page 82)

#### Performance Conditions Benchmark 8

- Listening texts are monologues/presentations and dialogues (five to 10 minutes), within familiar general topics and technical discourse in own field (page 82)

**Note:** B7 Listening texts are “dialogues on familiar general topics” (page 80) but in B8 are “monologues/presentations and dialogues (five to ten minutes), within familiar general topics and technical discourse in own field” (page 82). B8 is more appropriate for this descriptor for information, but B7, a “slow to normal rate” would be appropriate for social interaction but not for information at EAP III.

- b. Understand information delivered through a variety of broadcast media (e.g. radio, television, film, CD-ROM).**

Performance Condition Benchmark 7

- Discourse is live, or video- and audio-mediated (e.g., tape) (page 80)

Performance Condition Benchmark 8

- Communication is face to face, observed live, or video- and audio-mediated (e.g., tape, TV, radio).

Performance Condition Benchmark 9

- Discourse is live, or video- and audio-mediated (e.g. tape, TV, radio).

**Note:** This should not be a deciding factor in benchmarking; the breadth of exposure is important, and this occurs at many levels

**c. Distinguish between formal and informal register in speech.**

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- Can determine mood, attitudes and feelings

Social Interaction Benchmark 8

Performance Indicators

- Identifies situation, relationships between participants and speaker's purpose.
- Identifies some attitudinal nuance, emotional tone and register of the text.

What the Person Can Do Benchmark 7

Social Interaction

- Identify stated and unspecified details, facts and opinions about situation and relationship of participants containing expression of and response to gratitude and appreciation, complaint, hope, disappointment, satisfaction, dissatisfaction, approval and disapproval. (7)

What the Person Can Do Benchmark 8

Social Interaction

- Identify stated and unspecified details about mood, attitude, situation and formality in discourse containing expression of and response to formal welcomes, farewells, toasts, congratulations on achievements and awards, sympathy and condolences. (8)

**d. Understand most natural speech (See revised descriptor) with a varied rate of delivery and a full range of structures, with some dependence on repetition.**

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 7

- Can follow most formal and informal conversations on familiar topics at a descriptive level, at a normal rate of speech, especially as a participant.
- Has difficulty following a faster conversation between native speakers.

#### Performance Conditions Benchmark 7

- Learner may need one or two repetitions

#### What the Person Can Do Benchmark 7

##### Social Interaction

- Identify stated and unspecified details, facts and opinions about situation and relationship of participants containing expression of and response to gratitude and appreciation, complaint, hope, disappointment, satisfaction, dissatisfaction, approval and disapproval. (7)

#### Examples of Tasks and Texts Benchmark 7

- **C, S, W.** Listen to conversations between individuals. Identify stated and unspecified details about the situation, relationships, intent and mood of participants. Answer questions.

#### Overview

What may need to be taught or learned to achieve Listening Benchmark Competencies at Stage II (page 75)

Strategies to develop:

- Recognition of linguistic signals (e.g., sounds [segments], rhythm, and intonation for interpret oral discourse);
- Recognition of extralinguistic and paralinguistic signals (e.g., loudness, pitch, speech rate, body language, other visual clues); using the clues for inferencing, hypothesizing, guessing and predicting in oral discourse.

#### **e. Understand a range of idiomatic, abstract, technical and conceptual language related to general academic topics.**

#### Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 7

- Can understand an expanded inventory of concrete and idiomatic language

#### Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- Can comprehend an expanded range of concrete, abstract and conceptual language

#### **f. Understand opinions and feelings about relatively unfamiliar topics and abstract ideas about familiar topics.**



What the Person Can Do Benchmark 8  
Information

- Identify facts, opinions and attitudes in conversations about abstract and complex ideas on a familiar topic.

**g. Understand exchanges or discourses of moderate length (i.e. to identify main ideas and supporting details, rhetorical patterns, style, attitude and purpose).**

What the Person Can Do Benchmark 8  
Information

- Identify main idea (which is not explicitly stated) organization and specific details in extended oral presentations.

**h. Take notes from oral academic discourse of moderate to extended length (e.g. lectures, presentations, instructions, videos).**

Performance Indicators Benchmark 7  
Information

- Identifies rhetorical discourse markers and patterns of chronological order/sequence, comparison and contrast, and cause and effect.
- Responds to requests for facts, opinions and attitudes relating to the text.

**Note:** The writing description for this is also relevant.

Overview Benchmark 8

What may need to be learned to achieve Writing Benchmark Competencies at Stage II

- Ability to reproduce and reduce information (e.g., to paraphrase, summarize, outline in point form); techniques for taking messages and notes, and for completing a variety of forms and/or other documents. (page 99)

## **EAP III: Reading: CLB 8**

### **Articulation Outcomes for Reading Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors**

- a. Comprehend a variety of written materials of moderate length, within a less familiar context (e.g. sections of texts, short stories, novels and reports).**

#### Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- Learner can follow main ideas, key words and important details in an authentic two- to three-page text on a familiar topic, but within an only partially predictable context
  - May read popular newspaper and magazine articles and popular easy fiction as well as academic and business materials.
- b. Analyze sections of texts, (e.g. to discern major and supporting points, transitions, discourse patterns, bias, tone, purpose and audience).**

#### Social Interaction Texts Benchmark 8

##### Performance Indicators

- Identifies specific factual details and inferred [implied] meanings in text
- Identifies purpose of text, context of the situation, reader-writer relationship
- Identifies mood/attitude of writer and register of the text

#### Informational Texts Benchmark 8

##### Performance Indicators

- Identifies main idea
- Identifies organization of text, topic sentences and logical relationship links between paragraphs. (page 95)

#### **Note: Benchmark 7 text and length seem different than 8**

- c. Search for reading materials of interest, or relevant to an assigned task, using library resources and other sources of print media.**

#### Informational Texts: Information literacy/reference and study skills competencies Benchmark 8

- Access/locate several pieces of information in on-line electronic reference sources.

#### Examples of Texts and Tasks Benchmark 8

- **C,S,W** Access/locate several pieces of information in on-line electronic reference sources
- d. Be able to identify appropriate sources and to use standard reference materials (e.g. dictionaries, encyclopedias, catalogues, manuals, Internet) to clarify terms or concepts from reading.**

Performance Indicators Benchmark 8  
Informational texts

- Extracts detailed information
- Uses effective search strategy and tools

**e. Make useful study notes from reading.**

Performance Indicators Benchmark 8  
Informational texts

- Extracts detailed information

**f. Adjust reading rate according to the level of the material and the purpose for reading.**

Overview Stage II Reading

What may need to be taught or learned to achieve Reading Benchmark

Competencies at Stage II

Strategies to develop

- Ability to use difference reading techniques according to task purpose (e.g., developing skimming to get the gist, developing scanning to locate detailed information, speed reading, in-depth reading) (page 87)

**g. Comprehend a wide range of complex and low frequency structures using grammatical analysis.**

Overview Stage II Reading

What may need to be taught or learned to achieve Reading Benchmark

Competencies at Stage II

Strategies to develop

- Recognition of grammar structures and cohesion links to interpret text (page 87)

**h. Comprehend a range of content words, idiomatic expressions, and some abstract, symbolic and technical language.**

Overview Stage II Reading

What may need to be taught or learned to achieve Reading Benchmark  
Competencies at Stage II  
Strategies to develop

- Recognition and comprehension of an expanded range of simple, concrete, abstract, idiomatic and technical language relating to common knowledge, facts, opinions, feelings and ideas; basic concepts and application of numeric, science, technology, social issues, Canadian citizenship, literature and the media; health, education, jobs and occupations, financial and consumer services (page 87)
- i. Comprehend unfamiliar and/or technical terms using a range of decoding strategies and context clues.**

Overview Stage II Reading

What may need to be taught or learned to achieve Reading Benchmark  
Competencies at Stage II  
Strategies to develop

- Ability to use textual and contextual clues to interpret text (e.g. literal and inferential comprehension; reading between the lines, drawing conclusions, predicting outcomes)
- j. Use a unilingual dictionary independently.**

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- Uses a unilingual dictionary when reading for precision vocabulary building

## **EAP III: Writing: CLB 8**

### **Articulation Outcomes for Writing Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors**

#### **a. Draft, revise and edit essays/reports.**

Overview: Writing

What may need to be taught or learned to achieve Writing Benchmark Competencies at Stage II

- Writing as a process: pre-writing (e.g. generating ideas, concept-mapping), drafting a composition and re-writing (e.g., revising and proofreading for spelling, punctuation, grammar);
- Ability to write a paragraph/ a sequence of paragraphs; knowledge of paragraph structure/form and relationships between paragraphs (e.g., opening/introduction, development/body, conclusion/closing; using discourse indicators and patterns signalling such meanings as chronological sequence, comparison and contrast, cause and effect, or illustration by example) (page 99)

#### **b. Identify and correct most grammatical and lexical errors.**

Global Performance Descriptor Benchmark 8

- Demonstrates good control over common sentence patterns, coordination and subordination, and spelling and mechanics. Has occasional difficulty with complex structures (e.g., those reflecting cause and reason, purpose, comment), naturalness of phrases and expressions, organization and style (page 106)

Overview: Writing

What may need to be taught or learned to achieve Writing Benchmark Competencies at Stage II

- Writing as a process: pre-writing (e.g. generating ideas, concept-mapping), drafting a composition and re-writing (e.g., revising and proofreading for spelling, punctuation, grammar) (page 99)

#### **c. Use a range of complex structures and demonstrate control over a variety of sentence patterns.**

Performance Indicators Benchmark 8

Presenting Information and Ideas

- Demonstrates good use of complex structures, with only minor difficulties

**d. Use a range of vocabulary pertinent to the formality level, subject area, topic, and task.**

Performance Indicators Benchmark 8

Presenting Information and Ideas

- Demonstrates adequate vocabulary

**e. Write a unified and coherent expository text (e.g. cause/effect, comparison/contrast) on a familiar, relevant, or previously researched subject.**

Presenting Information and Ideas Benchmark 8

What the Person Can Do

- Write three or four paragraphs to narrate a historical event; to tell a story; to express or analyze opinions on a familiar abstract topic; or to provide a detailed description and explanation of a phenomenon or a process.

Examples of Tasks and Texts Benchmark 8

Presenting Information and Ideas

- **S** Write a three- or four-paragraph essay/composition on a general, previously researched academic or work-related topic, to relate events, describe, explain, or express opinions or argue a point. (page 107)

**f. Apply basic research skills, such as selecting ideas from various sources.**

Performance Conditions Benchmark 8

- Where necessary for the task, learners must include information presented to them from other sources (e.g. photographs, drawings, reference text/research information, diagrams).

Also refer to reading B8

Overview Benchmark 8

What may need to be learned to achieve Writing Benchmark Competencies at Stage II

- Ability to reproduce and reduce information (e.g., to paraphrase, summarize, outline in point form); techniques for taking messages and notes, and for completing a variety of forms and/or other documents. (page 99)

**g. Produce a standard, formal, academic essay or technical report related to the student's field of study.**

As for e

**h. Determine audience, purpose, form, content and organization.**

Presenting Information Benchmark 8

Performance Indicators

- Address the purpose of the task
- Conveys a sense of audience

**i. Write accurate paraphrases and summaries.**

Reproducing Information Benchmark 8

What the Person can Do

- Write an outline or a summary of a longer text.

## **Appendix III: Benchmark Alignments for EAP II for Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing**

### **EAP II: Reading: CLB 7/8**

#### **Articulation Outcomes for Reading Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors**

**a. Comprehend selected authentic texts and or/supported materials of moderate length (e.g. newspaper and magazine articles, manuals, forms, tables, short stories and novels) within a less familiar context.**

Benchmark 8 Global Performance Descriptors

- Learner can follow main ideas, key words and important details in an authentic two- or three-page text on a familiar topic, but within an only partially predictable context. ([partially predictable = less familiar])
- May read popular newspaper and magazine articles and popular easy fiction as well as academic and business materials

**b. Analyze sections of text (e.g. to discern main ideas, supporting details, fact from opinion, purpose and meaning).**

Benchmark 8 What the person can do

- Demonstrate comprehension of factual details and inferred meanings in an extended description, report or narration when events are reported out of sequence. Draw conclusions.

Benchmark 8 Performance indicators, Informational Texts

- Identifies factual details and inferred meanings in text (70-80%)
- Identifies main idea
- Distinguishes facts from opinions
- Extracts detailed information
- Evaluates ideas in text, draws conclusions and expresses own opinion.

**c. Select and use a variety of sources to get information (e.g. library catalogues, handbooks, Internet).**

Benchmark 7 What the person can do (Information literacy/reference and study skills competencies):

- Access and locate three or four pieces of information in on-line electronic reference sources (e.g., World Wide Web, library databases), if available, or from print reference sources.



Benchmark 8 What the person can do (Information literacy/reference and study skills competencies):

- Access/locate several pieces of information in on-line electronic reference sources

Benchmark 7 Performance Indicators

- Accesses/locates three or four pieces of information in a CD-ROM electronic reference source, if available.
- Accesses/locates three or four pieces of information in print reference sources.

**d. Use context, title, headings and format to predict and determine information about a text.**

Only mentioned in Overview of Stage II (Benchmarks 5-8) as “Background knowledge and preparation required for successful performance of a reading task:

- pre-reading, focusing, guided reading activities

**e. Adjust reading rate according to task (skimming and scanning a variety of passages, including visually complex texts, to find general and specific information)**

Mentioned in Overview of Stage II (Benchmarks 5-8) as a “strategy to develop”:

- ability to use different reading techniques according to task purpose (e.g., developing skimming to get the gist, developing scanning to locate detailed information, speed reading, in-depth reading).

**f. Comprehend a variety of high frequency structures.**

Not dealt with in CLB

**g. Comprehend high frequency content words, common expressions and idioms. Tolerate some ambiguity in reading passages (e.g. low frequency idioms, abstract terms, or culturally dependent references).**

Not dealt with in CLB

**h. Use context clues to guess meanings of unfamiliar words, and use affixes and roots in decoding.**

Benchmarks 7 Performance Indicators

- Guesses meaning of words

Benchmarks 8 Performance Indicators

- Infers meaning of words from context clues

(Note: Affixes and roots are not addressed in the CLB)

**i. Use a unilingual ESL dictionary regularly.**

Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptors 7

- Learner uses a unilingual dictionary when reading for confirmation of and precision in interpretation

## EAP II: Writing: CLB 7

### Articulation Outcomes for Writing Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors

#### a. Draft, revise and edit paragraphs.

##### Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptors

- Can construct coherent paragraphs on familiar concrete topics, with clear main ideas and some supporting details, and with a developing sense of audience

##### Benchmark 7 Presenting Information and Ideas, Examples of tasks and texts:

- Word process, revise, edit, format and print texts

#### b. Self-correct most frequent grammatical and lexical errors.

##### Benchmark 7 Performance Indicators

- Demonstrates accurate spelling and punctuation, makes minor errors only. (because of Performance condition 2-3 paragraphs)

#### c. Use some complex structures and demonstrate control over common sentence patterns.

##### Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptors 6

- Demonstrates good control over simple structures, but has difficulty with some complex structures and produces some awkward sounding phrases (word combinations)

#### d. Use a variety of content words and idiomatic language.

##### Benchmark 7 Performance Indicators

- Demonstrates adequate vocabulary for topic

#### e. Write expository paragraphs developed in a variety of ways, (e.g. chronological process, description, generalization and example).

##### Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptors

- Can construct coherent paragraphs on familiar concrete topics, with clear main ideas and some supporting details, and with a developing sense of audience

##### Benchmark 7 Presenting Information and Ideas, Examples of tasks and texts

- C,S write a report comparing two education systems, etc
- S describe a process

#### Benchmark 6 Performance Indicators

- Provides accurate descriptions, comparisons, account of events in the report/story, sequence of stages in a process

#### **f. Use both personal experience and information from other sources to support and develop academic topics.**

#### Benchmark 6 Performance Conditions<sup>1</sup>

- Where necessary for the task, learners must include information presented to them from other sources (e.g., photographs, drawings, reference text/research information, diagrams).

#### Benchmark 7 Performance Condition 12

- Where necessary for the task, learners must include information presented to them from other sources (e.g., photographs).

#### Benchmarks 6 & 7 Performance Indicators, Presenting information and ideas

- Expresses main ideas and supports them with details
- Provides an introduction, development and conclusion, and an adequate paragraph structure in the text.

#### **g. Review and practice the basic components of effective paragraph writing (unity, coherence, topic sentence and supporting details) and be introduced multi-paragraph compositions).**

#### Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptors

- Can join two or three paragraphs into a larger text

#### Benchmark 7 Performance Indicators

- Provides an introduction, development and conclusion, and an adequate paragraph structure in the text.

#### Benchmark 6 Performance Indicators, Presenting Information and Ideas

- Uses appropriate logical connectors [coherence]

#### **h. Make some adjustment for audience, purpose and intended effects.**

#### Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptors 3

- Can construct coherent paragraphs on familiar concrete topics, with clear main ideas and some supporting details, and with a developing sense of audience

#### Benchmarks 6 & 7 Performance Indicators (B7 preferred because of the nature (length) of the task:

- Addresses the purpose of the task

## EAP II: Speaking: CLB 7

### Articulation Outcomes for Speaking Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors

**a. Participate in a variety of complex (proposed change: change or remove this descriptor?) academic activities or situations involving multiple purposes and participants (e.g. group work, discussions, oral presentations, role plays).**

#### Benchmark 7 Performance Conditions

- Context is moderately demanding (e.g., real world environment)
- Presentation is informal or semi-formal

#### Benchmark 7 What the Person Can Do, Interaction in a group

- Participate in a small group discussion/meeting: express opinions and feelings; qualify opinion, express reservations, approval and disapproval

**b. Respond to questions and feedback in familiar contexts and in some unpredictable contexts, and maintain or extend an exchange with some rewording or rephrasing to clarify meaning.**

#### Benchmark 7 What the Person Can Do, Conversation Management

- Confirm own comprehension
- Use a number of strategies to keep the conversation going

#### Benchmark 7 Performance Indicators, Conversation management

- Confirms own comprehension of details by repeating and paraphrasing

#### Benchmark 7 Performance Indicators, Interaction one-on-one

- Responds to questions
- Summarizes and repeats back

**c. Demonstrate the appropriate use of conversation management skills (e.g. body language, timing, spatial relationships, turn-taking, eye contact) appropriate for most informal settings.**

#### Benchmark 7 Performance Indicators, Conversation management

- Uses appropriate non-verbal behaviour

**d. Express and/or explain ideas, opinions and feelings about familiar topics with some fluency.**

Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptors

- Can demonstrate discourse that is reasonably fluent, with frequent normal hesitations

Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptors

- Can speak on familiar concrete topics at a descriptive level (5 – 10 minutes)

Benchmark 7 Performance Indicators, Interaction in a group

- Expresses opinions, feelings and reservations

**e. Use a sufficient range of vocabulary, idioms, and expressions to participate in classroom discussion on general topics.**

[Not included in interaction in a group – is only dealt with in information/presentations]

**f. Use a limited range of new abstract, technical, conceptual and idiomatic language with some rewording and rephrasing to clarify meaning.**

Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptors

- Can use a variety of sentence structures (including compound and complex sentences) and an expanded inventory of concrete and common idiomatic language
- Discourse is reasonably fluent, with frequent self-corrections and/or rephrasing

**g. Use a variety of structures in which errors, while frequent, do not prevent basic communication.**

Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptors

- Can use a variety of sentence structures (including compound and complex sentences) and an expanded inventory of concrete and common idiomatic language
- Grammar and pronunciation errors are still frequent but rarely impede communication.

**h. Produce sustained coherent speech where errors in pronunciation do not prevent basic communication.**

Not addressed together in CLB

## EAP II: Listening: CLB 6

### Articulation Outcomes for Listening Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors

**a. Understand to a significant degree most conversations on a variety of general topics at a natural rate of speech. (Proposed change: change to slower to natural rate of speech)**

#### Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptors

- Learner can follow the main ideas and identify key words and important details in oral discourse in moderately demanding contexts of language use (e.g., face to face formal and informal conversations, audio tapes and radio broadcasts) on relevant topics and at a slower to normal rate of speed.

(Note: This benchmark is based on the assumption that the change in outcome will be accepted by the Articulation Committee)

**b. Understand selected information delivered through a variety of broadcast media (e.g. radio, television, film and CD-ROM).**

#### Performance Conditions Benchmark 6

- Communication is live, or video-and audio mediated

**c. Distinguish between formal and informal register (Proposed change: do we want to use the word register) in speech with some effectiveness. (Proposed change: possible wording – in some predictable situations).**

#### Performance Indicators Benchmark 7

- Identifies situation, relationship, mood/attitude of participants

#### Performance Indicators Benchmark 8

- Identifies some attitudinal nuance, emotional tone and register of the text

**d. Understand most natural speech containing a variety of structures, with some dependence on repetition.**

Mentioned in Overview of Stage II (Benchmarks 5 – 8), Strategies to develop:

- Recognition of grammar structures, cohesion links across utterances and discourse indicators signalling such meanings as contrast or illustration by example

**e. Understand sufficient concrete and abstract vocabulary, idioms, and expressions to follow classroom discussions on general topics.**

Mentioned in Overview of Stage II (Benchmarks 5 – 8), Strategies to develop:

- Recognition of words and expressions relating to topic areas (e.g., general content and academic areas; occupational and vocational areas; social participation areas); recognition of an expanded range of simple concrete, abstract, idiomatic and technical language relating to familiar everyday facts, opinions, feelings and ideas . . .

**f. Understand ideas, opinions, and feelings about familiar topics and activities, and some simple abstract, technical and conceptual language related to general topics.**

Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptors

- Can follow conceptualized [contextualized] discourse related to common experiences and general knowledge

Benchmark 6 Performance Indicators Social Interaction

- Identifies mood/attitude of participants

**g. Understand exchanges or discourse of short to moderate length (e.g. be able to discern main ideas, major supporting details and purpose, and to form opinions).**

Benchmark 7 What the person can do, Information

- Demonstrate comprehension of mostly factual details and some inferred meanings in an extended description, report or narration when events (or stages) are reported out of sequence

Benchmark 7 Performance Indicators, Information

- Responds to requests for facts, opinions and attitudes relating to the text.

**h. Take notes from modified oral discourse or authentic oral discourse of short to moderate length (e.g. short talks or lectures, songs, CBC news, presentations, instructions, videos).**

Not addressed in CLB – see writing



## **Appendix IV: Benchmark Alignments for EAP I for Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing**

### **EAP I: Reading: CLB 6/7**

#### **Articulation Outcomes for Reading Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors**

- a. Comprehend brief (Proposed change: Add 1- 2 pages) selected authentic readings on familiar or general topics.**

##### Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptor 1

- Learner can follow main ideas, key words and important details in an authentic one- or two-page text on a familiar topic within a predictable, practical and relevant context.

- b. Comprehend a range of (Proposed change: longer? – short novels, for eg.) simplified materials of various types.**

##### Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptor

- Learner can follow main ideas, key words and important details in a one-page (three to five paragraphs) plain language authentic prose and non-prose (formatted) text in moderately demanding contexts of language use.

- c. Comprehend the gist of longer passages, and the key words and details of sections of text.**

##### Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptor 1

- Learner can follow main ideas, key words and important details in an authentic one-or two-page text on a familiar topic within a predictable, practical and relevant context.

##### Benchmarks 6 & 7 Performance Indicators, Informational Texts

- Identifies/states main idea and key details

- d. Predict meaning and make inferences with limited accuracy and effectiveness.**

##### Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptor

- Language of the text is mostly concrete and factual, with some abstract, conceptual and technical vocabulary items,

and may require low-level inference to comprehend it (e.g., learner may guess some new words by recognition of prefixes and suffixes).

#### Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptors

- Language is concrete and abstract, conceptual and technical. Text contains facts and opinions; some information is explicit and some is implied. Low-level inference is required in comprehending the text. Linguistic and stylistic means of expression in some texts can be complex in range and demanding to follow.

#### Benchmark 6 Performance Indicators, Informational Texts

- Identifies factual details and inferred meanings in text as required (70-80%).

#### **e. Read in meaningful word groups and with sufficient speed to retain meaning.**

Not dealt with in CLB

#### **f. Comprehend a range of high frequency structures.**

Mentioned in Overview of Stage II (Benchmarks 5-8) as a “strategy to develop”:

- recognition of grammar structures and cohesion links to interpret text

#### **g. Comprehend higher frequency words and expressions, and basic concrete content words.**

Mentioned in Overview of Stage II (Benchmarks 5-8) as a “strategy to develop”:

- recognition and comprehension of an expanded range of simple concrete, abstract, idiomatic and technical language relating to common knowledge, facts, opinions, feelings and ideas.

#### Performance Conditions Benchmark 6

- Language is mostly concrete and literal, but may also be accurate and technical.

#### **h. Use context to guess some unfamiliar words and discern high frequency patterns and sound/symbol relationships.**

#### Benchmark 6 Performance Indicators

- Guesses meaning of words and expressions from textual clues

#### Benchmark 7 Performance Indicators

- Guesses meaning of words.

Mentioned in Overview of Stage II (Benchmarks 5-8) as a “strategy to develop”:

- print decoding and sight recognition of words and formulaic expressions (to assist bottom-up reading comprehension processing) in texts

#### **i. Use a bilingual dictionary regularly; begin to use a concise unilingual ESL dictionary.**

#### Benchmark 5 Global Performance Descriptor

- Generally, still uses a bilingual dictionary regularly; begins to use a concise unilingual ESL/EFL dictionary.

## EAP I: Writing: CLB 5/6

### Articulation Outcomes for Writing Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors

#### a. Draft and revise a basic paragraph.

##### Benchmark 5 Global Performance Descriptor

- Can effectively convey an idea, opinion, feeling or experience in a simple paragraph

##### Benchmark 5 What the Person Can Do, Presenting Information and Ideas:

- Write a paragraph to relate/narrate a sequence of events; to describe a person, object, scene, picture, procedure or routine; or to explain reasons

##### Benchmark 5 Presenting Information and Ideas, Examples of Tasks and Texts,

- **S,W** Write a paragraph describing an event/incident, or telling a story from your experience.
- **S** Write a paragraph to report the historical trek of an explorer, based on a map or a diagram.
- **C,S** Write a paragraph for a school newspaper to describe a community or a newly developed facility that you consider very attractive
- **C,S,W** Word-process, revise, edit, format and print texts using a computer, if available.

##### Benchmark 6 Performance Conditions

- Text is one or two short paragraphs
- Messages are five to six sentences or one paragraph long
- Text is one to two paragraphs long, on a familiar and personally relevant topic

**b. Identify common grammatical components and correct identified errors. (Proposed change: revisit this outcome --- labeling components not a writing outcome)**

Benchmarks 5 & 6 Performance Indicators, Presenting Information and Ideas

- Demonstrates good control of simple grammatical structures. May have difficulty with complex structures.

Presenting information and ideas Benchmark 5, 6, and 7

- Examples of texts and tasks
- Word-process, revise, edit, format and print texts using a computer, if available.

**c. Use a variety of simple, compound, or complex sentence patterns correctly. (Proposed change: possible elimination of the word “correctly” since it is asking too much at this level).**

Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptor

- Demonstrates good control over simple structures, but has difficulty with some complex structures and produces some awkward sounding phrases (word combinations)

Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptor

- Demonstrates mostly satisfactory control over complex structures, spelling and mechanics

**d. Use concrete content vocabulary.**

Not dealt with in CLB.

**e. Write a descriptive or narrative paragraph on a familiar or concrete topic.**

Benchmark 5 What the Person Can Do, Presenting Information and Ideas

- Write a paragraph to relate/narrate a sequence of events; to describe a person, object, scene, picture, procedure or routine; or to explain reasons

**What the person can do Benchmark 6  
Presenting Information and ideas**

Write one or two paragraphs: to relate a familiar sequence of events, tell a story, provide a detailed description or comparison of people places objects and animals plants materials or routines; or to describe a simple process. (P. 103)

Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptor

- Can effectively convey familiar information in familiar standard formats

**f. Use personal experience to write paragraphs.**

Benchmarks 5 and 6 Performance Conditions

- Topics are of immediate everyday relevance

Benchmark 5 Presenting information and ideas, Examples of Tasks and Texts

- Write a paragraph describing an event/incident, or telling a story from your experience

Performance Condition Benchmark 6

Text is one to two paragraphs long, on a familiar and personally relevant topic

**g. Use a variety of writing strategies in a sustained passage to improve fluency, e.g. journal writing.**

Not dealt with in CLB

**h. Complete functional writing tasks to meet personal and academic needs.**

Benchmark 5 Global Performance Descriptors

- Can take simple dictation with occasional repetitions at a slow to normal rate of speech
- Can reproduce in writing simple information received orally or visually
- Demonstrates better control over writing when reproducing information (e.g., writing down notes, messages, and paraphrasing)

Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptor

- Can fill out detailed job application forms with short comments on previous experience, abilities and strengths, and form reports

Benchmark 6, Business/Service Messages, Examples of Tasks and Texts, Business/service Messages

- **C** write a short letter of request to have your money returned for a guaranteed product that did not work to your satisfaction
- Fill out a short medical history form

## **EAP I: Speaking: CLB 5/6**

### **Articulation Outcomes for Speaking Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors**

- a. Participate in a variety of activities involving multiple purposes and participants (e.g. group and pair work, discussions, oral presentations, and role plays).**

Not clearly addressed in CLB

Benchmark 5 What the Person Can Do, Interaction in a group

- Participate in a small group discussion.

Benchmark 5 Performance Conditions

- Presentation is informal or semi-formal

Benchmark 6 Performance Indicators, Interaction in a group

- Participates in a small group discussion/meeting

(Note: See performance conditions for benchmarks 5 – 7.)

- b. Respond to questions and feedback in familiar and predictable contexts, and maintain a reasonably fluent exchange with frequent self-correction and/or rephrasing.**

Benchmark 5 Global Performance Descriptor

- Learner can participate with some effort in routine social conversations and can talk about needs and familiar topics of personal relevance.
- May avoid topics with unfamiliar vocabulary.
- Can demonstrate discourse that is connected (and, but, first, next, then, because) and reasonably fluent, but hesitations and pauses are frequent.

Benchmark 5 Performance Conditions

- Context is mostly familiar, or clear and predictable, but also moderately demanding (e.g., real world environment; limited support from interlocutors)
- Topics are of immediate everyday relevance

Benchmark 6 Performance Conditions

- Topic is concrete and familiar
- Context is familiar, or clear and predictable

Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptor

- Discourse is reasonably fluent exchange with frequent self-correction and/or rephrasing.

**c. Demonstrate the use of some basic conversation management skills (e.g. body language, timing, spatial relationships, turn-taking, eye contact) appropriate for daily conversations.**

Benchmark 5 What the Person Can Do, Conversation Management

- Take turns

Benchmark 5 Performance Indicators, Conversation Management

- Takes turns by giving non-verbal and verbal signals (signalling to speak)
- Encourages conversation (e.g., eye contact, smiling, nodding and short phrases).

Benchmark 6 Performance Indicators, Conversation Management

- Uses appropriate non-verbal behaviour

**d. Express and/or explain ideas, opinions and feelings about familiar topics with some reliance on re-wording or rephrasing.**

Benchmark 5 Global Performance Descriptor

- May avoid topics with unfamiliar vocabulary

Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptor

- Can communicate facts and ideas in some detail: can describe, report and provide a simple narration.

Benchmark 5 & 6 & 7 Performance Conditions

- Topic is concrete and familiar

Benchmarks 5 & 6 Performance Indicators, Interaction one-on-one

- Explains the nature of inquiry, provides necessary details.
- Asks relevant questions.
- Summarizes and repeats back.

Benchmark 5 Performance Indicators, Interaction in a group

- Expresses opinion.
- Agrees and disagrees.
- Expresses necessity and reason (must/because).

Benchmark 6 Performance Indicators, Interaction in a group

- Expresses opinions and feelings.



**e. Use a limited range of concrete vocabulary and some idiomatic expressions for use in classroom discussions on general topics.**

Benchmark 5 Global Performance Descriptor

- Can demonstrate a range of common everyday vocabulary and a limited number of idioms.

Benchmark 5 and 6 Performance Conditions

- Topic is concrete and familiar.

Benchmark 5 Performance Indicators, Information Presentations

- Uses vocabulary adequately.

Benchmark 5 and 6 Global Performance Descriptor

- Can demonstrate a range of everyday vocabulary, some common phrases and idioms.

**f. Use a very limited range of new abstract and technical language with some reliance on rewording or rephrasing.**

Not dealt with in CLB

**g. Use a limited range of structures in which errors, while frequent, don't prevent communication.**

Benchmark 5 Global Performance Descriptor

- Grammar and pronunciation errors are frequent and sometimes impede communication.

Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptor

- Grammar and pronunciation errors are frequent and may sometimes impede communication.

Benchmark 5 Performance Indicators, Information Presentations

- Uses simple grammar structures, with clear present, past and future time reference; and personal and textual reference (only some errors).

**h. Produce relatively coherent speech where errors in pronunciation seldom prevent basic communication.**

Benchmark 5 Global Performance Descriptor

- Can demonstrate discourse that is connected (and, but, first, next, then, because) and reasonably fluent, but hesitations and pauses are frequent

Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptor

- Grammar and pronunciation errors are still frequent but rarely impede communication.

Benchmarks 5 & 6 Performance Indicators, Information Presentations 1

- Presents information in a coherent connected discourse.

## **EAP I: Listening: CLB 5/6**

### **Articulation Outcomes for Listening Aligned to the Canadian Language Benchmark Descriptors**

#### **a. Understand the gist of most conversations on a variety of general topics at a natural (Proposed change: revisit natural) rate of speech.**

##### Benchmark 5 Global Performance Descriptor

- Learner can follow very broadly and with some effort the gist of oral discourse in moderately demanding contexts of language use (e.g. face to face formal conversations, audio tapes and radio broadcasts) on everyday personally relevant topics and at a slower to normal rate of speech.

##### Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptor

- Learner can follow the main idea and identify key words and important details in oral discourse in moderately demanding contexts of language use (e.g., face to face formal and informal conversations, audio tapes and radio broadcasts) on relevant topics and at a slower to normal rate of speech.

##### Benchmark 5 & 6 & 7 Performance Conditions

- Speech is clear at a slow to normal rate.

##### Benchmark 5 What the Person Can Do, Information

- Demonstrate comprehension of the gist, factual details and some inferred meanings by listening to a descriptive or narrative text.

#### **b. Begin to understand selected information delivered through a variety of broadcast media (e.g. radio, television, film and CD-ROM).**

##### Benchmark 5 Examples of Tasks and Texts, Information

- **S** Listen to a TV/Radio news item or report. Respond to a number of questions.

**c. Begin to distinguish between formal and informal register in speech.**

Performance Indicator Benchmark 5

- Social Interaction
- Identify situation and relationship between speakers

**d. Understand natural speech containing a variety of structures, in a familiar context, with some dependence on repetition.**

Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptor

- May still frequently request repetition.

Benchmark 7 Global Performance Descriptor

- Sometimes requires slower speech, repetitions and rewording.

Benchmark 6 & 7 Performance Conditions

- Learner may need one or two repetitions.

**e. Understand sufficient vocabulary to follow classroom discussions or presentations on general topics.**

Benchmark 5 Global Performance Descriptor

- Can understand a range of common vocabulary and a very limited number of idioms.

Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptor

- Can understand a range of common vocabulary and a limited number of idioms.

**f. Understand and follow instructions to complete a task.**

Benchmark 5 Global Performance Descriptor

- Can understand simple exchanges: contextualized short sets of common daily instructions and directions; direct questions about personal experience and familiar topics; routine (simple, repetitive, predictable) media announcements.

Benchmark 6 Global Performance Descriptor

- Can understand contextualized short sets of instructions and directions.

Benchmark 5 What the Person Can Do, Instructions

- Understand a range of spoken everyday instructions on step by step procedures.

#### Benchmark 5 Examples of Tasks and Texts, Instructions

- Follow oral instructions on how to use a computer (e.g., open or close a program).

#### Benchmark 5 Performance Indicators

- Responds with action to directions and instructions.
- Completes the task.

### **g. Understand ideas, opinions and feelings about familiar topics and activities.**

#### Benchmark 5 Performance Indicators, Social Interaction

- Identifies the emotional state of speaker from tone and intonation.

#### Benchmark 5 Performance Indicators, Suasion

- Identifies main intent, main idea, factual details, words and expressions and inferred meanings in persuasive oral texts as required.

### **h. Understand the gist of exchanges or discourse of short to moderate length.**

#### Benchmark 6 Performance Conditions

- Listening texts are moderately short (five to eight exchange turns, each turn three to five sentences long, or two to five minutes), on familiar topics.

### **i. Take simple notes on main ideas and some details from modified oral discourse**

Not dealt with in CLB. See writing (reproducing information) for this.

## Appendix V: Responses from Colleges that List Courses in Access

Questions	Colleges	Responses
1. Do you use the Access descriptors in the Articulation Guide? If so, how do you use them?	<p>Camosun College Capilano College College of New Caledonia</p> <p>Kwantlen University-College Langara College</p> <p>Malaspina University-College North Island College Okanagan College Thompson Rivers University University-College of the Fraser Valley University of Victoria Vancouver Community College</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Limited use occasionally when a student transfers but still use internal placement test</li> <li>• Pending</li> <li>• To articulate courses at Access 5, 6, and 7.</li> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• Sometimes</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• No (EAP used only)</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Not much</li> </ul>
2. What are your transfer issues at the access level and how do you resolve them?	<p>Camosun College Capilano College</p> <p>College of New Caledonia Kwantlen University-College Langara College Malaspina University-College North Island College Okanagan College Thompson Rivers University</p> <p>University-College of the Fraser Valley</p> <p>University of Victoria</p> <p>Vancouver Community College</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal transfer from Access to EAP</li> <li>• Access transfer issues rare to none</li> <li>• Rare (See #1)</li> <li>• Pending</li> <li>• Rare at this level</li> <li>• None</li> <li>• None</li> <li>• None</li> <li>• Seldom to none and if so would consult directly with institutions</li> <li>• None</li> <li>• The (General) Access streams and EAP streams are interchangeable *</li> <li>• Most outside applicants are referred to Assessment Department. Inter-departmental transfers</li> </ul>

		are handled using own level names (lower intermediate, upper intermediate etc.) because these are consistent across our departments.
3. Where is your link from access to EAP?	<p>Camosun College Capilano College College of New Caledonia</p> <p>Kwantlen University-College Langara College</p> <p>Malaspina University-College</p> <p>North Island College</p> <p>Okanagan College Thompson Rivers University</p> <p>University-College of the Fraser Valley University of Victoria Vancouver Community College</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access 8 to EAP III</li> <li>• No link (No Access)</li> <li>• Access 7 to EAP III (a gap at Access 8)</li> <li>• Pending</li> <li>• Access 7(LEAP 3) to EAP 1 (LEAP 4)</li> <li>• No link – students retest</li> <li>• Advanced 1 to Advanced 2 (Access 7-8)</li> <li>• Access 8 to EAP III</li> <li>• Access level 3,4,5, feeds into EAP 1</li> <li>• No link</li> <li>• No link</li> <li>• UI level (050) is articulated at Access 6. These students move to lower advanced (060) which, along with upper advanced (070) is articulated at EAP I. [RB addition: LA is articulated at Access 7, UA at Access 8. After LA/UA students move to 059, which is articulated at EAP II.]</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
4. Do you use benchmarks and if so how extensively?	<p>Camosun College</p> <p>Capilano College College of New Caledonia</p> <p>Kwantlen University-College Langara College</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All Access courses use benchmarks and the CLBPT is used for placement at the Access levels.</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Yes, course outlines, curriculum guides and marketing materials.</li> <li>• Pending</li> <li>• No but consulted the document as a resource when creating their STEP</li> </ul>

	<p>Malaspina University-College North Island College</p> <p>Okanagan College</p> <p>Thompson Rivers University University-College of the Fraser Valley</p> <p>University of Victoria</p> <p>Vancouver Community College</p>	<p>program. They didn't use the Access descriptors to create their program, but they used them to articulate it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No</li> <li>• Yes, for curriculum development and any discussion of ELSA</li> <li>• No, but use them to articulate or to write a course for the Vernon campus because of "the really excellent descriptors there," as opposed to the rather vague Access language</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Yes, In a preliminary fashion benchmarked single skill classes (scope and sequence has CLB headings) CLB not used extensively but can refer to CLB as level</li> <li>• Yes, to inform curriculum development and review – the CLBs are used as a tool rather than a Bible. They are looked at for entry descriptors to higher levels. They ask themselves "What do we do that works and how does it align."</li> <li>• Very extensively as VCC is moving quickly to integrate CLB. Placement (CLBPT), term planning, teaching, unit development, assessment and outcomes.</li> </ul>
--	---	---

\*The result of the 2005 review was to basically align the two streams. T  
The skills are the same but the content is different. UVIC is totally happy with EAP.





## **Appendix VI: Recommendations for Revisions to wording of EAP Course Outcomes**

### **EAP II Speaking**

- a. remove “complex”

### **EAP II Listening**

- a. change “natural rate of speech” to “slower to natural”
- c. discuss use of the word “register.” Differentiate and specify increments through the levels.

### **EAP I Reading**

- a. Add 1- 2 pages
- b. “Comprehend a range of [longer] simplified materials of various types [e.g., simplified readers]

### **EAP I Writing**

- b. “identified”: self-identified or teacher-identified?
- c. “complex” sentence patterns: higher benchmark

### **EAP I Listening**

- a. change “natural” rate of speech to “slow”.

## **Appendix VII: Recommendations or Queries to Canadian Language Benchmarks 2000**

Page 76

“often requests repetitions” and “Learner may need 1-2 repetitions”: which is it?

Page 78

“conceptualized” must be “contextualized”

page 82

Performance conditions: “Speech is clear, at a normal rate” listed twice. Why?

Page 92

“text is one page” or “text is one or two pages”: which is it?

Page 93

“Guesses meaning of words. [new bullet here?] Distinguishes facts from opinions.

Page 94

Length of texts: 2-3 pages (GPD) or 1 page (PC)?

Page 137

“Identifies factual details and inferred meanings.” “Inferred” should be “implied”?

page 154

GPD: “Tasks [should be “texts”] are dense, five to ten pages long, on . . . literacy [should be “literary”] topics.”

Reading, in general:

CLB doesn’t seem to address the complexity of vocabulary.