

NUFS Workshop 2011

Newsletter No. 4

Workshop in August

Date: August 7, 2011, 9:00-12:30

Venue: Green Hotel Sangane, Conference room

Advisors: Kazuyoshi Sato (NUFS),

Robert Croker (Nanzan University)

Title: Mid-term presentation on action research

The number of participants: 14



Comments from the participants

- What I learned: Ms. Inoko's survey was wonderful. She surveyed in detail how her students improved their four English skills using various points of view and analyzed them precisely and carefully. She also studied problems from all angles. It is supposed to take a lot of time to survey and analyze them. I learned that we can get reliable results through multiple points of view.
- What I noticed: Yoshi-sensei said that Ms. Inoko improved Ms. Tsuji's ideas and teaching procedure. I thought I should not miss finding out something new about the other teachers' valuable experience and practice. Making the most use of them, I should improve and improve them so that I can acquire better teaching procedures and work out better handouts with uniqueness.
- What should be improved: As for me, I was able to predict what the results of the mid-term survey would be because students I taught for three years improved their English skills while handouts and teaching procedures I worked out seemed to be available and effective. I'm afraid that my mid-term report became routine. In order to take a step forward, I should be flexible in my thinking. It is difficult for me to be punctual to the 15-minute-presentation. I have to summarize the essential points, seize the central issues, and explain them clearly and simply.
- I was impressed with other teacher's analysis of the data. Their ways of showing the data were clear and told the changes of students. I learned a lot from them. I was also encouraged by comments from other teachers.
- What I learned: I have learned that survey data are not the truth. They are what students say and not exactly what they think. Especially when students write their names, they share only what they are OK to be known by the teacher. Therefore, it has to be complemented by other research data.
- A question I have: I am not sure how I should treat the issue of accuracy in writing. If S1 made a lot of mistakes by using more complicated language and S2 made less mistakes by using only very simple language, is it fair to say S1 is low in accuracy and S2 is high in accuracy? Can I include complexity of language into rubric? If so, how does it look like?
- How to improve the workshop: I wonder if we could have half the presentation before dinner on the first day and the rest in the morning of the second day. In that way, we will have more time.



Workshop in September (Scheduled)

Date: September 17, 2011, 10:30-14:30 (Part 1), 14:30-17:00 (Part 2)

Venue: NSC College, Room 31

Title: “My Action Research”

Instructors: Takemi Morioka (Takinomizu Junior High School), Aya Yanagida (Agu High School)

Please email Chihaya ([chiha143\(at-mark\)nufs.ac.jp](mailto:chiha143(at-mark)nufs.ac.jp)) to participate in this workshop.