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ASSESSMENT PROFILE

Adapted from Heartland AEA, 1992
Figure 3

IDEAS FOR EXHIBITIONS AND PROJECTS

The following list provides teachers with ideas for products, performances, and processes that can be incorporated as authentic tasks into projects and exhibitions. Teachers using this list will provide students with meaningful, relevant classroom experiences that can be applied in real-world contexts and actively involve students in the learning process.

The list was compiled from a variety of sources (Jacobs, 1995; Maker & Nielsen, 1996); most are ideas from teachers who have used them in the classroom.

World language teachers are encouraged to use this list to create their own list of projects to fit course outcomes and the varied interests and talents of students.

The categories are only one way to arrange the list. Many products and performances can cross over into other categories. In the world language classroom, culture is interwoven throughout the products, processes, and performances, as are the communicative skills.

**Media/Technology**
- advertisements
- cable channels
- CD-ROM creations
- clip art
- commercials
- computer graphics
- computer programs

**Visual and Performing Arts**
- artwork:
  - painting
  - sculpture
  - ceramics
- banners
- billboards
- block prints
- bulletin boards
- cartoons
- choral readings
- chorales
- clay models
- clothing design
- collages
- comic strips
- costume creation

**Speaking/Listening**
- audio/videotapes
- choral readings
- court-trial simulations
- cooperative tasks

Adapted from Nebraska K-12 Foreign Language Frameworks, 1996
### IDEAS FOR EXHIBITIONS AND PROJECTS

#### Reading/Writing/Literature

- 3-D research papers
- ABC books
- bibliographies
- biographies
- bookmarks
- books
- children's stories
- dictionaries of terms
- encyclopedias
- essays
- expository writing
- fables
- historical documents
- histories
- illuminated manuscripts
- journal articles
- lists of books read
- lists of movies seen
- lyrics
- memoirs
- myths
- narrative writing
- outlines
- persuasive writing
- poetry
- poetry anthologies
- portfolios
- position papers
- reaction papers
- research reports
- satires
- stories
- term papers
- time capsules
- time-lines
- written questions
- writing systems

#### Hands-on/Kinesthetic

- collections
- constructions
- crafts
- demonstrations
- dioramas
- environmental studies
- field trips
- flash cards
- floor plans
- flower arrangements
- games
- inventions
- labs
- learning centers
- models
- museum displays
- obstacle courses
- physical exercise
- precision drill team
- project cube
- scale models
- scavenger hunts
- sewing
- sports/ outdoor
- activities
- synchronized movement
- terrariums
- tools
- treasure hunts

#### Daily Life

- application forms
- bills
- boxes/cartoons
- brochures
- checks
- cleaning
- contracts
- customs
- daily routines
- diaries
- directions
- e-mail
- eulogies
- family trees
- foods/cooking
- government forms
- instructions
- invitations
- journals
- junk mail
- labels
- last wills
- laws
- letters of all kinds
- manuals
- maps
- menus
- messages--voice/ written
- obituaries
- pamphlets
- parties
- petitions
- photo albums
- prescriptions
- questionnaires
- receipts
- recipe books
- recipes
- resumes
- schedules
- school
- scrapbooks
- shopping lists
- spreadsheets
- surveys
- work

#### Thinking Skills

- analogies
- categorizing/classifying
- cause/ effect
- charts
- compare/ contrast
- comparison charts
- concepts
- cross-number puzzles
- crossword puzzles
- decision making
design experiments
- diagrams
- elaboration
- evaluation
- evaluation of evidence
- experiments
- extrapolation
- fact files
- goal setting
- graphic organizers
- graphs
- graphs, 3-D
- homework
- lesson and test design
- patterns
- plans
- problem-solving
- puzzles
- rating scales
- reflection

Adapted from Nebraska K-12 Foreign Language Frameworks, 1996
### Figure 4

**STUDENT PORTFOLIO ARTIFACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Presentations</th>
<th>Multimedia Presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>debates</td>
<td>videotapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addresses</td>
<td>films</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussions</td>
<td>audiotapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mock trials</td>
<td>slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monologues</td>
<td>photo essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviews</td>
<td>print media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speeches</td>
<td>computer programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debates</td>
<td>storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addresses</td>
<td>oral histories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussions</td>
<td>poetry reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mock trials</td>
<td>broadcasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monologues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speeches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual and Graphic Arts</th>
<th>Representations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>paintings</td>
<td>maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storybooks</td>
<td>graphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drawings</td>
<td>dioramas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murals</td>
<td>models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posters</td>
<td>mock-ups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sculptures</td>
<td>displays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cartoons</td>
<td>bulletin boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mobiles</td>
<td>charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>replicas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performances</th>
<th>Written Presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role-playing, drama</td>
<td>expressive (diaries, journals, writing logs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dance/movement</td>
<td>transactional (letters, reports, surveys, essays)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choral readings</td>
<td>poetic (poems, myths, legends, stories, plays)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX A: ACTFL GUIDELINES

#### NEW JERSEY WORLD LANGUAGES CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK

**Generic Rubric for Collaborative Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload equality</strong></td>
<td>workload shared equally</td>
<td>workload somewhat unequal</td>
<td>workload unequal-done mostly by one or two students</td>
<td>workload unequal-done all the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On task</strong></td>
<td>all the time</td>
<td>most of the time</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>little involvement; rarely on task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td>much discussion; shows respect for others</td>
<td>some discussion; respectful of others</td>
<td>little discussion; easily distracted; somewhat disrespectful of others</td>
<td>shows little interest; disrespectful of others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Generic Rubric for Oral Presentations—Simple Answers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accurate pronunciation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accurate grammar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Generic Rubric for Oral Presentations—Cultural Role Play**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pronunciation</strong></td>
<td>accurate throughout, near native</td>
<td>understandable, with very few errors</td>
<td>some errors, but still understandable</td>
<td>poor pronunciation very anglicized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluency</strong></td>
<td>smooth delivery</td>
<td>fairly smooth</td>
<td>unnatural pauses</td>
<td>halting; hesitant; long gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensibility</strong></td>
<td>easily understood</td>
<td>understood</td>
<td>difficult to understand</td>
<td>incomprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>extensive use of targeted vocabulary</td>
<td>some use of targeted vocabulary</td>
<td>minimal use of targeted vocabulary</td>
<td>fails to use targeted vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credibility (shows knowledge of culture)</strong></td>
<td>credible role play; reflects the culture</td>
<td>credible role play; somewhat reflects the culture</td>
<td>limited credibility; little connection to target culture</td>
<td>not credible; no connection to target culture visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td>lively, enthusiastic; good eye contact</td>
<td>general enthusiasm; some eye contact</td>
<td>little enthusiasm; limited eye contact</td>
<td>reads from cards; monotonous; no eye contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Adapted from Nebraska K-12 Foreign Language Frameworks, 1996
### Generic Rubric for Written Material—General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>uses well what is being studied</td>
<td>some errors with what is being studied</td>
<td>doesn't seem to understand what is being studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>creative use of vocabulary</td>
<td>vocabulary at present level of study</td>
<td>some use of current vocabulary; key words missing</td>
<td>minimal use of targeted vocabulary at present level of study; words used incorrectly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spelling</strong></td>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>very few errors in spelling and accent marks</td>
<td>some errors in spelling and accent marks</td>
<td>many errors in spelling and accent marks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Generic Rubric for Written Materials—Creative Writing (3rd- or 4th-year students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outstanding 3</th>
<th>Satisfactory 2</th>
<th>Poor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spelling/Pronunciation</strong></td>
<td>spelling and punctuation almost always correct</td>
<td>some errors throughout</td>
<td>careless; numerous errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td>at current level of study or above with very few errors</td>
<td>some errors—subjects and verbs don’t always match, wrong tenses are sometimes used; does not always represent current level of study</td>
<td>writing is a 1st- or 2nd-year level; many grammatical errors—frequent mismatched subjects and verbs; writing is mostly in present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort</strong></td>
<td>more than required</td>
<td>meets requirement</td>
<td>some items missing; work appears hastily assembled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creativity</strong></td>
<td>creative, original descriptions; realistic characters; well illustrated; neat</td>
<td>some creativity; simple descriptions; mostly neat</td>
<td>shows no creativity or planning; incomplete descriptions; unrealistic characters; haphazard illustrations or no illustrations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Nebraska K-12 Foreign Language Frameworks, 1996
### Assessing the Quality of Portfolios

This rubric suggests standards and criteria that teachers can use to assess portfolios. The standards and criteria should be shared with students before they begin building their portfolios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appearance</strong></td>
<td>extremely eye appealing, professional looking</td>
<td>attractive, neat</td>
<td>somewhat attractive or neat</td>
<td>sloppy, effort not shown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creativity</strong></td>
<td>creativity abounds, much original thinking and/or elaboration</td>
<td>much creativity, original thinking, and/or elaboration</td>
<td>some evidence of creativity, original thinking or elaboration</td>
<td>little or no evidence of creativity, original thinking or elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>all quality artifacts chosen demonstrate a high level of reasoning</td>
<td>quality artifacts chosen demonstrate clear reasoning</td>
<td>some artifacts chosen demonstrate clear reasoning</td>
<td>few or none of the artifacts chosen demonstrate clear reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>striking organization that makes the reading flow smoothly</td>
<td>organized, definite transition between works and parts of the portfolio</td>
<td>fairly organized, good transition in topics</td>
<td>nothing in order, appears thrown together, no transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completeness</strong></td>
<td>contains required pieces, shows much extra effort with additional pieces</td>
<td>contains required piece, some additional pieces</td>
<td>contains required pieces</td>
<td>missing some required pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection</strong></td>
<td>high level of analytical thinking backed by sound evidence</td>
<td>obvious time on reflection, honest; excellent details</td>
<td>adequate reflection shown</td>
<td>very brief, done hurriedly, not sincere or honest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Nebraska K-12 Foreign Language Frameworks, 1996
Figure 7

SAMPLE ASSESSMENT RUBRICS

Rating Scales

Figure 7A. Example of a Holistic Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 — Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>No errors in expression (i.e., of likes/dislikes and/or asking/answering questions); near-native pronunciation; use of structures beyond expected proficiency; near-native use of appropriate cultural practices; followed instructions, went beyond expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 — Excellent</td>
<td>Almost all expressions of likes/dislikes and/or asking/answering questions correct; easily understood with infrequent errors in pronunciation, structures, and vocabulary usage; almost all cultural practices demonstrated and appropriate; followed instructions completely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 — Good</td>
<td>Some errors of likes/dislikes and/or asking/answering questions; comprehensible with noticeable errors in pronunciation, structures, and/or vocabulary usage; some cultural practices demonstrated and appropriate; mostly followed instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 — Not Yet</td>
<td>Few or no expressions of likes/dislikes and/or asking/answering questions stated correctly; nearly or completely incomprehensible; cultural practices were inappropriate or not demonstrated at all; little evidence of following instructions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7B. Example of an Analytic Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>3 Excellent</th>
<th>2 Good</th>
<th>1 Not Yet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expresses likes/dislikes</td>
<td>no errors</td>
<td>almost all correctly expressed</td>
<td>some errors, majority correctly stated</td>
<td>few or none correctly stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is comprehensible (pronunciation, structures, vocabulary usage)</td>
<td>near-native pronunciation; use of structure beyond expected proficiency</td>
<td>easily understood, infrequent errors</td>
<td>comprehensible with noticeable errors in pronunciation, structures, and/or vocabulary usage</td>
<td>nearly or completely incomprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates appropriate cultural practices</td>
<td>near-native use of practices</td>
<td>almost all demonstrated and appropriate</td>
<td>some demonstrated and appropriate</td>
<td>inappropriate or none demonstrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows instructions</td>
<td>went beyond expectations</td>
<td>follows instructions completely</td>
<td>mostly follows instructions</td>
<td>little evidence of following instructions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analytic rating scales give more information about specific criteria and should be used when students and teachers want feedback on the strengths and weakness of a performance, product, or process. Levels of performance (standards) are described for each of the criteria. “An analytic scale requires that raters give separate ratings to different aspects of the work. Criteria incorporating several outcomes are analytic.” (Herman, Aschbacker, & Winters, 1992, p. 70)

Adapted from Nebraska K-12 Foreign Language Frameworks, 1996
Figure 8

SAMPLE ASSESSMENT RUBRICS
Rubrics for Assessment of American Sign Language

The following rubrics suggest samples of standards and criteria for assessing the expressive and receptive language skills of students who are learning American Sign Language. These rubrics are not inclusive of the comprehensive expressive and receptive language skills that students will need to gain a fluency in American Sign Language, but rather they suggest a general framework for assessment.

Figure 8A: Rubric for Assessment of American Sign Language Expressive Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
<th>3 Very Good</th>
<th>2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>1 In Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formation:</strong></td>
<td>• Consistent use of correct signs</td>
<td>• Self-correction; few mistakes made</td>
<td>• Some errors, but is understandable</td>
<td>• Frequent incorrect formation of signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handshape</td>
<td>• Clear, easily understood</td>
<td>• Easily understood</td>
<td>• Errors are usually not corrected</td>
<td>• Very difficult to understand signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space Referents:</strong></td>
<td>• Extensive use of setting up points in space to refer to objects and people</td>
<td>• Frequently sets up points in space to refer to objects and people; makes some errors</td>
<td>• Limited use of setting up points in space to refer to objects and people; sometimes makes errors</td>
<td>• Difficulty with setting up points in space to refer to objects and people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion/Location of</td>
<td>• Good eye contact</td>
<td>• Maintains some eye contact</td>
<td>• Limited eye contact</td>
<td>• Difficulty with maintaining eye contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs (includes eye</td>
<td>• Lively, enthusiastic, uses expressiveness</td>
<td>• Some use of expressive behaviors</td>
<td>• Limited use of expressive behaviors</td>
<td>• Lacks expressive behaviors when signing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaze, body shifting,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and choice of signs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Story Grammar—Use</td>
<td>• Uses good facial expressions correctly and consistently</td>
<td>• Appropriate use of facial expressions when signing</td>
<td>• Some appropriate use of facial expressions</td>
<td>• Lacks facial expressions when signing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Non-Manual Markers:</td>
<td>• Uses intensifiers (dramatic use of facial expressions and signs) to match information conveyed</td>
<td>• Inconsistent use of intensifiers</td>
<td>• Limited use of intensifiers</td>
<td>• Difficulty using intensifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No Questions</td>
<td>• Uses all non-manual markers appropriately</td>
<td>• Inconsistent use of non-manual markers</td>
<td>• Limited use of non-manual markers</td>
<td>• Difficulty using non-manual markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Wh—“ Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrastive Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(referents, time,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intensity, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluency/Accuracy:</strong></td>
<td>• Communicates with fluency and confidence</td>
<td>• Smooth flow of signs with confidence most of the time</td>
<td>• Hesitates and self-corrects when signing</td>
<td>• Jerky hand movements and choppy use of signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothness and</td>
<td>• Signs conceptually accurate ideas/messages consistently</td>
<td>• Signs conceptually accurate ideas/messages the majority of the time</td>
<td>• Signs conceptually accurate ideas/messages on a limited basis</td>
<td>• Unable to sign conceptually accurate ideas/messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency of Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptually Accurate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/Messages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SAMPLE ASSESSMENT RUBRICS**

Rubrics for Assessment of American Sign Language

**Figure 8B: Rubric for Assessment of American Sign Language Receptive Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Basic Vocabulary**     | • Understands all signed vocabulary words  
                           • Does not need repetition of signed vocabulary words | • Understands most signed vocabulary words  
                           • Rarely requires repetition of signed vocabulary words | • Limited understanding of signed vocabulary words  
                           • Requires some repetition of signed vocabulary words | • Very limited understanding of signed vocabulary words  
                           • Requires frequent repetition of signed vocabulary words |
| **Fingerspelling**        | • Understands all fingerspelled words  
                           • Does not need any repetition | • Understands most fingerspelled words  
                           • Rarely requires repetition of fingerspelled words | • Limited understanding of fingerspelled words  
                           • Requires some repetition of fingerspelled words | • Very limited understanding of fingerspelled words  
                           • Requires frequent repetition of fingerspelled words |
| **Simple ASL Sentences** | • Understands all simple ASL sentences  
                           • Understands all simple ASL questions  
                           • Does not need any repetition of sentences/questions | • Understands most simple ASL sentences  
                           • Understands most simple ASL questions  
                           • Needs some repetition of sentences/questions | • Limited understanding of simple ASL sentences  
                           • Limited understanding of simple ASL questions  
                           • Often needs sentences/questions repeated | • Very limited understanding of simple ASL sentences  
                           • Very limited understanding of simple ASL questions  
                           • Requires frequent repetition of sentences/questions |
| **Complex ASL Sentences**| • Understands all complex ASL sentences  
                           • Understands all complex ASL questions  
                           • Does not need any repetition of sentences/questions | • Understands most complex ASL sentences  
                           • Understands most complex ASL questions  
                           • Needs some repetition of sentences/questions | • Limited understanding of complex ASL sentences  
                           • Limited understanding of complex ASL questions  
                           • Often needs sentences/questions repeated | • Very limited understanding of complex ASL sentences  
                           • Very limited understanding of complex ASL questions  
                           • Requires frequent repetition of sentences/questions |
| **Non-Manual Markers:**  | • Understands all non-manual markers  
                           • Responds appropriately to non-manual behaviors | • Understands most non-manual markers  
                           • Responds appropriately to most non-manual behaviors | • Understands some non-manual markers; asks for clarification of some non-manual behaviors  
                           • Responds appropriately to some non-manual markers | • Limited understanding of non-manual markers; frequently needs non-manual markers clarified or explained  
                           • Responds inappropriately to non-manual markers |
## Figure 9

**SAMPLE ASSESSMENT RUBRICS**

**Oral Activity Self-Evaluation**

Rate yourself in each of the following categories:

- ★★★★★ fantastic
- ★★★★ very good
- ★★★ good
- ★★ fair
- ★ needs improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The content was complete.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The ideas were well organized.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I was comprehensible to my partner.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I was comprehensible to the teacher.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary and expressions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I used recently learned expressions.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I used recently learned new vocabulary.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I used challenging constructions.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I spoke in reasonable quantity.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I spoke with few hesitations.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Register</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I used formal or familiar forms of expression, as appropriate.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developed by Karen Jogan, Albright College, Reading, PA
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SAMPLE ASSESSMENT RUBRICS
Oral Report Assessment

Speaker: ________________________________________________________________
Reviewer: ________________________________________________________________
Date: ________________________ Class: ________________________________
Assignment Title: _________________________________________________________
I understood what the report was about. _______Yes _______Somewhat _______No
I liked the way the speaker ________________________________________________
To improve, the speaker might ______________________________________________

Rate the oral report form from 5 (fantastic) to 1 (needs improvement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outlines presented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key words listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of visuals/illustrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal reference to written notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions answered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker appears interested in topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality, creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker supports an opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SAMPLE ASSESSMENT RUBRICS
Story Evaluation

Name:__________________________________ Date:______________________________

Rate the story:

★★★★ fantastic
★★★★ good
★★ average
★ needs improvement

The story was well organized. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
The story had a beginning, a middle, and an end. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
The story was interesting and entertaining. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
The story included a variety of expressions. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Ideas in the story were clearly expressed. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
The story was understood by others. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

I liked the story because_______________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

Developed by Eliason, Eaton, & Jogan, TESOL, 1997
### SAMPLE ASSESSMENT RUBRICS

**Expressing a Point of View**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: ______________________________</th>
<th>Date: _______________</th>
<th>Topic: ____________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Rate yourself along the continuum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I think I was successful in expressing my opinion.</th>
<th>very successful</th>
<th>not very successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My opinion had several supporting arguments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supporting arguments were well organized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was persuasive and convincing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My sentence structure was grammatically accurate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The best part of my presentation was

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

I could improve my presentation if I

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

 Developed by Eliason, Eaton, and Jogan, TESOL, 1997
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**SAMPLE ASSESSMENT RUBRICS**

*Story Retelling Checklist: Self-Assessment*

Please put an “X” in the box that describes your ability to do the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On my own</th>
<th>With help from a classmate or the teacher</th>
<th>I cannot do this yet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can name the main characters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can describe the setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can report the events in chronological order.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can identify the main issues or problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can describe the resolution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can express my feelings about the story and compare it to another story or event in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can identify my favorite part of the story or my favorite character and tell why.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developed by Karen Jogan, Albright College, Reading, PA
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SAMPLE DISTRICT & STATE ASSESSMENT MODELS: SPANISH

FLES Oral Assessment Kit

Availability: Unrestricted
Current Users: Columbus Public Schools, OH
Type of FL Program: FLES
Intended Grade Level: K-5
Intended Test Use: Achievement, proficiency
Skills Tested: Speaking, listening
Test Author: Karen Kendall-Sperry
Publication Date: 1995
Test Cost: None
Test Length: 20-25 minutes per child
Test Materials: Question cards, picture to describe
Test Format: Short answer, discrete point, picture description
Scoring Method: Holistic

Description: This individually administered speaking and listening assessment is appropriate for all languages. For ease of administration, the examination is on cards. These cards serve as written or visual prompts for the student, or as aural prompts (the teacher reads the card without showing it to the students). Students are asked to identify objects, guess colors, count, and describe a picture. Answers may or may not be scripted. They are rated using a three-point rubric: answering without hesitation is awarded a plus; answering after repeated prompting is awarded a check. If a student cannot respond, a minus is given. Students are engaged metacognitively by being asked to verbalize their reactions to the test situation. Immediate feedback is provided to the student.

Test Development and Technical Information: This teacher-made assessment instrument was field tested with K-5 students in May 1995.

Parallel Versions in Other Languages: Currently available only in Spanish, but appropriate for all languages

Contact Address:
Dr. Robert Robison
Foreign Languages/ESL Supervisor
Columbus Public School
100 Arcadia Avenue Room 318
Columbus, OH 43202
614-798-1206
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SAMPLE DISTRICT & STATE ASSESSMENT MODELS: SPANISH
(Also: French, German, Japanese)
Student Oral Proficiency Assessment (SOPA)

Availability: Unrestricted
Current Users: Various total and partial immersion programs, FLES programs
Type of FL Program: Immersion (total, partial, two-way), FLES
Intended Grade Level: 1-4
Intended Test Use: Proficiency
Skills Tested: Listening, speaking
Test Authors: Nancy Rhodes (immersion); Beverly Boyson, Nancy Rhodes, Lynn Thompson (FLES)
Publication Date: 1992, 1996
Test Cost: none
Test Length: 10-15 minutes per pair of students
Test Materials: Small pieces of fruit (plastic or rubber eraser type), picture sequence of science concepts, storybook with attractive pictures, the SOPA rating scale, tape recorder, and blank cassette tapes (For FLES version: picture of classroom and colorform house replace the picture sequence and story book)
Scoring Method: Holistic: each student is rated for comprehension and fluency on a 6-point scale

Description: The SOPA is an oral interview that measures listening and speaking skills of students in Grades 1-4. The immersion form of the test consists of four parts: listening comprehension, informal questions, science and language usage, and story telling. Two students are assessed at one time by one or two testers in a non-stressful, friendly environment. The listening section is based on commands and physical responses using fruit manipulatives. The informal questions assess comprehension and fluency for basic language concepts. Science concepts and language usage are measured by the students' description of a series of four pictures showing the stages of a seed growing into a tree. In the final part of the assessment, students are asked to tell a story in Spanish (one they already know in English) by describing what is happening in the pictures. Students are rated for comprehension and fluency on a 6-point scale ranging from junior novice low to junior intermediate high. [The scale is a modified version of the one used with the CAL Oral Proficiency Exam, based on the ACTFL proficiency scale.] For FLES students, the same rating scale is used, but the speaking and listening tasks differ somewhat. Rather than assessing science concepts and story telling, the FLES version offers further opportunities to demonstrate listening and speaking skills through the use of a colorform doll house and a classroom scene.
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**SAMPLE DISTRICT & STATE ASSESSMENT MODELS: SPANISH**

*Grand Blanc Community Schools: Spanish Proficiency Test*

4th Grade

**Availability:** Not available yet

**Current Users:** Grand Blanc Community Schools, MI

**Type of FL Program:** FLES

**Intended Grade Level:** 4

**Intended Test Use:** Achievement, proficiency

**Skills Tested:** Listening, speaking, reading, writing

**Test Authors:** Carol Ashmore, Kathy Kelley, Shelley Lance, Laura Lemke

**Publication Date:** 1995

**Test Cost:** Not reported

**Test Length:** 36 items

**Test Materials:** Test booklets, audiotape

**Test Format:** Matching, task completion, multiple-choice, fill-in-the-blank

**Scoring Method:** Answer key is used to determine whether a student has mastered content language objectives (i.e., has gotten all items correct) or needs to review.

**Description:** This Spanish test for a content-based FLES program will be used to test language objectives through five different content areas: reading/language arts, mathematics, social studies, science and health. Sample test objectives include predicting the outcome of a story, using metric measurement, naming three facts about South American culture, identifying four forms of energy, and identifying three body systems.

**Test Development and Technical Information:** This test and the curriculum on which it was based were piloted in 1994-95. The final form of the test and curriculum were put into official use in September of 1995. A test and curriculum were being developed for fifth grade as of January 1995. These tests and curricula are part of five-year curriculum and test development project undertaken by the Grand Blanc school district. Technical information was not available.

**Parallel Versions in Other Languages:** none

**Contact Address:**
Ms. Brenda Barnes
Foreign Language Coordinator
Grand Blanc Community Schools
11920 South Saginaw
Grand Blanc, MI 48439
810-694-8211 ext. 216
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SAMPLE DISTRICT & STATE ASSESSMENT MODELS: SPANISH

Glastonbury FLES Test

Availability: Restricted
Current Users: Glastonbury Public Schools, CT
Type of FL Program: FLES
Intended Grade Level: 5
Intended Test Use: Proficiency, program/curriculum evaluation
Skills Tested: Listening, reading, writing, speaking, culture
Test Authors: Elementary foreign language teachers in Glastonbury Public Schools, CT
Publication Date: 1994; revised 1995 and 1996
Test Cost: Not reported
Test Length: 74 items plus 10-item speaking segment for a portion of the students
Test Materials: Test booklet, answer sheets, audio tape
Test Format: Multiple-choice, matching, filling in information
Scoring Method: Speaking—4-point scale for each question. Other—number correct

Description: This criterion-referenced, situation-based test evaluates students at the end of fifth grade in all skill areas, including culture. The test is based on a sequential curriculum developed by the teachers. Test tasks are contextualized; all components of the test are built around an American student named Becky, her pen pal Maria Morales, and Maria’s family. The student is led through a series of tasks: reading a letter from Maria, going shopping with Maria and her mother, playing a geography game, listening to a radio program with Maria and her siblings, filling out a camp information form, and answering a telephone call from a local radio station. The test has been developed to determine how well students can apply what they have learned during a three-year FLES sequence. The curricula and test are revised as needed.

Test Development and Technical Information: Developed in 1993, this test was revised and re-administered in June of 1994. The test was subsequently revised for administration in 1995 and 1996.

Parallel Versions in Other Languages: There are no other versions, but the test could easily be adapted for other languages.

Contact Address:
Ms. Christine Brown
Director, Foreign Languages
Glastonbury Public Schools
232 Williams Street
Glastonbury, CT 06033
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**Figure 18**

**SAMPLE DISTRICT & STATE ASSESSMENT MODELS: SPANISH**

**Teddy Bear Test: 5th Grade Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability:</th>
<th>Restricted until test has been finalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Users:</td>
<td>Putnam City Schools, Oklahoma City, OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of FL Program:</td>
<td>FLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended Grade Level:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended Test Use:</td>
<td>Proficiency, program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Tested:</td>
<td>Listening, speaking, reading, writing, culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Author:</td>
<td>Peggy Boyles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Date:</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Cost:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Length:</td>
<td>10 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Materials:</td>
<td>Test, pictures, answer sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Format:</td>
<td>Short answer, matching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Method:</td>
<td>Rubric (1-5 points) based on comprehension, effort, and completion of task</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** This test is based on the ACTFL Guidelines (Novice Level) descriptions and draws on a proficiency-based curriculum. The test uses authentic materials and solicits student responses for all skill areas in order to assess what students can do with their second language. Students see several different pictures of teddy bears at work and at play and are asked to answer questions about the pictures, which evoke cultural themes in both the native and target cultures. The purpose of the test is to provide a thematic context for synthesizing novice-level vocabulary in a proficiency-oriented test and to provide an opportunity for students to personalize answers in a testing format.

**Test Development and Technical Information:** This is the third draft of the Teddy Bear Test. The first draft was field-tested in 1993 with 300 students. The second draft, after revision, was administered to 1,572 students in May 1994. The third draft was field-tested with approximately 1,400 fifth grade students. For a discussion of the high school level Teddy Bear Test, see Boyles, P. (1994). Assessing the speaking skill in the classroom. In C. Hancock (Ed.), Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection. Northeast Conference Reports. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

**Parallel Versions in Other Languages:** none

**Contact Address:**
Ms. Peggy Boyles
Foreign Language Coordinator
Putnam City Schools
5401 NW 40
Oklahoma City, OK 73122
405-495-5200 ext. 223
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SAMPLE DISTRICT & STATE ASSESSMENT MODELS: FRENCH
(Also: Arabic, Chinese, German, Japanese, Russian, Spanish)

CAL Oral Proficiency Exam (COPE)

Availability: All schools, if they agree to provide test results to CAL for research purposes
Current Users: Various total and partial immersion programs
Type of FL Program: Immersion (total, partial, and two-way)
Intended Grade Level: 5-6
Intended Test Use: Proficiency
Skills Tested: Listening, speaking
Test Authors: Shelley Gutstein, Sarah Goodwin, Nancy Rhodes, Gina Richardson, Lynn Thompson, Lih-Shing Wang
Publication Date: 1988
Test Cost: None
Test Length: 15-20 minutes per pair of students
Test Materials: COPE rating scale (one per student), COPE cue cards (Dialogs 1-17), instructions for using the COPE, tape recorder, blank cassette tapes
Test Format: Oral interview/role play
Scoring Method: Holistic, using the COPE rating scale

Description: Using an oral interview/role play technique with two students at a time, the COPE measures a student’s ability to understand, speak, and be understood by others in French. The test measures primarily cognitive-academic language skills (the ability to discuss subject matter effectively, e.g., social studies, geography, and science) as well as social language (the ability to discuss family, recreational activities, etc.). The rater evaluates each student’s proficiency in terms of comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, and grammar using a simplified holistic scale based on the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. Role play/discussion topics include greetings, program of studies, the cafeteria, timelines using the library, fire drills, social studies trips, school buses, the movies, social life, a party, a science project, future careers, an accident, a fight, unfair rules, and science equipment.

Test Development and Technical Information: The COPE was developed through a federally funded research study that identified the need for oral proficiency tests of Spanish for fifth to seventh grades. Steps in the test development process included a review of the literature on oral proficiency testing and of existing oral proficiency measures; observations of immersion classes; interviews with sixth-grade students and teachers; development and piloting of a trial COPE; and revisions of the COPE based on feedback from the pilot sites. The final COPE was then translated from Spanish into French and other languages. The COPE has a concurrent validity index of .62 when compared to the IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT). Test developers suggest that this provides a fair degree of assurance that the COPE validly measures oral proficiency as intended.
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SAMPLE DISTRICT & STATE ASSESSMENT MODELS: FRENCH
(Also: Arabic, Chinese, German, Japanese, Russian, Spanish)

CAL Oral Proficiency Exam (COPE)

Parallel Versions in Other Languages: Arabic, Chinese, German, Japanese, Russian, Spanish

Contact Address:
Ms. Nancy Rhodes
Co-Director, Foreign Language Education and Testing
Center for Applied Linguistics
4646 40th Street NW
Washington, DC 20016
## Sample District & State Assessment Models: Spanish

### Level 1 Proficiency Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Availability:</strong></th>
<th>Restricted until test has been field tested for 2 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Users:</strong></td>
<td>Putnam City Schools, Oklahoma City, OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of FL Program:</strong></td>
<td>Content-based FLES program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intended Grade Level:</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intended Test Use:</strong></td>
<td>Proficiency, program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills Tested:</strong></td>
<td>Listening, speaking, reading, writing, culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test Authors:</strong></td>
<td>Peggy Boyles and Putnam City Schools foreign language teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publication Date:</strong></td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test Cost:</strong></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test Length:</strong></td>
<td>13 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test Materials:</strong></td>
<td>Test, answer sheet, tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test Format:</strong></td>
<td>Taped oral responses, scantron graded listening and reading sections, sentence length responses in written section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scoring Method:</strong></td>
<td>Rubric based on comprehensibility, effort, risk taking and vocabulary usage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** This test is based on the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines (Novice High) descriptions and draws on a proficiency-based curriculum. The test uses real-life situations that are easily related to students’ lives. In most sections, students are given choices as to which task to execute. In the speaking section, students are asked to take the role of a young teenager in a particular situation that would require such things as expressing their likes and dislikes or describing their school and teachers. In the listening sections, students listen to taped conversations by native speakers who are involved in everyday situations that they would encounter at home or at school. They are asked to listen for the main theme of each conversation, as well as for some specific details. In the reading section, students demonstrate understanding of authentic materials such as advertisements or messages by answering multiple-choice questions. In the writing section, they are asked to describe in sentence-length text a friend they have met on the Internet. Only names and ages are given for the e-mail pals on the test sheet, and students must complete their imaginary description with details such as physical characteristics, favorite activities, etc.

**Test Development and Technical Information:** This is the first draft of the Novice High proficiency test for the district. It was field tested in 1995 with approximately 200 students. The test was scheduled to be given to a larger group in early 1997. The test was developed by a nine-member teacher task force from the Putnam City Schools.

**Parallel Versions in Other Languages:** none

**Contact Address:**
Ms. Peggy Boyles  
Foreign Language Coordinator  
Putnam City Schools, 5401 NW 40  
Oklahoma City, OK 73122  
405-495-5200 ext. 223
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SAMPLE DISTRICT & STATE ASSESSMENT MODELS: ALL LANGUAGES

Columbus Public Schools Foreign Language
Oral Assessment Kit, Levels I-III

Availability: Contact Robert Robison
Current Users: Columbus Public Schools, OH
Type of FL Program: Middle school/high school sequential foreign language
Intended Grade Level: 8-12
Intended Test Use: Proficiency, achievement
Skills Tested: Speaking
Test Authors: Robert Robison et al.
Publication Date: 1991
Test Cost: $30.00
Test Length: Variable
Test Materials: Test cards, score sheet
Test Format: Varied—interviews, situation role plays, question/answer, monologues/retelling, object/picture identification, simple descriptions
Scoring Method: Holistic

Description: This test is based on the new course of study recently adopted by Columbus Public Schools. It is proficiency oriented to determine what students can do with the language but, at the same time, is achievement based to measure to what extent course objectives have been met and to facilitate assigning letter or numerical grades rather than ratings or proficiency levels. Test items are situation based and attempt to test only what the student can realistically be expected to say. The test is administered to small groups or teams. The members of each team are allowed 2-4 minutes to accomplish their task. Teacher uses score sheet to assign grades to each member of the team. Using this method, 24 students can be tested and graded within 25 minutes. Level I kit includes mid-year checklist.

Test Development and Technical Information: Developed by the Columbus Public Schools Level I Foreign Language Oral Assessment Project over a three-year period.

Parallel Versions in Other Languages: Appropriate for all languages

Contact Address:
Dr. Robert E. Robison
Foreign Language Supervisor
Columbus Public Schools
100 Arcadia Avenue
Columbus, OH 43202
614-365-5281
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**SAMPLE DISTRICT & STATE ASSESSMENT MODELS: FRENCH**  
*(Also: German, Japanese, Russian, Spanish)*  

**Colorado Proficiency Sample Project (CPSP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability:</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Users:</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Education, Colorado Proficiency Sample Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of FL Program:</td>
<td>FLES, middle school/high school sequential foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended Grade Level:</td>
<td>4-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended Test Use:</td>
<td>Diagnostic (proficiency, achievement), program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Tested:</td>
<td>Listening, speaking, reading, writing, culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Authors:</td>
<td>Evelyna Donnelly et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Date:</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Cost:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Length:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Materials:</td>
<td>Test booklets, audio tapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Format:</td>
<td>Varies: multiple-choice, short answer, task completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Method:</td>
<td>Varies with skill area.  Speaking—use rubric to assign level. Writing—use flow chart (beginning and intermediate level) and scoring rubric (intermediate level only). Reading and listening—number correct. Culture—completion of cultural tasks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** As part of the Colorado Proficiency Sample Project whose goal is to assess student proficiency and the effectiveness of teaching in a number of foreign languages, various assessment materials have been developed and piloted in several school districts. The materials use a unique flow-chart scoring system where the items or tasks are linked to different levels and thus allow quick diagnosis of student performance. The tests contain both traditional features (e.g., reading passage followed by multiple-choice comprehension questions in English) and alternative features (e.g., giving student a project or creative task to complete).

**Test Development and Technical Information:** These assessment materials are being developed as the foundation for the development of Colorado State assessments, as part of the effort mandated by the education reform law (Law 93-1313, to which foreign languages were added by House Bill 94-1207). Materials were piloted in several school districts in 1993, then revised using feedback from teachers. Future plans include adding more testing materials in order to offer teachers a larger selection to choose from; creating a high tech dissemination network which will enable foreign language teachers to obtain even the most recent additions to the bank without delay; and forming testing teams of teachers already trained in the use of the materials to conduct random testing at different school sites to evaluate the reliability of the materials.

**Parallel Versions in Other Languages:** German, Japanese, Russian, Spanish

---
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SAMPLE DISTRICT & STATE ASSESSMENT MODELS: FRENCH
(Also: German, Japanese, Russian, Spanish)
Colorado Proficiency Sample Project (CPSP)

Contact Address:
Dr. Evelyne Donnelly
Foreign Language and Proficiency Sample Consultant
School Effectiveness Unit
Colorado Department of Education
201 E. Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80203
303-866-6757
Fax: 303-830-0793
Figure 23

SAMPLE DISTRICT & STATE ASSESSMENT MODELS: FRENCH
(Also: German, Spanish)
Assessment Tasks for French Level I and II

Availability: Unrestricted
Current Users: Indiana public and private schools
Type of FL Program: FLES, middle school/high school sequential foreign language
Intended Grade Level: 6-12
Intended Test Use: Proficiency, achievement
Skills Tested: Listening, speaking, reading, writing
Test Authors: Team of Indiana foreign language teachers
Publication Date: 1993
Test Cost: $6.00 per level (package) or $12.00 per language (two levels)
Test Length: Series of assessment tasks vary in length
Test Materials: Two packets of printed materials for each language and eight audio tapes for each language
Test Format: A variety of communicative assessment tasks, including map-reading, writing a letter to an imaginary pen pal, and situational role plays
Scoring Method: Suggested scoring rubric included with each task

Description: The packets include a set of assessment tasks based on the learner outcomes of the Indiana Proficiency Curriculum Guide. The tasks require students to respond using all four skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. These packets also include answer sheets, scoring rubrics for each task, and a tape script for the audio tapes. The listening/speaking tasks require the use of audio tapes. The packets are loose-leaf bound, giving teachers the option to select and combine tasks to meet their particular curriculum needs. Packets are available while the supply lasts.

Test Development and Technical Information: The materials were developed and field-tested by Indiana foreign language teachers under the general direction of Walter H. Bartz, Foreign Language Education Consultant, Indiana Department of Education.

Parallel Versions in Other Languages: German, Spanish

Contact Address:
Dr. Walter H. Bartz
Consultant Foreign Language Education
Indiana Department of Education
Room 229, State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798317-232-9156
Fax: 317-232-9121
wbartz@ideanet.doe.state.in.us
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