

*George Mason University
College of Education and Human Development
Multilingual/Multicultural Education Program*

**EDCI 520 - Section 002
Assessment of Language Learners
Fall 2009
CRN 72212
Wednesdays 4:30-7:10PM
Location: Science & Technology II, room 15**

Instructor: Associate Professor Dr. Rachel Grant
Ph.D., University of Maryland, Literacy Education

Mailing Address: Graduate School of Education, CEHD, MSN 4B3
George Mason University, Fairfax, VA 22030-4444

Office Location: Robinson Hall A, 3rd floor, Room 310

Office Hours: **Wednesday** 3:00-4:00PM and by appointment

URGENT/Same Day Messages TEL: (703) 993-4721 FAX: (703) 993-4370

NON-Urgent Messages Email: rgrant4@gum.edu or rag022@aol.com

Note: *This syllabus reflects course development and planning for EDCI 520 by Dr. Lorraine Valdez Pierce. I am grateful for her leadership in the field of assessment.*

Course Prerequisites

Candidates admitted to the ESL and FL Initial Teacher Licensure Programs and to the Multilingual/Multicultural Education M.Ed. degree programs are required to have completed all foundations courses in CISL, CIMM, or CIFL. If you have not yet completed the prerequisites or are not in any of these programs, please let me know.

Course Description

This graduate course provides an introduction to basic principles and current and innovative approaches to **classroom-based assessment of language learning students in ESL, bilingual education, foreign language, and grade-level classrooms in Grades PreK-12, Adult Education, and University programs**. The principles introduced in this course *are also applicable to native speakers of English in general education classrooms, especially those who speak African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and other varieties of English.*

Among the topics addressed are: applying research on language acquisition and teaching to instruction and assessment; embedding assessment of oral language, reading, and writing in daily instruction to monitor student progress; setting assessment

purpose; ensuring reliability and validity; scaffolding assessments in the content areas; portfolios for ELL; using informal reading inventories; using assessment as feedback for learning (diagnostic teaching); developing evaluation rubrics and other performance-based assessments; engaging students in peer and self-assessment; improving grading practices; reviewing language proficiency tests; writing and critique of multiple-choice tests; using criterion-referenced vs. norm-referenced testing; and preparing students to take standardized tests; and assessment issues for special needs learners and gifted-talented learners.

Graduate students will have opportunities to both critically examine assessment tools used in current practice and to develop their own. **This course is required for both ESL and Foreign Language teacher licensure as well as for the endorsement of teachers who are already licensed. It meets or exceeds NCATE, TESOL and ACTFL Standards for Teacher Preparation in assessment.**

STANDARDS: The following TESOL/NCATE program standards are addressed in this course:

Domain 4: Standard 4.a. Issues of Assessment for ESL, 4.b. Language Proficiency Assessment and 4.c. Classroom-Based Assessment in ESL

Domain 3: Standard 3.c. Using Resources Effectively in ESL and Content Instruction
Visit www.tesol.org for complete details on the standards.

This course is designed to help you develop knowledge of assessment and assessment design to assist students (levels 1-4) in oral language, reading, and writing and in meeting English Standards of Learning for Virginia Public Schools and English Language Proficiency (LEP) Standards of Learning for Virginia Public Schools.

Visit <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Instruction/ESL/> for complete description of each standard. This website also includes a supplemental resource guide to the K-12 English Standards of Learning. This guide contains useful information about the following topics: informal assessment for LEP students, assessment accommodations for LEP students, LEP resources.

Learner Outcomes

Candidates EDCI 520 will be able to:

1. **Link assessment to instruction** by designing a variety of assessments that are embedded within instructional activities;
2. **Critically examine and develop assessment procedures and tools** for (a) the language skills (listening, speaking, reading, viewing, and writing) and (b) the content areas;
3. **Add scaffolding to assessment and instruction** for language learners and learners placed at-risk for learning;
4. **State the importance of feedback for language learning and provide feedback** to students that promote language learning;

5. **Draft clear and objective learning domains, performance criteria, and levels of performance** for language learning;
6. **Discuss student assessment portfolios** and explore ways to involve learners in self-assessment;
7. **Critically review language proficiency assessment measures** for validity, reliability, and cultural bias, and make recommendations for use with English, and foreign language learning students (and native speakers of English);
8. **Prepare language learning students to take standardized tests** and high-stakes statewide assessments.
9. **Compare purposes, advantages, and limitations** of standardized achievement tests to those of alternative assessments and compare purposes, advantages, and limitations of standardized achievement tests to those of alternative assessments;
10. **Define concepts and terminology** used in traditional assessment and evaluation and in innovative approaches to assessment.
11. **Critically address issues** of assessment for learners with special needs and those identified as gifted and talented.

*Students will be asked to use a personal computer for preparing course requirements, for accessing Blackboard, and for contacting the instructor and classmates via email.

Instructional approaches include: Whole class mini-lectures and demonstrations, in-class workshops, small group and peer feedback sessions, Socratic discussion method, field projects, videos, journal articles, in-class discussion, and work assignments for applying principles discussed in texts. *Interacting in meaningful ways with other grad students/teachers during each class session is essential for success in this course.* **Student reports and projects will be evaluated** using performance-based, criterion-referenced scoring rubrics.

GSE Syllabus Statement of Expectations/Behaviors/Attitudes

The Graduate School of Education (GSE) expects that *all students* abide by the following:

Students are expected to exhibit professional **behavior and dispositions**. See gse.gmu.edu for a listing of these dispositions.

Students must follow the guidelines of the University **Honor Code**. See http://www.gmu.edu/catalog/apolicies/#TOC_H12 for the full honor code.

Students must agree to abide by the university policy for **Responsible Use of Computing**. See <http://mail.gmu.edu> and click on Responsible Use of Computing at

the bottom of the screen.

Students with **disabilities who seek accommodations** in a course must be registered with the GMU Disability Resource Center (DRC) and inform the instructor, in writing, before the third class session. See www.gmu.edu/student/drc or call 703-993-2474 to access the DRC.

Inclement Weather/Emergency Policy

In case of snow, hurricanes, other bad weather, or security emergencies, call 993-1000 or go to www.gmu.edu for information on class cancellations and university closings.

*Any exceptions to the following guidelines for attendance, tardiness, and late assignments will only be made with pre-approval by the professor.

Attendance: Missed Classes

Due to the collaborative nature of the class sessions, the reflective nature of the course assignments, and the interrelated and cumulative sequence of activities, students are required to be present at each class. Each absence will result in a grade reduction. For example, one absence will lower a grade from an "A" to an "A-". The second absence will lower the grade from an "A" to a "B+". The third absence will lower the grade from a "B+" to a "C". More than three missed classes will result in a failing grade for the course.

Tardiness:

Students are expected to arrive on time. After two late arrivals (10 minutes) to class, each subsequent late arrival will result in a grade reduction. For instance, a third late arrival will lower the grade from an "A" to an "A-". The fourth will lower the grade from an "A-" to a "B+"; and so forth.

Late Assignments:

If class must be missed, prior to the absence the student must contact the professor and submit any work that is due during your absence at the next class meeting. In case of an emergency, the professor must receive notice as soon as possible. All assignments are due on the assigned date. Late assignments will receive a 20% penalty for each missed deadline.

Collaboration:

Collaboration is a cornerstone for this course. **Many of the class sessions utilize a workshop format. In advance you must locate materials, complete readings, and be prepared to discuss share instructional resources in class.** Careful record is maintained by the instructor of your attendance and participation in collaborative activities. Students are expected to participate in a lively, professional, punctual, and equitable manner in all collaborative work.

Course Delivery

The course delivery will be accomplished in a combination of ways in order to meet the needs of all learners and learning styles. Methods of instruction include:

- *Presentations* (i.e., mini-lectures assisted by PowerPoint or other visuals);
- *Independent assignments*;
- *Self-study*;
- *Self-reflection and self-evaluation*;
- *Group discussion and group/individual presentation*;
- *Performance-based assessment*;
- *Peer feedback and critique*
- *Field activities*;
- *Small group discussions and activities*; and
- *Critique of media*.

GRADING

Policy

1. Students are expected to complete all readings assigned for each class and participate in class discussion to demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of the topics.
2. All assignments are due on the assigned date. Without pre-approval by the instructor, late assignments will receive a 20% penalty for **each** missed deadline. If an assignment is late, another deadline will immediately be given. All assignments are due by the last class. Without previous arrangement, **NO assignments will be accepted after the examination period**. No arrangements can be made to extend the course beyond the last class meeting except under extraordinary conditions.
3. Note that incomplete assignments will receive zero points.
4. Resubmission of an assignment is not a right. No resubmissions will be accepted without the pre-approval of the professor through conferencing. When a resubmission is granted the final grade for the assignment will be the average of the two scores, not the higher score. Before requesting permission to resubmit an assignment, students must show evidence of having read and reflected upon the professor's evaluation and feedback.

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION OF WORK

Assessment of Student Work

Each assignment for the course will be assessed using a scoring rubric and rating scale developed especially for that project. Evaluation tools will typically be performance-based, using an analytic scoring rubric or checklist with rating scale with a fixed range from 1-4. Total scores for each project may result in decimal values, as in 3.5 or 3.8 and will be indicated on each project. The rubrics include the following criteria: (1) connection of project or work to previous course work and assigned readings; (2) depth of analysis rather than just description of research and interpretation of data; (3) application to personal experiences and change process; and (4) coherence and clarity in writing and correct use of APA reference style. The checklist with rating scale will monitor and serve as a roadmap for your plans to implement instruction during the data collection process. Students will receive the assessments for each project

before the project is due so that they know in advance how their work will be evaluated.

Evaluation for Course Grade

Course grades will be calculated by multiplying the rating received for each project by its assigned weight on the syllabus and then tallying the subtotals for a total score. For example, if a student achieves a total score of 3.9 – 4.0 (on a 4.0 scale), he/she will receive an A. “A”s or “A minuses” will be assigned to final scores totaling 3.7 or above. *[Pluses (+) and minuses (-) are optional and may be assigned at the discretion of the instructor.]* Total course scores from 3.0 -3.69 will be assigned a “B” or “B plus” and scores at 2.9 or below will receive a C.

This grading policy is based on past experience using scoring rubrics to assign course grades. Each course instructor develops his/her own grading system. GMU has no official grading policy, although it does assign numerical values to grades received in this course. However, these numerical values are in no way comparable to the scores assigned to projects using the scoring rubrics in this course.

Interpreting Your Grades

The mark of **A** denotes substantial performance and/or excellent mastery of the subject through work that reflects effort beyond basic requirements. **This means work that does not require revision.** It denotes outstanding scholarship; and represents internalization and the creative use of the principles underlying theory, research, and pedagogy.

The mark of **B** denotes satisfactory mastery of the basic elements of the subject through work that addresses all of the requirements. It reflects an understanding of and the ability to apply principles underlying instruction.

The mark of **C** denotes unacceptable attempt to master the subject through work that addresses the basic requirements.

The mark of **D** denotes failed understanding and mastery of basic elements of the subject. It denotes unsatisfactory performance.

The mark of **F** denotes failed understanding and mastery of basic elements of the subject. It denotes unsatisfactory performance.

Note: GSE students are advised that, although a B- is a satisfactory grade for a course, students must maintain a 3.0 average in their degree program and present a 3.0 GPA on the courses listed on the graduation application. Final performance will be evaluated using letter grades.

Course Assignments & Requirements

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Language Assessment Critique (<i>Option A or B</i>) | 20% Paper or Poster Session (group or individual) |
| 2. Socratic Seminar on Assessment and ELL w/ Special Needs (Learning Disabilities and Giftedness) | 15% Dialogue Team (group) |
| 3. Discussion of Readings | 5% individual or partner |

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 4. Scaffolding Project | 30% Infusing scaffolding within assessment tools (individual) |
| 5. Classroom-Based Assessment | 30% Develop Performance-Based Assessments (individual) |

All assignments must be submitted via electronic file before class on the date it is due.

** If you need access to students in a classroom setting to conduct the Language Assessment Project, you can join a teacher in this class or see me to make arrangements no later than the third week of class.*

Option A or Option B for the Language Proficiency Assessment Project may be conducted in teams of up to 3 class members. **Both of these projects are required for NCATE TESOL & ACTFL Accreditation.

DOCTORAL STUDENTS: PLEASE SEE ME FOR DOCTORAL LEVEL REQUIREMENTS.

Textbooks

All books have been ordered through the GMU Bookstore.

Required Texts

Gottlieb, M. (2006). *Assessing English language learners: bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for language teachers*. 2nd Ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Recommended Texts (Not Required)

Abedi, J. (2007). *English language proficiency assessment in the nation: current status and future practice*. CA: University of California Press.

Arter, J. & McTighe, J. (2001). *Scoring rubrics in the classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Blaz, D. (2001). *Collection of performance tasks and rubrics: foreign languages*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Brantley, D.K. (2007). *Instructional assessment of English language learners in the k-8 classroom*. Boston: Pearson.

Calkins, L., Montgomery, K. & Santman, D. (1998). *A teacher's guide to standardized reading tests*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Guskey, T. R. & Bailey, J.M. (2001). *Developing grading and reporting systems for student learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Leslie, M. L. & Caldwell, J. (2005) (7th Ed.). *Qualitative reading inventory-4*. New York: Longman.

Publication Manual for the American Educational Research Association (2001) (5th edition) Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Additional Required Readings soon to be available through electronic reserve.
Password: **learning**

Andrade, H.L., Du, Y., Wang, X. (2008). Putting rubrics to the test: the effects of a model, criteria generation, and rubric-referenced self-assessment on elementary school students' writing. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 27, 3-13.

Coniam, D. & Falvey, P. (2007). High-stakes testing and assessment: English language teacher benchmarking. In J. Cummins and C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 457-471). NY: Springer.

Davison, C. (2007). Different definitions of language and language learning. In J. Cummins and C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 532-548). NY: Springer.

Ellis, R. (2008). Investigating grammatical difficulty in second language learning: implications for second language acquisition research and language testing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 4-22.

Gee, J.P. (2006). Reflections on assessment from a sociocultural-situated perspective. In P. Moss (Ed.), *Evidence and decision-making: yearbook of the national society for the study of education, vol. 106(1)*, (pp. 362-375). London, UK: Blackwell.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (2007). The impact of testing practices on teaching: ideologies and alternatives. In J. Cummins and C Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 487-504). NY: Springer.

Kame'enui, E.J., Fuchs, L., Francis, D.J., Good, R., O'Connor, R.E., Simmons, D.C., Tindal, G., & Torgesen, J.K. (2006). The adequacy of tools for assessing reading competence: a framework and review, *Educational Researcher*, 35, 3-11.

Lu, Ying & Sireci, S. (2007). Validity issues in test speededness. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 26, 29-37.

Kopriva, R.J. (2007). Do proper accommodation assignments make a difference? examining the impact of improved decision making on scores for English language learners. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 26, 11-20.

McNamara, T. & Shohamy, E. (2008). Language tests and human rights. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 89-95.

Moss, P.A., Girard, B.J., & Haniford, L.C. (2006). Validity in educational assessment. *Review of Research in Education*, 30, 109-163.

Parkes, J. (2007). Reliability as argument. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 26, 2-10.

Rea-Dickins, P. (2007). Classroom-based assessment: possibilities and pitfalls. In J. Cummins and C Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 505-520). NY: Springer.

Shohamy, E. (2007). The power of language tests: the power of the English language and the role of ELT. In J. Cummins and C Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 521-531). NY: Springer.

Solano-Flores, G. (2008). Who is given tests in what language by whom, when, and where? The need for probabilistic views of language in the testing of English language learners. *Educational Researcher*, 37, 189-199.

Soloranzo, R.W. (2008). High stakes testing: issues, implications, and remedies for English language learners. *Review of Educational Research*, 78, 260-329.

Additional Reading of Interest on Assessment

Hudelson, S. (1999). Evaluating reading, valuing the reader. In E. Franklin (Ed.), *Reading and writing in more than one language: lessons for teachers* (pp. 81-94). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Websites on Socratic Discussion methods

http://www.angelicum.net/html/what_is_the_socratic_method_.html

http://www.studyguide.org/socratic_seminar.htm#Background

Class Schedule

*Prepare to discuss assigned readings during the week in which they appear.

Sessions	Topics, Activities & Assignments
1 9/2/09	<p>Course Introduction: Objectives and Requirements</p> <p>Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Pretest -Defining classroom based assessment -Role and Power of assessment <p>Readings: Gottlieb (p.ix-x) ch. 1; Hughes ch.1</p> <p>Workshop: Organizing for discussion presentations</p>
2 9/9/09	<p>Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Assessment and educational equity for ELL -Teaching and testing -Backwash -Purposes for assessment -Types of measures for assessing ELL -Overview Language assessment critique

	<p>Readings: Gottlieb ch. 1; Hughes ch. 2-3</p> <p>Discussion: Gee; Hamp-Lyons</p> <p>Workshop: Language Assessment Critique</p> <p>Next Class: bring samples of oral language assessments</p> <p>*Assign Socratic Groups on LD and GT</p> <p>Materials Release Forms.</p>
<p>3 9/16/09</p>	<p>Topics: -Assessing oral language -Social language proficiency and academic language proficiency -Evaluating language proficiency tests -Structured interviews</p> <p>Readings: Gottlieb ch. 3; Hughes ch. 10</p> <p>Discussion: McNamara & Shohamy; Shohamy; Davison</p> <p>Workshop: Language Assessment Critique</p>
<p>4 9/23/09</p>	<p>Topics: -Standards and Assessment -High-stakes testing -Reliability in assessment >What does reliable assessment look like? -Linking assessment and instruction -Assessments (limitations and strengths)</p> <p>Readings: Hughes ch. 5; Gottlieb ch. 2 & 7</p> <p>Discussion: Parkes; Coniam & Falvey; Soloranzo</p> <p>Workshop: Language Assessment Critique</p> <p>For next class: Organizing for the Socratic Discussion on LD & GT Each student will locate one professional journal article or book chapter on LD or GT English language learners bring it to class to discuss. Be sure to email the title and bibliographical information to the instructor and class members before class.</p>
<p>5 9/30/09</p>	<p>Topics: -Assessment of language and literacy -Validity in assessment >Linking assessment and instruction -Using an Assessment Planning Template</p>

	<p>-Authenticity of performance tasks -Scaffolding assessment</p> <p>Readings: Hughes ch. 4; Gottlieb ch. 7 & 8</p> <p>Discussion: Solano-Flores; Moss; Lu & Sireci</p> <p>Workshop: Socratic Discussion</p>
6 10/7/09	<p>Topics: -Assessment techniques >Designing a valid & reliable evaluation tools (scoring rubric, checklist and rating scales) -Testing, Assessment, & Evaluation -Scaffolding (part 2)</p> <p>Readings: Hughes ch. 8; Gottlieb ch. 5 & 6</p> <p>Discussion: Andrade et al; Rea-Dickins</p> <p>Workshop: Socratic Discussion</p> <p>DUE Today: Language Proficiency Critique (Option A and B)</p>
7 10/14/09	<p>Topics: -Organizing Socratic Discussion -Socratic Discussions on assessing ELLs with special needs (learning disabilities and those who are gifted and talented) >Who are the GT and LD English language learners? How can we conduct valid and reliable assessment of these learners? What are issues in assessing ELL with learning disabilities and those who are gifted and talented?</p> <p>DUE Today: Participation in Socratic Discussion on LD and GT</p>
8 10/21/09	<p>Topics: -Assessing literacy for ELL >Effective assessment techniques (DRA, QRI, etc.) >Assessing reading strategies >Connecting literacy assessment to instruction</p> <p>Readings: Gottlieb ch. 3 & 4; Hughes, ch. 11 & 12</p> <p>Discussion: Hudelson; Kame'enui et al</p> <p>Workshop : Scaffolding Project. Bring draft to class for peer feedback and revising.</p>
9	<p>Topics: -Standards and large-scale assessment</p>

<p>10/28/09</p>	<p>-Assessing language and content areas >Content area standards >Developing valid and reliable content area assessments >Common testing techniques</p> <p>Readings: Gottlieb ch. 2 & 7; Hughes ch. 6& 14</p> <p>Discussion: Kopriva</p> <p>Workshop: Scaffolding Project. Bring draft of Scaffolding Project for Peer Feedback</p>
<p>10 11/4/09</p>	<p>Topics: -Assessing writing >Addressing State Standards >From sentence to essay >Utilizing Text structures >Testing grammar & vocabulary -Exploding Data</p> <p>Readings: Hughes ch. 9; 13</p> <p>Discussion: Ellis</p> <p>Workshop: Classroom-Based Assessment Project (Final assignment)</p> <p>For Next Class: <i>*Bring samples of content area assessments.</i></p> <p>DUE Today: Scaffolding Project.</p>
<p>11 11/11/09</p>	<p>Topics: -Revisiting rubrics and evaluation tools >domains, criteria, & levels of performance >communicating and understanding performance -Testing, Assessment & Evaluation -Grading and ELLs -Exploding data >Grading policies. Converting rubrics into grades.</p> <p>Readings: Gottlieb ch. 9</p> <p>Workshop: Classroom-based Assessment Project</p>
<p>12 11/18/09</p>	<p>Topics: -Self-assessment and peer assessment >Involving students in self-reflection & goal setting -Using assessment to guide instruction</p> <p>Readings: Gottlieb ch. 7</p>

	<p>Workshop: Classroom-based Assessment Project</p> <p><i>DUE Today: First draft of Classroom-based Assessment Project for Peer Feedback.</i></p>
<p>13 12/2/09</p>	<p>Topics: -Portfolio Assessment >Types and essential elements of portfolios >Assessing portfolios & Using results for improving instruction</p> <p>Course evaluations.</p> <p>Workshop: Sharing Classroom-based Assessment Project</p>
<p>14 12/9/09</p>	<p>Topics: Sharing Classroom-based Assessment Project</p> <p><i>DUE Today: Classroom-Based Assessment Project.</i></p>

COURSES ACTIVITIES and ASSIGNMENTS

I. Language Assessment Critique

Purpose: To demonstrate your understanding of assessments and issues related to the language proficiency of English language or foreign language learning students using either norm-referenced or criterion-referenced assessments.

Process: You will critique and/or administer a state- or locally-mandated or recommended assessment to one or more students and analyze the results. ***USE ASSESSMENTS CURRENTLY REQUIRED FOR LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT BY YOUR OWN SCHOOL SYSTEM. In addition, you can also critique or try out Language Proficiency Assessments developed or used by other school systems.***

Time Frame: Conduct all projects for this course during the semester in which you take the course (*not from previous semesters or years*). This will ensure your understanding of principles presented in this course.

ALL FOREIGN LANGUAGE MATERIALS WILL BE PRESENTED WITH APPROPRIATE EXAMPLES FROM THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH.

Procedures

Critique and/or Administer a state- or locally-mandated language proficiency assessment to one or more language learners (for example, Foreign Language teachers in Fairfax Co. use the PALS Test, and ESOL teachers in Prince Wm. Co. use the IPT). If the assessment process has several components, provide an overview of all components and then provide an in-depth critique of at least one of these components.

Assessments must be criterion-referenced and/or norm-referenced. You will analyze the usefulness of the results for making program placement decisions, as well as make recommendations for improving the assessment measure itself, possibly by using additional measures of language proficiency. Analyze the validity and reliability of the assessment based on research and the assigned class readings for this course. Make recommendations for addressing the limitations of each assessment, including eliminating threats to validity and reliability. Don't just rely on what the developer or publisher has to say. Be sure to comment on "What needs to be added, removed, or improved to make the measure more valid and reliable?" "What might help it address the needs of ELL or foreign language learners?"

OPTION A (may be completed as Group or Individual)

Preparing the Written Report (individual or group)

- Don't forget the cover page
- Use the headings as indicated to organize in your report.

Organize your report to include the following information:

- 1. Introduction.** Name the assessment measures used and clearly identify the number and categories of components for each measure, including number of items for each component (e.g., oral language: interview, picture-cued description).
- 2. Target Population.** With whom are the assessment measures used? (e.g., ESL, foreign language, 3rd grade ESOL, etc.)?
- 3. Analysis.** Address the same categories as those covered under the Special Needs Assessment Critique. In addition, address the following areas:
 - a. Validity – assessment of all 4 language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing)
 - b. Reliability – accuracy of scoring
 - c. Psychological and/ or Emotional Effects (affects of formal testing situations, multiple-choice test formats, response formats, timing effects)
 - d. Format – multiple-choice, performance-based, or other
 - e. Scaffolding – What type of scaffolding is presented? Is it enough?
 - f. Practicality – time/days needed to administer; cost
 - g. Scoring Procedures – reliable, teacher training provided, or objective
 - h. Usefulness for making placement decisions
 - i. Recommendations for addressing limitations of the assessment process and tool
- 4. Conclusion.** Include a conclusion that synthesizes the points made in your paper (issues identified and addressed). In closing, add some comments on what you have learned by doing this project.
- 5. Use citations and references.** Provide in-text citations and references to the readings for the course throughout your project (beginning on Page 1 of your report) to support your analysis. References to readings assigned for other courses should be limited – this course

aims to determine if you are connecting what you have read IN THIS COURSE with your course projects. However, do *Challenge yourself by citing additional outside readings that specifically address assessment for language learners*. See Style Sheet for other helpful ideas on preparing the written report. Consult the current edition of the American Psychological Association (APA) style manual when preparing written reports for this course.

Guidelines

1. Put your name on the cover sheet only, please, not on every page. This helps maintain anonymity and subsequent fairness in the rating process.
2. Limit the main body of your report to 12 pages. Add additional pages with sample assessment tools, samples of student work, and your references
3. I will post to Blackboard TWO sample projects for option A.
4. Samples for option b will be available in class.

If you chose Option A, *Please send the report electronically.

OPTION B (Group or Individual)

PROFESSIONAL POSTER PRESENTATION

There are three major differences between Options A and B

- For Option B you will present information about the assessment on a tri-folding presentation board. This requires you to understand, condense and then, visually represent critical elements of the assessment in an accurate, visually appealing manner.
- Also, you will need to prepare a ONE-PAGE (two-sided) handout as a summary for the assessment measurement. Think of this as an information overview sheet for the assessment measure. Use the guidelines for the written report in Option A to identify information to include on the one-page summary. Please prepare enough copies to share with the class.
- You should be prepared to answer any questions “on the spot” about your assessment measure. Remember the poster session format is widely used at professional conferences. It is a highly effective way to present information to a large number of individuals in a short period of time. Yes, references are expected. In addition to becoming familiar with a language proficiency assessment, Option B provides you with excellent practice in presenting before an audience of your peers at workshops and professional conferences.

Organize your presentation board to include the following information:

- 1. Introduction.** Name the assessment measures used and clearly identify the number and categories of components for each measure, including number of items for each component (e.g., oral language: interview, picture-cued description).
- 2. Target Population.** With whom are the assessment measures used? (e.g., ESL, foreign language, 3rd grade)?

3. Analysis

Address the same categories as those covered under the Special Needs Assessment Critique. In addition, address the following areas:

- a. Validity – assessment of all 4 language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing)
- b. Reliability – accuracy of scoring
- c. Psychological/Emotional Effects
(affects of formal testing situations, multiple-choice test formats, response formats, timed tests)
- d. Format – multiple-choice, performance-based, or other
- e. Scaffolding – What type of scaffolding is presented? Is it enough?
- f. Practicality – single or multiple days needed
- g. Scoring Procedures – reliable, teacher training provided, or objective
- h. Usefulness for making placement decisions
- i. Recommendations for addressing limitations of the assessment process and tool

If you use these as headings in your poster, visitors to your poster will quickly and easily identify the most salient points about the assessment measure. In addition, this will facilitate my rating of this assignment.

4. Conclusion. Include a conclusion that synthesizes the points made in your paper (issues identified and addressed). Add some comments on what you have learned by doing this project. During the presentation of the poster, be sure to address this area.

5. References. For Option B, it is understood that your citations and references may be limited in number but should still be included. Provide citations to the assigned readings, where feasible. *Challenge yourself by citing additional outside readings that specifically address your assessment topic.* See the Style Sheet for guidelines on how and when to cite references and other resources.

Guidelines for Poster Session

1. List the names of group members on a neatly typed label. Attach this to the back side of the poster.
2. Turn in a copy of the one-page assessment summary. Include a cover sheet for the copy you turn in to the instructor.
3. You may turn in up to 5 additional pages with sample assessment tools, samples of student work, and your references with the one-page summary.
4. See our Style Sheet for details on citation format and writing style.
5. **Be sure to protect your poster** so that it will not be damaged in transport. Remember, it is a long distance to and from the parking lot.
6. I have model projects in my office available for your viewing.

7. Your Language Proficiency Assessment Project is

****Please send the one-page summary and cover page for this project to the instructor by email and provide a hard copy during your poster session.***

DUE: Week 6

II. Scaffolding Project

Purpose

To apply principles of scaffolding (reducing linguistic demand) to instruction and assessment and to adjust scaffolding to match learners' language proficiency level.

Tasks

To add scaffolding devices to **3 assessments**, preferably those that you designed for your own students before taking this course. Also, you may obtain assessments from other teachers and other sources. Be sure the assessments have a STRONG CONTENT AREA (math science, social studies, language arts, literature, etc.) base possible options will be shared in class. In addition, focus on **oral language assessment, reading assessment, and/or writing assessment.**

1. We will review sample assessment tools for different levels of English or foreign language proficiency to help you in understanding the process and options for scaffolding assessments.

2. You will prepare THREE (3) assessment tasks. You may revise exiting tasks and prepare a new and improved version of the task. Add scaffolding to each assessment task by incorporating scaffolding devices discussed in class. Useful approaches for accomplishing this would be: simplifying the language, providing choices, and using visuals and graphics. Use a variety of (at least three for each assessment) scaffolding devices (see handout) to make the content accessible to beginning or intermediate language learners. You can take a teaching activity such as a story retelling, an oral report, open-ended questions, or a table or matrix for students to fill in. A constructed response requires the student to listen, speak, read, or write to demonstrate his/her competence in the language. Be sure to attach student directions for each assessment task. *If you do not include this part of the project, you will receive a rating no higher than 2.0 or C on this project. Attach your original assessment tool* and a revised tool showing scaffolding you have added for beginning or intermediate language learners. GREAT CARE MUST BE TAKEN WITH MULTIPLE CHOICE TASKS OR QUESTIONS. In the final project for the course, YOU MUST STILL DEVELOP A CHECKLIST W/ RATING SCALE OR RUBRIC IF YOU USE A MULTIPLE-CHOICE FORMAT. SEE INSTRUCTOR.

***ALL FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROJECTS WILL PROVIDE ASSESSMENT TOOLS AND DIRECTIONS TO STUDENTS BOTH IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND IN ENGLISH. The introductory narrative for each paper will be in English.**

3. To prepare the written report for your Scaffolding project, provide an introduction to the three assessment tasks you scaffold, then describe each individually. Use subheadings naming each task.

First, identify the limitations of each tool and obstacles they pose to the language learners. **Then, explain the scaffolding** that you added to each assessment tool. For example, if you simplified the language, **explain in detail (and with examples from the tool itself) HOW you did this.** Use citations from our course texts and other

readings to support your modifications.

4. Use citations to the assigned readings to justify all modifications that you make to the assessment tools. Precautions: (1) Limit citations of course handouts; (2) Limit direct quotes; (3) Be sure to credit work by others, otherwise this is plagiarism; (4) **Use your own words (paraphrase)** to write about the ideas expressed in the reference resources you cite within the report; and (5) Use correct APA style for all within text citations and end of text references.

Production Basic Guidelines

1. Put your **name on the cover sheet only** (see Style Sheet).
2. Add page numbers to every page.
3. Submit a **maximum of 8 pages, excluding appendices**. (See special direction page to organize your written report) Attach and **clearly label** each of the following: the original assessment tool and your *own revised* assessment task. Label each attachment (e.g., Attachment or Appendix A, B, C) in the order in which you mention it in your narrative. For example, if the first attachment you refer to in your narrative is a social studies interview, then that will become Attachment A.

*Consult the current edition of the American Psychological Association (APA) style manual to prepare all work for this course.

***Submit this project via email. Appendices may be submitted as hard copies.**

Writing Your Report

Don't forget the cover page

Part A. Introduction to Project

Part B. Assessment One

1. Summary (purpose, content, components, target population, special features, etc.)
2. Validity and Reliability
3. Benefits (This is your critique don't rely exclusively on the developer or publisher.)
4. Limitations (This is your critique don't rely exclusively on the developer or publisher.)
5. Scaffolding techniques

Part C. Assessment Two

1. Summary (purpose, content, components, target population, special features, etc.)
2. Validity and Reliability

3. Benefits
4. Limitations
5. Scaffolding techniques

Part D. Assessment Three

1. Summary (purpose, content, components, target population, special features, etc.)
2. Validity and Reliability
3. Benefits
4. Limitations
5. Scaffolding techniques

Part E. Conclusion (provide a concluding statement about scaffolding benefits and/or challenges)

Part F. References

Part G. Appendices (clearly label and place in order of appearance in the report)

1. Original
2. Revision

Due: Week 10

III. Special Needs Assessment- Socratic Discussion Groups

Purposes: (1) To show that you can apply principles acquired in this course to assessment of Special Needs (Learning Disability and Gifted and Talented) for English Language Learners, Foreign Language Learners and Language Minority Students. (2) To engage in dialogue and stimulate thoughtful interchanges of ideas.

Process: You will review and critique at least three journal articles or book chapters that address assessment for English language learners for placement in Special Education or Gifted & Talented programs. In addition, you should **REVIEW ASSESSMENTS CURRENTLY USED IN YOUR OWN OR A LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM**. You should focus on issues of: student selection criteria, cultural and linguistic bias; political, social, and psychological factors; familial or community factors; threats or concerns for validity and reliability; strengths and limitations in assessment for ELL. You will be assigned to LD or GT groups for this assignment. When possible, preferences will be honored.

Time Frame: Begin the process of selecting appropriate readings early and seek

approval of your readings before participating in the Socratic Discussion. This will ensure you are prepared to offer analysis, demonstrate knowledge of the issues, listen actively, and offer clarification on the issues. This will enhance your understanding of principles presented in this course.

ALL FOREIGN LANGUAGE MATERIALS WILL BE PRESENTED WITH APPROPRIATE EXAMPLES FROM THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH.

Assessment Process

This is a group activity. Instructor and peer and/or self assessments will be used to evaluate and provide feedback on group and individual performance. A modified Socratic Seminar method will be used to present this assignment. A rubric will serve as the evaluation tool.

Socratic Discussion Method

The Socratic method of teaching is based on Socrates' theory that it is more important to enable students to think for themselves than to merely fill their heads with "right" answers. Therefore Socrates regularly engaged his pupils in dialogues, fueled by responding to their questions with questions, to encourage divergent rather than convergent thinking. There are several variations to the Socrates' method. We will utilize a modified "Inner Circle- Outer Circle" model.

STEPS IN THE PROCESS

1. Assignment to Socratic discussion group.
2. Select journal articles or book chapters.
3. Get instructor's approval.
4. Via email, send bibliographic information for the articles/book chapters to instructor and peers. If time permits, this would allow class members to review other materials and have additional resources about assessing ELL identified as LD and GT.
5. Review information about assessment and procedures for assessing ELL for LD or GT in local school districts (at least 2 school districts should be represented on each discussion team). These individuals will have valuable knowledge and will share their knowledge during the formal discussion process. This will be explained in class.
6. Arrange to meet with your Socratic discussion group prior to the formal in-class discussion.
7. Develop criteria for peer and/or self assessment. We will discuss options in class.
8. On the day of the Socratic discussions (see schedule) on LD and GT English language learners you will be seated in the Inner Circle during the time your group is leading the discussion. When you are a member of the audience, you will be seated in the Outer Circle.
9. The instructor will ask a single question to begin the discussion. If you are in the **Inner Circle**, a member of your group will begin by making an "opening

statement” of not more than two **minutes**. The Inner Circle group will have **30 minutes** to discuss issues related to assessment issues for LD or GT English language learners. The instructor will ask additional questions during the discussion. Each member of the inner circle **MUST contribute** to the discussion in a meaningful manner. At the end of 30 minutes, the Inner Circle group will have **3 minutes** to make closing remarks. After time is called, groups will change positions in the circles.

Step 9 will be repeated for the second group.

10. **Outer Circle** members. When you are in the Outer Circle you should be watching and listening in silence. This is the observation component. You will be asked to evaluate the performance of the inner circle students by recording checks, plusses, and minuses for good, terrific, or weak responses that you hear from each student.
11. When both groups are finished, you will have 10 minutes to conduct peer and/or self-assessment. This must be in writing.
12. Turn in the evaluation forms and your responses.
13. Instructor evaluation for the groups (see rubric) will be provided.

See the listing below for areas that should be addressed during the Socratic discussion.

Discussion Criteria

>Name specific assessment measures reviewed and clearly identify the number and categories of components for each measure, including number and type of items for each component (e.g., reading comprehension, 50 multiple-choice items).

>Analyze and Critique the validity and reliability of the tests and procedures used to identify ELL; analyze the level of validity according to information from our readings and class discussions. Do you see evidence of systematic linguistic or cultural bias or other threats to validity? What evidence do you find of construct, content, and consequential validity? Incorporate issues and concerns and based on the assigned readings, don't just accept what the test developer(s) or publisher say.

>Describe grade levels for whom a test has been designed (e.g., ESL, foreign language, 3rd grade), name of school system using the assessment procedure.

>Discuss concerns about reliability – Is only one test or procedure used or are multiple tests/procedures used? Are the assessors familiar with the language development issues related to second or multiple language learning? Does inter-rater reliability apply? How about test-retest reliability?

>**Identify** psychological and emotional effects – What are the likely effects of a formal testing situation on the language learners? Do they have prior experience with such testing? Is it a high-stakes testing situation likely to cause stress?

>**Specify** the format used– Are members of the target population familiar with multiple-choice formats or any other format used? What other kinds of response formats are used?

>**Comment on** practicality – Are the assessment processes and tool practical to use? Can the assessment measure be administered in less than one hour?

>**Discuss** the usefulness – How useful is the information in the test score report for diagnosing individual student learning needs and making placement decisions for LD or GT?

>**Point out** accommodations – What accommodations are offered to the target population, such as allowing extra or unlimited time to complete the test, allowing use of a bilingual dictionary, and allowing use of translators? How might these affect the validity and reliability of the test? Are the accommodations appropriate for the needs of the language learners?

>**Make** recommendations – What recommendations can you make to address any limitations revealed in your analysis? For example, if you found threats to validity, how would you need to change the test or process to eliminate those threats? How can issues that are not addressed be included?

>**Present concluding** thoughts-Synthesize the findings of your analysis. Are the assessment measures, process, issues, etc. valid and reliable?

>**Use citations**-*Challenge yourself by citing readings that specifically address your assessment topic.* Do not read from prepared notes, however, it is permitted that you have articles and/or book chapters present during the discussion.

Due: Week 7

IV. Classroom-Based Assessment Project

Purpose

In lieu of a final examination, the *Classroom-Based Assessment Project* will demonstrate your ability to apply knowledge of assessment by developing evaluation

tools and scoring criteria for the assessment tasks from your Scaffolding Project. You must provide rationale to justify why you developed the evaluation tools and scoring criteria by referencing the assigned readings in this course and other relevant resources. References to outside *readings should directly address your topic* and be limited to *recently published professional journals and/or books on assessment*. All proposed revised assessments must be original (do not copy from our textbooks, presentations I make in class, or my handouts). You will use the three assessment tasks you developed for the Scaffolding Project to prepare **innovative, authentic and accurate** Evaluation Tools (analytic rubrics, checklists with rating scales) and Scoring Guides (interpreting the tools to judge performance). In this project, *build on what you have learned from your previous projects* in this course by improving assessments that you have used or seen used. The PROCESS of developing your own project is just as important as the PRODUCT of your work.

Task

Design Performance-Based Assessments and Evaluation Tools of Language & Content BASED ON STATE LEARNING STANDARDS FOR A SPECIFIC GRADE LEVEL: Choose one at least one of the following literacy categories: **oral language assessment, reading assessment, writing assessment**. Focus on instruction in one or more of the content areas (social studies, science, or mathematics).

ALL FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROJECTS WILL BE PRESENTED COMPLETELY IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE, except for the introductory narrative in each paper. Provide translations of all foreign language tools and student handouts in English, please.

(1) Using the instructional activities and assessment tasks developed for the Scaffolding Project you will design Evaluation Tools with Scoring Guides for each assessment task. (2) At least two of the Evaluation Tools must be rubrics. (3) You will describe and justify them. Should you decide to develop activities for Portfolios, describe at least 3 required and 3 optional entries and tools and provide examples of all of the required tools. Describe the 3 required tasks for Portfolio Assessment, and provide student directions and handouts for them.

Using information from your Scaffolding Project.

Describe a single target population (grade level, level of language proficiency, number of students in class,) their learning needs, instructional objectives and setting (target population can be different from that of previous projects).

State assessment purpose. Justify the validity and reliability of your assessment tools. Provide criteria for assessment tools. Start with a model that suits your assessment purpose. Include directions and student handouts. Include the revised and scaffolded assessment tasks with justification for your modifications. *NO assessment task will be entirely your original work, so give credit to the original source and explain how you changed it (This is VERY important).* Cite authors of the original tool you used on the tool itself. Assessment tools might include teacher observation checklists with rating scales, holistic or analytic rubrics, and self- and peer assessments with rubrics or checklists.

Show applications of technology to your assessment tasks, such as through use of clip art, on-line assessments, Power Point, videos, and so on. Base design on assigned class readings; use outside readings for support.

Organize your report in a narrative (not bulleted list) include the following information and use subheadings:

Writing Your Report

Part I. **Assessment Category.** Explain the category (e.g., portfolio) you have selected and give reasons for having chosen it.

Part II. **Target Population.** Identify the target population by describing the grade level, language proficiency level, and number of students in class. The target population can be different from the one in your Field Project. Describe the type of program (ESOL, FL).

Part III. **Instructional Objectives.** State your instructional objectives (learning or performance outcomes for ELL) for this project.

Part IV. **Assessment Purpose.** State specific rather than general purpose of assessment tasks and tools, e.g., to assess content knowledge, oral language skills, reading comprehension, or writing. Show how each tool or activity matches your assessment purpose.

Part V. **Evaluation Tools.** (This is connected to the Scaffolding Project) Describe and justify assessment tasks. For example, if you choose to use an analytic rubric, first justify why you chose an analytic rubric instead of another evaluation tool (such as a holistic rubric or a checklist), then justify each component and the language of the rubric. Identify original tools, adapt them for your target population, and explain how you adapted them. *Adapting means changing the language and the format of the assessment tool, not using the same exact words or format as the original. Select from*

assessment toolbox (but do not select Anecdotal Records). You must draft and include a checklist with rating scale or rubric to assess student work. These are more important than a story map or a visual used to elicit language. NO BLANK VENN DIAGRAMS, PLEASE. Attach the original rubrics, checklists, or rating scales if these are not in our required textbooks. If they ARE in our required textbooks, refer to them by Page and Figure Number.

Part VI. Scoring Criteria (Guide). Explain and show how you will score each student's work or performance. This does not mean just how you will assign grades but how you will determine whether students met your content and performance standards. Justify each domain criterion and performance level on the rubric or checklist with rating scale.

Part VII. Scaffolding. (Insert information from the scaffolding project) Describe and justify VISIBLE scaffolding added to assessment tasks and tools. Show how your instructional activities will **provide simplification of language through visuals, manipulatives & choices, and completed examples** for the learners. (Teacher modeling and cooperative learning, while useful, are not considered VISIBLE scaffolding for this project).

Part VIII. Validity & reliability. Explain how you have ensured the validity & reliability of your assessment tasks and evaluation tools you developed. This will extend the section you included in the Scaffolding Project. Now, you must explain how the evaluation tool (domain, criteria, and performance levels) adhere to elements of validity and reliability. Don't forget to explain any threats to validity and reliability. REMEMBER: Address specific types of validity and reliability. You will not earn the maximum rating if this section is broad and not precise. All assessment measures contain some threats to validity and reliability. There is no such thing as the perfect test.

Part IX. Conclusion. Provide a concluding paragraph that shows what you have learned from this project and the course.

REMEMBER TO:

- Refer to assigned course readings in your paper to justify the points made. Refer to outside readings to demonstrate how you exceeded expectations. Your syllabus contains many resources, use them.
- Discuss how you addressed the validity and reliability of your assessment tools.
- Use the sample assessments in Gottlieb (or other sources) as models, but modify them by changing the language and format - don't copy exact words to meet your own purposes and needs. **Show HOW and EXPLAIN WHY you adapted the models (this is VERY IMPORTANT). Give page numbers where they appear in**

the original source. Number each item on a checklist or rating scale. Attach copies of both the original models (if they are not in our required texts) and your revised versions.

- Write at the bottom of each adapted tool the original source, e.g., ***Adapted from Gottlieb, p. 36.*** Attach the original scoring rubric, checklist, or rating scale if it is not included in our required course texts.

Writing your Report

1. Specify the category your paper addresses on the cover sheet and again at the top of the first page, such as "READING ASSESSMENT".
2. Your project should:
 - * Not exceed 15 **pages**. This page limit does not include appendices and sample formats. To help me meet grading deadlines, try not to exceed page limits.
 - * Include a narrative description and rationale and several pages of sample assessment tasks, evaluation tools with scoring guidelines. List only references cited in your narrative on the last page of your paper.
 - * Typed on only one side of the page.
 - * When referring to adapted assessment formats, provide page numbers from original sources.
 - * Include the original assessment tools you adapted; *rather than attach originals available in our texts, refer to the m by Figure and Page Number.*
 - * Provide translations of all foreign language handouts and assessment tools to English.
3. Proofread your paper carefully for stylistic and formatting errors.
4. Remember, I will post 2 examples of previous work for this assignment on Blackboard
5. Part of Graduate Studies is making time for RESEARCH OUTSIDE OF CLASS, and *this includes reviewing previous projects*, scheduling time to meet with me during my office hours for this course or by appointment, and searching the INTERNET and library for articles.
7. Classroom-Based Assessment Project ***DUE on or before the final class***

V. Required Readings and Presentation on Assessment

Purposes:

- To help you to understand and interpret professional readings and issues
- To facilitate group discussion and respond to professional readings
- Promote professional development

Tasks:

Identify one of the readings from the list of e-reserves and prepare a 10 minute oral summary for the class.

SCORING RUBRICS

FOR COURSE PROJECTS

SCAFFOLDING PROJECT-ANALYTIC SCORING RUBRIC

**Foreign Language Assessments and other Handouts will be completely in the Foreign Language w/ Translations.*

DOMAIN POINTS	JUSTIFICATION	VARIETY	REFERENCES	WRITING
4	Accurately & completely explains why scaffolding used is appropriate to the learners' level of language proficiency.	Uses a variety of scaffolding approaches, and these greatly improve the assessment tasks.	Makes many appropriate references to readings & other sources to support scaffolding. No errors in APA	Produces a well-organized, clearly written detailed narrative. NO errors in punctuation, grammar, syntax, or citation format.
3	Accurately BUT incompletely explains why some scaffolding is appropriate to the learners' level of language proficiency.	Uses a variety of scaffolding approaches with some improvement, needs additional scaffolding	Makes some appropriate references to readings & other sources to support scaffolding OR few errors in APA.	Produces organized narrative but needs more elaboration or contain FEW errors in word choice, punctuation, grammar, syntax, or citation format.
2	Provides little explanation for why most scaffolding is appropriate to the learners' level of language proficiency.	Uses similar scaffolding approaches, and these do not improve the assessment tasks.	Makes few references to readings OR some inappropriate references to support scaffolding. Several errors in APA.	Produces a narrative that lacks organization OR contains inconsistent clarity and insufficient elaboration. Numerous errors in punctuation, grammar, syntax, or citation format.
1	Inaccurately OR Fails to explain why scaffolding is appropriate to the learners' level of language proficiency.	Uses only a single scaffolding approach with no improvement to the assessment tasks.	Makes few references to readings AND many inappropriate references to support scaffolding. Several errors in APA.	Produces a narrative that lacks detail, clear organization AND contains Numerous errors in punctuation, grammar, syntax, or citation format. OR Evidence of PLAGIARISM.

EDCI 520
Assessment of Language Learners

R. Grant
Course Syllabus

				<i>(This alone will result in a rating of 1).</i>
--	--	--	--	---

Feedback:

NAME: _____

SCORE: _____

Analytic Scoring Rubric- Special Needs Socratic Discussion (Group)

**Foreign Language Assessments and other Handouts will be completely in the Foreign Language w/ Translations.*

Domain/ Points	Analysis____ _____ _____	Knowledge _____	Preparation _____	Listening _____	Advancement _____
4	Consistently and clearly offers thorough analysis without prompting.	Demonstrates a deep knowledge of topic, readings and questions.	Comes well prepared w/ notes and audience resources.	Listens actively and consistently to other participants.	Consistently offers clarification, follow-up, that extends topic.
3	Consistently offers analysis without prompting BUT occasionally unclear.	Demonstrates knowledge of topic, readings and Most questions.	Comes prepared w/ notes AND some audience resources.	Listens and occasionally engages other participants.	Offers clarification and follow-up that occasionally extends topic.
2	Inconsistently offers analysis with without prompting AND frequently unclear.	Demonstrates limited knowledge of topic OR readings AND some questions.	Appears unprepared in some areas AND offers few audience resources.	Listens to other participants.	Inconsistently clarifies OR offers follow-up AND rarely extends topic.
1	Inconsistently offers analysis with without prompting AND frequently unclear AND inaccurate.	Demonstrates limited knowledge of topic OR readings AND incorrectly responds to questions.	Appears unprepared in most areas AND offers few audience resources.	Inconsistently listens to others AND interrupts.	Inconsistently clarifies OR offers follow-up AND rarely extends topic.

Language Assessment Critique- Analytic Scoring Rubric

**Foreign Language Assessments and other Handouts will be completely in the Foreign Language w/ Translations.*

Domain/ Points	Description of Procedure/	Analysis _____	Recommen- dations _____	Citations/ References	Quality of Writing _____
-------------------	------------------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------

	Measure_ _____			_____	
4	Clearly describes target population and components of procedure and assessment measure.	Conducts a thorough, accurate analysis and justifies and supports points made.	Explains and justifies research-based recommendations for improvement of procedure and assessment measure.	Makes many appropriate references to readings & research that support points made.	Writes clearly, with good organization, elaboration and no errors in conventions and word choice; no APA errors.
3	Describes target population and components of procedure or test incompletely.	Conducts accurate analysis, BUT does not consistently justify & support points made.	Makes recommendations BUT does not fully explain or justify them w/ research.	Makes some inappropriate references to readings & research.	Writing w/ organization BUT needs elaboration OR contains some errors in conventions and word choice, AND some APA errors.
2	Describes target population and components of procedure or test inaccurately and incompletely.	Conducts an incomplete AND inaccurate analysis AND does not justify OR support points.	Makes no recommendations that are justified OR research-based.	Makes few references to readings BUT references other research.	Writing needs elaboration and contains repeated errors in conventions, word choice, AND numerous APA errors.
1	Does not completely describe target population AND components of procedure AND test.	Does not conduct an analysis.	Does not make recommendations for improvement.	Makes no references to assigned readings AND other research.	Writing lacks clarity, elaboration, contains numerous errors in convention, word choice, many APA errors OR Evidence of PLAGIARISM. <i>(This alone will result in a rating of 1).</i>

NAMES:

Classroom-based Assessment Project-Analytic Scoring Rubric

**Foreign Language Assessments and other Handouts will be completely in the Foreign Language w/ Translations.*

Domain Score Points	JUSTIFICATION	APPROPRIATENESS	REFERENCES	VALIDITY & RELIABILITY	WRITING
4	Provides detailed explanation for selecting and adapting all assessment tools appropriate to target	Presents clear, appropriate variety of tools and good scaffolding AND provides appropriate domains, scoring criteria,	Bases design on several required readings and makes citations to them to support design. No error in APA style.	Shows how design ensures validity and reliability of assessments. Addresses multiple	Writes with clear organization and academic style, no errors in conventions.

EDCI 520
Assessment of Language Learners

R. Grant
Course Syllabus

	group and assessment purpose.	and appropriate performance levels.		types of validity and reliability.	
3	Provides details in rationale BUT may lack justification for adapting some tools OR needs elaboration.	Presents appropriate tasks BUT little variety, some scaffolding, provides some inappropriate domains, scoring criteria OR performance levels.	Bases part of design on some assigned required readings but may omit some key references to them to support design. Few errors in APA style.	Addresses issues of validity or reliability with some inaccuracies or incompletely. Addresses limited range of validity & reliability issues.	Writes with clear organization but may lack clarity OR consistency in academic style, some errors in writing.
2	Provides few details in rationale, little justification for adapting each assessment tool, AND needs extensive elaboration.	Presents some inappropriate tasks w/ little variety, limited scaffolding, AND several inappropriate domains, scoring criteria, or performance levels.	Refers few required readings to support design OR uses a design not supported by readings. Many errors in APA style.	Does not address range of issues with validity or reliability OR addresses them incorrectly.	Writes with ineffective organization and frequently lacks clarity and/or coherence. Often contains stylistic and conventions errors.
1	Does not provide a rationale or justification for adapting EACH assessment tool.	Presents tasks with no Variety, scaffolding insufficient AND several domains, scoring criteria, or performance levels missing or inappropriate.	Provides little or no support from required readings. Many errors in APA style.	Does not address issues of validity and reliability or addresses them incorrectly. No clear understanding of threats to validity OR reliability.	Writes with no organization or coherence. Inconsistent academic style with many stylistic and conventions errors OR Evidence of plagiarism.

NAME: _____

SCORE: _____