assessment 2010-2011

• target population: advanced language level students

• goals assessed:
  – command of complex communicative structures
  – ability to work with authentic material

• ad hoc measures: proficiency report, portfolio review.
II.
Individual Grade Breakdown

Name __________________________

Term __________________________

Course __________________________

Participation ______/100

Attendance ______/100

Homework ______/100

Quizzes ______/100

Oral Presentation ______/100

Oral Midterm Exam ______/25

Written Midterm Exam ______/75

Oral Final Exam ______/25

Written Final Exam ______/75
III.
Proficiency Report

Name _______________________

Date _______________________

Section _______________________

1. Listening Comprehension

comprehension of factual messages 1 2 3 4 5
comprehension of argumentative messages 1 2 3 4 5
comprehension of individualized messages 1 2 3 4 5
appreciation of idiosyncrasies and nuances 1 2 3 4 5
responsiveness and engagement in meaning negotiation 1 2 3 4 5
overall comprehension skills of proposed material 1 2 3 4 5
4. Spoken Production

range of vocabulary 1 2 3 4 5
ability to present on a variety of topics 1 2 3 4 5
structural complexity 1 2 3 4 5
fluency/continuity of speech 1 2 3 4 5
pronunciation 1 2 3 4 5
accuracy and range of morphologic/syntactic structures 1 2 3 4 5

5. Written Production

lexical proficiency and richness 1 2 3 4 5
ability to articulate a narration 1 2 3 4 5
argumentative skills 1 2 3 4 5
clarity, organization and logical coherence 1 2 3 4 5
use of subordination (hypotaxis) 1 2 3 4 5
accuracy and range of morphologic/syntactic structures 1 2 3 4 5
IV.
Portfolio Review

Name __________________________

Date __________________________

Section _________________________

1. Summary of relevant artifacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>artifacts</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Evaluation of key learning strategies and project development skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>topical organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observance of instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevance of content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of assigned morphosyntactic structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress after instructor’s feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inferential skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to contextualize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personalization of material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to find and draw from appropriate resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autonomous acquisition of new information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Evaluation of cultural and sociolinguistic competences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>understanding of subtext</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of style/tone appropriate to topic and setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>command of both formal and informal register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individuation and basic grasp of idioms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest in cultural practices and perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis of cultural products and phenomena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to make intercultural comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>richness of cultural references</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. How would you rate the overall progress of the student’s organizational skills?  

[1-5 scale]

Comment: ____________________________________________________________

6. How would you rate the overall progress of the student’s ability to advance his/her knowledge autonomously?  

[1-5 scale]

Comment: ____________________________________________________________

7. How would you rate the overall progress of the student’s cultural interest and competence?  

[1-5 scale]

Comment: ____________________________________________________________

8. In your opinion, does the student have the quality to become a lifelong learner of Italian language and culture?  

[1-5 scale]

Comment: ____________________________________________________________
results / actions

- fossilization, partial loss of progress
  students need actionable feedback
  > midterm feedback form
  > expanded tutorial support

- uneven responsiveness
  new challenges inherent to real material
  > sharing of good practices (workshops) on structured input
  > organization of student portfolios
assessment 2011-2012

• target group: elementary and intermediate level courses
• objective: validity of testing procedure
• materials sampled: 2011-12 final exams for all elementary and intermediate classes, intensive and extensive (758 total exams)
• a priori validity (evaluation of test design)
• a posteriori validity (evaluation of scoring)
results / actions

• limitations in response format

  students not habitually exposed to full variety of task types

• suboptimal coefficient of error in reading comprehension items

  lack of contextual complexity in vocabulary and comprehension tasks

> standards for exams/syllabi alignment
> guidelines for formats
> introduction of real, non-simplified textual artifacts in exams
> new design of reading comprehension items
assessment 2012-2013

• target group: elementary/intermediate sequence
• goals assessed: student intake and output in non-standardized course component (tasks, projects, presentations)
• method of assessment: task survey (analysis of typology, structure, sequencing, review of relevant input, type of student artifacts; progress and grade report)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>insegnante e corso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>titolo del task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strutture attivate (grammatica e/o vocabolario)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tipologia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ info-gap ☑ jigsaw X problem-solving ☑ presentazione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>altro (specificare):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materiales usato come input (video, audio, testi scritti o altro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>output degli studenti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- specificare se unico o diviso in due fasi (nel caso, spiegare come la riadattazione interviene fra la prima e la seconda fase).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- specificare il tipo/i tipi di prodotto (audio, video, testo scritto, performance orale, ecc) realizzato/i dagli studenti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sequenza delle varie fasi del task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commento sui risultati (compreensione, partecipazione, e apprezzamento degli studenti delle attività presentate nelle diverse fasi; assorbimento delle strutture; progresso degli studenti nelle fasi del task e nelle fasi di comprensione/produzione scritta/orale).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

results / actions

• communicative goals are met but issue with task grading
  grading focuses too exclusively on performance
  > extension of grading criteria beyond evaluation of performance

• archaic or unusual lexis in student’s written output
  online translation services
  > revision of dept. policy. mention of machine translation as form of plagiarism

• repetitiveness of output
  strategies for diversification/time management
  > creation of archive with effective models