**Final Presentation Guidelines and Rubric**

**GUIDELINES FOR FINAL PRESENTATION ON LANGUAGE ASSMENT**

The purpose of this project is to make you familiar with the Process of Designing a Language Assessment Tool with a Special Emphasis on the WARP V Testing Qualities so that they can be effective learning and assessment tools. You will choose a skill area that you would like to focus on and create an assessment that measures learners’ progress in the objectives you choose.

In designing your test, please follow these steps:

1. Choose a skill area that you are interested in (e.g., listening, speaking, reading, writing, grammar and vocabulary). This can be an area in which you would like to improve yourself, you are currently teaching, or you would like to teach.
2. Imagine a teaching context and a group of students (e.g., U.S. elementary school, 4th grader ELLs, beginner proficiency). This can also be a real group of students if you are actively teaching.
3. Next, imagine the test type and assessment objectives (e.g., achievement test, use of simple past tense)
4. Then, start designing your assessment tool (e.g., type of questions, time, length of test, evaluation criteria, who evaluates, how evaluation is done).
5. After you finish designing your test, critically think about how your test can do with WARP V specifications. Does it pass all the qualities?
6. Next, you start working on your PowerPoint presentation so that your classmates will see what you prepared and how you went about it. Since you may have chosen a different skill area than your classmates, most of what you will present might be new to them. Therefore, please elaborate on your design and choices assuming that your audience has minimal knowledge of what you are talking about.
7. ~~If you have no previous experience with preparing voice-over powerpoint presentations, here are some resources to help:~~[~~http://office.microsoft.com/en-us/powerpoint-help/add-narration-to-a-presentation-HA001230306.aspx~~](https://mail.shsu.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=XOkw1n2lRUyP2aqE3EM8Fi1upUkuStEIhZkzRuTaqDrqoYSalZ1Evb6qKSb18axoU263XvMCz90.&URL=https%3a%2f%2fmail.shsu.edu%2fowa%2fredir.aspx%3fC%3dBlhTpPyNbUSySlNTDZ5NtIzBxv_LJtEIzd5nOKPTY24lLUzbwoBpCP9UpzxAcH6jauoCwsHQcOs.%26URL%3dhttp%253a%252f%252foffice.microsoft.com%252fen-us%252fpowerpoint-help%252fadd-narration-to-a-presentation-HA001230306.aspx)[~~http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oTlzpwFFvLE~~](https://mail.shsu.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=XOkw1n2lRUyP2aqE3EM8Fi1upUkuStEIhZkzRuTaqDrqoYSalZ1Evb6qKSb18axoU263XvMCz90.&URL=https%3a%2f%2fmail.shsu.edu%2fowa%2fredir.aspx%3fC%3dBlhTpPyNbUSySlNTDZ5NtIzBxv_LJtEIzd5nOKPTY24lLUzbwoBpCP9UpzxAcH6jauoCwsHQcOs.%26URL%3dhttp%253a%252f%252fwww.youtube.com%252fwatch%253fv%253doTlzpwFFvLE)[~~http://www.emergingedtech.com/2012/12/add-voice-over-to-powerpoint-presentations-in-5-easy-steps/~~](https://mail.shsu.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=XOkw1n2lRUyP2aqE3EM8Fi1upUkuStEIhZkzRuTaqDrqoYSalZ1Evb6qKSb18axoU263XvMCz90.&URL=https%3a%2f%2fmail.shsu.edu%2fowa%2fredir.aspx%3fC%3dBlhTpPyNbUSySlNTDZ5NtIzBxv_LJtEIzd5nOKPTY24lLUzbwoBpCP9UpzxAcH6jauoCwsHQcOs.%26URL%3dhttp%253a%252f%252fwww.emergingedtech.com%252f2012%252f12%252fadd-voice-over-to-powerpoint-presentations-in-5-easy-steps%252f)[~~https://screencast-o-matic.com/~~](https://screencast-o-matic.com/) ~~(~~PPT ONLY)
8. Your powerpoint presentation can be about 10-15 slides and should include the process of test design and how it addresses the WARP V specifications. You can copy and paste parts of your test as a text or picture and talk about specific sections of it. It should also include the background contextual information that was mentioned in steps 3 and 4 above.
9. At the end of your presentation, ask your classmates a question for them to address in their responses. This question can be something you are still curious about after completing your test or an area that you struggled while preparing your assessment tool. Your friends’ responses should help you improve your assessment design and your thought process to go toward your final report.
10. Remember, the assessment tool may not be perfect across WARP V, but if you have an awareness of the shortcomings and reflect on these in your report, you will be better able to modify the evaluation process, prepare better assessment tools gradually, and improve your students’ learning experiences.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CATEGORY | **10- Above Standards** | **7 - Meets Standards** | **5- Approaching Standards** | **2- Below Standards** |
| **Content** | Covers essential aspects of language assessment with details, examples, and specific references to the content. Subject knowledge is excellent. | Includes essential knowledge about language assessment. Some parts are vague and need elaboration. No explicit examples used. Subject knowledge appears to be good. | Includes some essential information about language assessment but some parts are covered superficially without sufficient explanation. Some parts are unclear and examples are not used to support. | Content is minimal OR there are several factual errors. |
| **Organization** | Content is well organized using headings or bulleted lists to group related material. It’s easy to follow the presentation with good cohesion from slide to slide. | Uses headings or bulleted lists to organize, but the overall organization of topics appears flawed. Some organizational information is missing such as contextual information. | Content is logically organized for the most part. Organization lacks cohesion. No background information is given. | There was no clear or logical organizational structure, just lots of facts. |
| **Presentation** | Well-rehearsed with smooth delivery that holds audience attention. Powerpoint is well-designed without being overloaded with text. Visuals are used successfully and voice supports text rather than reading along text. | Rehearsed with fairly smooth delivery that holds audience attention most of the time. Powerpoint demonstrates good design aspects without being overloaded with text. Voice supports text rather than reading it. | Delivery not smooth, but able to maintain interest of the audience most of the time.  Powerpoint demonstrates adequate design aspects overall, but is weak in areas. Voice is not supporting text, but simply reading what is on the slides. | Delivery not smooth and audience attention often lost.  Powerpoint is poorly designed and fails to represent the topic. Too much text and too much reading the text. |
| **Requirements** | All requirements are met and exceeded, including submitting powerpoint on the requested date and requested length. (10-15 slides) | All requirements are met including submitting powerpoint on the requested date, but a few slides shorter or longer. | One requirement was not completely met. The presentation was not submitted when it was due or it was too long or too short. | More than one requirement was not completely met. |
| **WARP V** | All WARP V qualities were mentioned; if the test addresses each one or may fall short in one area. Reflection was provided for reasons of failure across WARP V and possible solutions to address these concerns. | Most WARP V qualities were mentioned, but some were done only superficially. More explanation is needed to support. Some reflection was provided, but it does not adequately explain how the concerns can be addressed. | Some WARP V qualities were mentioned, but discussed very superficially. Gaps in knowledge of WARP V and its implications. More support needed to justify reasoning for how a test addresses all test qualities. | No mention of WARP V qualities or very minimal references. |

Wrap V Testing

**What Do Teachers Need to Know about Second Language Assessment?: Introducing WARP V Framework**

The framework is titled "WARP V" inspired by the well-known TV series Star-Trek and stands for the 5 major qualities of second language assessment: Washback, Authenticity, Reliability, Practicality, and Validity. WARP V is an escalated speed in which the ship improves its performance to its peak, but not every ship can handle the WARP V speed. Similarly, when teachers design or find a test, they put it across the WARP V analysis and see how the test is doing across these benchmarks. If the test survives the WARP Vanalysis, it’s a good test.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Formative Assessment** | **Summative Assessment** |
| Evaluating students in the process of forming their competencies and skills with the goal of helping them to continue that growth process. | Aims to measure, or summarize, what a student has grasped, and typically occurs at the end of a course or unit of instruction. |
| The key to such formation is the delivery (by the teacher) and internalization (by the student) of appropriate feedback on performance, with an eye toward the future continuation of learning. | Implies looking back and taking stock of how well that student has accomplished objectives, but does not necessarily point the way to future progress. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Washback** | Learning from the assessment, either while preparing for it or remembering certain assessment experiences.   Positive washback refers to expected test effects.  For example, a test may encourage students to study more or may promote a connection between objectives and instruction. Negative washback refers to the unexpected, harmful consequences of a test.  For example, instruction may focus too heavily on test preparation at the expense of other activities. |
| **Authenticity** | In a test, authenticity may be present in the following ways:  -The language in the test is as natural as possible.  -Items are contextualized rather than isolated.  -Topics are meaningful (relevant, interesting) for the learner.  -Tasks represent, or closely approximate, real-world tasks. |
| **Reliability** | A reliable test is consistent and dependable.  If you give the same test to the same student or matched students on two different occasions, the test should yield similar results.  Different types of reliability:  -rater reliability: human error, subjectivity, and bias enter into the scoring process.  -student-related reliability (e.g., temporary illness, fatigue, anxiety),  -test administration reliability (street noise outside the classroom, conditions of desks, variations in temperature) |
| **Practicality** | An effective test is practical. This means that it  -is not excessively expensive  -stays within appropriate time constraints  -is relatively easy to administer  -has a scoring/evaluation procedure that is specific and time-efficient |
| **Validity** | Test validity refers to the extent to which inferences made from assessment results are appropriate, meaningful, and useful in terms of the purpose of the assessment.  Different types of validity:  Content validity: If a test actually samples the subject matter about which conclusions are to be drawn, and if it requires the test taker to perform the behavior that is being measured, then it has content validity.  Construct validity: the test actually taps into the theoretical construct as it has been defined (e.g., communicative competence)  Face validity: the degree to which a test looks right, and appears to measure the knowledge or abilities it claims to measure, based on subjective judgment of the examinees who take it, or the administrative personnel who decide on its use. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment** | **Evaluation** |
| Assessment: gathering and synthesizing of information about students’ learning during a lesson | Evaluation: making judgments about students’ learning. |

**Characteristics of assessment for ELLs**

* + *informal*, e.g., teacher observations, T-S and S-S interactions during a lesson
  + *authentic*, i.e., while Ss are involved in meaningful tasks related to real-life contexts
  + *multidimensional*, i.e., different methods are used (e.g., written work, interviews, observations, oral group responses, discussion)
  + involve *multiple indicators* (i.e., evidence specifically related to language and content objectives)

**Techniques for quick assessment during group nonverbal responses**

Thumbs up/thumbs down

* + For yes/no questions or true/false statements, Ss raise their thumbs to signal ‘yes’ or ‘true’. Other signals can be used to indicate a lack of understanding.

Number wheels

* + Ss turn to the number on their paper wheels to indicate their answer to a multiple-choice question.
* To elicit a response on the correct use of the possessive in the following orally produced sentence, “The little boy’s shirt was dirty.” Options on the board are

1. boys 2. boy’s 3. boys’

* + Ss hold up the number that matches their response choice or a zero for “don’t know”.
  + T can easily see how many have understood.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Range** | adapt the number of test items ELLs is expected to complete (e.g., add numbers only) |
| **Time** | provide more processing time and/or breaking tasks into manageable chunks for ELLs |
| **Level of support** | adapt the amount of scaffolding provided to ELLs (e.g., peer assistant, translation of items if possible) |
| **Difficulty** | adapt the skill level, type of problem or task (not to the extent of sacrificing content) |
| **Product** | adapt the type of response ELLs is allowed to provide (e.g., permitting drawings, a hands-on demonstration, a verbal response) |
| **Participation** | adapt the degree of active involvement of an English learner in assessment (e.g., individual self-assessment, assistance in creating rubrics, cooperative group self-assessment) |

**Reflective Paper-Based on the Powerpoint presentation- (1-2 pages)—Separate Order:**

**Reflective questions:**

**What does it mean to you? What parts do you find interesting? What parts seem challenging or new to you? How can this apply to your teaching context or your profession in general?**

**Thank you!**

Final Paper Guidelines and Rubric

Top of Form

Bottom of Form

**Final Paper Guidelines and Rubric**

**TITLE**  
**Introduction**(this part can be a paragraph or can have subheadings)

**Teaching context**

**Group of students** (e.g., their proficiency levels)

**Assessment type** (e.g., achievement test, diagnostic test)

**Assessed skills and objectives** (e.g., how students use simple past tense in their narration of a wonderful day in writing)

**Assessment subtypes** (e.g., what kind of tasks included)

**WARP V** (e.g., a paragraph in each test quality)

Washback (explain in a paragraph what kind of impact your test will have in terms of learning)

            Authenticity (explain in a paragraph how your test reflects real life tasks)

Reliability (explain in a paragraph how your test is reliable and will give the same scores by different raters or at different occasions)

            Practicality (explain how your test is easy to administer and grade)

            Validity (explain how your test measures what you wanted to measure and not something else)

**Conclusion**(e.g., what you learnt from this overall process of creating an assessment tool)

**Appendix**(e.g., add your assessment tool in this section)

Style notes:

* 1. Use Times New Roman 12 pt, double space
  2. Indent new paragraphs
  3. Use APA for citations
  4. Word limit between 1,000 and 3, 000 words.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CATEGORY | **10- Above Standards** | **7 - Meets Standards** | **5- Approaching Standards** | **2- Below Standards** |
| **Content** | Covers essential aspects of language assessment with details, examples, and specific references to the content. Subject knowledge is excellent. | Includes essential knowledge about language assessment. Some parts are vague and need elaboration. No explicit examples used. Subject knowledge appears to be good. | Includes some essential information about language assessment but some parts are covered superficially without sufficient explanation. Some parts are unclear and examples are not used to support. | Content is minimal OR there are several factual errors. |
| **Organization** | Content is well organized using headings or bulleted lists to group related material. It’s easy to read the report with clear transitions from section to section. | Uses headings or bulleted lists to organize, but the overall organization of topics appears flawed. Some organizational information is missing such as contextual information. | Content is logically organized for the most part. Organization lacks cohesion. No background information is given. | There was no clear or logical organizational structure, just lots of facts. |
| **Requirements** | All requirements are met and exceeded, including submitting the paper on the requested date and requested length. (1,000-3,000 words, excluding the Appendix) | All requirements are met including submitting the paper on the requested date, but shorter than 1,000 words or longer than 3, 000 words (excluding the Appendix). | One requirement was not completely met. The paper was not submitted when it was due or it was too long or too short. | More than one requirement was not completely met. |
| **WARP V** | All WARP V qualities were mentioned; if the test addresses each one or may fall short in one area. Reflection was provided for reasons of failure across WARP V and possible solutions to address these concerns. | Most WARP V qualities were mentioned, but some were done only superficially. More explanation is needed to support. Some reflection was provided, but it does not adequately explain how the concerns can be addressed. | Some WARP V qualities were mentioned, but discussed very superficially. Gaps in knowledge of WARP V and its implications. More support needed to justify reasoning for how a test addresses all test qualities. | No mention of WARP V qualities or very minimal references. |
| **Writing** | Paper is well-written and formatted, using APA. The writing flows well from introduction to conclusion, and has no or very few mechanical errors. The paper includes all the sections provided in the guidelines. | Paper is well-written and formatted, using APA and has few mechanical errors. The writing is clear and the paper is divided into identifiable sections with good transitions in-between. | Paper is poorly-written and formatted, with noticeable number of mechanical errors. Sections do not flow and connect well and look like lots of facts listed. It’s hard to follow the author’s train of thought. Not all requirements in the guidelines were included. | Paper is very poorly-written, is not in narrative format and looks like a list of facts. It’s difficult to follow writer’s thoughts and sentences or paragraphs do not connect to each other or to the whole. |