CEFR ONLINE WORKSHOP SERIES 2022 #9

Title

Developing CEFR-based assessment rubrics and rating scales for interaction and production

Date & Time

Thursday, December 1 2022, 16.00 CET

Presenter

Claudia Harsch

Handout

In this workshop there will be three activities in breakout rooms:

Activity I: EXAMINE existing scales / checklists based on the CEFR-CV
Reflecting on rating scale types, user groups, constructs (interaction and production) and on how the CEFR-CV can be adapted.

Activity II: REFLECT on self-assessment criteria
Discussing your understanding of success criteria for integrated writing and considering how to employ the CEFR-CV to develop such criteria.

Activity III: DEVELOP and EVALUATE rubrics for integrated reading-into-writing
Formulating descriptors for a rubric and evaluating them.

ACTIVITY 1

EXAMINE existing scales / checklists based on the CEFR-CV

You will find two examples of rubrics in this handout (**Example 1 and 2**).

Examine the two rubrics for the following aspects:
   a) What are the target user groups?
      (e.g. teachers, self-assessment, peer assessment?)
   b) What type of instrument do we have?
      (e.g. rating scale or checklist; holistic or analytic; multi-level or level-specific?)
   c) What is the most likely purpose of the assessment?
      (e.g. formative or summative, proficiency or achievement?)
   d) What constructs are assessed?
      (What assessment criteria do we have? Are they relevant for the purpose?)
   e) Where can you see the influence of the CEFR? (e.g. assessment criteria, descriptors?)
      Can you see how the CEFR was adapted for the local context?

You have **25 min** to work in your group in breakout rooms.
Write down your results in **one note for both** instruments.
Make sure you mention **your group** ☺

ACTIVITY **1** - EXAMPLE **1**

	Interaction	Coherence and Fluency	Pronunciation
B1+	Provides the information required in an interview including additional details. *May at points need a sympathetic interviewer.* Initiates, maintains and closes simple conversation with confidence and politeness Reformulates responses/utterances and asks for clarification in order to keep the interaction going.	Uses a meaningful sequence of linked ideas relevant to the task, with adequate topic progression. Uses various cohesive devices to link his/her utterances into clear, coherent discourse but not always appropriately. Establishes more complex relations between ideas, e.g. introduce a counter-argument, cause and consequence, cause and effect. *May show occasional pausing, false starts and reformulation.*	Pronunciation has little effect on intelligibility. Mother tongue influence may be noticeable for pronunciation and intonation.
B1	Provides the information required in an interview. Is sometimes dependent on the interviewer in the interaction. Initiates, maintains and closes simple conversation with some hesitation, generally polite enough. *May repeat back what someone has said to confirm mutual understanding or ask for clarification.*	Mostly organizes ideas into a meaningful sequence, with adequate topic progression. Ideas are generally relevant to task. Links a series of shorter, discrete simple elements into a connected, linear sequence of points. *May show pausing, false starts and reformulation.*	Pronunciation is generally intelligible. Mother tongue influence is still evident for pronunciation and intonation.
A2+	Makes him/herself understood in an interview provided he/she can ask for clarification occasionally, and is given some help to express what he/she wants to. Understands enough to manage simple short conversations without undue effort.	Produces a list of points that shows an attempt at organization and topic progression, with partial success. Ideas are not necessarily all relevant. Uses the most frequently occurring connectors to link simple sentences in order to tell a story or describe something as a simple list of points. *May make evident pauses, false starts and reformulation.*	Pronunciation is generally clear enough to be understood, with occasional strain on the interlocutor. Mother tongue influence is evident.

Mind: this is only an excerpt of the full rubrics. There are criteria and levels missing here.

ACTIVITY **1** - EXAMPLE **2**

Task fulfilment (language criteria carry more weight if in doubt)		Completely fulfilled	Almost completely fulfilled	Largely fulfilled	Only partly fulfilled	Not fulfilled
Content	Can complete the task in terms of content: *- list expected content points here*					
Language functions, comm. effect	Output text demonstrates candidate's ability to realize the following language functions: *- List target language functions here, e.g., communicate formally, compare & contrast, justify, evaluate, conclude, summarise, defend* Achieves the targeted communicative purpose and effect. *- List expected effects here (e.g. persuasive argument)*					
Genre, register	Can use appropriate format and conventions for genre and task: *- List expected genre characteristics here (e.g. use of effective and appropriate citations in an academic paper)* Chooses appropriate register: *- specify formal / informal / neutral* Demonstrates ability to incorporate culturally appropriate conventions. *- List expected conventions here*					

Language competence (language criteria carry more weight if in doubt)		Very good ++	Good +	Satisfactory +/-	Sufficient -	Insufficient - -
Organisation (Coherence and Cohesion)	Text is clear, detailed, well-organised, coherent and cohesive. Paragraphs and sections correspond with logical structuring of the text. Show good command of an appropriate range of complex discourse markers and means of logical connections.					
Vocabulary (Range and Usage)	Uses linguistically complex and broad lexical repertoire relevant to the task: *- Specify task-specific topic here.* Shows good command of collocations, terminology, idiomatic language and colloquialisms. Uses required vocabulary for task correctly. Can overcome gaps readily with circumlocutions; little use of avoidance strategies.					
Grammar (Range and Accuracy)	Uses a wide range of complex grammatical structures and sentence patterns. *- List target grammar relevant to course here.* Demonstrates a high degree of grammatical accuracy, syntax and morphology are correct. *Errors are rare and difficult to spot.*					

	Punctuation is consistent, apart from occasional slips. Spelling is accurate and helpful (for text processing).					

ACTIVITY 2

REFLECT on self-assessment criteria

Imagine the following:
In a course on academic writing (B2+) that you are teaching, you are planning to introduce self-assessment criteria for integrated-reading-into-writing (summary writing) to your university students.

Discuss in small groups how you would plan this introduction with your students.
    a) What approach would you choose to get students on board?
    b) What role can the CEFR-CV play?

You have **10 min** to work in your group in breakout rooms.
Write down your results in **bullet points** in one note.
Make sure you mention **your group** ☺

ACTIVITY 3
DEVELOP and EVALUATE rubrics for integrated reading-into-writing

Imagine a **summary** task for university students in a course on academic writing (**B2+**). The source text is taken from an introductory study book on a suitable topic. It is about 750 words long.

Develop a self-assessment rubric based on the CEFR-CV scales presented on the following pages.

Choose the **three** most salient assessment criteria and develop **two descriptors per criterion**.

➢ Adapt the CEFR descriptors as you see necessary.

➢ Where do you have to add aspects that are not in the CEFR-CV?

You may use the **template** provided in the separate handout (word document), but please copy your results into Padlet.

You have **25 min** to work in your group in breakout rooms.
Write down your results, i.e. the adapted CEFR descriptors in Padlet.
Make sure you mention **your group** ☺

ACTIVITY 3 - selected scales from the CEFR-CV

PROCESSING TEXT IN WRITING, Levels B1 – C1 (2020: pp. 99-100; 2018: p. 112)

C1	Can summarise in writing (in Language B) long, complex texts (written in Language A), interpreting the content appropriately, provided that he/she can occasionally check the precise meaning of unusual, technical terms.
	Can summarise in writing a long and complex text (in Language A) (e.g. academic or political analysis article, novel extract, editorial, literary review, report, or extract from a scientific book) for a specific audience, respecting the style and register of the original.
B2	Can summarise in writing (in Language B) the main content of well-structured but propositionally complex spoken and written texts (in Language A) on subjects within his/her fields of professional, academic and personal interest.
	Can compare, contrast and synthesise in writing (in Language B) the information and viewpoints contained in academic and professional publications (in Language A) in his/her fields of special interest.
	Can explain in writing (in Language B) the viewpoint articulated in a complex text (in Language A), supporting inferences he/she makes with reference to specific information in the original.
	Can summarise in writing (in Language B) the main content of complex spoken and written texts (in Language A) on subjects related to his/her fields of interest and specialisation.
B1	Can summarise in writing (in Language B) the information and arguments contained in texts (in Language A) on subjects of general or personal interest.
	Can summarise in writing (in Language B) the main points made in straightforward informational spoken and written texts (in Language A) on subjects that are of personal or current interest, provided spoken texts are delivered in clearly articulated standard speech.
	Can paraphrase short written passages in a simple fashion, using the original text wording and ordering.

READING FOR INFORMATION AND ARGUMENT (2020: pp. 56-57; 2018: p. 63)

C1	Can understand in detail a wide range of lengthy, complex texts likely to be encountered in social, professional or academic life, identifying finer points of detail including attitudes and implied as well as stated opinions.
	Can understand in detail lengthy, complex texts, whether or not they relate to his/her own area of speciality, provided he/she can reread difficult sections.
B2	Can obtain information, ideas and opinions from highly specialised sources within his/her field.
	Can understand specialised articles outside his/her field, provided he/she can use a dictionary occasionally to confirm his/her interpretation of terminology.
	Can understand articles and reports concerned with contemporary problems in which the writers adopt particular stances or viewpoints.
	Can recognise when a text provides factual information and when it seeks to convince readers of something.
	Can recognise different structures in discursive text: contrasting arguments, problem-solution presentation and cause-effect relationships.
B1	Can understand straightforward, factual texts on subjects relating to his/her interests or studies.
	Can understand short texts on subjects that are familiar or of current interest, in which people give their points of view (e.g. critical contributions to an online discussion forum or readers' letters to the editor).
	Can identify the main conclusions in clearly signalled argumentative texts.
	Can recognise the line of argument in the treatment of the issue presented, though not necessarily in detail.
	Can recognise significant points in straightforward newspaper articles on familiar subjects.
	Can understand most factual information that he/she is likely to come across on familiar subjects of interest, provided he/she has sufficient time for re-reading.
	Can understand the main points in descriptive notes such as those on museum exhibits and explanatory boards in exhibitions.

STRATEGIES TO EXPLAIN A NEW CONCEPT (2020: pp. 119-120; 2018: p. 128), subscale ADAPTING LANGUAGE, Levels B1-C1

C1	Can explain technical terminology and difficult concepts when communicating with non-experts about matters within his/her field of specialisation.
	Can adapt his/her language (e.g. syntax, idiomaticity, jargon) in order to make a complex specialist topic accessible to recipients who are not familiar with it.
	Can paraphrase and interpret complex, technical texts, using suitably non-technical language for a listener who does not have specialist knowledge.
B2	Can explain technical topics within his/her field, using suitably non-technical language for a listener who does not have specialist knowledge.
	Can make a specific, complex piece of information in his/her field clearer and more explicit for others by paraphrasing it in simpler language.
	Can make accessible for others the main contents of a spoken or written text on a subject of interest (e.g. an essay, a forum discussion, a presentation) by paraphrasing in simpler language.
B1	Can paraphrase more simply the main points made in short, straightforward spoken or written texts on familiar subjects (e.g. short magazine articles, interviews) to make the contents accessible for others.
	Can paraphrase short written passages in a simple fashion, using the original order of the text.