Oral Communication for Language Teachers: Assessment Rubric Development

Dustin Crowther, Betsy Gilliland, Kenton Harsch,
Daniel Isbell, Cari Gochenouer

Department of Second Language Studies/General Education Office
Please contact dcrowth@hawaii.edu with any questions.

The Proposal

The Department of Second Language Studies (SLS) BA major includes two electives, SLS 312 and SLS 313, that prepare students to teach key skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening) to learners of a second and/or foreign language. Assessment of students' oral communication requires not only consideration of their immediate ability to communicate clearly to their instructor and peers, but also a projection to how clearly they will communicate to second/foreign language learners (their future students). Both audiences have different needs and impose different communicative challenges for students. The goal of our project is to develop the "Oral Communication for Language Teachers" rubric, which integrates University of Hawai'i Oral Communication Learning Objectives within a discipline-specific rubric for assessing students' oral communication skills.

Workshop 1 (summer 2020)

Faculty and students (N = 17) discussed what language teachers should be able to do (in terms of Oral Communication). Also, how the SLS course assignments allow students to develop Oral Communication skills and what mastery of the skills looks like.

Draft Rubric (August 2020)

Faculty and staff drafted rubric descriptors based on criteria identified in Workshop 2.

- · 3 rating categories
 - Lesson implementation
 - Student-teacher interaction
 - Language use
- Scoring criteria: Exceeds, Meets, Approach Expectations

Ongoing (spring 2021)

We made slight revisions to the rubric based on fall piloting. The revised rubric is now being piloted in SLS 312: *Teaching Reading and Writing.* During summer 2021, we intend to finalize the rubric for official course use in fall 2021.







Piloting (fall 2020)

Rubric piloted in SLS 313: Teaching Listening and Speaking. Students completed two microteaching assignments, and feedback was provided using the draft rubric. In December 2020, the course instructor met with the research team to discuss their use of the rubric.





Workshop 2 (summer 2020)

Faculty and students (N = 14) discussed one assignment in detail, *microteaching*, or a demo activity from a larger lesson plan. They then watched video recordings of students doing the assignment and began to discuss the criteria for the assignment's oral communication rubric.

Rubric (as of end of fall 2020)

		nication for Language Teachers Rubric	
	3: Exceeds expectations	2: Meets expectations	1: Approaching expectations
Lesson Implementation	Consistently gives clear directions instructions Consistently signals transitions among activities/sequences of lessons Models appropriate language and content Effectively uses supporting materials	- Gives mostly clear directions/instructions Occasionally signals transitions among activities/sequences of lessons - Models some language and content - Uses some supporting materials (or some supporting materials not used effectively)	- Rarely gives clear directions/instructions or gives confusi directions - Does not signal transitions among activities/sequences of lessons - Does not model appropriate language and content or provides ineffective or incorrect models - Does not use supporting materials or uses supporting materials ineffectively
Student-Teacher Interaction	Consistently elicits andment's participation through the use of primarily referential questions. Consistently provides students with an appropriate amount of time to formulate and provide a response to a question propried. Consistently uses techniques such as remained to the control of th	Frequently elicits students' participations though may do so through a combination of referential and display questions. Mostly provides students with an appropriate amount of time to formulate and provide a response to a question prompt. equipment of the combination of the comb	Infrequently elicits students' participation, or does so using primarily display questions. Rarely provides students with an appropriate amount of time to formulat and provide a response to a question prompt. repetition and comprehension checking repetition and comprehension checking the provided and the provided are preptition and comprehension checking the continuing with the lesson. In consistently or inappropriately addresses students' language difficultie addresses students' language difficulties.
Language* Use	- Consistently uses: language well-matched to learners' profisions (we'vel). LEfficiently uses a consistent of the cons	- Mostly uses language well-matched to learnery proficiency, level. Mostly assertively simplified to the most profit of the most profit of the most proving directions, responding to student questions or providing feedback. - Mostly speaks at a suitable pace and volume. - Delivery (though intonation, gesture, eye contact, etc.) conveys professionalism and approachability most of the time.	- Uses language that is only sometimes autied to learners' proficiency levels autied to learners' proficiency levels shows limited or inappropriate simplification in language when giving directions, responding to student questions or providing feedback. - Speaks at a saitable pace and volume only some of the time. - Delivery (though intonation, gesture, eye contact, etc.) conveys professionalism and approachability on some of the time.