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Prior Assessment Gaps
- Student assessments previously only measured word & grammar accuracy, not communication in context
- Evidence of SLOs according to syllabus not measured
- Washback from accuracy-focused assessments: students want to “memorize, move on, & forget”
- Reliable measures needed for performance in communicative modes (interpretive, interpersonal, presentational) in plausible real-world contexts
- Needed incremental reminders of goals (can-dos)
- Teacher collaboration not yet established
- Resources for improving existing assessment unclear

Research Significance
1. IPA is standards-based and performance-based. It assesses the progress students are making in building their proficiency through the World-Readiness Standards.
2. IPA meets our program’s goal of developing students’ academic and professional use of the language.
3. IPA has been popular in K-12 but has not been widely used in higher education.
4. IPA is not a radical change to the current curriculum. Traditional assessments remain an integral part of the curriculum.

EALL First-year Chinese Course Facts
- Number of faculty: 1 professor, 2 instructors, 5 TAs
- Number of students: 76 (CHN 102)
- Unit quiz every two days
- Unit test each 6 days, on average
- Midterm written and oral exams
- Textbook: Integrated Chinese, 3rd Ed.
- Meeting time: 4 days/week, 50 min/day, 16wk/sem.

Integrated Performance Assessment (IPA) Procedures
- Student performance criteria now based on performance in ACTFL’s 3 communicative modes: Interpersonal, Listening & Reading, Presentational: Speaking & Writing
- Evidence of outcomes in performance-based assessments scored by ACTFL rubrics
- Positive washback effects from performance-based assessments (students talk about communicative objectives)
- Reliable measures needed for performance in communicative modes
- Systematic scaffolding of assessment tasks (“can-do” pre- and post- likert scales)
- Collaboration procedures developed among faculty
  - Interpersonal: 1 teaching member responsible for each 2 units “can-do” goals & IPA tasks
  - Presentational: 1 teaching member responsible for each round of IPA unit
  - Interim round between each round to meet and discuss modifications to assessment tasks and can-do goals
  - Feedback from IPA rubrics

Findings and Future Directions
- Students visibly read and discuss the IPA rubrics before and during tasks; treat important
- Students give varied responses on Can-do surveys; appear honest
- Students ask questions about can-do statements; appear goal-oriented
- Students ask questions about rubric comments on performance assessment videos
- Can-do surveys should be done at pre and post lesson times to help students and instructors monitor students’ own perceptions of growth, and modify instruction and assessment accordingly
- Course instructors should continue to meet and discuss modifications to assessment tasks and can-do goals

Conclusions
IPA were generally welcomed by students, and often preferred over tests of vocab & grammar accuracy
Can-do statements help remind students of course goals.
Enrollment numbers should benefit
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