



Teachers'
Assessment
Literacy
Enhancement

TALE

English Language Teaching and Assessment in the Romanian Secondary School System

VALENTINA MURESAN PHD.

University of Debrecen, June 10th, 2016



Erasmus+

The Context

- EFL in Romania has moved in LEAPS

Grammar-Translation → Audiolingualism →

Communicative Approach

- New and old Approaches co-exist

(Some type of communicative language teaching)

- Popularity of the English Language Exams
(Cambridge, IELTS, TOEFL)

- Foreign language proficiency involves
communicative competence

Understanding Communicative Competence

▶ “communicative competence often resumes to knowledge of specialised terminology, even when there is reference to expressing one’s opinion; communicative competence as interaction is rarely mentioned if mentioned at all in the curricula” (Dumbrăveanu, 2006)

▶ M. Celce-Murcia 2007 model

Strategic Competence + Discourse Competence + Linguistic Competence + Formulaic Competence + Socio-cultural Competence + Interactional Competence (Actional, Conversational, Non-verbal)

National Exams in Romania

National Tests from 2013/2014 (PISA format)

2nd and 4th grade

testing Romanian Language, Mathematics and 1st Language (Mother tongue)

6th grade

Romanian and Modern Language, Sciences (Mathematics, Physics and Biology)

High-stakes National Exams

8th grade - National Exam

(testing Romanian Language, Mathematics and 1st Language (Mother tongue) -75% overall average for the 4 years of study 25%)

12th grade - the Baccalaureate

(testing Romanian Language, 1st Language (Mother tongue), Modern Language, Digital Competences, Compulsory Subject, Chosen Subject (arts/science class)) English Language - minimum level PET (B1)

Bilingual Programmes

5th grade admission (any YLE exam or higher is a 10) (CEFR level A1, A2)

9th grade admission (KET or higher is a 10) (minimum CEFR level A2)

“ENGLISH MADE FUN” 8TH GRADE 2016 - SPEAKING ASSESSMENT SCHEME

| SCORE | VOCABULARY Appropriacy Range | GRAMMAR Accuracy Complexity | DISCOURSE MANAGEMENT Structure Coherence and cohesion | CONTENT Relevance to the topic Development of argument | DELIVERY (PRESENTATION) Overall effect upon audience Pronunciation Voice Body language (eye-contact) |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | Basic vocabulary Frequent lexical errors | Limited control of simple grammatical structures (eg. Present , Past, Future Tenses – affirmative, negative, interrogative) | Lack of clear structure, difficult for the listener to follow Little use of basic cohesive devices | Irrelevant content No development of ideas/point of view (enumeration)/ too many ideas | Inaudible Speech mostly read Frequent intonation and pronunciation errors Frequent pauses and hesitation Almost no eye contact Unnatural body language |
| 3 | More features of 2 than of 6 | | | | |
| 4 | Some features of 2 and some features of 6 in approximately equal measure | | | | |
| 5 | More features of 6 than of 2 | | | | |
| 6 | Limited range of vocabulary, sufficient to deal reasonably with the task Generally appropriate at lexical level | Reasonably accurate use of basic grammatical structures and attempts some more complex structures (eg. degrees of comparison of adjectives and adverbs) | Evidence of some structure (series of short simple sentences, missing introduction, abrupt ending), some difficulty for the listener to follow Occasional use of basic cohesive devices (and, but, or) | Some irrelevant content may occur Some Ideas/opinions are not clearly defined and developed | Good volume control although less audible parts may occur Independent speaker Some pronunciation and intonation errors may occur Some hesitation Occasional eye contact Somewhat natural body language |
| 7 | More features of 6 than of 10 | | | | |
| 8 | Some features of 6 and some features of 10 in approximately equal measure | | | | |
| 9 | More features of 10 than of 6 | | | | |
| 10 | A wide range of vocabulary (evidence of related vocabulary) Rare inaccuracies at lexical level | Mostly accurate use of basic grammatical structures and some complex structures (eg. Passive Voice, Conditionals, Modals) Self-correction may occur | Clear 3 part structure, easily followed by the listener Good use of simple and some complex cohesive devices (and, but, or, then, finally, in addition, as a result, moreover, however, on the one | Relevant content for the topic Ideas are developed into short phrases There is evidence of an extended point of view (examples, sub-points) | Consistently appropriate volume Persuasive presentation Generally accurate pronunciation and intonation Very little hesitation Maintains eye contact Natural body language for the context |

- **2 POINTS PENALTY FOR SPEAKING UNDER 1MIN OR OVER 3 MIN (from the total 50 points)**

Method of calculation - MAXIMUM SCORE = (10 POINTS/CRITERION) x2 = TOTAL OF 50POINTS x2 =100 POINTS

| Criteria | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Grade |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Use of Arguments & Organisation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logical development (topic sentence, justification/reason, examples) Incisive conclusion (individual rounding off) | All arguments were very persuasive, clearly tied to an idea (premise) and organised in a coherent, logical flow. | Arguments were mostly persuasive, however, clearly tied to an idea (premise) and organised in a coherent, logical flow. (reason/example missing) | Some arguments were persuasive, but the organisation was sometimes not clear or logical. | Hardly any arguments were given and the organisation was not clear or logical. (not convincing presentation) | |
| 2. Use of Research findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facts and examples | Every major point was well supported with 3 or more relevant facts, statistics and/or examples. | Most major points were adequately supported with 1-2 relevant facts, statistics and/or examples. | The relevance of some facts and examples is questionable. | Hardly any relevance. | |
| 3. Presentation Style: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tone of voice, clarity of expression, eye contact (raport with the group) Interaction skills: turn taking +; taking over arguments/ideas /words +; cutting in -; fudging -; | <p>All style features were used convincingly</p> <p>All interactive + skills were used naturally</p> | <p>Most style features were used convincingly</p> <p>Mostly natural</p> | <p>Few style features were used convincingly</p> <p>Attempted to be natural (presented his arguments without connecting them to the previous ideas); some fudging</p> | <p>Failed to convey the message *</p> <p>Sounded rehearsed; with no connection with the group</p> | |
| | | | | | TOTAL SCORE: _____ |

| Criteria | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Score |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 1. Use of Arguments & Organisation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logical development (premise-conclusion); Structure (justification/reason, examples, lack of repetition/variation; fully developed ideas); | All arguments were very persuasive, clearly tied to an idea (premise) and organised in a coherent, logical flow; | Arguments were mostly persuasive, however, clearly tied to an idea (premise) and organised in a coherent, logical flow (reason/example missing); | Some arguments were persuasive, but the organisation was sometimes not clear or logical (repetition); | Hardly any arguments were given and the organisation was not clear or logical (not convincing presentation) | |
| 2. Use of Research Findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facts and examples (nationally/internationally recognised sources, reliable sources, of public interest, accurate information) | Every major point was well supported with 3 or more relevant facts, statistics and/or examples (well researched) | Most major points were adequately supported with 1-2 relevant facts, statistics and/or examples | The relevance of some facts and examples is questionable.(name dropping) | Hardly any relevance. | |
| 3. Presentation Style: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tone of voice, clarity of expression, eye contact (rapport with the group); Interaction skills: politeness, initiate-respond-expand (linking ideas, taking over/picking up on previous arguments/ ideas/words +); cutting in -, interruption -, fudging -; | <p>All style features were used convincingly;</p> <p>All interactive + skills were used naturally;</p> | <p>Most style features were used convincingly;</p> <p>Mostly natural;</p> | <p>Few style features were used convincingly;</p> <p>Attempted to be natural (presented his arguments without connecting them to the previous ideas); some fudging</p> | <p>Failed to convey the message;</p> <p>Sounded rehearsed; with no connection with the group;</p> | |

Conclusions

- ▶ Beginner teachers do not have sufficient training in ELT

(a rupture between learning goals - learning/teaching activities - assessment/evaluation)

- ▶ Absence of a mentoring programme leads to constantly having to revisit and practise key strategies and concepts
- ▶ Repeated training and standardizing is often not perceived positively
- ▶ Co-existing practices - The danger of falling back on old paradigms

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION.



Teachers'
Assessment
Literacy
Enhancement



Erasmus+