Using Electronic Portfolios for Second Language Assessment

PATRICIA W. CUMMINS
Virginia Commonwealth University
School of World Studies
P.O. Box 842021
Richmond, VA 23284-2021
Email: pcummins@vcu.edu

CÉLINE DAVESNE
Rouen Business School
Department of Languages, Cultures, and Society
Boulevard André Siegfried BP215
76825 Mont-Saint-Aignan Cedex
France
Email: cdv@rouenbs.fr

Portfolio assessment as developed in Europe presents a learner-empowering alternative to computer-based testing. The authors present the European Language Portfolio (ELP) and its American adaptations, LinguaFolio and the Global Language Portfolio, as tools to be used with the Common European Framework of Reference for languages and the American national standards, which reference the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages proficiency scale. The ELP's characteristic three-part format, consisting of a language passport, a language biography, and a dossier, builds on earlier research on portfolios and second language assessment. The portfolios' qualitative assessment complements other types of quantitative assessment measures. The authors also explore the unique affordances offered by electronic portfolios to connect teaching and learning to assessment, discuss the effectiveness of portfolios as an assessment tool, and point to future directions for e-portfolio research and development for language learning.

COMPUTER ASSESSMENT OF SECOND LANGUAGE (L2) learner outcomes is a field that encompasses computer-based testing (CBT), computer-adaptive testing (CAT), and semi-adapted CAT, as described by Ockey (this issue). It also includes alternate forms of assessment made possible through portfolios, especially electronic (e-)portfolios (EPs), which are the focus of this article. As Garrett (1991) noted, teachers experienced in computer-assisted language learning (CALL) found the use of computerized tests for real grades undesirable, especially in light of the possibility that not all students may have the same familiarity with the technology involved in administering the assessment.

After noting how CBT today can provide similar if not identical results to other forms of testing, Ockey (this issue) still identifies a number of remaining challenges in addition to those cited by Garrett (1991). These include problems with

using item response theory (IRT) as a basis (which undermines the results of CAT), variations in CAT scores depending on the algorithm used to determine the sequence of questions, and the challenge of classifying the level of difficulty in a large bank of test questions. Given that a machine cannot fully replicate the interpretive abilities of human beings, qualitative portfolio assessment presents a reasonable alternative form of evaluating linguistic outcomes and intercultural competence. This article focuses on the assessment of L2 communication skills and cultural competence in an e-portfolio environment.

Norton and Wiburg (1998) defined a *portfolio* as "a systematic and selective collection of student work that has been assembled to demonstrate the student's motivation, academic growth, and level of achievement" (p. 237). As is the case for portfolios in any discipline, language learners go through a process of *inquiry* during which they collect, sort, select, describe, analyze, and evaluate evidence to demonstrate how well they have met a standard, goal, or objective. In addition, learners often engage in ongoing *reflection* on what they

accomplished and on how to set future goals and develop strategies to reach those goals (Johnson, Mims-Cox, & Doyle-Nichols, 2006).

Al Kahtani (1999) defined an *electronic portfolio* as "a purposeful collection of a student's work that is made available on the World Wide Web or a recordable CD–ROM" (p. 262). EPs as described in this article also focus on collection, selection, and reflection. What makes them different from paper-based portfolios is the type of *artifacts* that the EP can contain and the interactivity that digital portfolios allow. Unlike paper-based portfolios, EPs are capable of storing a wide variety of media files (e.g., audio files, video files, movies, photos, text files, PowerPoint) in a single location, organized chronologically, thematically, or according to a specific purpose. When created within a learning management system such as Blackboard they can be shared easily with classmates and the instructor. In addition, internal links allow interactivity among the parts of a portfolio, such as the learner's goals, the learner's progress toward goals, and samples of work to illustrate how well the learner meets those goals. Interactivity can also include portfolio feedback from peers or instructors through discussion groups, chat rooms, or even social networking sites or online classrooms. Once created, EPs can be reorganized for future purposes after further selection and reflection (Gibson, 2006; Stevenson, 2006; Yancey, 2001).

This article provides practitioners with a basic overview of e-portfolio models currently used in Europe and the United States: the European Language Portfolio (ELP), and its American adaptations, LinguaFolio (LF) and Global Language Portfolio (GLP). It also reviews the assessment scales used by these EPs—that is, the Common European Framework of Reference for languages (CEFR) and the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) proficiency guidelines, cited in the American national standards—and how they are expressed in "can do" self-assessment checklists used by learners in their portfolios. This article then explores the affordances of EPs, their effectiveness for language assessment, and future directions for research on and implementation of EPs for language learning.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON
PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT

Researchers on portfolio assessment over the past 75 years have built on Dewey's (1933) landmark work *How We Think: A Restatement of the*

Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process. His basic premises, still evident today in the ELP and GLP, involve the use of portfolios to reflect on and summarize what was learned and to keep track of one's progress over time. Paris and Ayres (1994) expanded on the work of Dewey, encouraging learners to take ownership of and responsibility for their own learning to bring together coursework, personal experiences, and independent learning in the organization of their portfolios. This required a certain amount of metacognition on the part of learners; that is, they needed to reflect on how they learn best, on how they are motivated, and on their attitudes and behaviors toward learning. This metacognition also required them to think about their knowledge base and skills and their personal strategies to improve those skills. Teachers were expected to assist the students in providing portfolio evidence of the progress they made toward course goals, program goals, or their personal goals.

By the 1980s and 1990s, portfolios came to be regarded as a vehicle to collect and store concrete evidence, or artifacts, to attest to a learner's skills and knowledge. Cole, Ryan, and Kick (1995) provided examples of how portfolios can work successfully in several disciplines, with a focus on *authentic assessment*; in other words, the situations as presented in the portfolio closely reflected situations that would be found in real life. Moore (1994) saw the need for learners to select what goes into a portfolio, plan how the end product will look, organize the contents, and produce a final result as a kind of *formative assessment*; that is, portfolio construction was an assessment activity designed to help them learn. At the same time, she recognized the need for the teacher to react to the learner's portfolio, discuss it with the learner, and/or provide written feedback.

Johnson et al. (2006) classified nine types of university and adult portfolios, ranging from those suited to academic assessment to others suited for complementing a résumé and a cover letter for a job or promotion; other portfolios resembled those described by Dewey (1933), with their emphasis on self-assessment, reflection on past learning, and planning of future learning experiences. An EP allows the learner who has focused on the self-assessment element in putting a portfolio together to explore the option of reorganizing elements of the portfolio to address other purposes at a later date.

Yancey (2001) addressed the successes and challenges of EPs in English classes. For instance, EPs provide easy storage for artifacts, as they do not require physical space and they

provide opportunities to connect and represent intellectual work in new ways. In addition, Yancey proposed that digital portfolios help align pedagogy and assessment, allow connections across classes, and incorporate the personal experiences of the learner. For Yancey, "the engaged learner, one who records and interprets and evaluates his or her own learning, is the best learner" (p. 83). However, technology does not solve the perennial challenges of making sure that there is sufficient motivation and reward for the learner to create a portfolio. Other challenges cited by Yancey and by Cummins (2007b), with foreign language students, involved the need to provide sufficient infrastructure (technological resources, knowledge, staffing), faculty training in technology, and opportunities for students to develop skills with technology and with portfolio organization. Both provided recommendations regarding the design of digital portfolios to address some of these issues.

In Yancey's (2001) study, learning management systems allowed learners to share their portfolios with peers as well as with the instructor, computer-mediated communication provided the advantage of online anonymity that face-to-face communication did not allow, and the process of peer review also benefited from structured EPs with preset requirements and online assessment tools available for giving feedback to peers. Cummins (2007b) had similar success in the graduate classroom but reported that foreign language educators wanting to export their own portfolios as models for their classes found that the exported versions did not always function well without Blackboard internal links.

Gibson (2006) also reviewed the opportunities and constraints of EPs. On the one hand, he lauded the access to media resources and digital libraries, interactivity with varied audiences, links to an archive of artifacts that can be stored for future needs, and opportunities to link to social networking sites. On the other hand, he noted the limitations of technology for this kind of assessment—for example, that the subtleties of face-to-face interactions are not captured in videoconferences or chat room narratives, and meetings are transformed in a digital setting. Nevertheless, he concluded that the creation of EPs "will cause new types of thinking, reflection, and expression" (Gibson, 2006, p. 144).

ELECTRONIC PORTFOLIOS FOR LEARNING, TEACHING, AND ASSESSMENT

In this section, we will provide an overview of EPs used for learning, teaching, and assessment in Europe and the United States. The specific instruments to be discussed include the ELP, based on the CEFR, and the American LF and GLP, based on the national standards and the ACTFL proficiency scale.

Assessment Scales

Before discussing the design and development of the three EP environments described in this study (ELP, LF, GLP), an overview of the assessment scales used by these EPs is appropriate.

Common European Framework of Reference. In 2007 *The Modern Language Journal* presented European perspectives on this framework with a short article (Cummins, 2007a) and in a special issue with a lead article by Little (2007). The CEFR was developed during the 1990s by the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe as a result of European language and education policy, which tied language learning and cultural competence to political stability, economic prosperity, and social cohesion in Europe. In addition, having a common framework of reference to evaluate performance in all major disciplines for all ages was seen as necessary to allow greater mobility of European citizens for academic, professional, and personal reasons.

The Council of Europe's volume, entitled *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, and Assessment* (2001), both explained and presented the CEFR and its rating scale (see Appendix A). CEFR levels range from basic user (A1, A2) to independent user (B1, B2) to proficient user (C1, C2). Much research on testing in Europe over the past two decades has focused on correlating the existing national language exams, which had referenced only national scales, to the new CEFR scale. As of 2009, all major testers in Europe correlated their tests to the CEFR (to see these correlations, see the Association of Language Testers in Europe [ALTE, n.d.] Web site at http://www.alte.org/alteframework/table.php).

After publication of the CEFR, questions of interrater reliability and use of comparable metrics to arrive at the same CEFR ratings became a cause for concern (i.e., "Is your B2 the same as my B2?"). Alderson (2007) noted a potential problem with the interpretation of CEFR test scores administered by members of ALTE. Tests determine learners' levels of proficiency and achievement or performance in one or more skills (reading, writing, spoken production, spoken interaction, and listening) at specific levels of the CEFR. Yet, how well tests determine specific levels

and distinguish among proficiency, achievement, and performance is not always clear, as various organizations who design the tests help make that determination. The European Association of Language Testing and Assessment and Cito (Institute for Educational Measurement) hope to offer solutions to this problem (Figueras & Noijons, 2009).

The CEFR will also play an important role in the European higher education reforms known as the Bologna Process. By 2010, 46 nations will form a European Higher Education Area (http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/). This initiative has also created a European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) to assess program quality using common standards across Europe; within ENQA's framework, the CEFR serves as a common metric for assessing language skills. ENQA plays a similar role in quality assessment for European K–12 schools.

ACTFL Proficiency Scale. The American *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1999) was seen as a companion tool to the ACTFL scale, which defined levels of proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, and listening (ACTFL, 1986, 1999, 2001). The ACTFL scale includes levels ranging from Novice to Intermediate to Advanced to Superior. As this scale and its history are familiar to most readers of *The Modern Language Journal*, it will not be discussed further. The ACTFL proficiency guidelines for speaking and writing may be accessed at the Web site of the ACTFL language testing office: http://www.languagetesting.com/corp_opi.htm.

CEFR and ACTFL "Can Do" Checklists and Grids. The use of "can do" checklists referencing levels of the CEFR and/or ACTFL scales is an integral part of all three portfolio environments discussed in this article. Alderson (2005) explained much of the thinking that went into self-assessment and diagnostic testing tools used in the ELP and DIALANG (n.d.), both of whose checklists referenced the CEFR scale; the actual statements in the checklists resulted from the Bergen "can do" project, reported in Hasselgreen (2003). Designed primarily for independent European language learners, DIALANG provides self-assessment tools for various language skills and grammar via Web-based testing in 14 languages. Table 1 contains excerpts from the DIALANG writing self-assessment checklist.

Learners using DIALANG, like those using an ELP, can also refer to a grid that summarizes each of the six CEFR levels in five skills (listening, reading, spoken production, spoken interaction, and writing).

Alderson (2005) considered self-assessment to be an integral component of language learning and asserted that without self-assessment there can be no self-awareness. Self-awareness is required for knowing what level one has already achieved and knowing one's strengths and weaknesses and one's preferred way of learning and developing. Refuting those who question the validity of self-assessment without identifying them, Alderson reported on his own survey of U.K. undergraduates and tutors and on studies done by Luoma and Tarnanen (2003) and by Dandenault (1997), which demonstrated a high correlation between self-assessment results and formal testing (90% or higher). These studies showed little evidence that learners attempted to rate themselves higher

TABLE 1
Select DIALANG Writing Descriptors

A1	I can write simple notes to friends.
A1	I can describe where I live.
A2	I can give short, basic descriptions of events and activities.
A2	I can write very simple personal letters expressing thanks and apologies.
B1	I can describe dreams, hopes, and ambitions.
B1	I can describe the plot of a book or film and describe my reactions.
B2	I can evaluate different ideas and solutions to a problem.
B2	I can synthesize information and arguments from a number of sources.
C1	I can give clear, detailed descriptions of complex subjects.
C1	I can expand and support points of view at some length with subsidiary points, reasons, and relevant examples.
C2	I can produce clear, smoothly flowing, complex reports, articles, or essays that present a case, or give critical appreciation of proposals or literary works.

Source. Council of Europe (2001, p. 232).

than their actual levels. Alderson also surveyed learners who used DIALANG and found that they liked having samples of work to which they could compare their performance. However, the learners reported that it was difficult to discern their own exact levels when deciding between the two options that came closest to their own written or oral sample. To address this, Alderson recommended further exploration of the structure of feedback comments to discern what types of comments would facilitate learning. As a result, much effort was made by the creators of the ELP and GLP to provide learners with effective feedback as they created their electronic portfolios. In another study based on feedback from U.K. undergraduates using self-assessment for homework and in the classroom, Alderson concluded, "self-assessment could work well if students make the effort to . . . compare their work with the benchmark analyses" (p. 252).

Nunan (2004) discussed self-assessment as part of his presentation of task-based language teaching (TBLT). He saw portfolios as one of five TBLT tools. Citing the work of Cram (1995) and others, Nunan believed that those who criticize self-assessment were wrong to think that learners are inaccurate judges of their own ability. Like Alderson (2005), Nunan believed that students should be involved in their own learning processes; thus, he asserted that the prime purpose of self-assessment is to help learners understand their skill levels and knowledge base in relation to their goals and to track the progress they make.

Both the ELP and the GLP use the DIALANG self-assessment tool based on the CEFR scale. It helps both learners and those interested in their scores in their interpretation of what someone can do in reading, writing, speaking, and listening at each CEFR level (Council of Europe, 2001, pp. 226–243). In similar fashion, the ACTFL organization approved a self-assessment grid based on the NS/ACTFL scale, which was adopted by the designers of the LF (see Appendix B). The GLP also uses this national standards/ACTFL-referenced grid in tandem with its CEFR-referenced grid, as learners who use the GLP may choose between the ACTFL and the CEFR-referenced checklists.

Design of the European Language Portfolio

Portfolio assessment was implemented for quality assurance and consistent assessment of learner outcomes in many core disciplines in the schools and universities across Europe. The Council of Europe's Language Policy Division created the ELP with a three-part format: (a) a record of language learning inside and outside the language classroom, including both any official test results as well as international and intercultural experiences (*language passport*); (b) a diagnostic self-assessment of L2 skills and cultural competence linked to plans for improvement (*language biography*); and (c) evidence of the L2 learner's progress in the development of language skills and intercultural competence over time (*language dossier*).

Language Passport.   The passport summarizes a learner's experiences and provides the CEFR ratings of the learner's skills. It asks for the learner's name, the date of the assessment, and an indication of his or her native language (mother tongue). Every ELP passport is accompanied by a grid that summarizes descriptions of the CEFR levels (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2) in each of five skills (listening, reading, writing, spoken production, and spoken interaction). This enables a potential employer or a higher education institution in another country to understand what a given CEFR rating means in terms of the individual's functional proficiency in a language. The technology available on an electronic ELP site normally allows the learner to present information on his or her abilities in any number of languages.

Language Biography.   The language biography has templates to help learners self-assess what they can do in terms of language skills and cultural competence and to determine what their future learning goals will be. The checklist format as shown earlier for DIALANG reflects the importance the CEFR assigns to self-assessment; assuming high stakes are not involved, it effectively complements testing and teacher assessment. The accuracy of self-assessment is increased by the use of clear descriptors and by the training of learners in techniques to accomplish it (Council of Europe, 2001).

The language biography in every ELP has working self-assessment templates for use by learners that can be filled in with or without consultation with language instructors. An ELP must use checklists consisting of specific descriptors to self-assess learner unofficial ratings in listening, reading, spoken interaction, spoken production, and writing. Echoing the ALTE "can do" project, all descriptors are positive, describing what learners can do rather than what they cannot do.

As illustrated in the Dutch EP listening checklist in Figure 1, learners begin at the lowest level and continue up the list until they no longer "can do" items at a given level.

FIGURE 1
Dutch ELP Listening Descriptor for the A1 Level

Dutch ELP Listening Descriptor for the A1 Level

	Yes	A bit	Not yet
I can understand someone, when he speaks very slowly, articulates carefully, and inserts long pauses for me to assimilate meaning.	☐	☐	☐

FIGURE 2
Dutch ELP Sample Descriptor Example and Explanations

I can understand someone, when he speaks very slowly, articulates carefully and inserts long pauses for me to assimilate meaning.

Example	**Explanation**
I can understand simple directions how to get from X to Y.	You are familiar with words and phrases like *straight on, at the end of the street, left at the traffic lights, first street to the right.*
Example	**Explanation**
I can understand simple instructions or directions.	You are on a campsite in a foreign country. At the reception, they explain to you where you can wash, do the laundry, wash dishes, etc. Provided they speak slowly and clearly.
Example	**Explanation**
Your teacher uses the foreign language in his/her lesson. He/she explains what you should do, explains things, and asks what you did yesterday.	Your teacher will be aware of your shortcomings and therefore will often repeat phrases or rephrase certain elements in order for you to understand. You won't need to recognize and understand every word.

Technology allows learners to choose among three categories of ability regarding the statements presented to them: "Yes," "A bit," or "Not yet." If learners in the example in Figure 1 answer all A1 questions affirmatively, they can choose to go to the A2 level, where they find seven additional tasks listed for the A2 level accompanied by the same check-off boxes. If at the A1 level learners instead choose either "A bit" or "Not yet," they can save their work and find out more by clicking on "Save and go to evaluation," whereupon a planning template appears. The learner may use that template to plan (with or without input from an instructor) how to become proficient enough to do this task in the future. If learners do not understand what is meant by the "can do" statement, they click on "Examples" to help them understand how to interpret what is being affirmed. In the case of the above descriptor, they see the screen in Figure 2.

By consulting the descriptors, examples, and explanations of the "can do" statements, the learner and the teacher thus have opportunities to teach, to learn, and to plan using the language biography.

Language Dossier. The dossier allows learners to provide samples of L2 written and oral work using any medium (audio files, video files, links to personal Web sites, photos, movies, etc.). In addition, it allows them to record professional certifications (e.g., for translators, teachers, or

engineers) or any official language testing results (e.g., Goethe Institute certificate, Paris Chamber of Commerce diploma); learners can even scan copies of their actual certificates or diplomas and post them to their ELP. Typically subfolders house official certifications and diplomas, and separate folders are established for each language.

The ELP language dossier provides an alternative assessment to formal testing by furnishing evidence of what learners can do without the pressure of the testing situation. Timed writing tests give a different picture of what a learner can do than a dossier showing a writing sample that has gone through several drafts or a series of writing samples done throughout the term. Speaking in a test situation is also different from speaking in a recorded oral presentation integrated into a portfolio. A video file showing learners involved in a group project demonstrates the integration of listening and speaking skills and can include discussions of cultural content as well as explanations of what group members read or wrote in preparation for their project.

This kind of integrated skill and knowledge assessment fits well with the ACTFL Integrated Performance Assessment (IPA), resulting in a video file prepared after several days of activities. Researchers (Adair-Hauck, Glisan, Koda, Swender, & Sandrock, 2006; Glisan, Adair-Hauck, Koda, Sandrock, & Swender, 2003) have described how it can be used in the classroom, where learners are asked to read or listen to something, discuss it with each other, write about it, and present it, with a video being made of the final product. This kind of test may not only allow learners to assess how well they did in order to record results in the language passport, but the video constituting the final product may be integrated into the dossier. In the preparation of an IPA video, technology also allows for group feedback through the sharing of work among students and the integration of group discussions outside of class (Allen, 2009).

Validated Electronic ELPs for the University and Adult Levels

Although guidelines are provided on how to develop an ELP (Council of Europe, 2001), each ELP determines how it designs the layout of its passport, biography, and dossier. They all use "can do" checklists and templates in the language biography that make sense for their intended purpose and context; for example, an ELP designed for a young learner is different from that designed for

an adult. However, only portfolio templates validated by the Council of Europe are recognized as official across Europe; ELPs created outside Europe are not eligible for validation.

As of July 2009, 99 ELP portfolio templates had been validated by the Council of Europe. However, only two were EPs geared for adult learners (i.e., the EAQUALS–ALTE and the Dutch portfolios). The EAQUALS–ALTE portfolio, validated in 2000, was developed by members of the ALTE, whose CEFR-referenced exams officially validate learners' skill levels. ALTE members include such organizations as the Alliance Française and the Goethe Institute. The EAQUALS–ALTE ELP provides guidance for learners to create their own ELPs. In 2007, the Dutch EP was made available for language learners everywhere. It was created by a government curriculum development unit as 1 of over 40 portfolios in a variety of disciplines. The Dutch portfolio targets university students and adult learners.

A third EP currently being developed at the University of Bordeaux (ePEL) will be proposed for validation in 2010. The name ePEL comes from the French abbreviation for ELP, which stands for *Portfolio européen des langues* (see ePEL, n.d.). The ePEL provides added options for learners, teachers, and evaluators by asking learners to share data they generate with researchers. The widespread availability of the data provides opportunities for collaborative research.

LinguaFolio and Global Language Portfolio

In 2003, members of the (American) National Council of State Supervisors for Languages (NCSSFL) were invited to Germany to learn about the CEFR and ELP to see if they wanted to develop an American-style ELP for K–12 school systems. State foreign language supervisors in four states (Virginia, Nebraska, Kentucky, and Indiana) decided to develop such a model, titled LinguaFolio. Each state LF had the three-part design of the ELP: a language passport, a language biography, and a dossier. Virginia invited K–16 teachers to help put together their model; six faculty from Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) participated in its development. Following the process used in Europe, the NCSSFL leadership and university faculty approached ACTFL about the possibility of bringing together the CEFR and ACTFL scales for LF assessments.

The LF developers recognized the parallels between the CEFR and the national standards in their approaches to communication skills and culture. Thus, they established three modes of

communication (*interpretive*, *presentational*, and *interpersonal*), and added rubrics to assess the five communication skills in the CEFR (reading, writing, listening, spoken production, spoken interaction). The national standards' "five Cs" of language learning (communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, communities) wove together communicative and intercultural competence along the same lines as the CEFR. Although there were separate standards established for each language, they were all tailored by grade level—Grades 4, 8, 12, and 16 (corresponding to ages 9, 13, 17, and adult)—thus making it possible to use age-appropriate ELPs as models for LF development.

As the LF development progressed, differing needs of K–12 and university learners became more recognized. For instance, when the four K–12 versions of the LF coalesced to form a single LF, the university-level input from Virginia and from the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the American Association of Teachers of French was no longer solicited. At the same time, university-level LF developers recognized that university templates had to incorporate elements that were not required in a K–12 template; for example, the university-level language biography includes study abroad, internships, and experiences available through a university media center that normally would not be possible among K–12 learners. In addition, although the K–12 LF was available online, it was designed to be downloaded and completed as a paper version, whereas the university-level LF used at VCU and elsewhere was designed as an EP and made use of the Blackboard learning management system.

In 2008–2009, the university-level version of LF with its separate checklists for the CEFR and ACTFL scales came to be known as the Global Language Portfolio. The K–12 LF, which had been using a single set of blended checklists to reference both the ACTFL and CEFR scales, was revised by NCSSFL in 2008 to reference only the ACTFL scale. NCSSFL developed for the LF language passport an ACTFL scale grid that that broke the ACTFL speaking skill into spoken production and spoken interaction. ACTFL approved that grid, and it is found at the Web site http://www.ncssfl.org.

The GLP allows learners to assess themselves on either the European or American scales. It uses the ACTFL scale alongside the CEFR grid to accompany the GLP passport. GLP's language biography also made available both provisional CEFR-referenced checklists and provisional ACTFL-referenced checklists, even adding at the upper levels provisional checklists for the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) scale (levels 3+ and above, thus going beyond the baseline of the ACTFL Superior level). The GLP used the word *global* in its title because it allowed someone to reference either the CEFR or ACTFL scale. Table 2 provides a sample summary of skills from the GLP language passport using both the ACTFL and CEFR scales.

Two summary grids at the end of the passport define the ACTFL and CEFR levels and explain the abbreviations and rating scales. Although self-assessment of skills can be based on checklists in the language biography, they also can come from formal tests referencing the ACTFL or CEFR scales. The last part of the GLP language passport asks learners to record diplomas and certificates, referring either to a university degree, a professional certification, or a diploma or certificate resulting from a language exam (e.g., an ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview or an exam of

TABLE 2
Sample Student GLP: Summary of Skills From the Language Passport

Language 1: Spanish									
Self-Assessment of Language Skills ACTFL Levels: NL, NM, NH, IL, IM, IH, AL, AM, AH, S, D CEFR levels: A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2									
Understanding				Speaking				Writing	
Listening		Reading		Spoken Interaction		Spoken Production			
NM	ACTFL	IL	ACTFL	NM	ACTFL	NH	ACTFL	NM	ACTFL
A1	CEFR	A2	CEFR	A1	CEFR	A2	CEFR	A2	CEFR

Note. Sample responses are shaded. ACTFL = American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages; CEFR = Common European Framework of Reference for languages.

the Goethe Institute or Paris Chamber of Commerce). Other information in the GLP passport includes a record of international or domestic target language experience (e.g., internships).

AFFORDANCES OF ELECTRONIC PORTFOLIOS

An electronic environment for language portfolios provides several advantages over paper. Looking first at the language passport, where summative assessment occurs, we find that technology allows learners to create a series of language passports and to store them in order to track progress over time. The storage function of the GLP enables a learner, a teacher, or a program coordinator to keep track of progress from one year's assessment to the next by referring to a subfolder with all of the passports in a learner's major-program EP. The ePEL makes special use of technology, as it allows the learner to share the passport data not only with the instructor but also with the institution or other researchers elsewhere. In addition, ePEL connects its language passport directly to the Europass Web site at http://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/. This is the site where European university students find required documents, including the Europass language passport, which they need if they are planning to study outside of their home countries with EU funding or to participate in the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System. Technology also facilitates creation of a language passport for use outside of academic environments. Finally, technology allows a learner to navigate easily among the three components of the EP—completing a language biography checklist, for example, automatically calculates one's skill level and records it in the passport.

The language biography does more than provide an opportunity for formative self-assessment. It also helps learners prepare for summative tests, whether they are to assess proficiency, achievement, or performance. The biography sections of EPs described here allow learners to access added information of all kinds, such as the text file shown in relation to the Dutch language passport, audio files, and videos, which can model not only pronunciation and intonation in the formative assessment of speaking and listening but can also illustrate gestures, reactions, and behaviors that are important for intercultural understanding. In the search for authentic assessment, connection to databases and Web sites, to social networking sites, and to free telephone calls via Skype offers special opportunities to use both receptive and productive skills on the language biography

checklists. VCU and Rouen Business School (RBS) used different learning management systems (Blackboard at VCU and Sharepoint at RBS) to facilitate the use of these options in a way that complemented student work on language biography templates. At these two institutions, discussion groups, chat rooms, and blogs (Web logs) associated with a specific class have helped learners to complete language biography templates; moreover, certain templates have served as part of the syllabus for civilization courses, language for special purposes classes, and especially a capstone language portfolio course designed for VCU majors. Inclusion of cultural knowledge in the biography will be described later in the section on the assessment of intercultural competence.

In the dossier, an EP site provides instructions on how to submit samples of work (e.g., providing a date of assessment, indicating whether it was a revised writing sample or rehearsed oral sample, showing when there was peer or instructor feedback). One can tailor dossiers for a special professional purpose, like teaching or engineering, where a learner scans a teaching certificate or an engineering qualification or integrates evidence that demonstrates expertise in professional areas beyond the use of language skills.

In addition, collaboration with others and learners' social skills are enhanced by the sharing of portfolios. Their experience working in pairs or in groups on assigned topics provides a more global assessment of what they can do. Such collaboration is important for EPs but might well be prohibited or go unnoticed in formal testing situations. Thus, EPs provide a deeper and broader understanding of what a learner can do in real-life situations and, thus, can serve as an assessment tool with a high degree of ecological validity. Two aspects of EPs that help foster this type of validity are their use of authentic assessment and their emphasis on development of intercultural competence.

Authentic Assessment and Transparency

The ability to integrate *authentic assessment* (relating to real-life situations or simulated real-life situations) into testing situations, in both official and classroom settings, is a continuing focus of American researchers (Phillips, 1995; Wiggins, 1994). To help with motivation, researchers for the past two decades have advised teachers to incorporate *context* (real or simulated) and *contextualization* (how the learner understands the context) in assessing both receptive (listening and reading) and productive (speaking and writing) skills (Davis, 1994; Ginther, 2002; Long & Macián,

1994; Omaggio Hadley, 1993). Valette (1994) presented a five-step process to develop skills, which facilitates a type of performance that leads to success in real-life contexts. As a result of this focus by scholars in the field of foreign language pedagogy, authentic assessment became an important element of the national standards. Moreover, the Council of Europe has advocated that syllabi, textbooks, classroom experiences, and tests be related to real-life tasks "chosen on the basis of needs outside the classroom" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 157).

Advice for classroom activities and homework assignments described by Swaffar, Arens, and Byrnes (1991) and Valette (1994) is still relevant in 2009. For instance, students still must integrate all four skills, talking about what they read, writing about what they hear, and communicating with each other. In 2009, however, students are more likely to engage in classroom and homework assignments that require them to use a DVD or Web site that accompanies a textbook, to develop audio files or video files, and to react to written comments through online discussion groups or even class-related blogs established by the teacher. These technology functions were only in their earliest stages when encouraged by Garrett in 1991, but today they fit easily into the syllabus for a language class that has access to both computers and technical support. Relating their assignments to authentic real-life situations and storing them in an EP can allow students to imagine themselves operating effectively in the target culture.

Assessment of Intercultural Competence

Assessment of intercultural competence was a challenge for those who developed the CEFR and the national standards (Byram, 2008; Magnan, 2008; Neuliep, 2009; Schulz, 2007). Those frameworks distinguish the *perspectives* that underlie a culture's *products* (e.g., art, history, literature) and *practices* (e.g., values, beliefs, and behaviors). In the CEFR and NS, however, the need to prepare for a plurilingual and pluricultural society (a goal of the CEFR) and to address cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities (goals of the national standards) is not well met. Although cultural knowledge for a specific country has long been part of classroom assessment, the ELP and GLP also attempt to develop intercultural competence by helping learners as they advance through several stages: (a) Learners assume that their native culture's perspective is universal. Comments such as "we are all alike" are common at this stage. (b) Learners recognize cultural differences while assuming the superiority of the ways things are done in their own culture. (c) Learners minimize the cultural differences between the native and target cultures. (d) Learners accept that major differences exist between the two cultures. (e) Learners are able to adapt to other cultures and function comfortably within them. Although the steps may have slightly different names, variations of these stages are found in Adler (1997), Bennett and Bennett (2004), and Hammer (2009).

Currently, the GLP uses Storti's (1999) exercises, which ask learners to interpret situations and decide between what is universal, what is personal, and what is cultural. For example, seeking food and shelter is universal, burping after a meal to show your appreciation is cultural, and preferring apples to oranges is personal. Storti provided formative tests with answers to accompany them so that learners develop skills to assess another culture. Cultural tests address, for example, the locus of control (belief in fate vs. individual initiative), the concept of time (doing one thing at a time vs. carrying out many activities at once), or the role of the individual in a given society (the importance of individual accomplishment vs. the good of the group). The GLP tailors these instruments to assess knowledge about specific target cultures.

A new "Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters 2007–2008" piloted by the Council of Europe (2008) was planned as an addition to the language biography templates in all ELPs. Pilot versions of the autobiography asked learners to explore attitudes, behaviors, knowledge, and skills as they reflected on their experiences in the classroom and in intercultural settings. This kind of qualitative data is important to researchers who wish to understand attitudes of learners and how learners' interaction with the context of learning may affect linguistic outcomes. Reports of cultural encounters parallel the five C's of the American national standards for individual languages, addressing not only *communication* but also knowledge of other *cultures*, *connections* to other disciplines, *comparisons* across languages, and interchanges with target language *communities* at home and abroad.

Such intercultural reflections in the EP's language biography can easily complement the kind of communicative language teaching proposed by Magnan (2008)—that is, the use of authentic interactions (e.g., through virtual communities, service learning, and study abroad), reflection on cultural identity, interdisciplinary connections to other courses, and the learner's tracking of his or her cultural competence. These types of activities are easily documented with the use of an EP.

EFFECTIVENESS OF E–PORTFOLIOS FOR
LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT

As the use of EPs for adult language assessment
is a new field, research on their effectiveness is
scarce. Given the time needed for implementa-
tion, Europeans have only begun to determine the
ELP's success in improving motivation and evalu-
ating learner outcomes. Preliminary assessments
of European experiences with EPs suggest mixed
reactions to portfolios. Whereas self-assessment or
determination of skill levels by learners shows a
high correlation with assessments by teachers or
by raters who set up DIALANG benchmarks, the
greatest challenges were implementation barriers
and lack of motivation and willingness of learners
to use tools that were available (Little & Perclová,
2001).

At the University of Bordeaux IV, although
learners and teachers felt initial enthusiasm for
the ePEL, Méthy (2005) showed that 60% of re-
spondents did not consider the ELP to be a moti-
vating factor for language learning. However, the
lack of information given by Méthy about the con-
text of and teacher role in the portfolio activity
makes it difficult to interpret these findings. For
example, were students presented with a model
portfolio with explanations of how it might be
used? Was teacher training a factor? Was techni-
cal support a factor? Were improvements to the
Web site needed? Frath (2005) piloted a paper
portfolio at Marc Bloch University with equally dis-
appointing results, predicting that students would
only use the ELP if it is required, if they see an ad-
vantage to using it, and if they are properly trained
in its use.

Although this research seems to provide a
gloomy picture of the effectiveness of EPs, the
variety of approaches used to create ELPs and the
complex combination of local factors surround-
ing their use in different contexts make it unwise
to generalize. At both RBS and VCU, it is too early
for researchers to present results on the effec-
tiveness of ELP and GLP formats. Course evalu-
ations and interviews at both institutions treated
pilot EPs positively. Scholars at both institutions
are planning empirical studies on the effective-
ness of EPs for facilitating language learning and
cultural knowledge. Echoing Garrett's (1991, this
issue) views on the need to narrow down research
questions on the effectiveness of CALL for certain
purposes in certain contexts, it is clear that more
specific, localized questions need to be asked in
order to understand the effectiveness of various
parts of these EPs for assessing certain, specific lin-
guistic outcomes or aspects of intercultural com-
petence.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The effectiveness of EPs for language acqui-
sition will be enhanced by future cooperation
among scholars from Europe, North America, and
other parts of the globe who wish to collaborate
in research on and development of EPs. For in-
stance, research on learner attitudes toward the
reflective process and the portfolio project itself
will be crucial in determining the effect of L2
students' motivation in carrying out EP projects
on their linguistic and cultural learning out-
comes. To facilitate development of EPs, EP Web
sites are adding online training for faculty and
students, intercultural exercises, and samples of
speaking and writing at specific CEFR and ACTFL
levels.

Changes planned for the ACTFL guidelines,
the CEFR, and the American national standards
over the next 3 years are likely to affect the ELP,
LF, and GLP assessment scales. ACTFL and the De-
fense Language Institute are reexamining higher
levels of the ILR scale, and they will divide the
currently monolithic Superior level into sublevels
in the next set of ACTFL ratings. Better correla-
tion of the ACTFL and CEFR scales may result
from another project involving universities in the
Netherlands and Germany, in which side-by-side
double testing using the CEFR and ACTFL scales
is being used to assess writing in Spanish and read-
ing in German.

In addition, ACTFL has undertaken another
national standards project, which will result in an
electronic and searchable bibliography of works
on the standards as found in professional lit-
erature, determine how standards were institu-
tionalized K–16, develop standards for yet other
languages, and suggest how research and profes-
sional development can effectively promote teach-
ing toward standards.

In 2006, Canadian researchers evaluated sev-
eral language frameworks in the public domain.
In that review, Vandergrift (2006) recommended
adapting the CEFR and the ELP in Canadian
schools because it determined that the CEFR was
better suited to the needs of Canadian learners,
scholars, and other stakeholders than other lan-
guage frameworks. Plans exist to pilot a Canadian
ELP in 2010. (See Vandergrift, 2006, for a critical
review and comparison of the ILR, ACTFL, and
CEFR frameworks.)

New directions in language and professional
assessment using portfolios can impact EP de-
velopment for those learning languages for var-
ious professional purposes. For instance, the
European Portfolio for Student Teachers of
Languages in Europe, a variation of the ELP

developed by the Council of Europe and the European Centre for Modern Languages (Newby et al., 2006), is expected to impact the development of portfolios used for teacher education in the United States (see Campbell, Melenyzer, Nettles, & Wyman, 2004; Fox, 2009). Moreover, the European Language Council's (2006) Thematic Network Project in the Area of Languages III recommends reforms in the assessment of languages for the professions using the CEFR and ELP. Davesne and Cummins (2009) advocated similar EP uses for business education. In addition, a Canadian "Language Portfolio for Internationally Educated Engineering Graduates" (M. Wheller, personal communication, July 14, 2009) is being piloted for immigrants needing to function in English or French environments in engineering. Thus, the subsequent reworking and development of EPs for assessing language in professional contexts will provide another avenue for future research.

CONCLUSION

As transatlantic partnerships grow (Kinser & Green, 2009) and higher education reforms create more joint degree programs, the three-part EP format will be more commonplace in Europe and North America, and technology will facilitate the sharing of information and the assessment of both institutional and interinstitutional programs, internships, and research collaborations. Attempts to evaluate and correlate the language frameworks used in Europe, Canada, and the United States, as described earlier, will of necessity impact the future development of EPs on both sides of the Atlantic.

However, major challenges to the implementation of EPs still exist. For instance, learning management systems and open-source portfolio options do not yet function well, especially for the export of EPs (Cummins, 2007b). In addition, Al Kahtani (1999) noted that an electronic portfolio "can only be used by technologically literate students and it can only be used when the necessary equipment and software are available" (p. 267). Consequently, the development of effective EP projects will require better technological training of students and faculty, more local support for infrastructure, better funding for EP research and development, and more collaboration among CALL scholars and practitioners around the world interested in the development of authentic assessment tools to evaluate the linguistic and cultural competence of L2 learners.

REFERENCES

Adair-Hauck, B., Glisan, E., Koda, K., Swender, E., & Sandrock, P. (2006). The integrated performance assessment (IPA): Connecting assessment to instruction and learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, *39*, 359–382.

Adler, N. J. (1997). *International dimensions of organizational behavior* (3rd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.

Alderson, J. C. (2005). *Diagnosing foreign language proficiency: The interface between learning and assessment*. London: Continuum.

Alderson, J. C. (2007). The CEFR and the need for more research. *Modern Language Journal*, *91*, 659–663.

Al Kahtani, S. (1999). Electronic portfolios in ESL writing: An alternative approach. *CALL*, *12*, 261–268.

Allen, L. Q. (2009). Designing curricula for student language performance. *French Review*, *82*, 1281–1298.

ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages). (1986). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines*. Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: ACTFL.

ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages). (1999). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines—Speaking* (Rev. Ed.). Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: ACTFL.

ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages). (2001). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines—Writing* (Rev. Ed.). Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: ACTFL.

ALTE (Association of Language Testers in Europe). (n.d.). *European Language Portfolio*. Retrieved July 13, 2009, from http://www.alte.org/framework/table.php

Bennett, J. M., & Bennett, M. J. (2004). Developing intercultural sensitivity: An *integrative* approach to global and domestic diversity. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett, & M. J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed.; pp. 147–165). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Byram, M. (2008). *From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship: Essays and reflections*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Campbell, D. M., Melenyzer, B. J., Nettles, D. H., & Wyman, R. M., Jr. (2004). *How to develop a professional portfolio: A manual for teachers*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Cole, D. J., Ryan, C. W., & Kick, F. (1995). *Portfolios across the curriculum and beyond*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, and assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Council of Europe. (2008). *Autobiography of intercultural encounters 2007–2008 pilot program*. Retrieved July 14, 2009, from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/AutobiogrWeb_EN.asp

Cram, B. (1995). Self-assessment: From theory to practice. In G. Brindley (Ed.), *Language assessment in action* (pp. 282–292). Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.

Cummins, P. (2007a). LinguaFolio: American model for the European Language Portfolio. *Modern Language Journal, 91*, 117–121.

Cummins, P. (2007b). LinguaFolio and electronic language portfolios in teacher training. In M. A. Kassen, R. Z. Levine, K. Murphy-Judy, & M. Peter (Eds.), *Preparing and developing technology-proficient L2 teachers*. CALICO Monograph Series 6 (pp. 321–344). San Marcos, TX: Computer Assisted Language Instruction Consortium.

Dandenault, E. J. (1997). *Self assessment of communicative ability: Investigation of a novel tool for ESL learners*. Unpublished master's thesis, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada.

Davesne, C., & Cummins, P. (2009). European language policy and quality assurance tools for management education. *International Journal of Management in Education, 3–4*, 388–401.

Davis, J. (1994). Authentic assessment: Reading and writing. In C. Hancock (Ed.), *Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (1994 Northeast Conference Reports, pp. 139–162). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. (Rev. ed.) Boston: D.C. Heath.

DIALANG. (n.d.). DIALANG [Computer software]. Retrieved July 13, 2009, from http://www.dialang.org

Dutch portfolio. (SLO). (n.d.). *One of two validated electronic ELPs designed for adults*. Retrieved July 15, 2009, from http://www.europeestaalportfolio.nl/TaalPortfolio/nl/show.do?ctx=10010,10020

EAQUALS–ALTE. (n.d.). *EAQUALS–ALTE portfolio. One of two validated electronic ELPs designed for adults*. Retrieved July 15, 2009, from http://www.eelp.org/eportfolio/index.html

ePEL portfolio. (n.d.). *Electronic ELP for adults going through validation process in 2010*. Retrieved July 15, 2009, from http://langues.u-bordeaux4.fr/e-pel/

European Language Council. (2006). *Thematic network project in the area of languages III (2003–2006) final report*. Berlin: Germany: European Language Council. Retrieved July 12, 2009, from http://www.celelc.org/

Figueras, N., & Noijons, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Linking to the CEFR levels: Research perspectives*. Arnhem, The Netherlands: Cito and European Association for Language Testing and Assessment.

Fox, R. (2009). The world languages professional portfolio: A performance-based document aligned with national standards. In J. Davis (Ed.), World language teacher education: Transitions and challenges in the 21st century (pp. 175–209). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishers.

Frath, P. (2005). Introducing the Cercles European Language Portfolio into a self-study multilingual resource centre. In A. Morvcikova, C. Taylor Torsello, & T. Vogel (Eds.), *University language centres: Broadening horizons, expanding networks* (pp. 57–65). Bratislava, Slovakia: CercleS.

Garrett, N. (1991). Technology in the service of language learning: Trends and issues. *Modern Language Journal, 75*, 74–101.

Garrett, N. (2009). Computer-assisted language learning trends and issues revisited: Integrating innovation. *Modern Language Journal, 93*(s1), 719–740.

Gibson, D. (2006). ePortfolio decisions and dilemmas. In A. Jafari & C. Kaufman (Eds.), *Handbook of research on e-portfolios* (pp. 135–145). Hershey, PA: Idea Group.

Ginther, A. (2002). Context and content visuals and performance on listening comprehension stimuli. *Language Testing, 19*, 133–167.

Glisan, E. W., Adair-Hauck, B., Koda, K., Sandrock, P., & Swender, E. (2003). *ACTFL integrated performance assessment*. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL.

Global Language Portfolio. (2008–2009). Electronic portfolio developed by VCU and the Commission of Colleges and Universities of the American Association of Teachers of French. Retrieved July 15, 2009, from http://www.globallanguageportfolio.com

Hammer, M. (2009). Solving problems and resolving conflict using the intercultural conflict style model and inventory. In M. Moodian (Ed.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the dynamics within organizations* (pp. 203–218). Los Angeles: Sage.

Hasselgreen, A. (Ed.). (2003). *The Bergen can do project*. Graz, Austria: ECML.

Johnson, R., Mims-Cox, J. S., & Doyle-Nichols, A. (2006). *Developing portfolios in education: A guide to reflection, inquiry, and assessment*. London: Sage.

Kinser, K., & M. F. Green. (2009). *The power of partnerships: A transatlantic dialogue*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Little, D. (2007). The common European framework of reference for languages: Perspectives on the making of supranational language education policy. *Modern Language Journal, 91*, 645–655.

Little, D., & R. Perclová. (2001). *The European language portfolio: Guide for teachers and teacher trainers*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.

Long, D. R., & Macián, J. L. (1994). Listening skills: Acquisition and assessment. In C. Hancock (Ed.), *Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (Northeast Conference Reports, pp. 111–138). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Luoma, S., & Tarnanen, M. (2003). Creating a self-rating instrument for second-language writing: From idea to implementation. *Language Testing, 20*, 440–465.

Magnan, S. (2008). The unfulfilled promise of teaching for communicative competence: Insights from sociocultural theory. In J. Lantolf & M. Poehner (Eds.), *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages* (pp. 351–379). London: Equinox.

Méthy, A. -M. (2005). L'impact de l'utilisation du Portfolio européen des langues en cycle de Licence de Sciences économiques [Impact of the use of the European Language Portfolio in an undergraduate economics program]. *Asp*, *47*, x–xx.

Moore, Z. (1994). The portfolio and testing culture. In C. Hancock (Ed.), *Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (1994 Northeast Conference Reports, pp. 163–182). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1999). *Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press.

Neuliep, J. (2009). *Intercultural communication: A contextual approach*. London: Sage.

Newby, D., Allan, R., Fenner, A.-B., Jones, B., Komorowska, H., & Soghikyan, K. (2006). *European portfolio for student teachers of languages: A reflection tool for teacher education*. Graz, Austria: European Centre for Modern Languages.

Norton, P., & Wiburg, K. (1998). *Teaching with technology*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ockey, G. (2009). Developments and challenges in the use of computer-based testing (CBT) for assessing second language ability. *Modern Language Journal*, *93*(s1), 836–847.

Omaggio Hadley, A. (1993). *Research in language learning: Principles, processes, and prospects*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Paris, S., & Ayres, L. (1994). *Becoming reflective students and teachers with portfolios and authentic assessment*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Phillips, J. (1995). Testing. In V. Galloway & C. Herrin (Eds.), *Research within reach II* (pp. 161–174). Valdosta, GA: Southern Conference on Language Teaching.

Schulz, R. (2007). The challenge of assessing cultural understanding in the context of foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, *40*, 9–26.

Stevenson, H. (2006) Using ePortfolios to foster peer assessment, critical thinking, and collaboration. In A. Jafari & C. Kaufman (Eds.), *Handbook of research on e-portfolios* (pp. 112–124). Hershey, PA: Idea Group.

Storti, C. (1999). *Figuring foreigners out: A practical guide*. Boston: Intercultural Press.

Swaffar, J., Arens, K., & Byrnes, H. (1991). *Reading for meaning: An integrated approach to language learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Valette, R. (1994). Teaching, testing, and assessment: Conceptualizing the relationship. In C. Hancock (Ed.), *Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (1994 Northeast Conference Reports, pp. 1–42). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Vandergrift, L. (2006) *New Canadian perspectives: Proposal for a common framework of reference for languages for Canada*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Heritage.

Wiggins, G. (1994). Toward more authentic assessment of language performances. In C. Hancock (Ed.), *Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (1994 Northeast Conference Reports, pp. 69–86). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Yancey, K. (2001). General patterns and the future. In B. Cambridge (Ed.), *Electronic portfolios: Emerging practices in student, faculty, and institutional learning* (pp. 83–90). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

APPENDIX A
***Common European Framework Of Reference (CEFR) Levels—Self-Assessment Grid

UNDERSTANDING

	A1	A2	B1	B2	C1	C2
Listening	I can understand familiar words and very basic phrases concerning myself, my family and immediate concrete surroundings when people speak slowly and clearly.	I can understand phrases and the highest frequency vocabulary related to areas of most immediate personal relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local area, employment). I can catch the main point in short, clear, simple messages and announcements.	I can understand the main points of clear standard speech on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. I can understand the main point of many radio or TV programmes on current affairs or topics of personal or professional interest when the delivery is relatively slow and clear.	I can understand extended speech and lectures and follow even complex lines of argument provided the topic is reasonably familiar. I can understand most TV news and current affairs programmes. I can understand the majority of films in standard dialect.	I can understand extended speech even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signalled explicitly. I can understand television programmes and films without too much effort.	I have no difficulty in understanding any kind of spoken language, whether live or broadcast, even when delivered at fast native speed, provided I have some time to get familiar with the accent.
Reading	I can understand familiar names, words and very simple sentences, for example on notices and posters or in catalogues.	I can read very short, simple texts. I can find specific, predictable information in simple everyday material such as advertisements, prospectuses, menus and timetables and I can understand short simple personal letters.	I can understand texts that consist mainly of high frequency everyday or job-related language. I can understand the description of events, feelings and wishes in personal letters.	I can read articles and reports concerned with contemporary problems in which the writers adopt particular attitudes or viewpoints. I can understand contemporary literary prose.	I can understand long and complex factual and literary texts, appreciating distinctions of style. I can understand specialised articles and longer technical instructions, even when they do not relate to my field.	I can read with ease virtually all forms of the written language, including abstract, structurally or linguistically complex texts such as manuals, specialised articles and literary works.

(*Continued*)

APPENDIX A
(Continued)

	A1	A2	B1	B2	C1	C2
SPEAKING						
Spoken Interaction	I can interact in a simple way provided the other person is prepared to repeat or rephrase things at a slower rate of speech and help me formulate what I'm trying to say. I can ask and answer simple questions in areas of immediate need or on very familiar topics.	I can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities. I can handle very short social exchanges, even though I can't usually understand enough to keep the conversation going myself.	I can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. I can enter unprepared into conversation on topics that are familiar, of personal interest or pertinent to everyday life (e.g. family, hobbies, work, travel and current events).	I can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible. I can take an active part in discussion in familiar contexts, accounting for and sustaining my views.	I can express myself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. I can use language flexibly and effectively for social and professional purposes. I can formulate ideas and opinions with precision and relate my contribution skilfully to those of other speakers.	I can take part effortlessly in any conversation or discussion and have a good familiarity with idiomatic express-ions and colloquialisms. I can express myself fluently and convey finer shades of meaning precisely. If I do have a problem I can backtrack and restructure around the difficulty so smoothly that other people are hardly aware of it.
Spoken Production	I can use simple phrases and sentences to describe where I live and people I know.	I can use a series of phrases and sentences to describe in simple terms my family and other people, living conditions, my educational background and my present or most recent job.	I can connect phrases in a simple way in order to describe experiences and events, my dreams, hopes and ambitions. I can briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans. I can narrate a story or relate the plot of a book or film and describe my reactions.	I can present clear, detailed descriptions on a wide range of subjects related to my field of interest. I can explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.	I can present clear, detailed descriptions of complex subjects integrating sub-themes, developing particular points and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion.	I can present a clear, smoothly-flowing description or argument in a style appropriate to the context and with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significant points.

(Continued)

APPENDIX A
(Continued)

	A1	A2	B1	B2	C1	C2
WRITING Writing	I can write a short, simple postcard, for example sending holiday greetings. I can fill in forms with personal details, for example entering my name, nationality and address on a hotel registration form.	I can write short, simple notes and messages. I can write a very simple personal letter, for example thanking someone for something.	I can write simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. I can write personal letters describing experiences and impressions.	I can write clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects related to my interests. I can write an essay or report, passing on information or giving reasons in support of or against a particular point of view. I can write letters highlighting the personal significance of events and experiences.	I can express myself in clear, well-structured text, expressing points of view at some length. I can write about complex subjects in a letter, an essay or a report, underlining what I consider to be the salient issues. I can select a style appropriate to the reader in mind.	I can write clear, smoothly-flowing text in an appropriate style. I can write complex letters, reports or articles which present a case with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significant points. I can write summaries and reviews of professional or literary works.

APPENDIX B
LinguaFolio Self-Assessment Grid (http://www.ncssfl.org)

	NOVICE			INTERMEDIATE			ADVANCED			SUPERIOR
	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	
INTERPRETIVE										
Listening	I can understand a few familiar words. I can understand some words that are similar to those in my own language.	I can understand some everyday words, phrases and questions about me, my personal experiences and my surroundings, when people speak slowly and clearly.	I can understand ideas on familiar topics expressed through phrases, short sentences, and frequently used expressions. I can understand the main point in messages and announcements.	I can understand main ideas and a few details in sentences, short conversations and some forms of media.	I can understand ideas on familiar topics expressed through a series of sentences. I can understand details expressed in conversations and through some forms of media.	I can understand some extended speech on a variety of familiar and some unfamiliar topics delivered through conversations and other media.	I can understand some extended speech on unfamiliar topics delivered through a variety of media.	I can understand extended speech and lectures, even when somewhat complicated. I can understand most forms of media with little effort.	I can understand most spoken language and some technical discussions. I can understand some accents and dialects.	I can understand any kind of spoken language, including most accents and dialects.
Reading	I can identify some words or phrases, especially those that are similar to words in my own language.	I can understand familiar words and short, simple phrases or sentences.	I can understand the main idea and some details in simple texts that contain familiar vocabulary.	I can understand the main idea and many details in some texts that contain familiar vocabulary.	I can understand most details in texts that contain familiar vocabulary and the main idea and many details in texts that contain unfamiliar vocabulary.	I can understand many different types of texts that contain unfamiliar vocabulary.	I can understand the subtleties of texts on familiar topics and information from texts on unfamiliar topics.	I can understand long, complex texts and recognize some literary and technical styles.	I can understand abstract and linguistically complex texts. I can make appropriate inferences and identify literary elements.	I can comprehend with ease virtually all forms of written language.

(Continued)

APPENDIX B
(Continued)

	NOVICE			INTERMEDIATE			ADVANCED			SUPERIOR
	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	
INTERPRETIVE										
Person to Person Communication	I can use single words and simple memorized phrases.	I can interact with help using memorized words and phrases. I can answer simple questions on very familiar topics.	I can exchange info about familiar tasks, topics and activities. I can handle short social interactions using phrases and sentences, but I may need help to keep the conversation going.	I can begin and carry on an unrehearsed conversation on a limited number of familiar topics. I can ask and answer simple questions and exchange information in highly familiar situations.	I can state my views and begin and carry on conversations on a variety of familiar topics and in uncomplicated situations.	I can state and support my views and take an active part in discussions on familiar topics and in some complicated situations.	I can express myself on a range of familiar and some unfamiliar topics. I can link ideas in extended discussions.	I can communicate with fluency and flexibility on concrete social and professional topics.	I can usually adapt my language to the situation. I can express myself with fluency, flexibility and precision on concrete and some abstract topics.	I can effectively and consistently use language for all purposes. I can take part effortlessly in any conversation or discussion.
PRESENTATIONAL										
Spoken production	I can use single words and memorized phrases to provide information about myself, and my immediate surroundings.	I can use simple phrases and sentences to provide information about myself, and my immediate surroundings.	I can use a series of phrases and sentences to provide basic information about familiar topics.	I can connect basic sentences to provide information on familiar topics. I can relate with some details, information about what I read, hear and see.	I can connect sentences in order to describe experiences, events, and opinions. I can narrate a story and make a simple factual presentation.	I can present clear and detailed descriptions on topics related to my experiences and interests. I can present my viewpoint on an issue and support my opinions.	I can deliver a comprehensible presentation appropriate to my audience on a variety of topics.	I can deliver a clearly articulated presentation on personal, academic, or professional topics.	I can deliver a clear and fluid presentation and appropriately respond to the audience.	I can deliver a presentation for a variety of purposes in a style appropriate to any type of audience.

(Continued)

APPENDIX B
(Continued)

Writing	NOVICE			INTERMEDIATE			ADVANCED			SUPERIOR
	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	
Writing	I can copy some characters and words.	I can provide some basic information on familiar topics in lists and simple forms.	I can write simple descriptions and short messages and request or provide information on familiar topics.	I can write about familiar topics and experiences in series of sentences.	I can summarize, describe or explain familiar topics and support my views with some details.	I can express ideas in detailed narratives, descriptions or explanations on familiar and some new topics.	I can express ideas on a variety of topics in clear, organized texts. I can adjust my writing for some audiences.	I can write clear, well-organized texts for a variety of audiences on concrete social and professional topics.	I can express myself with fluency and precision on concrete and some abstract topics. I can adapt my writing style according to purpose and audience.	I can effectively and consistently express myself in a variety of styles for academic and professional audiences and purposes.
			A1		A2	B1		B2		C1 ->C2-Distinguished

The A, B, C designations represent approximations with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages used in the European Language Portfolio. NCSSFL - February 2008