



<https://bulletin.vals-asla.ch> · e-ISSN: 2813-7973 · p-ISSN: 1023-2044

Spika, D. (2020). Final learning objectives: Challenges and solutions of a curricular reform. *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée*, 112, 181-194. <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-978704>

This article is publish under a *Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International* (CC BY):
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>



© Danko Spika, 2020

Final learning objectives: Challenges and solutions of a curricular reform

Danko ŠIPKA

Arizona State University
School of International Letters and Cultures
MC 0202, Tempe, AZ 85287, USA
Danko.Sipka@asu.edu

Dieser Artikel beschreibt die Möglichkeiten und Herausforderungen der Standardisierungsinitiative für Sprachunterricht an der Schule für Fremde Sprachen und Kulturen der Arizona State University. Die Initiative wendet die NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-do-Statements (Sprachkompetenzbeschreibungen, die auf der ACTFL Skala basieren) als Grundlage für alle Sprachkurse (mit über 9.000 Studenten) an. Diese auf mehrere Jahre angelegte Initiative setzt und kalibriert die Ziele des Sprachunterrichts und entwickelt gleichzeitig eine Kohorte zertifizierter Tester. Gegenwärtig basieren bereits über 90% aller Sprachkurse des ersten und zweiten Studienjahres auf den Can-do-Statements, und über 20 Kolleginnen befinden sich im Zertifizierungsverfahren. Die Initiative findet in einem hochkomplexen Milieu statt, das unter anderem Sprachen von unterschiedlicher Schwierigkeit und Popularität unter den Studierenden umfasst. Das Ziel der Initiative besteht darin, die Qualität des Unterrichts zu verbessern, das Engagement der Studierenden zu erhöhen und den Austausch von Sprachkursen mit anderen Institutionen zu ermöglichen. Die Initiative gibt den teilnehmenden Lektorinnen volle Autonomie und trägt ihrer Lehrfreiheit Rechnung. Alle wichtigen Entscheidungen werden unter allen Stakeholdern diskutiert und abgestimmt. Der einzige standardisierte Teil sind die Lernziele für den Abschluss. Die Lektoren sind dafür verantwortlich, mithilfe des Reverse-Design-Modells ihre eigenen Bewertungsinstrumente und -strategien zu entwickeln und anschließend Unterrichtsaktivitäten durchzuführen. Der Aufsatz konzentriert sich in erster Linie auf die Erfahrungen, die für seltener unterrichtete Sprachen relevant sind, und bietet Lösungen, die in anderen akademischen Umgebungen repliziert werden können.

Stichwörter:

backward design, ACTFL Skala, Kann-Beschreibungen, wenig unterrichtete Sprachen, endgültige Lernziele, Beurteilungsobjekte, Lehrerausbildung, Tester-Zertifizierung.

Keywords:

backward design, ACTFL scale, can-do statements, less commonly taught languages, final learning objectives, Assessment objects, teacher training, tester certification.

1. Introduction

The present paper addresses the process of standardizing final learning outcomes in a case study of a diversified environment of languages representing commonly and less commonly taught languages, as well as varied difficulty categories. The analysis in this paper is meant to fill a conspicuous gap between theoretically-minded research and hands-on classroom activities. The issues discussed here are those about translating theory into classroom practice. In that sense, this paper is more of a technical report than a traditional research study. It addresses several very practical issues in the process of establishing final learning outcomes in language learning: accommodating diversity in language programs, the role of teacher training, securing the stability of the existing programs and introducing new ones, and the timeline of implementation.

The case study presented here is that of the Language Instruction Standardization Initiative (LISI) at the School of International Letters and Cultures (SILC, <https://silc.asu.edu>) of Arizona State University (ASU, <https://www.asu.edu>). SILC serves over 9,000 students and regularly offers more than 20 languages.

In the next section of this paper key concepts required to get an insight into the curricular reform discussed here will be explained (reverse design, can-do statements, language difficulty scale, commonly taught vs. less commonly taught languages), including those that are specific to language-learning communities in the United States. The general curricular design of the aforementioned initiative and its rationale will be presented in the next section. The third section is devoted to the challenges in implementing this curricular design. Among other things, the data from an instructor and student survey are presented. The final section includes the discussion about practical and theoretical consideration stemming from this case study.

2. The Conceptual Map

The first concept that needs to be explained is that of reverse design as it lays in the curricular reform background. Wiggins and McTighe (2011: 4) define its curriculum-design aspect as follows: "Effective curriculum is planned 'backward' from long-term desired results through a three-stage design process (Desired Results, Evidence, Learning Plan)."¹ In the setting of language classes, skills at a desired proficiency level (i.e., final learning outcomes) are determined first. This is followed by the design of the appropriate assessment mechanisms. The final step is the design of class activities.

In this particular case, the framework used to state desired learning outcomes are *NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-do Statements* (ACTFL 2019), based on the ACTFL proficiency guidelines (ACTFL 2012a). The ACTFL scale covers the same range as similar language proficiency assessment scales going from rudimentary to highly sophisticated proficiency. The scale is described as follows:

The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines are descriptions of what individuals can do with language in terms of speaking, writing, listening, and reading in real-world situations, in spontaneous and non-rehearsed contexts. For each skill, these guidelines identify five major levels of proficiency: Novice, Intermediate, Advanced, Superior, and Distinguished. The major levels Novice, Intermediate, and Advanced are subdivided into High, Mid, and Low sublevels. The levels of the ACTFL Guidelines describe the continuum of proficiency from that of the highly articulate, well-educated language user to a level of little or no functional ability. (ACTFL 2012a: 3)

¹ More detailed explanations about the design process can be found in the chapter titled *The Design Process* by Wiggins and McTighe (2005: 254-274).

While there are different estimates as to the correspondence of the levels on that scale with CEFR, the correspondences presented in Table 1 are most commonly assigned.²

CEFR	ACTFL
A1	Novice
A2	Intermediate Low and Mid
B1	Intermediate High and Advanced Low
B2	Advanced Mid and High
C1	Superior
C2	Distinguished

Table 1: CEFR vs. ACTFL levels

The main idea behind using the aforementioned *NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-do Statements* (ACTFL 2019) was to foster teacher and learner autonomy. Accordingly, both these groups were given the opportunity to select the areas and the timeline of the progress toward reaching final learning outcomes. More information about the complexity of the concepts of teacher and learner autonomy can be found in Lamb & Reinders (2008) and Murray, Gao, & Lamb (2011).

The most common assessment form that relies on the ACTFL scale is the Oral Proficiency Interview, or OPI³. There are several types of OPI, depending on the status and number of testers. 'Regular OPI' is conducted by a tester and then verified by one or more raters. 'Informal OPI' is just performed by a certified tester who is the only one issuing the rating. 'Assessment of Speaking Skills' is the name given to an interview which is completed by somebody who is not a certified tester.

Another important concept for this particular case study is the language difficulty scale, given that languages encompassed by the curricular reform described here belong to different difficulty-level categories. Longitudinal research in the US government agencies has identified four difficulty level categories for English-speaking learners. The measure used to classify various languages is the average amount of contact hours (*ceteris paribus*) that the learner needs to reach the Superior level (called ILR3, Level 3 on the Interagency Language Roundtable Scale, used in the US government⁴). Difficulty category I (the

² More information about these correspondences can be found in McGinnis (2019: 4).

³ For more information, see ACTFL (2012b).

⁴ See ILR (2020) for more information.

easiest) includes languages like Spanish, Italian, Dutch, etc., with 720 contact hours needed to reach ILR 3. In Difficulty category II one can find German, Romanian, Swahili, etc., with 960 hours needed. Difficulty category III includes Turkish, Hindi, Slavic languages, etc. with 1440 hours required. Finally, the most difficult Category IV includes Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean and requires 2160 hours. These are the US Department of Defense numbers, reported in Leaver et al. (2005: 26).⁵

Finally, an important distinction in the language-learning landscape in the United States is that between commonly taught languages (Spanish, German, and French) and less-commonly taught languages (all other languages that are taught in the United States). The distinction is based on the fact that commonly taught languages are regularly offered in high schools. Brecht and Walton (1994: 191) describe this distinction as follows:

To most Americans today, competence in a foreign language is often thought to be competence in French, German, or Spanish [...] The remainder of the world's languages, including those languages that increasingly seem to figure so prominently in today's news reports, have come to be called in this country the less commonly taught languages (LCTLs).

While some marginal presence of Chinese, Japanese, and Arabic is noted in the period after this statement, the division between commonly and less commonly taught languages is still where it used to be, as can be seen from the current statement of the umbrella organization for less commonly taught languages in the United States:

Approximately ninety-one percent of Americans who study foreign languages in our schools, colleges, and universities choose French, German, Italian, or Spanish; while only nine percent choose languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Yoruba, Russian, Swahili and the other languages spoken by the overwhelming majority of people around the world. (NCOLCTL 2020)

3. The Context and the Design

The design for establishing final learning objectives has been created at Arizona State University (a large public university) and its School of International Letters and Cultures (SILC), which is home to nearly 200 faculty⁶ and graduate students. It offers more than 40 undergraduate and graduate programs and certificates and also hosts a wide array of innovative and interdisciplinary study abroad programs. It serves around 9,000 students, with enrollments showing a

⁵ The US State Department has somewhat different figures with the number of hours for the first two aforementioned categories being the same, so in their classification, there are only three difficulty categories (I, which encompasses the aforementioned I and II), II (corresponding to the Department of Defense III) and III (corresponding to the Department of Defense IV). Also, recent estimates have increased the numbers somewhat – for more details, see McGinnis (2019: 13-14). It is important to note that all these are not universal figures, but they pertain to the learners who are native speakers of English.

⁶ This includes those who teach content courses, lower-division language courses, and upper-division language courses.

strong increasing trend in recent years. Aside from Greek and Latin, it offers all three commonly taught languages, and less commonly taught languages, ranging from those that are traditionally well-enrolled in the US setting (Russian, Arabic, Mandarin Chinese, Japanese, Italian, and Portuguese) to those that are traditionally less well-enrolled (Korean, Vietnamese, Indonesian, Romanian, Polish, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, and Hebrew). There are also languages that have been offered occasionally (most commonly Turkish and Hindi/Urdu). Languages that are offered at SILC represent all four aforementioned difficulty categories. This is then a rather complex environment.

The principal goal of the design for changes implemented in this complex educational setting was to give to the learners tangible final learning outcomes, empowering them with real-life skills and giving them a sense of achievement. The secondary goal was to create a predictable and transparent educational setting, which would eventually enable the exchange of teaching and assessment with partner universities. Needless to say, the all language programs are included in SILC's general mission to develop intercultural communication⁷.

A key decision in meeting both aforementioned goals was to align final learning objectives (FLOs) with the *NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-do Statements* (ACTFL 2019) and reverse-design the curriculum (in terms of Wiggins and McTighe 2005). This initiative gives full agency to the participating instructors and remains mindful of their academic autonomy. All key decisions are discussed by all stakeholders and voted on. The only standardized parts are the final learning outcomes, everything else is determined by the instructors. Using the reverse design model, the instructors are in charge of developing their own assessment tools and strategies and then classroom activities. The standardization of the learning outcomes assumes only that they need to be stated in terms of the *NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-do Statements*. The level that should be attained in each of the skills is left to the instructors to decide. This design strategy was dictated by the fact that SILC offers languages of all four difficulty categories, which entail varied amounts of time to reach proficiency benchmarks.

As far as the second goal – the exchange of teaching and assessment – is concerned, in addition to the alignment of FLOs with the *NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-do Statements*, the design also involved the mechanisms for assessment. The idea was to create a pool of certified testers. If the same design were to be implemented in a partner institution, there would be clarity with the skills developed in each class and the manner of assessing these skills. This, in turn, would enable that respective language courses that are offered by just one of the two partner institutions be shared. At the same time, certified testers from one partnering institution would be able to assess learning outcomes (i.e., they

⁷ To know more about intercultural language learning, see Liddicoat & Scarino (2013).

can conduct informal OPIs) at another for those courses that the two institutions share.

The motivation to engage in this standardization project was based on the public university mission, responsibility toward the students, potential payoffs in enrollments and in sharing solutions, and the possibility to expand the range of course offerings by sharing courses. Basic principles behind the initiative were to enable agency of the instructors, respect their academic autonomy, and involve all stakeholders in decision-making. As mentioned, the only issue over which they do not have control is the way the final learning outcomes are stated. However, that too was decided by the assembly of instructors.

4. The Implementation

The implementation of the standardization process relied on curricular redesign, teacher training, the development of assessment mechanisms, with an eye toward the special needs of traditionally less-enrolled, less commonly taught languages. Lower-division courses (first and second year) are addressed first, followed by upper-division courses (third and fourth year).

4.1. First milestones of the standardization process

In terms of curricular redesign, the instructors were asked to use a syllabus template. Aside from mostly legal issues mandated by the university, the instructors were asked to provide class activities and assignments for each week, the forms of assessment and grading criteria, and also to state the final learning outcomes in terms of the *NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-do Statements*. Additionally, the expectation is that there is one sub-level increase in at least two skills. Everything else (the content of these activities, the level attained in each of the skills, which skills are emphasized, if any, etc.) was left to the instructors to decide. The syllabus template is partly provided in Appendix 1. This was a conscious effort to introduce modularity to accommodate various language difficulty level categories present in the pool of languages at SILC and also the differences between commonly and uncommonly taught languages

Concurrently, teacher training sessions have been organized to familiarize the instructors with the ACTFL scale and reverse design. The process started in the fall of 2018 with a symposium devoted to the initiative. At the same time an internal website was created where various documents related to backward design, proficiency scales, assessment, etc. have been shared throughout the process. A one-day ACTFL familiarization workshop was held in the Spring 2019 semester, which was attended by 25 colleagues. It provided general orientation about the ACTFL scale and associated testing procedures⁸. A further workshop on assessment was also held in the spring of 2019, followed by two ACTFL OPI

⁸ More information about those workshops are available in ACTFL (2021a).

certification workshops (see below), for a total of 20 prospective testers who are also instructors in SILC. An open discussion devoted to the process was held in the fall of 2019. In this discussion, the instructors discussed all issues related to the reform in a free discussion of equal partners. The discussion has shown the key role of modularity (having different FLOs for different programs) and the importance of the tester certification program. Future partnering with other universities was also discussed. A webinar titled *Transforming Post-Secondary Language Programs with Proficiency Testing* (<https://youtu.be/2sOPeb60UXA>) was made available in early 2020. This was another tool to help the implementation of the assessment of the FLOs into the curriculum.

An ACTFL OPI certification workshop is the first step in the process of becoming a certified tester⁹. At the beginning of our standardization process, the central assessment mechanism is the Assessment of Speaking Skills, which mimics the Oral Proficiency Interview, *i.e.*, it uses the ACTFL scale as the basis for assessment and it is organized following the steps of the Oral Proficiency Interview. This assessment will then turn into Informal Oral Proficiency Interview for those languages where the instructors earn their tester certification. The certification of our teachers into official OPI testers is at the heart of the standardization process and it will allow SILC to partner with other universities and share assessment and courses. The instructors of all lower-division language courses (first and second year) were given until the fall of 2020 to align the syllabi using the aforementioned template. By the fall of 2019 already 90% of the syllabi were aligned, with the remaining 10% meeting this goal with the start of the fall 2020 semester. During the next two years from that point (*i.e.*, until the fall of 2022), the final learning outcomes will be tested during four semesters and calibrated if needed. At the end of each semester, the instructors will conduct in-house Assessment of Speaking Skills and from the point when they become certified testers, they will also conduct an Informal Oral Proficiency Interview. What is meant by calibration is that the proficiency goals stated in the syllabus will be matched against the data from the Assessment of Speaking Skills. The goals will then remain unchanged if the Assessment of Speaking data support the goals established in the syllabus. If there exists a discrepancy between the Assessment of Spoken Skills data and the goals in the syllabus, the goals will be set higher or lower, depending on what the data show.

Following the two ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview Certification Workshops, there are 20 colleagues in the process of certification, covering all languages taught at ASU SILC, with multiple prospective testers in the largest programs (Spanish, Chinese). Further steps involve another Certification Workshop in early January 2021 for additional 10 prospective testers (the workshop was

⁹ More information about the process are available in ACTFL (2021b).

initially planned for the summer of 2020 but it had to be postponed because of the pandemic).

At the end of the fall semester 2022 extramural assessment will take place. The expectation is that by that time all FLOs will be calibrated, that SILC will have a pool of certified testers and that it will be paired up with institutions which also have pools of certified testers to trade assessment. At that time, the standardization of FLOs in the upper-division courses (third and fourth year) will begin, which will be done within each program (e.g., Russian language and culture) as developing proficiency at the higher bands of the scale heavily relies on the cultural content and requires involvement of all faculty members, not just language instructors and coordinators. Trading assessment with other institutions was included to accommodate many less commonly taught languages, which face paucity of resources.

The next step in the process will entail synchronous online course sharing. This will be the most challenging part of the project, given that American universities do not have a credit-sharing system like ECTS. This part of the project will involve bilateral agreements of the universities involved, which is extremely time-consuming as it involves multiple levels of university administration. When completed, this part is expected to give a boost to lesser enrolled LCTLs and extend the repertoire of languages offered at SILC.

4.2. Validation of the standardization process

To validate the hitherto course of the project, two separate surveys were conducted, one involving a sample of instructors and the other a sample of students. The survey was conducted in early September of 2020 at the point when the final learning outcomes in all syllabi were aligned with the *ACTFL can-do statements*. The survey was filled out by 42 instructors and 295 students. The survey was organized within regular class activities, which exempted it from IRB¹⁰ approval. The survey questions are provided in Appendix 2.

The first two questions were on the difficulty categories of the course languages and their commonness. The language difficulties from the survey are distributed as follows: 1 (Spanish, Portuguese, French, Italian, Romanian): 47.6%, 2. (German, Indonesian): 7.1%, 3. (Russian, Polish, BCS, Vietnamese, Hebrew): 16.7%, and 4. (Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean): 28.6%. Commonly taught languages are taught by 45.2% of the instructors who responded to the survey, less commonly taught languages by 54.8%.

For all the questions, except for the first two (see above), the respondents had to respond using the Likert scale with the following values: *Strongly disagree*, *Disagree*, *Neither agree nor disagree*, *Agree*, *Strongly agree*. These responses

¹⁰ IRB (Institutional Review Board) is a US equivalent of ethical commissions for research at European universities.

were then assigned a value from 1 to 5¹¹ and thus the higher the mean of a response means a higher level of approval for that particular statement (1 is extreme disapproval and 5 is extreme approval). Table 2 shows the mean values for instructor responses that have been obtained.

Statement	All instructors	CTLs ¹²	LCTLs ¹³
<i>Final learning outcomes should depend on the concrete teaching environment rather than be established across the board</i>	3.79	3.68	3.87
<i>I feel that I have autonomy in setting final learning outcomes for my classes</i>	4.12	3.89	4.3
<i>I believe that having clear final learning outcomes in my classes will make my program more stable</i>	4.43	3.36	4.48
<i>Participating in OPI workshops helps to understand final learning outcomes better</i>	4.24	4	4.4
<i>Establishing final learning objectives, which should be done gradually across a longer period of time</i>	4.07	3.63	4.43

Table 2: Instructors' responses to the survey

As one could see, the responses are well in the approval territory (with the results being around 4, the numerical value of the "agree" statement). There is a strong sense that establishing clear final learning outcomes helps with program stability (that statement has the highest approval rate). Across the board, the level of approval among the teachers of less commonly taught languages is higher than among the teachers of commonly taught languages. A possible explanation of this is that the teachers of commonly taught languages have more resources at their disposal, which may make them less open for changes.

Student responses have showed an even somewhat higher level of approval. The following values have been recorded. The mean for the statement: *The syllabus for my class gives a clear information about language skills expected at the end of the semester* was a mean of 4.48. The mean for the statement: *The syllabus for my class establishes realistic language skills for the end of the semester* was 4.5. The mean for the statement: *I believe that attaining the skills established by my course will help me in my future career* was 4.35.

¹¹ In coding the responses, the following values were assigned to each notch on the Likert scale: 1. *Strongly disagree*, 2. *Disagree*, 3. *Neither agree nor disagree*, 4. *Agree*, 5. *Strongly agree*.

¹² Commonly taught languages.

¹³ Less commonly taught languages.

5. Project Takeaways

The idea to align FLOs with the *NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-do Statements* aimed at empowering the learners and giving them a high degree of autonomy (in that they can see at any point what it is that they can and cannot do). Concurrently, the implementation also involved leaving most of the decision-making to the instructors, and it was meant to respect their autonomy.

The evidence from the hitherto course of the project, including the survey, confirms the validity of the following claim: "[...] the interrelationships between teacher and learner autonomy depend very much on the way in which these concepts are construed and the contexts in which they are situated" (Lamb 2008: 11). In particular, the role of the context can be confirmed in the following course of the project. A range of languages of varied difficulty level have different traditions established within each program (e.g., a high ratio of business students in the Mandarin Chinese programs and students interested in the government service in the Arabic and Russian programs). Also, different backgrounds of the instructors all mean that autonomy should be understood differently in each of the programs, as it pertains to the language difficulty level and other elements in the context of each program in question. If can-do statements are properly implemented, they offer a proper balance of teacher autonomy (in setting the FLOs) and student autonomy (in working to achieve them, being constantly informed by those statements). The fact that all courses involved in the process have aligned their syllabi by the fall of 2020 deadline, that the project is on the timeline despite extraordinary situation caused by the COVID-19 virus show that the established parameters were conducive to completing the process. Similarly, high approval rate for the relevant statements in the survey among the instructors and students alike, prove this point.

Another important takeaway is the role of tester certification. Its present and emerging role in the summative assessment of the FLOs is obvious. Once the instructors become familiar with the ACTFL scale and the OPI procedure, they can do in-house assessment of the speaking skills. Once they are certified, they can conduct informal OPIs and trade assessment with other universities. The course of this project has shown that, coupled with additional seminars and webinars, tester certification becomes transformative in organizing classroom activities by embedding checks for learning and various forms of formative assessment. This was abundantly emphasized in all meetings, seminars, and webinars. Once the instructors are familiar with the proficiency scale in question and OPI, they are able to provide formative feedback to help their students move toward the desired proficiency goals. Cheng and Fox (2017: 209) state: "As teachers, we are the principal agents of assessment, so we need to ensure the quality of classroom assessment practices and need to use these practices in ways that best support our students' learning." The process of tester certification made sure that the instructors understand how assessment ties into reaching

the desired FLOs. This in turn makes sure that all forms of in-classroom assessment are serving the students' learning, as advocated by Cheng and Fox. This is also confirmed in the survey, where the instructors have shown a high level of approval for the claim about the importance of tester training.

At a more practical level, the experiences from this complex environment reveal three key ingredients of the project. First, modularity, *i.e.*, varied times and approaches to reaching final learning outcomes in the programs involved, is important given enormous diversity of the programs, ranging from well-established commonly taught languages to less commonly languages in an incessant struggle for survival. Second, gradual implementation, *i.e.*, giving to the programs some time to calibrate the objectives, is crucial, given that tester certification and assessment of final learning outcomes takes considerable amount of time. Finally, multipronged support structures, *i.e.*, general teacher training in events and the web site, familiarization workshops, tester certification, etc. are of paramount importance, given that the process rests on know-how in various areas. A high level of approval for the main elements of the project design, in the instructor and student survey alike, is a proof of this point. It is of particular importance that the approval rate among the instructors was particularly high among those who teach less commonly taught languages, which are chronically work with extraordinarily limited resources.

REFERENCES

- ACTFL (2012a). *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines*. Alexandria: ACTFL.*
- ACTFL (2012b). *Oral Proficiency Interview Familiarization Manual*. Alexandria: ACTFL.*
- ACTFL (2019). *NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-do Statements. Progress Indicators for Language Learners*. Alexandria: ACTFL.*
- Brecht, R. & Walton, R. (1994). National strategic planning in the less commonly taught languages. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 532, 190-212.
- Cheng, L. & Fox, J. (2017). *Assessment in the Language Classroom*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Lamb, T. & Reinders, H. (2008). *Learner and teacher autonomy: concepts, realities, and responses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lamb, T. (2008). Introduction to this volume. In T. Lamb & H. Reinders (eds.), *Learner and teacher autonomy: concepts, realities, and responses* (pp. 5-11). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Leaver, B.L., Ehrman, M. & Shekhtman, B. (2005). *Achieving Success in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liddicoat, A. J. & Scarino, A. (2013). *Intercultural Language Teaching and Learning*. New York NY: Wiley-Blackwell.
- McGinis, S. (2019). Can-dos and oughta-dos: Designing and predicting final learning outcomes for LCTLs beyond and within United States Government (USG) settings, paper presented at the NCOLCTL Conference.*

- Moeller, A. & Yu, F. (2015). NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do statements: An effective tool for improving language learning within and outside the classroom. In P. Swanson (eds.), *Dimension 2015* (pp. 50-69). Decatur, GA: SCOLT.
- Murray, G., Gao, X. & Lamb, T. (2011). *Identity, Motivation and Autonomy in Language Learning*. Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design. Expanded second edition*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (2011). *The understanding by design guide to creating high-quality units*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

* These articles and documents are available online.

WEBSITES

- ACTFL (2021a). *OPI Familiarization Workshop*, <https://www.actfl.org/learn/proficiency-assessment-workshops/opi-familiarization-workshop>
- ACTFL (2021b). *OPI Tester Familiarization*, <https://www.actfl.org/center-assessment-research-and-development/tester-rater-certifications/opi-tester-certification>
- IRL (2020). *History of the IRL Scale, Washington, DC: Interagency Language Roundtable*, <https://www.govtilr.org/Skills/IRL%20Scale%20History.htm>
- NCOLCTL (2020). Welcome statement of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages, <https://ncolctl.org>

Appendix 1: Syllabus Template

Only the relevant information for the understanding of this article has been kept.

[...]

Syllabus

[Insert a paragraph advertising your language and its learning – what is fascinating about it, what are the benefits of learning it]

[...]

3. Learning outcomes

Learning outcomes are based on ACTFL proficiency standards, see <https://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012> for more information.

[Use the provided language in a separate file to insert learning outcomes based on the ACTFL proficiency level that you feel comfortable with. It is expected that there is at least one sublevel increase in at least two skills, with other skills either being at the same level or lagging behind not more than one sublevel]

Interpersonal communication: [Insert the outcomes for interpersonal communication]

Presentative speaking: [Insert the outcomes for presentative speaking]

Interpretative reading: [Insert the outcomes for interpretative reading]

Interpretative listening: [Insert the outcomes for interpretative listening]

Presentative writing: [Insert the outcomes for writing]

Intercultural communication: [Insert the outcomes for intercultural communication]

[...]

5. Assessment, grading policies and percentages

[State formative and summative assessment of learning outcomes. Provide grading policies and how grades are tabulated]

[...]

Appendix 2

The Instructor Survey Questions

- a. Which language category do you teach (select one):
 1. Spanish, Portuguese, French, Italian, Romanian
 2. German, Indonesian
 3. Russian, Polish, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Vietnamese, Hebrew
 4. Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean
- b. Do you teach:
 1. A commonly taught language (Spanish, French, or German) or
 2. A less commonly taught language (any other language)
- c. Final learning outcomes should depend on the concrete teaching environment rather than be established across the board.¹⁴
- d. I feel that I have autonomy in setting final learning outcomes for my classes.
- e. I believe that having clear final learning outcomes in my classes will make my program more stable.
- f. Participating in OPI workshops helps me to understand final learning outcomes better.
- g. Establishing final learning objectives should be done gradually across a longer period of time.

The Student Survey Questions

- a. The syllabus for my class gives clear information about language skills expected at the end of the semester.
- b. The syllabus for my class establishes realistic language skills for the end of the semester.
- c. I believe that attaining the skills established by my course will help me in my future career.

¹⁴ Teachers answered questions c to g and students answered questions a to c using the Likert scale described in 4.2.