

Implementing IPAs: One Department's Odyssey

EVELYN BECKMAN AND RICHARD GREEN

BULLIS SCHOOL

ABSTRACT

Integrated Performance Assessments (IPAs) allow students to show what they know via the three modes of communication: Interpretive, Interpersonal, and Presentational. This is an account of one foreign language department's multi-year journey in refining its assessments and transitioning to the use of IPAs throughout the year, including in lieu of final exams. This paper will provide an account of the work that one foreign language department has been doing in recent years to improve the way students are assessed by adopting IPAs, with specific examples provided from Latin classes. Examples given will focus primarily on Interpretive Reading, Interpersonal Writing, and Presentational Writing. This paper addresses the reasoning behind choosing IPAs, detailed information about what they are, and the results the department has had so far. Lastly, this paper discusses how the department has changed the way classes are taught and assessed, with specific attention given to the Latin classroom.

1 – LATIN . . . LATIN NEVER CHANGES

Change can be difficult for many reasons, but it can also bring about significant positive growth in our students and ourselves as educators. In recent years, our foreign language department found itself wanting to change how we assess students in order to capture more accurately what our students know and can do with their respective languages. The authors of this article are the two Upper School (grades 9-12) Latin teachers who are members of a foreign language department comprised of Chinese, French, Latin, and Spanish teachers at a K-12 independent school on the trimester system. In order to graduate, our students must take at least two years of the same foreign language in the Upper School and are free to take whichever of our four foreign languages they would like. Overall, as a department, we are continually looking to improve how we teach and are willing to adapt if we feel it is in the best interest of our students and program. As such, we decided as a department with the support of our administration that Integrated Performance Assessments (IPAs) are the best way to assess our students' progress in our

respective languages and have moved forward in implementing and improving our IPAs each year. In this article, we will explain how we brought about these significant changes by implementing IPAs as a department in our Upper School, with specific focus on how we have used them in our Latin classes.

The impetus for our decision to completely change our major assessments (final exams, unit tests) was that despite our best intentions as Latin teachers, the assessments we used previously only evaluated our students' reading ability in Latin. Also, their grammar and linguistic skills were tested in isolation, with little-to-no language comprehension required on the part of the student. In our Latin classes, we would cover a Latin reading by requiring students to translate the text before we would then go over it aloud with students in class, telling them what the proper English translation was. Because we wanted to hold students accountable for each of the readings we covered, on the subsequent assessment, students would translate an excerpt from a seen passage (i.e., the Latin text we had already covered in class) into English. If we are honest with ourselves, many of our students were simply memorizing the English translation and regurgitating it on the test. Other sections of tests would require them to answer some grammar, syntax, and possibly some culture questions pertinent to that reading. We found that such questions would only serve to separate those students who shared our love of grammar from those students who did not. The latter would lose points on that section because they just memorized the English translation and usually never noted when we went over the Latin in class those particular grammar items. Lastly, our tests would include noun, adjective, and verb charts to check for student memorization of forms. Such tasks were disjointed at times and only pertained to those skills in isolation. Final exams, which our school requires us to give our students once per year, were extended versions of these sorts of tests.

As one can imagine, these tasks were inflexible and did not allow students to show what they know and can do with the language. The emphasis was on errors students would make. Unfortunately, the result was that students were often discouraged by their test scores because their scores did not reflect what language they did know. To compensate for this, we found that our students (frequently with a tutor) would cram and never really understand the Latin text during or after we covered it in class. Students were not motivated to develop an understanding of what the Latin vocabulary words meant, because they were too focused on memorizing the English translation of the Latin we had covered. Many of

our students could decline and conjugate like professionals, but they could not actually read any Latin, and especially not Latin passages they had not translated previously. In essence, we found that our assessments and teaching methods were only beneficial to our few students who loved and craved grammar charts and were easily able to memorize English translations of Latin. The worst part of all this is that most of our students were unhappy, felt unsuccessful, and would rapidly lose their love of the Latin language. We felt we were making little to no actual progress with the majority of our students and wanted to change our assessments to increase students' accessibility to the language we love.

2 - MUTATIS MUTANDIS

Our decision to transition into using Integrated Performance Assessments was facilitated by work that our modern language colleagues had been doing around their assessments of student performance. The idea of using IPAs had been introduced to us by Sara-Elizabeth Cottrell of musicientos.com. In addition, we had recently purchased the ACTFL manual [Implementing Integrated Performance Assessment](#) for use as a department. We were also fortunate to have some local professional development opportunities through [The Center for Transformative Teaching and Learning](#), which inspired us to think differently about how to help our students. An IPA uses three tasks, each addressing the three modes of communication: Interpretive (Reading/Listening), Interpersonal (Writing/Speaking), and Presentational (Writing/Speaking), and each of these three tasks align with a particular unit or theme. IPAs are performance-based and should be used with rubrics that rate student performance. Coinciding with all the research we were doing on IPAs, the [American Classical League](#) released its [Revised Standards for Classical Language Learning](#). The revised document gives attention to the three modes of communication and is further support to us Latin teachers as we took a look at the widespread changes we wanted to make to our curriculum and assessments. We began to see that IPA tasks could work as assessments for our entire department, not just our modern languages but also in our Latin classes if we were willing to rethink and revise our curriculum.

IPAs increasingly seemed to be not only a viable method of assessment but also one that afforded us the flexibility to take and leave those portions which seemed well- or ill-suited to what our students were doing with the language and our student population. Our confidence in that decision increased as we sought out further resources around what

IPAs could be; we made particular use of [CARLA at the University of Minnesota](#), the [Ohio Department of Education's World Languages Model Curriculum](#), and our colleague [Maris Hawkins'](#) implementation of IPAs in her classroom. We concluded after our research that using IPAs to assess students would allow us to measure what our students can do with the language more accurately. Once we decided to move forward using IPAs as a department, we identified two specific goals for how we would use them. We wanted to use IPAs, and the IPA model, to rework and replace the assessments, large and small, which we were using in class. We also wanted to use IPAs as a replacement for end-of-year final exams. It was also necessary for us to develop analytics and rubrics for each level of language. We worked together as a department to create these rubrics for each level. For implementation in our Latin classes, we adapted the Interpretive Reading task rubric, in particular, to fit more closely with what we focus on when reading in class with our students (later explanation on this is in section 3). Our foreign language teachers use the analytic sheets to score student performance and for grade conversion, per the grading curve we created and use (Appendix B). Teachers score student performance for each category within each IPA task using the descriptions within the rubrics we developed (Appendix C).

In the end, we decided to move forward with IPAs beginning with our level III classes while we reworked our Latin I class to incorporate a more Comprehensible Input (CI)-based approach to instruction. We also decided to adopt Ørberg's *Lingua Latina per se Illustrata* as the textbook in our Latin I and II classes because of its many merits, not the least of which is the amount of input it gives students in the target language. Other textbooks could be used, of course, but we decided that *Lingua Latina* would be best for our students. We viewed this shift to a more CI-friendly teaching method to be necessary to the long-term viability of the IPA model as we worked to try to incorporate all modes of communication. Therefore, our implementation sequence proceeded thus:

- In our first year (2016-2017), we implemented IPAs in our Latin III and Honors Latin III classes.
- In the subsequent year (2017-2018), we added IPAs to our Latin IV class and also decided to accelerate our implementation by adding IPA tasks in our Latin II classes.
- Near the end of the 2017-2018 school year, we accelerated our implementation even further and added an IPA to Latin I in the spring in lieu of a final exam.

The initial implementation was very limited in its scope. Since our program had been modeled around a more “traditional” grammar-translation approach, we felt that implementing Interpretive Reading would be a natural first step. We then added Presentational Writing, and Interpersonal Writing came last. While we were working with our Latin III classes to implement this initial round of IPAs, we were also introducing IPA-style tasks to all levels of Latin in order to start preparing students, and ourselves, to begin working in this new paradigm. This also served our long-term goal of increasing the amount of comprehensible input our students were receiving in order to furnish them with the language they would need to start producing later.

The 2018-2019 school year marked our third year of implementation, and all foreign language classes in our Upper School, apart from Advanced Placement (AP), use IPA tasks as their primary mode of assessment. In other words, we no longer give tests or exams in our classes. We do still give students small and frequent quizzes, and students utilize the same skills they would use to be successful in our Interpretive, Interpersonal, and Presentational tasks. As most of these small quizzes are formative, we often grade for completion and do not apply a full rubric as on a larger assessment. We look at these small quizzes (each worth only a handful of points) as motivating students to be accountable for their learning while helping them to check to see if they are on the right track leading up to IPA tasks.

In the Upper School, we give IPA tasks to students that align with the content and activities students have been doing in class. Students feel less nervous about these assessments since they have found that they cannot study (or cram!) for them. At this point, our IPA tasks are announced ahead of time to students, though we would eventually like to move to unannounced IPA tasks. Our students know that if they consistently attend class and participate in class activities, they will do fine on any IPA task they are given. Thus, student anxiety has lessened, which has been better for their well-being. We should note that we feel that, for each unit, it is not necessary to have students complete IPA tasks for all three modes of communication. For instance, for a given unit, perhaps it is only appropriate to assess students using an Interpretive Reading and a Presentational Writing task for that particular unit. The teacher is given the discretion to make that choice. However, for an IPA that is given in place of a final exam, our department requires all three modes are addressed for that assessment. The amount of IPA tasks we have given each trimester in

Latin II, III, and IV is four or five, with Interpretive Reading being the most frequent task we give. In Latin I, Interpretive Reading is by far the most common. Those students only are given Interpretive Reading for the first half of the year until they are comfortable enough producing the language to complete simple Presentational Writing tasks later in the year. Currently, we do not have plans to implement IPAs in the AP classes given the nature of the AP curriculum, although that may change in the future.

Regarding the logistics of giving a full and formal IPA which assesses all three modes, we like to devote four class days to it. On the first day, students complete the Interpretive Reading task. The next day, we debrief the previous day's Interpretive Reading to make sure students comprehend what they read. We also use that day to discuss possible answers for the comprehension questions on that task. For a question that requires students to infer, for instance, there could be a few possible correct answers, as student responses are plausible and coincide with the Latin they have cited to support their answer. On the third day, students complete an Interpersonal Writing task. Then on the fourth day students complete a Presentational Writing task. We have found this order works best, because students are getting more input by doing the Interpretive Reading task first. In addition, the Interpersonal Writing task coming before the Presentational Writing gives students practice producing and negotiating the language in a comprehensible way (Interpersonal task) before they are required to produce Latin that is not only comprehensible but accurate.

As far as grading is concerned, we have found that the Interpretive Reading task takes the longest to grade because, on some questions, there are many possible answers that students could provide if they back it up with appropriate Latin. The Interpersonal Writing task does not take as long to grade, but doing so does require us to carefully read over the transcript of their conversation from [Backchannel Chat](#) (see more information about this tool in section 3 under Interpersonal) and track each student's contribution to the conversation. We need to consider student responses mindfully. Are they just repeating what someone else has already said? Are they contributing something new to the conversation? Are they furthering the conversation by responding and then asking appropriate questions? There is nuance in student conversations, and care needs to be taken when reading through and scoring points. Lastly, Presentational Writing takes us the least amount of time to grade and can be the most enjoyable to grade, especially as students inject their creativity and humor in their writing.

3 - THE TASKS

The Interpretive Task

The following paragraph is our department's statement on the Interpretive task. The first statement is taken directly from ACTFL (Adair-Hauck 43), and the second is our own department's goal statement.

The Interpretive task requires the appropriate interpretation of meanings, including cultural, that occur in written and spoken form (read, heard, or viewed) where there is no recourse to the active negotiation of meaning with the writer or speaker.

The goal of this task is to demonstrate **comprehension**, not to produce language. Thus, comprehension is typically assessed in English (i.e., English questions requiring an English response), particularly at the lower levels of each language.

The matter of how we should ask questions and require students to answer questions (i.e., English or target language) was a matter of considerable debate within our department. Some members of our department insisted we should ask questions in the target language and/or require students to respond in the target language. In the end, we determined that because the goal of the Interpretive task is to **demonstrate comprehension**, we would ask in English and allow students to respond in English, so it would be obvious what students can comprehend from a text written in the target language.

Questions on Interpretive tasks require them to:

- Identify Key Words
- Identify Main Ideas
- Identify Supporting Details
- Identify Organizational Features
- Guess Meaning from Context
- Infer
- Identify Authorial Perspective
- Identify Cultural Perspective and Norms

***NOTA BENE: Within our department, we do not cover each of the above-bulleted items in a*

single Interpretive task. An average Interpretive task might include four to six of these elements depending on the text assessed and teacher discretion. Therefore, our Interpretive rubric in its base form is the oddest, because it has eight possible sections which reflect ACTFL's manual [Implementing Integrated Performance Assessment](#) (Adair-Hauck 259).

In our Latin classes, we conduct Interpretive Reading tasks on which students are given a Latin text and must answer English questions with English answers. It is imperative to note that the Latin texts on our Interpretive Reading tasks are not the same Latin readings we have done in class. After all, we did not want our students to memorize and regurgitate as they had done in the past on our assessments. The texts given on our Interpretive Reading tasks do, however, contain familiar vocabulary compared to Latin we have read as a class. The supplementary resources for Ørberg's *Lingua Latina per se Illustrata* have texts that can easily be used or adapted to meet our needs. Likewise, we will often compose a story using familiar vocabulary for an Interpretive Reading task using our students as characters within the story, in order to make the assessed text both compelling and comprehensible for the students in the class. Students enjoy reading fictional stories about themselves, and overall, we have found that this helped strengthen our rapport with students. The rubrics that we have used with our Latin classes are found in Appendix C. We have chosen to assess Word Recognition, Grammar Recognition, Main Idea Detection, Supporting Detail Detection, and Making Inferences.

The Interpersonal Task

The following paragraph is our department's statement on the Interpersonal task. The first statement is taken directly from ACTFL (Adair-Hauck 43), and the second is our own department's goal statement.

The Interpersonal task requires the active negotiation of meaning among individuals. Participants observe and monitor one another to see how their intentions and meanings are being communicated. Adjustments and clarifications can be made accordingly. Participants need to initiate, maintain, and at some levels sustain the conversation.

The goal of this task is to successfully (and spontaneously) **negotiate meaning**. Effective communication and understanding are the goals of this task, and the correct use of language is secondary.

For the Interpersonal task, students are given a prompt or questions to discuss and must have a spontaneous (i.e., not practiced beforehand) conversation. We assess students based on:

- Task Completion
- Comprehensibility (by a sympathetic reader/listener)
- Quality of Interaction (i.e. ability to sustain and further the conversation)
- Vocabulary
- Language Control (use and accuracy of language structures)

As a department, we have found it best practice to make sure that we have some way of recording what our students have produced during the Interpersonal task. This will help students to see what they need to improve and helps the teacher with scoring each student using the rubric. Our modern language colleagues have their students complete Interpersonal Speaking tasks, and they use various tools for audio or video recording to capture those student conversations. We Latin teachers have decided that our students will complete Interpersonal Writing tasks. At our school, each student has a laptop computer. For Interpersonal Writing tasks, our students are required to communicate in Latin using an online chatroom created by us using Backchannel Chat, which has both free and paid versions. We like using the Classroom tier of Backchannel Chat because it has many features that we like including the ability to save transcripts of the Latin conversation our students have. For each Interpersonal Writing task, we divide them into small groups of 3-4 students and give them two or three prompts (our prompts are written in English and Latin) for them to discuss together virtually. They are given five to ten minutes to respond and carry on a conversation in the chatroom with each other. We want them to respond to the prompt but then further the conversation by asking and responding to each other's questions and responses. We are able to save transcripts of these conversations for use in grading and for later discussions with students both individually and as a class about how to improve their ability to conduct a conversation in Latin.

The Presentational Task

The following paragraph is our department's statement on the Presentational task. The first statement is taken directly from ACTFL (Adair-Hauck 43), and the second is our own department's goal statement.

For the Presentational task, students create verbal and/or written messages in a manner that facilitates interpretation by an audience of listeners, readers, or viewers where no direct opportunity for the active negotiation of meaning exists.

The goal of this task is to **convey content and meaning successfully**. Correct and appropriate use of the target language is a primary goal.

For the Presentational task, students in our department are given a speaking/writing prompt, and students are assessed based on:

- Task Completion
- Comprehensibility
- Level of Discourse
- Vocabulary
- Language Control (use and accuracy of language structures)

In the Latin classroom, we have our students complete Presentational Writing tasks. We give them a prompt (our prompts are written in English and Latin) for them to write about, and they are given a class period (our classes are fifty minutes long) to write their response. They write and edit their responses before turning it in to us.

4 - HOW DID THINGS CHANGE?

Our shift to using IPAs as the primary mode of assessment in our Latin classes and across our entire department necessitated a great many changes from ourselves, our colleagues, and from our institution. The first, and most significant, challenge and change was in the idea that we no longer wanted to give final summative exams that were bound to a two to three hour exam period. This was a seismic shift for us on an institutional level,

and we believe that a major part of why we were successful in convincing our institution to allow us to make this shift has to do with the depth that the IPA allows. A “final exam” lasting two to three hours can incorporate reading, writing, and possibly some listening and speaking in a formulaic way, such as the AP manages to do, but a full IPA requires much more time to implement and allows students time to process what they are reading or hearing before sharing their thoughts in speech or writing. It also helped us that IPAs systematically utilize a broad array of skills, which can work to support our students with particular learning needs who might not perform their best on a more traditional exam emphasizing perhaps only one or two modes of communication.

Another large change came in our program’s relation to students and parents. The nature of a classroom centered around comprehensible input, and assessments using IPAs instead of more traditional tests, makes studying, in the stereotypical sense, rather difficult. It has also been the case that we assign significantly less homework now in our Latin classes than we used to. While the initial student reaction to these changes was exceedingly positive, it has also caused us to hear about more anxiety and concern from students and parents when assessments do come around. A common question we receive – “How can my child study for this upcoming test?” – is much more difficult to answer when we assess with IPAs. Another concern, primarily brought to us by parents, is around the idea of “rigor” and how our classes, which rarely if ever assign homework and do not necessarily have students making flashcards or drilling verb tenses, are shepherding students along the path to developing facility with the language. In both cases, we have found that having examples of student work on hand to show students and parents has been essential to allaying fears around study habits and rigor. Our emphasis, as mentioned elsewhere, is that if students are present and participating in the classroom regularly, and if we are doing our part as teachers to plan appropriate IPA tasks, the language will come with time and facility will develop with practice. Showing parents the work that their children have done with an unseen story or a creative writing task goes a long way to allaying concerns around rigor, and keeping journals of student work and incorporating reflection helps diminish student anxiety around assessment.

We have changed much about how we teach and lesson plan for our classes. There are many great resources online that fellow teachers have shared. We are grateful for the following resources: [Keith Toda’s Totally Comprehensible Latin](#), [Lance Piantaggini’s](#)

[blog](#), [John Piazza's blog](#), [Latin Best Practices: Comprehensible Input Resources](#), [Rachel Ash's and Miriam Patrick's Pomegranate Beginnings](#), [Maris Hawkins' blog](#), and [Ellie Arnold's Latin Toolbox](#). We also routinely look to the following Latin teaching Facebook pages: [Latin Best Practices: The Next Generation in Comprehensible Input](#) and [Teaching Latin for Acquisition](#). Apart from adopting *Lingua Latina Per Se Illustrata, Pars I: Familia Romana* in our Latin I and II classes, we have also begun incorporating Latin novellas and utilizing tiered readings of ancient authors in our upper-level classes. It is important that we lesson plan with intention and have our students doing activities that give them more input and allow them to practice producing the language in appropriate ways. We have chosen in our Latin classes to assess students formally on the following: Interpretive Reading, Interpersonal Writing, and Presentational Writing. One can see those analytic and rubric sheets provided in Appendices B and C.

Here is a list of IPA tasks with a sampling of class activities we do with students to providing students practice using the language:

Interpretive Reading:

- Students read a Latin text and answer various types of English comprehension questions (fill-in-the-blank; true or false; short answer) in English, while also citing the corresponding Latin

Interpretive Listening:

- Students listen to teacher-narrated Latin recordings on [EdPuzzle](#) with English comprehension questions embedded
- Students watch videos by Magister Craft on YouTube to highlight historical or cultural themes
- Students participate in MovieTalks led by the teacher which reinforce familiar vocabulary and to invite students to contribute when they feel comfortable

Interpersonal Writing:

- In small assigned groups students compose Latin responding to prompts given by the teacher using [Backchannel Chat](#)

Interpersonal Speaking:

- Students participate in informal discussions in class (e.g., [Discipulus Illustris](#))

Presentational Writing

- Students practice composing Latin during free/timed writes in class with occasional peer editing
- Students generate drawings and comic strips labeled in Latin (speech/

thought bubbles and captions), which can then be used as additional sources of input

It is worth noting that, while we have chosen not to assess students on their Interpretive Listening or Interpersonal Speaking, we still think it is worthwhile to provide students with as numerous opportunities to be exposed to Latin. Hearing and speaking Latin, in addition to the reading and writing which our IPA tasks assess, can also provide students with more input and practice with output.

5 - NEXT STEPS

After all of the work that has gone into developing, launching, and updating IPAs in our classes year by year, we have noted several successes and also some areas where we have identified improvements that we could make in the future.

Firstly, almost immediately upon implementing IPAs and the concomitant classroom changes, we noticed that student engagement improved, and their feedback reflected pride and satisfaction with how they were doing in Latin. All the students at our school complete the same course survey anonymously for each of their classes the Upper School. While the questions on the survey do not pertain specifically to Latin class or our assessments, students have provided feedback about how they are assessed on these surveys. After implementing IPAs in our Latin classes, we noticed the following positive trends in their feedback. In summation:

- Students comment on how completing IPA tasks has helped them see, in a more immediate and tangible way, how their proficiency in Latin is developing.
- Students feel that the in-class tasks directly connect to how they are assessed on IPA tasks.
- Students increasingly understand the importance of attending and actively participating in class.
- Students at all levels have shared feedback that being assessed with IPAs has made them feel less stressed around Latin as a class and more confident in their ability to succeed.

Overall, our student grades have slightly improved, which is indicative of us being more intentional regarding lesson planning and considering the activities we do with students in class to ensure that we are setting them up for success on any assessed tasks.

We have also noticed that there has been a dramatic reduction in the amount of concerned parent phone calls and emails regarding student grades and performance on assessments after we implemented IPAs. While some parents have noted that our new approach to teaching and assessing is different from their own experience learning a foreign language, when we show them their child's completed Interpretive Reading task or a sample of their child's writing from an Interpersonal or Presentational Writing task, they are pleasantly surprised by what their child is able to do with the language. After all, for the latter tasks that require Latin output, it is much more rigorous to produce Latin than it is to fill in declension or conjugation charts in isolation, for instance, and parents see the truth in that.

We should also note that we use the ACTFL Latin Interpretive Reading Assessment (ALIRA) as an external measurement of Interpretive Reading proficiency, and this year some of our students scored high enough to qualify for the [Global Seal of Biliteracy](#), much to the delight of our students, parents, administrators, and college counselors. We believe that the proficiency scores our students received this past year on the ALIRA are the most accurate they have ever been to our students' Interpretive Reading proficiency level and look forward to tracking our students' progress each year.

After reflecting as a department, we acknowledge that there are still ways we can do better. One area for improvement is how we should best handle students who need to take extended absences for unavoidable reasons. Since developing proficiency depends on classroom engagement and interaction, we need to explore ways to share similar opportunities for growth with students who cannot reliably be in class so said students do not fall inextricably behind. Another area for improvement that we have identified is to upgrade and enhance our rubrics for clarity and ease of use. They can be opaque and often unwieldy for our teachers to use. For some language levels, the rubrics have been inputted and integrated into the electronic gradebook of our school's learning management system (LMS). However, not all of them have been entered as of yet. In addition, our rubrics are potentially powerful tools, but it is not always clear that students are receiving valuable and immediate feedback from them. We want them to use the descriptions outlined on the rubric to reflect on their progress beyond the grade they received and want to encourage our students to think about this feedback more profoundly and how they can improve. We have considered creating a one-page, easy-to-use rubric that not only conveys to students what they can do and need to work on, but which also incorporates possible 'next steps', or stretch goals that students can aim at to further enhance their proficiency. This will

empower our students to use this feedback to continue to improve their reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills within the classes in our department.

Finally, and particularly apt for Latin, we have a goal of developing our students' Interpersonal Speaking skills so that conversations can be less teacher-directed and classroom-centered. In our mind, allowing the students to take more of a leadership role in their speaking to one another will not only encourage them to take more ownership of their learning but will also further develop their speaking proficiency and build community among Latin students. This can be challenging for students in the lower levels who need tons of input before they can be expected to start providing output, and we are sensitive to that fact.

In conclusion, it is our sincere hope that you the reader can benefit from reading our story and the changes we have made as a department. We realize that we are fortunate our school's administration trusts us and has worked with us to make these changes because they know we are striving for what is best for our students. Not all language teachers have the flexibility to make these changes, whatever the reason may be. Throughout this long process we have found that the hard work done has been worthwhile, and we are motivated to continue on our path. Perhaps what we have shared will inspire you to reflect upon what changes you should be making regarding how you assess students. We hope you will feel empowered to consider making changes that will enrich the student experience in your language classroom.

WORKS CITED

Adair-Hauck, Bonnie, et al. *Implementing Integrated Performance Assessment*. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2015.

APPENDIX A

EXAMPLES OF LATIN IPA TASKS WITH PROMPTS

The following is a sampling of tasks and prompts that we gave to our students during the most recent school year. We have a diverse population of learners whose experience with the target language varies. Therefore, we crafted tasks that align closely with the readings and activities students have done in class. As one can imagine, there can be quite a difference in what our Latin I students can do as opposed to what our Latin IV students can do. We consider that when scoring students using the descriptors in our rubrics (see Appendix C).

Latin I

The Latin I IPA is administered near the end of the school year, in early May. By this time, we have read through Capitulum XI or XII in *Lingua Latina*. Below is an example of an IPA that was administered to Latin I students in 2019 and used a story from the *Colloquia Personarum*, an accompanying reader to *Lingua Latina*.

Latin I – INTERPRETIVE READING task: post-Capitulum XI

Iūlia et Syra in hortō ambulant cum Margarītā, cane Iūliae parvā et crassā. Sōl lūcet in caelō sine nūbibus. Iūlia laeta canit. Canis eam canere audit et caudam movet.

Ecce avis ante canem volat. Canis avem ante sē volāre videt et currit, sed avis iam procul ā cane est. Canis, quae avem capere vult neque potest, īrāta lātrat: “Baubau!”

Iūlia canem suam vocat: “Margarīta! Venī!” Canis cōnsistit et ad Iūliam, dominam suam, currit.

Syra: “Necesse nōn est canem vocāre, neque enim canis avēs capere potest.”

Iūlia: “Sed avēs canem timent.” Canis iam fessa iacet ad pedēs Iūliae. Syra canem crassam in herbā iacere videt eamque spīrāre audit.

Syra: “Canem tuam crassam nūlla avis timet.”

Iūlia: “Margarīta nōn est crassa!” Canis aspicit Iūliam et caudam movet.

Iūlia: “Sed cūr nōn canunt avēs? Quid timent?”

Syra: “Nōn canem fessam, sed avem feram timent.”

Iūlia: “Quam avem feram?”

Syra magnam avem quae suprā hortum volat digitō mōnstrat. “Ecce avis fera quae ā parvīs avibus timētur.” Iūlia caelum aspicit et magnam avem suprā sē volāre videt. Avīs magnīs ālīs sustinētur, neque Iūlia ālās movērī videt.

Iūlia: “Quae est illa avis?”

Syra: “Est aquila, quae cibum quaerit.”

Iūlia: “In caelō cibum reperīre nōn potest.”

Syra: “Nōn in caelō, sed in terrā cibum quaerit. Aquila enim bonōs oculōs habet et parva animālia procul vidēre potest. Aquila est avis fera, quae aliās avēs capit et est.”

Iūlia: “Avis improba est aquila!”

Syra: “Magna aquila etiam parvam puellam capere potest et ad nīdum suum portāre.”

Iūlia: “Quid? Mēne aquila portāre potest?”

Syra Iūliam aspicit: puella tam crassa est quam canis sua. Syra rīdet neque respondet. Iūlia eam rīdēre nōn videt, nam caelum aspicit neque iam aquilam videt.

Iūlia: “Iam abest aquila.”

Syra: “Est apud nīdum suum.”

Iūlia: “Ubi est nīdus aquilae?”

Syra: “Procul in monte est, quō nēmō potest ascendere. Puerī nīdum aquilae reperīre nōn pōssunt.”

Iūlia: “Sed aliōs nīdōs reperīre pōssunt. Ecce puerī quī nīdōs quaerunt in arboribus.” Iūlia Mārcum et Quīntum in umbrā inter arborēs errāre et nīdōs quaerere videt.

Iūlia et Syra in sole sunt. Syra vocat, “Venī in umbram, Iūlia!”

Iūlia canem, quae ad pedēs eius iacet, pede pulsat. “Age, curre, Margarita crassa!” Syra canem aspicit, et ridet. Etiam Iūlia ridet. Margarita ante Iūliam currit ad parvam arborem. Canis caudam movet et latrat, “Baubau!” Ecce! Avis perterrita ex arbore volat. Iūlia et Syra consistunt ante arborem, unde parvae vocēs audiuntur: “Pīpīpī, pīpīpī!”

Iūlia Syram interrogat, “Quid hoc est?”

Syra ramōs et folia arboris movet et inter ramōs parvum nīdum videt. Syra nīdum prope aspicit et respondet, “Ecce nīdus in quō quīnque pullī sunt. Aspice, Iūlia!”

Iūlia nīdum aspicit neque pullōs videt, quia nimis parva est. Iūlia, quae pullōs aspiciere vult, imperat, “Impone mē in umerōs tuōs, Syra!”

Syra respondet, “Umerī meī te portāre nōn pōssunt.” Sed Iūlia iterum imperat, “Sustinē mē tantum!” Syra Iūliam ā terrā sustinet. Iam puella pullōs videt in nīdo. Pullī autem tacent neque iam pipiant. Iūlia clamat, “O, quam parvī sunt! Cur nōn pipiant neque sē movent?”

Syra respondet, “Quia perterritī sunt; tē enim vident.”

Sed Iūlia: “Pullī mē vidēre nōn pōssunt. Nōn enim oculōs aperiunt.”

Syra fessa puellam crassam in terrā ponit. Syra respondet, “Sed vocem tuam audiunt pullī – et mater pullōrum tē nōn solum audit, sed etiam videt. Audī: mater pipiat, quia ad nīdum suum venīre nōn audet.”

Auditur vox Marcī: “Venī, Quinte! In hāc arbore nīdus est.” Sed Syra imperat, “Discede ab arbore, Iūlia! Marcus alium nīdum videt, hunc nīdum reperīre nōn potest.” Iūlia et Syra cum cane ab arbore discedunt. Avis eās discedere videt et ad nīdum suum volat. Pullī, quī matrem suam venīre vident, rursus pipiant, “Pīpīpī!” Pullī cibum exspectant.

I. **Please give the Latin word or words that best convey the meaning of the English words below. Only use Latin from the story.**

1. Tail _____
2. Above _____
3. Finger _____
4. Wild/fierce _____
5. Large wings _____
6. From / out of _____
7. Order(s) _____
8. Leave / depart _____

II. **Please answer the following questions in English based on the story.**

1. Where is this story taking place and who is there?
2. Identify **two (2)** physical characteristics of Margarita.
3. Why does Margarita get angry and bark?
4. Why do the birds not fear Margarita?
5. Identify **two (2)** physical characteristics of the eagle.
6. What is the eagle doing when Syra and Iūlia see it?
7. Syra teases Iūlia a little about eagles. What does she say an eagle might do?
8. Does Syra actually think it could happen? Why or why not?

9. Why is there no danger of the boys, Marcus and Quintus, finding the eagle's nest?
10. What is the first clue that there is a nest in the tree near Iulia and Syra?
11. Why do the chicks stop singing? Be as specific as you can:
12. Where is the chicks' mother and what are the chicks waiting for?
13. Why is Syra tired by the end of the story?
14. Why do Syra and Iulia decide to leave this nest and go somewhere else?

III. **Please render the following phrases into the best English you can. Use context clues to assist you.**

1. *Syra magnam avem ... digitō mōnstrat.*

2. *Aquila ... parva animālia procul vidēre potest.*

3. *“Est apud nīdum suum.”*

4. *Iūlia canem ... pede pulsat.*

5. *“Cur nōn pipiant neque sē movent?”*

Latin I - INTERPERSONAL WRITING task: post-Capitulum XI

In today's class you will show your Interpersonal Writing skills by responding to and discussing IN LATIN the following questions with your group. These questions pertain to the story you read in the Interpretive Reading:

- ***Qualis puella est Iulia? Estne bona an mala? Cur?***
(What sort of girl is Iulia? Is she good or bad? Why?)
- ***Amatne Syra Iuliam? Cur an cur non? Da exempla ex fabula.***
(Does Syra love/care for Iulia? Why or why not? Give examples from the story.)

Latin I – PRESENTATIONAL WRITING task: post-Capitulum XI

[*Pastoral Landscape: The Roman Campagna*, Claude Lorraine, licensed under Creative Commons 1.0, from the Metropolitan Museum of Art](#)

Look carefully at the picture above. Write a story about what is happening in the picture. Some things you might want to consider could be: Who are the characters? Where are they? How did they get here? What are they doing? How did this happen? What is going to happen next?

Latin II

Students ended the winter trimester by reading through Capitulum XVI in *Lingua Latina* and participated in class activities pertaining to that chapter. The following are the three IPA tasks which were administered to our 2019 Latin II classes:

Latin II - INTERPRETIVE READING task: post-Capitulum XVI

Aeolus, god of the winds, sends a storm to attack the Trojan hero Aeneas' fleet.

Aeolus* est deus ventorum. Juno*, regina deorum et hominum, ad Aeolum advenit. Juno Aeneam* et Troianos* nautas non amat. Ea navem Troianorum in mari mergere vult. Juno Aeolo imperat tempestatem facere. Itaque Aeolus, deus ventorum, altum montem pulsatur. Venti statim ex illo monte egrediuntur. Venti supra mare et terram flant. Mare turbidum fit. Venti a meridie et oriente flare incipiunt. Simul venti a septentrionibus et occidente flant.

Aeneas, heros Troianus, gubernator navis est. Is septentriones spectat et nubes atras procul supra mare oriri videt. Aeneas nautis inquit, "Non serenum est caelum. Ecce nubes atrae..."

Nautae perterriti sunt. Statim mare multo turbidum fit. Simul tempestatem advenit cum tonitru et fulguribus. Nautae Neptunum invocant: "O Neptune! Serva nos!" Sed vox eorum vix auditur propter tonitrum. Quia nubes multae sunt, dies de oculis nautarum labitur. Atrax nox mare complectitur.

Aeneas iam deum maris invocat: "Domine, serva nos! Tu non modo hominibus, sed etiam ventis et mari imperare potes! Iube mare tranquillum fieri! Serva nos!" Statim os eius aqua implet. Aeneas loqui conatur neque potest.

Neptunus Aeneam non audit. Magnus fluctus puppim et vela navis pulsatur. Aeneas hoc videns perterritus est. Is nautas fessos suos de nave labi et in

mare mergi videt. Multi nautae sub fluctibus eunt. Aeneas ipse pedibus stare non potest et quoque in aquam cadit.

Tum deus maris magnam tempestatem in mari esse videt. Erat iratus, quia Aeolus et Juno illam tempestatem faciunt. Neptunus submersas naves Troianorum aspiciens, deus mare tranquillum iterum facit. Aeneas et pauci nautae sunt fessi sed Libyam adeunt.

*Aeolus, Aeoli, m.

*Juno, Junonis, f.

*Aeneas, Aeneae, m.

*Troianus, -a, -um

Write down the Latin word that best expresses the meaning of each of the following English words:

1. sailors _____
2. blow _____
3. cloud _____
4. fall _____
5. command _____

True or False?

- Read each sentence and tell whether it is True or False.
- If the sentence is False, correct the English sentence to be True.
- **For each, make sure to cite the Latin.**

6. Juno likes Aeneas and the Trojans.

True or False? Correction to make it True, if necessary Latin citation

7. The sailors are the ones who first notice the storm.

True or False? Correction to make it True, if necessary Latin citation

8. All of the sailors survive the storm.

True or False? Correction to make it True, if necessary Latin citation

Answer the following questions in English:

9. What does Juno order Aeolus to do? Cite the Latin.

10. Why does Aeolus beat the mountain? Cite the Latin.

11. In the reading, from what direction(s) do the winds blow? Cite the Latin.

12. Who is captain of the ship? Cite the Latin.

13. When Aeneas invokes Neptune, what does he say Neptune is able to command? Cite the Latin.

14. During the storm, describe what the sea looked like. Make sure to cite the corresponding Latin.

15. Does Neptune seem concerned about Aeneas and his ship? Explain why or why not and make sure to cite the corresponding Latin.

Latin II - INTERPERSONAL WRITING task: post-Capitulum XVI

In today's class you will show your Interpersonal Writing skills by responding to and discussing IN LATIN the following questions with your group. These questions pertain to what you read in *Capitulum XVI*:

- **Medus and Lydia are alive at the end of this chapter. Does this make you happy, sad, angry, etc? Why?**
(Medus et Lydia vivi sunt ad finem. Esne tu laetus/a, tristis, iratus/a, et cetera? Cur?)
- **To what place do you want to take a trip? Why?**
(Quo iter facere vis? Cur?)

Latin II - PRESENTATIONAL WRITING task: post-Capitulum XVI

For Presentational Writing, your goal is to accurately convey content and meaning. Therefore, make sure your writing is as grammatically correct as possible.

For today's Presentational Writing, please do the following Latine:

- **Write an alternate ending to this chapter.** (Scribe alterum finem capitulo.)

If you get stuck trying to remember a particular vocabulary word, try to circumlocute (talk around) or describe what you mean.

Latin III

By the end of the winter trimester students had finished reading Rachel Ash's Latin novella *Camilla*. For their IPA, students were presented with an adapted version of the story of the heroine Atalanta, taken loosely from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and heavily adapted to roughly mimic the style of the novella *Camilla*.

Latin III - INTERPRETIVE READING task: the story of Atalanta

Atalanta

Fortasse audivistis dē virgine quae celerius quam omnēs virī currere poterat? Illa fabula rumor nōn est – ego sum ista virgo. Nomen mihi est Atalanta, et haec fabula est mihi.

Vigintī annōs nata sum, sed familiam nōn habeō. Cur nōn? Pater mē nōn amāvit. Pater meus vir pessimus erat, et mē nōn amāvit quia tantum filiōs, nōn filiās, cupiēbat. Sed ego filia eram, et ille mē nōn amāvit. Ergo (miserabile dictu!) pater – pater meus – mē ipsam, parvam et novam infantem, in silvīs reliquit! In summō monte pater mē reliquit ut ego moriar, quia filius nōn fueram.

Sed nōn mortua sum. Ursa mē invēnit et curāvit. Habitābam cum ursā et eius familiā, et surgēbam. Cum puella eram, poteram animalia varia sequī et interficere. Poteram hastam iacere et arcum spiculaque gerere. Vestēs meae erant pellēs animalium quae ego ipsa interfēcī. Amicī meī erant ursae et cervī et tigrēs et leonēs. Cum adulescens eram, ego feminam pulcherrimam et fortissimam spectāvī. Haec femina ad mē advēnit et dixit, “Salvē, Atalanta. Sum Diana, dea venationis et lunae. Ego tē spectābam et tē admirābar. Tu mēcum venīre et mē servīre potes. Sed tu debes esse semper virgo. Placetne tibi?”

Laetissima respondī, “Certē!” Ego virōs nōn amō. Ego coniunx esse nolō. Ego maritum habēre nolō. Virī malī et stultī sunt. In silvīs cum Dianā semper remanēre volō. Per montēs et vallēs et silvās et flumina cum animalibus, amicīs meīs, currere volō.

Nunc virgo sum. Pulcherrima sum. Fortissima sum. De mē multī audivērunt. Ego sum notissima et fama mea ad caelum surgit. Multī virī ad mē adveniunt ut mē in matrimonium ducant. Fufae! Ego eōs nōn cupiō. Sed virī ā mē nōn abeunt! Ergo consilium capiō. Si vir celerior mē est, ille mē in matrimonium ducere potest. Sed....si ego eum vincō, ille ā mē interficitur! Hahahae! Multa capita virōrum, in hastīs posita,

ante domum meam stant, quia ego celerior omnibus sum! Nemo mē vincere potest!!

Meleager

Paratus sum. Ego paratus et confidens sum. Atalanta erit mea coniunx!

Atalanta...tam pulchra, tam ferox, tam celer...ego nōn sum celerior quam illa. Nemo celerior illā est. Sed hodiē victor erō!

Ut primum Atalantam spectāvī, eam ipsam amāvī et desiderāvī. Ego dē illā audīvī – quis nōn audīvit dē Atalantā? Celerior hastā...celerior spiculō...celerior ventō ipsō! Quomodō potest vir eam vincere? Ecce! Vir Atalantam vincere nōn potest, sed Atalanta deōs vincere nōn potest!

Ego iterum iterumque precābar et orābam ad Venerem, deam amoris, “O Venus, dea amoris et pulchritudinis, audī mē et adiuvā mē! Si Atalanta mea coniunx esse potest, ego tibi magnum et ornatum templum dedicābō! Adiuvā mē, o dea potentissima!”

Ego precatus sum et Venus mē audīvit. Ecce! Tria mala aurea ante meōs oculōs apparuerunt. Consilium capiō...

Atalanta

Hic vir Meleager mē vincere nōn potest. Sed ille currere vult, ergo curramus...et post cursum, ego eum interficiam! Hahahae!

Currimus. Ille celer est, sed ego celerior. Nemo est celerior mē.

Quid? Ille vir aliquid iacit. Quid iacit Meleager? Meherculē! Est malum aureum! Cur malum aureum ille iacit? Nesciō.....sed illud malum est pulchrum. Id volō. Id cupiō. Ego malum aureum capiō, et tum ego vincam et Meleagrum interficiam.

Quid?? Ego currebam ante eum et Meleager alium malum aureum iacit! Hoc malum est pulchrius quam primum. Anxia sum, sed illud malum cupiō. Debeō currere quam celerrimē, sed nemo est celerior mē!

QUID??? Tertium malum aureum ā Meleagrō iacitur! Et hoc tertium malum est pulcherrimum! Ecce...malum lucet sicut sol! Nōn debeō illud malum sequī...necesse est mihi vincere et Meleagrum interficere...sed malum est pulchrum ...pulcherrimum...

MINIME! MELEAGER VICTOR EST! Hic vir mē vicit. Ego victa sum et nunc debeō in matrimonium ducī. Sed...fortasse errābam. Fortasse hic vir bonus est. Ille est intelligens...et pulcher...et celer...nōn celerior quam ego! Sed fortasse ego illum amāre possim...

Respond to the following questions **in English** unless the question specifically asks you to write Latin.

1. Why does Atalanta not want a husband?
2. Under what conditions would Atalanta marry a man?
3. How does Meleager defeat Atalanta?
4. Why does Atalanta lose to Meleager?
5. Choose an adjective (or a short phrase) to describe Atalanta and one to describe Meleager. Explain why you chose each, using evidence from the text. You do NOT have to quote the Latin, just explain in English.

Latin III - INTERPERSONAL WRITING task: the story of Atalanta

In today's class you will show your Interpersonal Writing skills by responding to and discussing IN LATIN the following questions with your group. These questions pertain to what you read in *Perseus et Medusa*:

- **Tuā opinione, estne aequum ut Atalanta viros tam vehementer spernat? Cur an cur non?** *In your opinion, is it fair/reasonable that Atalanta so fiercely dislikes men? Why or why not?*
- **Putasne Dianam futuram esse iratam ut Meleager Atalantam in matrimonium ducat? Cur an cur non?** *Do you think that Diana will be angry that Meleager is going to marry Atalanta? Why or why not?*
- **Si tu deum/deam servire debeas, quem deum/am servias et cur? Quid ā deō/ā exspectas et quid deō/deae das?** *If you had to serve a god/goddess, which god/dess would you serve and why? What would you expect from the god/dess and what would you offer the god/dess?*

Latin III - PRESENTATIONAL WRITING task: the story of Atalanta

For this Presentational Writing task, please continue the story of Atalanta and Meleager. You may choose to set your story immediately after the events of the race that you read about, or you may choose to start your story at some later point in time. What has happened to Atalanta and Meleager after the events of the race? What is their life like now, and how have they changed (if at all) from who they were before?

Latin IV

In Latin IV we finished the 2018-19 year by reading Andrew Olimpi's *Perseus et Medusa* novella, which are reflected in the IPA tasks shown below which were given to our students at the end of the spring trimester. The Interpretive Reading passage uses the Latin names of students in the Latin IV class to make the story more compelling.

Latin IV - INTERPRETIVE READING task: post-*Perseus et Medusa* novella

Est Dies Veneris, et post scholam Maximus domum suam redire vult. Maximus in Virginia habitat. Amicus Maximi est Stolo. Maximus Stolinem ad domum suam invitat. Stolo consentit, et duo pueri ad Flumen Potomacum ambulare incipiunt.

Maximus ducit, et Stolo sequitur. Cum duo pueri prope Flumen Potomacum sunt, subito Stolo clamat, "Maxime, aliquid in flumine video! Ecce - navis est. Aliquis navem agit, et lente adit."

Navis antiqua ad eos adit. Quidam vir navem agit, pueros spectans et non subridens. Vir pueris non placet.

Vir manum extendit et inquit, "Duos nummos." Maximus et Stolo valde confusi sunt. Maximus respondet, "Quid?"

Vir iterum inquit, "Duos nummos. Sum Praetextatus. Vos trans flumen ferre possum. Duos nummos volo. Duos pueros, duos nummos!"

Maximus intelligit et inquit, "Ecce, duos nummos!" Maximus manum extendit. Ecce - nummi sunt in manu eius. Maximus pecuniam habet! Tres dies abhinc soror eius (ei nomen est Ella) Maximo pecuniam dedit. Ella

soror optima est!

Praetextatus nummos accipit, eos magna cum cura inspiciens. Tandem, vir satisfactus est, et nummi in sacco Praetextati ponuntur.

Praetextatus inquit, “Multas gratias vobis ago, pueri. Ascendite in navem meam.” Maximus et Stolo in navem ascendunt. Lente navis per Flumen Potomacum movet. Stantes in navi Maximus et Stolo ad Virginiam lente iter faciunt.

Praetextatus rogat, “O pueri, cur vos ad Virginiam hodie adeunt? Non multi homines ad Virginiam adire volunt!”

Stolo ridet, sed Maximus iratus respondet, “In Virginia cum familia habito! Virginia est optima!”

Vir putat de quo Maximus dixerit, navem per flumen ad Virginiam agens. Tandem navis tangit terram Virginiae. Praetextatus inquit, “Esne tu tristis, puer? Omnes sciunt tristes homines in Virginia habitare.”

Maximus adhuc iratus e nave exiens respondet, “Minime, tristis non sum, Praetextate!”

“Eris,” Praetextatus inquit.

Stolo e nave exit et nunc valde anxius est. Stolo Maximum lente sequitur.

I. Write down the Latin word that best expresses the meaning of each of the following English words:

1. coins _____
2. follows _____
3. ship _____
4. slowly _____
5. driving/steering _____

II. Answer the following questions in English:

6. What does Maximus want to do after school? Be as detailed as possible. Cite the Latin.
7. In their friendship, who seems to be more in charge: Maximus or Stolo? Explain your reasoning. Cite the Latin.
8. What does Praetextatus demand? Cite the Latin.
9. What conflict arises between Maximus and Praetextatus? Explain. Cite the Latin.
10. How does Stolo feel at the end of the story? Why do you think he feels that way? Cite the Latin.

Latin IV - INTERPERSONAL WRITING task: post-*Perseus et Medusa novella*

In today's class you will show your Interpersonal Writing skills by responding to and discussing IN LATIN the following questions with your group. These questions pertain to what you read in *Perseus et Medusa*:

- **Grandpa Acrisius was killed by Perseus at the end of the story. Did you like Acrisius' death? Why or why not?**
(*Avus Acrisius interfectus est a Perseo ad finem fabulae. Placetne tibi mors Acrisii? Cur an cur non?*)
- **Who was your favorite character and why?**
(*Quae persona tibi placet? Cur?*)

Latin IV - PRESENTATIONAL WRITING task: post-*Perseus et Medusa* novella

For Presentational Writing, your goal is to accurately convey content and meaning. Therefore, make sure your writing is as grammatically correct as possible.

If you get stuck trying to remember a particular vocabulary word, try to circumlocute (talk around) or describe what you mean.

- **Imagine that you are writing a third Perseus book. Write an explanation of what would happen in that third book. Feel free to use humor, if you would like.**

APPENDIX B**IPA TASK ANALYTIC SHEETS**

These are the analytic sheets our Latin teachers use for scoring student performance on each task, as well as the grade curve. A more detailed breakdown of each category with accompanying descriptions is included on the IPA rubric sheets in Appendix C.

INTERPRETIVE READING TASK - Analytic sheets for Latin I-IV

Word Recognition	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Grammar Recognition	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Main Idea Detection	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Supporting Detail Detection	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Making Inferences	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4

Score: _____ / 20

Score	Percent	Rating	Score	Percent	Rating
20	100	EE	8	68.8	DNME
19.5	98.7	EE	7.5	67.5	DNME
19	97.4	EE	7	66.2	DNME
18.5	96.1	EE	6.5	64.9	DNME
18	94.8	EE	6	63.6	DNME
17.5	93.5	EE	5.5	62.3	DNME
17	92.2	EE	5	61	DNME
16.5	90.9	EE	4.5	59.7	DNME
16	89.6	ME	4	58.4	DNME
15.5	88.3	ME	3.5	57.1	DNME
15	87	ME	3	55.8	DNME
14.5	85.7	ME	2.5	54.5	DNME
14	84.4	ME	2	53.2	DNME
13.5	83.1	ME	1.5	51.9	DNME
13	81.8	ME	1	50.6	DNME
12.5	80.5	ME	0.5	49.3	DNME
12	79.2	AME			
11.5	77.9	AME			
11	76.6	AME			
10.5	75.3	AME			
10	74	AME			
9.5	72.7	AME			
9	71.4	AME			
8.5	70.1	AME			

EE = Exceeds Expectations

ME = Meets Expectations

AME = Almost Meets Expectations

DNME = Does Not Meet Expectations

Grade: _____

Please note that we use the same Interpretive Reading analytic sheet for all levels of Latin. The difference between levels is the text used for tasks at each level. See Appendix A for examples.

INTERPERSONAL WRITING TASK**Analytic sheet for Latin I-IV**

Task Completion	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Comprehensibility	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Quality of Interaction	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Vocabulary	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Language Control	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4

Score: _____ / 20

Score	Percent	Rating	Score	Percent	Rating
20	100	EE	8	68.8	DNME
19.5	98.7	EE	7.5	67.5	DNME
19	97.4	EE	7	66.2	DNME
18.5	96.1	EE	6.5	64.9	DNME
18	94.8	EE	6	63.6	DNME
17.5	93.5	EE	5.5	62.3	DNME
17	92.2	EE	5	61	DNME
16.5	90.9	EE	4.5	59.7	DNME
16	89.6	ME	4	58.4	DNME
15.5	88.3	ME	3.5	57.1	DNME
15	87	ME	3	55.8	DNME
14.5	85.7	ME	2.5	54.5	DNME
14	84.4	ME	2	53.2	DNME
13.5	83.1	ME	1.5	51.9	DNME
13	81.8	ME	1	50.6	DNME
12.5	80.5	ME	0.5	49.3	DNME
12	79.2	AME			
11.5	77.9	AME			
11	76.6	AME			
10.5	75.3	AME			
10	74	AME			
9.5	72.7	AME			
9	71.4	AME			
8.5	70.1	AME			

EE = Exceeds Expectations

ME = Meets Expectations

AME = Almost Meets Expectations

DNME = Does Not Meet Expectations

Grade: _____

PRESENTATIONAL WRITING TASK**Analytic sheet for Latin I-IV**

Task Completion	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Comprehensibility	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Level of Discourse	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Vocabulary	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Language Control	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4

Score: _____ / 20

Score	Percent	Rating	Score	Percent	Rating
20	100	EE	8	68.8	DNME
19.5	98.7	EE	7.5	67.5	DNME
19	97.4	EE	7	66.2	DNME
18.5	96.1	EE	6.5	64.9	DNME
18	94.8	EE	6	63.6	DNME
17.5	93.5	EE	5.5	62.3	DNME
17	92.2	EE	5	61	DNME
16.5	90.9	EE	4.5	59.7	DNME
16	89.6	ME	4	58.4	DNME
15.5	88.3	ME	3.5	57.1	DNME
15	87	ME	3	55.8	DNME
14.5	85.7	ME	2.5	54.5	DNME
14	84.4	ME	2	53.2	DNME
13.5	83.1	ME	1.5	51.9	DNME
13	81.8	ME	1	50.6	DNME
12.5	80.5	ME	0.5	49.3	DNME
12	79.2	AME			
11.5	77.9	AME			
11	76.6	AME			
10.5	75.3	AME			
10	74	AME			
9.5	72.7	AME			
9	71.4	AME			
8.5	70.1	AME			

EE = Exceeds Expectations

ME = Meets Expectations

AME = Almost Meets Expectations

DNME = Does Not Meet Expectations

Grade: _____

APPENDIX C

IPA TASK RUBRIC SHEETS

These IPA tasks rubric sheets provide more student performance detail than the analytic sheets in Appendix B.

Latin I-IV – INTERPRETIVE READING Task Rubric

Word Recognition

1. Identifies a few key words appropriately within the context of the text
2. Identifies half of key words appropriately within the context of the text
3. Identifies majority of key words appropriately within context of the text
4. Identifies all key words appropriately within context of the text

Grammar Recognition

1. Identifies a few grammar concepts appropriately within the context of the text
2. Identifies half of grammar concepts appropriately within the context of the text
3. Identifies majority of grammar concepts appropriately within context of the text
4. Identifies nearly all or all grammar concepts appropriately within context of the text

Main Idea Detection

1. May identify some ideas from the text but they do not represent the main idea(s)
2. Identifies some part of the main idea(s) of the text
3. Identifies key parts of the main idea(s) of the text but misses some elements
4. Identifies the complete main idea(s) of the text

Supporting Detail Detection

1. Identifies a few supporting details in the text but may be unable to provide information from the text to explain these details
2. Identifies some supporting details in the text and may provide limited information from the text to explain these details. Or identifies the

majority of supporting details but is unable to provide information from the text to explain these details.

3. Identifies the majority of supporting details in the text and provides information from the text to explain some of these details.
4. Identifies all supporting details in the text and accurately provides information from the text to explain these details.

Guessing Meaning From Context and Making Inferences (Reading ‘between the lines’)

1. Inferences of meaning of unfamiliar words and phrases are largely inaccurate or lacking.
Inferences and interpretations of the text’s meaning are largely incomplete and/or not plausible.
2. Infers meaning of unfamiliar words or phrases in the text. Most of the inferences are plausible although many are not accurate. Makes a few plausible inferences regarding the text’s meaning.
3. Infers meaning of unfamiliar words or phrases in the text. Most of the inferences are plausible although some may not be accurate. Infers and interprets the text’s meaning in a partially complete and/or partially plausible manner.
4. Infers meaning of unfamiliar words or phrases in the text. Inferences are accurate. Infers and interprets the text’s meaning in a highly plausible manner.

Latin I-IV – INTERPERSONAL WRITING Task Rubric

Task Completion

1. Content is minimal and/or frequently inappropriate; ideas are repetitive and/or irrelevant
 - Content may be unrelated to the task
2. Content somewhat adequate and mostly appropriate; ideas expressed with very little elaboration or detail
 - Content is relevant but lacks appropriate detail
3. Content adequate and appropriate; ideas developed with some elaboration and detail
 - Content has sufficient information or detail based on learned material
4. Content rich; ideas developed with elaboration and detail
 - Content includes much information related to the task

Comprehensibility

1. Text barely comprehensible
 - Text is almost impossible to understand, even for a sympathetic reader
 - Errors of vocabulary, grammar, and/or spelling may be impossible to decipher
 - A sympathetic reader is required to “figure out” what the student is trying to say
- . Text somewhat comprehensible, requiring interpretation on the part of the reader
 - A sympathetic reader should be able to “figure out” parts of the text
 - Some parts of the text may be barely understandable, with frequent or significant errors that impede comprehensibility
- . Text comprehensible, requiring minimal interpretation on the part of the reader
 - A reader may have to pause briefly in order to understand the text fully
 - Ideas should flow and show organization
- . Text readily comprehensible, requiring no interpretation on the part of the reader
 - A reader should be able to understand all of the text with very brief pauses
 - Text should flow in such a way that the reader and readily understand it

Quality of Interaction

1. Minimal engagement in the interaction; little ability to sustain the conversation
 - Interaction may be disjointed
 - Student does not comprehend the message and/or is unable to ask for clarification
 - Student gives minimal responses
 - Student rarely elicits further information
- . Some engagement in the interaction; some ability to sustain the conversation
 - Interaction may be somewhat disjointed
 - Student mostly comprehends the message and/or is able to ask for

- clarification
 - Student responds adequately
 - Student occasionally elicits further information
- . Consistent engagement in the interaction; ability to sustain the conversation
 - Interaction flows naturally most of the time
 - Student comprehends the message
 - Student gives adequate responses
 - Student elicits further information
- . Consistent engagement in the interaction; ability to sustain and advance the conversation
 - Interaction flows naturally
 - Student readily comprehends the message
 - Student gives elaborate responses
 - Student elicits further information

Vocabulary

1. Inadequate and/or inaccurate use of vocabulary
 - Student uses a limited variety of vocabulary
 - Student may frequently repeat words or expressions
 - Vocabulary may be used inappropriately or out of context
 - Response may include very few words
- . Somewhat inadequate and/or inaccurate use of vocabulary and too basic for this level
 - Student uses appropriate but basic vocabulary
 - Some vocabulary may be used inappropriately
 - Response may lack quantity of descriptive words
 - Some attempts may be made to include less commonly used vocabulary
- . Adequate and accurate use of vocabulary for this level
 - Student uses varied and generally appropriate vocabulary
 - Most vocabulary is used accurately and appropriately
 - Attempts are made to include less commonly used vocabulary
- . Elaborate use of vocabulary with some idiomatic expressions
 - Student accurately uses varied and appropriate vocabulary and idiomatic language
 - Frequent attempts are made to include less commonly used vocabulary

Language Control

1. Little or no control of grammar, syntax, and usage
 - Basic language structures are used correctly approximately half of the time
- Limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage
 - Basic language structures are used correctly about three quarters of the time
- Some control of grammar, syntax, and usage
 - Basic language structures are used correctly most of the time, not all of the time
- General control of grammar, syntax, and usage
 - Basic language structures are used correctly most of the time, not all of the time, and advanced language structures are used with some success

Latin I-IV – PRESENTATIONAL WRITING Task Rubric

Task Completion

Task Completion is a big picture domain, which reflects the communication of the message. Consequently, it is affected by:

- Level of Discourse – minimal sophistication may inhibit communication
- Vocabulary – inadequate and/or inaccurate vocabulary may produce undeveloped content
- Language Control – inadequate and/or inaccurate use of basic language structures may produce undeveloped content

Each rating for this domain has particular characteristics:

- 1 Minimal completion of the task and/or content undeveloped
 - Response is mostly relevant but lacks appropriate details
 - A required portion of the task may be missing
 - Response is underdeveloped
- 2 Partial completion of the task; ideas somewhat developed
 - Response is relevant and some ideas are developed with appropriate details

- A minor portion of the task may be missing
 - Response shows minimal organization and cohesion
- 3 Completion of the task; ideas adequately developed
- Response directly relates to the task as given
 - Response has minimal information or detail based on learned material
 - Response shows some organization and cohesion
 - Response illustrates some originality and details
- 4 Superior completion of the task; ideas well developed and well organized
- Response includes much information related to the task
 - Response has sufficient information or detail based on learned material
 - Response shows organization and cohesion
 - Response illustrates originality, details and/or an unexpected feature that captures interest and attention

Comprehensibility

The Comprehensibility domain covers the big picture and measures the degree to which the sympathetic reader needs to interpret the student's response. It is affected by:

- Level of Discourse – the use of appropriate cohesive devices facilitates comprehensibility
- Vocabulary – inaccurate use of vocabulary and spelling which requires interpretation hinders comprehension
- Language Control – errors in basic language structures may hinder comprehensibility when they require interpretation

Each rating for this domain has particular characteristics:

- 1 Text barely comprehensible
- Text is almost impossible to understand, even by a sympathetic reader
 - Errors in vocabulary, grammar and/or spelling may be impossible to decipher

- Text requires reader to “figure out” what the student is trying to say
- 2 Text somewhat comprehensible, requiring interpretation on the part of the reader
- A sympathetic reader should be able to “figure out” parts of the text
 - Multiple errors in vocabulary, grammar, and/or spelling hinder comprehension
 - Some parts of the text may still be incomprehensible
- 3 Text comprehensible, requiring minimal interpretation on the part of the reader
- A sympathetic reader may have the pause briefly in order to understand the text fully
 - Some errors in vocabulary, grammar, and/or spelling may hinder comprehension
 - Ideas should flow and show some organization
- 4 Text readily comprehensible, requiring no interpretation on the part of the reader
- A sympathetic reader should be able to understand all of the text with very brief pauses
 - Few errors in vocabulary, grammar, and/or spelling do not hinder comprehension
 - Text should flow in such a way that the reader can readily understand it

****NOTA BENE:**

- Short responses cannot receive a score higher than a 3 because they lack sufficient evidence

Level of Discourse

This domain measures the degree of linguistic sophistication used to communicate ideas (not what is said, but how it is said). Students are creating with the language using a variety of discrete sentences.

Each rating for this domain has particular characteristics:

- 1 Sentences are disjointed and/or repetitive; little cohesive vocabulary
 - Sentences have no variety of vocabulary
 - Sentences are disconnected and show no relation to each other
- 2 Variety of discrete sentences; some cohesive vocabulary
 - Sentences have a limited variety of vocabulary
 - Sentences are somewhat disconnected or show little relation to each other; few to no cohesive devices used
- 3 Discourse of satisfactory length; variety of vocabulary
 - Sentences have adequate variety of vocabulary
 - Sentences are generally connected and/or show relation to each other; few cohesive devices used
- 4 Discourse of appropriate length; wide variety of vocabulary
 - Sentences have a wide variety of vocabulary
 - Sentences are ordered logically; some cohesive devices used

Vocabulary

Vocabulary reflects the accuracy, variety, and quantity of the language produced. Since this is a summative assessment, students should incorporate vocabulary learned previously. If students choose simplified vocabulary in an attempt to avoid errors, the result is often an accurate but inadequate use of vocabulary. Errors in spelling not related to the language structures (i.e. not verb endings, adjective agreement, etc.) will be considered vocabulary errors.

Each rating for this domain has particular characteristics:

- 1 Inadequate and/or inaccurate use of vocabulary
 - Response lacks variety of vocabulary
 - Students may frequently repeat words or expressions
 - Vocabulary may be used inappropriately or out of context
 - Response may include insufficient words

- 2 Somewhat inadequate and/or inaccurate use of vocabulary and too basic for this level
 - Students use minimal variety of vocabulary
 - Some vocabulary may be used inappropriately
 - Response may lack quantity of descriptive words
 - Some attempts may be made to include less commonly used vocabulary
- 3 Adequate and accurate use of vocabulary for this level
 - Students use a variety of vocabulary
 - Most vocabulary is used accurately and appropriately
 - Attempts are made to use less commonly used vocabulary
- 4 Rich use of vocabulary, which may include some idiomatic expressions
 - Students accurately use a rich variety of vocabulary and some idiomatic expressions
 - Frequent attempts are made to include less commonly used vocabulary

Language Control

Language Control measures the use and accuracy of basic and advanced language structures. Since this is a summative assessment, students are asked to demonstrate the skills acquired over their whole language experience. Composition of verbs in various tenses may be appropriate, depending on the level. Errors in spelling due to a lack of control of language structures (i.e. verb endings, adjective agreement, etc.) will be considered errors in language control.

Each rating for this domain has particular characteristics:

- 1 Emerging use of basic language structures
 - Basic language structures are used correctly less than half of the time
- 2 Emerging control of basic language structures
 - Basic language structures are used correctly about half of the time

- 3 Control of basic language structures
 - Basic language structures are used correctly most of the time

- 4 Control of basic language structures with use of some advanced language structures
 - Basic and advanced language structures are used correctly mostly, if not all, of the time