

Indicators for the quality assurance matrix for CEFR use

This is a list of all indicators use in the online version of the quality assurance matrix for CEFR use. Below each indicator you will find the quality principles it is associated with. You can find the online version here: <https://tools.ecml.at/matrix/>

Planning

P1-1. Needs analysis: The CEFR descriptive scheme and descriptors are used to analyse learner needs, develop a curriculum related to real world needs, which focuses on learners as language **users**.
Relevance, Validity, Coherence

P1-2. Needs analysis: We have adapted the CEFR descriptors in order to make them appropriate for our particular context.
Relevance

P1-3. Needs analysis: We have used the CEFR descriptive scheme and descriptors to provide a curriculum focused on developing transversal competences e.g. language awareness, communicative language strategies, learning to learn.
Validity, Sustainability

P1-4. Needs analysis: We have involved and consulted our learners about their needs from an early stage of designing our curriculum.
Transparency, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

P1-5. Needs analysis: CEFR descriptors are used to take account of learners' language biographies and repertoires in order to set course objectives
Relevance

P1-6. Needs analysis: We plan the necessary steps to fill the 'gap' between where learners are now and where they need to be in order to achieve the course objectives.
Relevance

P1-7. Situation analysis: We have used the CEFR to analyse the strengths and weaknesses/gaps in our current practice, and have planned change that is challenging but reasonable.
Relevance

P1-8. Situation analysis: In designing our curriculum, we have consulted and involved stakeholders, e.g. parents, and future employers.
Relevance, Transparency, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

P1-9. Situation analysis: We have planned the necessary steps to implement the curriculum: (e.g. coordination meetings, workshops, piloting, dissemination).
Relevance, Validity, Coherence, Inclusiveness

P1-10. Situation analysis: We have considered constraints in terms of expertise, materials, support, and above all the available time and budget.
Relevance

P2-1. Clarity: We use CEFR descriptors to communicate to learners and stakeholders what will realistically be achieved by the end of the course.

Transparency, Coherence

P2-2. Clarity: We ensure that the aims for different languages are formulated in relation to CEFR descriptors in a parallel way in order to encourage a plurilingual approach.

Transparency, Coherence

P2-3. Clarity: We make clear the relationship between the curriculum, the CEFR levels and relevant (national) standards and examinations.

Transparency, Coherence

P2-4. Clarity: Each course module/unit has aims expressed as CEFR-related descriptor

Validity, Transparency, Coherence

P2-5. Clarity: Module/unit aims include development of communicative language strategies related to the activities concerned.

Validity, Transparency, Coherence

P2-6. Sequencing: We have subdivided the CEFR levels to set up curriculum milestones.

Validity, Transparency, Coherence

P2-7. Sequencing: We have specified 'core grammar' by analysing the language needed to do the tasks suggested by the CEFR descriptors.

Validity, Coherence

P2-8. Sequencing: We select communicative aims to create balanced learning modules with a variety of inputs and activities.

Validity, Coherence

P2-9. Sequencing: Our curriculum encourages a cyclical approach to language learning.

Coherence

P2-10. Materials: Our resources and tasks refer to CEFR descriptors and related language aims.

Validity, Coherence

P2-11. Materials: We use materials that facilitate the implementation of the CEFR's action-oriented approach through real-life tasks.

Validity, Sustainability

P2-12. Materials: We help learners develop language skills by using authentic materials at all levels.

Validity

P2-13. Materials: We use materials that present language in context.

Validity, Coherence

P2-14. Materials: We recommend the use of specific authentic materials outside class.

Validity

P3-1. Teachers involvement: We have collaborated with a network of teachers from an early stage of

the curriculum development.

Validity, Transparency, Coherence, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

P3-2. Wider involvement: We have taken conscious steps to ensure administrative and political backing, and union neutrality, in relation to the changes we envisage.

Relevance, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

P3-3. Wider involvement: We give regular updates on developments to our stakeholders.

Transparency, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

P3-4. Wider involvement: We have set up a scientific advisory board with experience of structuring and evaluating curriculum projects

Validity, Transparency, Inclusiveness

P3-5. Communication: For our curriculum project, we have set up a clear system to communicate what we are trying to achieve, the timelines, resources etc.

Transparency

P3-6. Communication: We are in touch with other institutions like ourselves to explain what we are doing and exchange ideas.

Transparency, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

P3-7. Teacher education: Teachers are provided with opportunities for self-learning and development, with scaffolded steps to self-direction.

Inclusiveness, Sustainability

P3-8. Teacher education: We integrate training sessions on the implementation of the curriculum into our existing opportunities for teacher development.

Relevance, Coherence

Implementation

I1-1. Creating effective conditions: We establish a relationship with each learner and provide a supportive environment.

Relevance, Transparency, Inclusiveness

I1-2. Creating effective conditions: We provide a stimulating yet achievable challenge for teachers and learners.

Relevance, Inclusiveness

I1-3. Creating effective conditions: We have opportunities to work together in person or online and to set up communities of practice linked to our curriculum.

Validity, Coherence, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

I1-4. Creating effective conditions: We encourage creativity in the classroom, e.g. through projects, expressive writing, games and play.

Relevance, Inclusiveness

I1-5. Learner focus: We address learners' real-world communication needs and draw on their experience and personal interests.

Relevance, Validity, Inclusiveness

I1-6. Learner focus: We inform learners about the aims of each course module, using CEFR descriptors.

Validity, Transparency, Inclusiveness

I1-7. Learner focus: Whilst following the curriculum, we react flexibly to what engages learners, rather than sticking rigidly to a set programme.

Relevance, Inclusiveness

I1-8. Empowerment: We include activities that encourage learners to practice communicative language strategies (e.g. interaction strategies, CEFR 4.4).

Validity, Sustainability

I1-9. Empowerment: We provide opportunities for mediation activities (mediating texts, concepts and/or communication itself)

Relevance, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

I2-1. Variety & balance: We use a variety of activities that take account of different learning styles.

Relevance, Coherence, Inclusiveness

I2-2. Variety & balance: We ensure a balance between input, controlled practice and freer practice.

Validity, Coherence

I2-3. Variety & balance: We ensure a balance between teacher-centred lessons and collaboration in pairs and small groups.

Validity, Coherence, Sustainability

I2-4. Variety and balance: We provide easier alternatives or more challenging materials to different learners if appropriate.

Relevance, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

I2-5. Action-oriented approach: We present new structures and vocabulary in a meaningful context.

Relevance, Validity

I2-6. Action-oriented approach: We design or select real-life tasks that bring together a number of communicative aims and the related language competences.

Validity, Coherence

I2-7. Action-orientated approach: We ensure that tasks are purposeful, meaningful, and collaborative, with a clear goal and product.

Validity, Transparency, Coherence, Sustainability

I2-8. Competences: Learners are made aware of the relationship between language and culture and consciously develop intercultural awareness.

Validity, Transparency, Sustainability

I2-9. Competences: We promote awareness of the structure of the target language.

Transparency, Coherence, Sustainability

I2-10. **Competences:** Learners are sensitised to sociocultural/-linguistic aspects of language use (e.g. level of formality and politeness, register, expressions for particular situations).

Validity, Sustainability

I3-1. **Monitoring:** There is an ongoing diagnostic assessment of learners' strengths and weaknesses.

Relevance, Transparency

I3-2. **Monitoring:** We regularly monitor both communicative effectiveness and accuracy.

Validity, Transparency, Coherence

I3-3. **Monitoring:** We use a variety of correction techniques (e.g. delayed correction during fluency activities; discussion of common errors).

Relevance, Validity, Coherence

I3-4. **Monitoring:** We provide learners regularly with clear and structured feedback and with suggestions for follow up work.

Relevance, Transparency, Sustainability

I3-5. **Learner development:** We encourage a plurilingual approach, raising awareness of metalinguistic aspects (e.g. cognates, similarities/differences in grammatical structures).

Validity, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

I3-6. **Learner development:** We encourage learners to view their plurilingual profile as an asset and to exploit and develop all their (plurilingual) language resources.

Relevance, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

I3-7. **Learner development:** We encourage learners to transfer skills and strategies across tasks and across languages (e.g. reading strategies, how to structure a text).

Relevance, Sustainability

I3-8. **Learner development:** We encourage learners to use their general competences (knowledge of world, intercultural, professional, etc.) with their language competence.

Relevance, Sustainability

I3-9. **Learner development:** We provide opportunities for learners to undertake personally meaningful tasks or projects.

Relevance, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

Evaluation

E1-1. **Constructive alignment:** There is a coherent, visible link between the curriculum, the aims communicated to learners and the assessment.

Validity, Transparency, Coherence

E1-2. **Constructive alignment:** There is a coherent, visible link between the activities and tasks used for teaching and those used for assessment.

Validity, Transparency, Coherence

E1-3. **Assessment for/as learning:** We use assessment to provide targeted feedback to learners, rather than solely for the purpose of assigning grades.

E1-4. Assessment for/as learning: We encourage lifelong learning in a portfolio approach (e.g. European Language Portfolio), to document competence in different kinds of work.

Transparency, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

E1-5. Assessment for/as learning: When we give marks/grades for assignments we suggest practice materials for further development and advice about learning strategies.

Relevance, Transparency, Coherence

E1-6. Assessment of learning: 'Can do' checklists are used to assess progress at certain 'milestones' (e.g. end of unit, end of term), including self-assessment and/or peer assessment.

Validity, Transparency, Coherence, Inclusiveness

E1-7. Assessment of learning: We assess both the quality of the *products* from tasks (e.g. texts, posters, presentations) and of the *process* (e.g. language in discussion, collaborative strategies).

Validity, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

E1-8. Transparent criteria: Descriptors of both *communicative success* (CEFR Chapter 4, 'Can do') and *quality* of language (CEFR Chapter 5; CEFR Table 3) inform assessment of performance in communicative tasks.'

Validity, Transparency, Coherence

E1-9. Transparent criteria: Grades are given on the basis of shared, defined criteria that are discussed in advance with the class.

Validity, Transparency, Coherence, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

E2-1. Design: Our testing instruments reflect the action-oriented CEFR-based objectives for the level.

Validity, Transparency, Coherence

E2-2. Design: We have followed the standard stages of test design (specifications, development, piloting, revision, pre-testing, validation): See CoE/ALTE Guide (<https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/developing-tests-examining>), EALTA Guidelines for Good Practice (<http://www.ealta.eu.org/documents/archive/guidelines/English.pdf>).

Validity

E2-3. Design: Our tests assess communicative activities of reception, production and interaction (e.g. listening, reading, spoken production and interaction, and written production.)

Validity, Coherence

E2-4. Design: Samples of tests and learner productions benchmarked to the CEFR are made available to teachers and test developers.

Validity, Transparency, Coherence

E2-5. Design: Our speaking and writing assessment tasks are designed to elicit different types of discourse (e.g. spoken interaction/production; description/argument, etc.)

Validity, Coherence

E2-6. Design: Our assessment of listening and reading includes a balanced selection of text types, e.g. as listed in the CEFR Section 4.4.2.

Validity, Coherence

E2-7. Design: We use a common assessment grid/rubric that balances linguistic aspects with pragmatic and socio-linguistic ones, fluency as well as accuracy (see CEFR Ch. 5).

Validity, Transparency, Coherence

E2-8. Validation: Our testing instruments and assessment grids/rubrics have been piloted with representative learners.

Relevance, Validity

E2-9. Validation: We have related the results from our tests to CEFR levels following a principled methodology (e.g. as recommended in the Council of Europe's Manual: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/relating-examinations-to-the-cefr>)

Validity, Transparency, Coherence

E2-10. Validation: Our team receive standardisation training to ensure a consistent interpretation of CEFR levels (e.g. through use of samples of learner performances benchmarked to the CEFR).

Validity, Transparency, Coherence, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

E2-11. Validation: We compare our teachers' grades regularly to test scores and discuss possible differences with the teachers.

Validity, Coherence

E3-1. Reporting results: When we award grades, we ensure a balance between continuous assessment (e.g. with portfolios) and formal testing.

Validity, Transparency, Coherence

E3-2. Reporting results: We report results as a profile (e.g. separate grades for listening, for reading., etc.) as well as in a single overall grade.

Relevance, Transparency, Coherence

E3-3. Reporting results: We systematically report learner progress and results in terms of CEFR levels and/or sublevels (e.g. A2+, A2.2) .

Relevance, Validity, Transparency, Coherence

E3-4. Reporting results: In addition to the grades, learners are provided with comments concerning, e.g. strategies, language awareness, plurilingual and intercultural competence.

Relevance, Validity, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

E3-5. Reporting results: We discuss assessment results with the learners (and parents, if appropriate), and agree suitable action plans.

Relevance, Validity, Inclusiveness

E3-6. Reporting results: We use results to inform stakeholders (e.g. administrators, policy makers, employers).

Relevance, Transparency, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

E3-7. Reflecting on results: We use learners' progress to evaluate the course and methodology, trying to identify reasons for success/limited success.

Relevance, Validity, Transparency, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

E3-8. **Reflecting on results:** After identifying reasons for (limited) success we plan future action at an institutional as well as class level.

Relevance, Validity, Transparency, Inclusiveness, Sustainability

Reflection