

Index

Page numbers followed by t indicate table

- ACT, 121–122, 146, 168t, 176–177
analytic rubrics, 44
artificial intelligence, 166–167, 168t
assessment: characteristics, 14–17,
33, 80; control of, vii, 5–6,
10–13, 72–73, 129–131, 185;
criteria, 70–72, 102–104;
design, 33–50; history, 19–27;
political aspects, 110–112,
129–131; purposes, 5–6, 8–9,
32; responsibility for, vii, 2–3,
9–13, 159–160, 177–179, 185;
training needed, 181–182;
types, 14, 56–57, 77–85,
108–109, 128, 132, 176; views
on, vii, 14–17. *See also* biases;
tests, standardized
assignments: bias in, 87–88;
compare and contrast, 64,
65–67; design of, 59–64,
68–70, 72–73; essays, 64,
68–69, 70, 74–76; in-class
writing, 71; peer review,
77–78, 104–107; reflection
letter, 47–48; shaped by
assessment, 101–104. *See
also* curriculum
asynchronous communication,
138–141
automated essay scoring. *See*
machine scoring
biases: contrastive rhetoric
and, 105–107; definition,
86; development of, 88; of
grammar errors, 98–101; of
L2 students, 97–98; in peer
review, 104–107; personality
type and, 91–92; political,
111–113; in tests, 87–88,
107–111, 125–126
Blake, R.J., 138–142
Bloch, J., 138–140, 142–143
blogs, 140–141
Breland, H., 87, 158
Broad, B., 12, 16, 19, 26, 43, 158
Brown, H.D., 33, 45, 46, 72, 87–88,
128
Burstein, J.C., 157, 159, 161–162,
164, 173, 177, 179
California Intersegmental
Committee, 89–90
chat rooms, 142, 153–154
Chodorow, M., 157, 177
College Board, 120–121, 126–127,
167, 168t
COMPASS, 107, 168t
computer-mediated
communication (CMC), 138–
139, 142
computer-mediated discourse
(CMD), 138–139, 142
Connor, U., 105–106
consequential validity, 41
construct validity, 41
content standards, 34–35
content validity, 41
contrastive rhetoric, 105–107
Cornett, C., 102–104
costs, testing, 115–116
course catalog descriptions, 62–63
criteria development, 70–72
CRITERION, 158, 168t, 174

- criterion validity, 41
Crusan, D., 2, 12–13, 29, 73, 93–94, 96, 102–104, 107–109, 111, 144–145, 153, 175, 181
cultural capital, 59, 134
curriculum: assessment design and, 33–50; assessment impact on, 10–13; assignment design and, 59–64, 68–70, 72–73; influence of standardized testing on, 127–128; maintaining control of, 72–73; NCLB impacts, 42–43, 131–132

deficit theory, 23–24
Delpit, L.D., 59, 134
descriptors, 60–61
direct assessment, 108
discussion, online, 138–143

EduMetry, 149–150
Illuminate®, 138, 142
email, 139–140
Emig, J., 24, 92
English as a Second Language.
 See second language teaching
e-rater, 124, 164–165, 168t, 177
Educational Records Privacy Act (ERPA), 139–140
ESL. *See* second language teaching
essays: process, 70; in testing, 20, 26–27, 126–129; timed, 64, 68–69, 126–128; writing prompts, 68–69, 71, 87–88.
 See also machine scoring
ETS, 116–119, 122–124, 158–159, 164–165, 168t
e-Write, 176–177

face validity, 41
Ferris, D.R., 46, 59, 72, 91, 98, 101, 153, 181
formative assessments, 56–57
Freire, P., 130–131

Generation 1.5 students, 119–122
goals, 62–63
grammar and bias, 98–101
GRE, 122–124

Hamp-Lyons, L., 2, 4, 6, 9–10, 12, 14, 16, 18–20, 27, 30, 46, 108–109, 127–128, 153, 174–175, 180
Hansen, J.G., 77, 104–105
Haswell, R.H., 7, 11–12, 50, 108–109, 126, 161, 163, 164, 172, 175, 178–179
Hedgcock, J., 46, 59, 72, 101
holistic rubrics, 44, 45–46
Huot, B., 1, 7, 12, 16–19, 28, 32, 80, 107–108, 145, 153, 175, 185

in-class writing assignments, 71
indirect assessment, 14, 108
Intelligent Essay Assessor (IEA), 165–166, 168t, 171–172
IntelliMetric®, 166–167, 168t, 172
Internet: paper mills, 146–148; TOEFL testing, 116–118

Kaplan, R.B., 105–106
Knowledge Analysis Technologies, 165

language: acquisition process, 91, 99, 182; proficiency tests, 116–119; testing theories, 27–30
large-scale assessment. *See* tests, standardized
latent semantic analysis (LSA), 165–166, 168t
Leki, I., 8, 64, 96, 171
Liu, J., 77, 104–105, 181
low English proficiency (LEP) writing, 34–37

machine scoring: ability to read for meaning, 171–172; accountability in, 183–184; advantages, 172–173; debate about, 156–157; definition, 157; disadvantages, 173–174; effects of, 170; evolution of, 161–164; how it works, 160; and L2 students, 176–177; products, 164–170; professional opinions on, 174–175; student benefits, 158–159

- Matsuda, P.K., 17, 29, 93, 96, 171
Matzen, R.N., 176–177
McAllister, K.S., 157, 161
McNamara, T., 33–34, 108, 185
Menken, K., 132, 133
multiple-trait rubrics, 46
MY Access!®, 167, 168t, 169–170, 173, 174, 176
- natural language processing (NLP), 164–165, 168t
NCLB. *See* No Child Left Behind (NCLB)
New York standards, 35–36
NLP (natural language processing), 164–167, 168t
No Child Left Behind (NCLB): costs, 115; criticism, 126, 130; effects, 42–43, 110; and L2 students, 131–133; and Obama administration, 133; standardized testing and, 110
norm referencing, 132
- Obama administration, 133
objectives, 38–39
objectivity in testing, 124–126
ODSP (online directed self-placement), 144–146
Ohio standards, 34–35, 37
online directed self-placement (ODSP), 144–146
online discussion, 137–142
- Pearson Knowledge Technologies, 165–166, 168t
peer review, 77–78, 104–107
PEG (Project Essay Grader), 163
performance standards, 35
personality and biases, 91–92
placement, student, 107–111, 126, 144–146
plagiarism, 147–149
political bias, 111–113
portfolio assessment, 27, 79–80
practicality, 42
primary trait rubrics, 44, 46
process essay, 70
progress indicators, 61–62, 64
Project Essay Grader (PEG), 161
prompts, writing, 68–69, 71, 87–88
- real-time communication, 142–143, 153 183
reliability, 16–17, 39–40, 124–126
Roever, C., 33–34, 185
Rose, M., 24–25
rubrics: about, 43–44, 50; assessment goals and, 72–73; assignments and, 44; development of, 44, 73; examples, 45, 48–49, 51–54, 74–76, 81–84; negative views of, 43–44; sources for, 72; types of, 44–46
- SAT®, 119–121, 126–129, 146
second language teaching: about good writing, 97–98; assignment development, 64–69; communicative competence, 171; course development, 59–63; criteria development, 70–72; NCLB impacts, 131–133; preparing for standardized tests, 133–136; rubric use, 44–46; standards, 34–37, 60–62; training needs, 181–182; writing for different fields, 94–95. *See also* students; teachers and teaching
- Silva, T., 29, 171
SMARTHINKING®, 150–152
Sorensen, C., 176–177
Spolsky, B., 27, 29
standards, 34–37, 60–62
students: assessment criteria development, 33, 44, 72, 102–104; biases of, 104–107; cultural capital and, 59, 133; Generation 1.5, 119–122; Internet paper mills use, 146–148; language

- acquisition, 90, 98, 182;
machine scoring and,
158–159, 176–177; NCLB
effects on, 131–133; online
communication tools,
138–143; peer review and,
77–78, 104–107; placement
of, 107–111, 126, 145–146;
standardized tests and,
107–111, 115–123, 133–136;
statistics on, 180–181
- Students Will Be Able To
(SWBAT), 38–39, 62
- StyleWriter, 152
- summative assessments, 56–57
- Swain, M., 171
- SWBAT (Students Will Be Able
To), 38–39, 62
- synchronous communication, 138–
139, 142–143
- teachers and teaching: assessment
preferences, 92–94; assessment
responsibilities, 2–3, 9–13,
159–160, 177–179, 185;
biases, 88–95, 98–102; control
of assessment process, 5–6,
10–13, 17–19, 129–131, 185;
de-skilling, 151, 153, 170;
inconsistency in assessment,
96, 98; literacy expectations,
89–90; machine scoring use,
148–154, 177–179; personal
experiences in assessment,
58–59; reasons not to assess,
vii, 10–11; technology and,
137–138, 182–184; training
needs, 181–182. *See also*
second language teaching
- technology: assessment and, 138–
148; effects on teaching, 137–
138, 148–154, 182–186; and
L2 students, 142–143; online
communication tools, 138–
143; online tutoring, 153–154;
self-placement assessments,
144–146. *See also* machine
scoring; tests, standardized
- TESOL, 36, 38, 53–54, 60–61
- testing: bias in, 87–88; costs,
115–116; history of, 20–23;
practicality, 42; reliability,
16–17, 39–40, 124–126;
validity, 17, 41–42, 124–126;
washback, 42–43. *See also*
tests, standardized
- tests, standardized: accountability
in, 184–185; admission tests,
119–124, 129; advantages,
124–126; bias in, 107–111;
business of, 115–116, 124;
disadvantages, 126–129; history
of, 20–23, 25–27; impact on
assessment, 6–7; language
proficiency tests, 116–119; and
parental income, 126; political
bias and, 111–113; preparing
students, 133–136; used for
placement, 125; written essays
in, 126–129. *See also* testing
- TOEFL®, 116–118, 178
- TOEIC®, 118–119
- tutoring, online, 153–154
- TWE (Test of Written English),
118–119
- Valdez-Pierce, L., 33–35, 72, 101,
132
- validity, 17, 41–42, 124–126
- Vantage Learning, 166–167, 168t,
169–170, 171–172
- Ware, P., 156, 161, 163, 170–171,
177–178
- Warschauer, M., 156, 161, 163,
177–178
- washback, 42–43
- Weigle, S.C., 1, 9, 10, 12, 16, 18, 72,
117, 136, 143, 175, 177, 181
- White, E.M., 1, 11, 12, 15, 17–19,
26–28, 69, 79, 89, 109, 128–
129, 145, 153, 157–158, 161,
175, 185
- wikis, 141
- World-Class Instructional Design
and Assessment (WIDA), 36

- WritePlacer, 167, 168t
WriteToLearn, 160, 168t
writing: ability definitions, 7–8,
13–14; academic preferences
in, 93–95; definition of good,
93, 96–98, 131; differing
views on, 13–14; meaning in,
plagiarism, 147–149; process
of, 9, 24–25, 92; prompts,
68–69, 71, 87–88; standards,
34–37; teacher training
needed, 181–182; technology
impacts, 143–148. *See also*
assignments
Wysche-Smith, S., 11, 50
Yancey, K.B., 10–12, 14, 16–17,
19–20