

Presenter Notes: Staging an “Assessment Smack-down”

Objectives:

- To briefly introduce a group to 5 or 6 intercultural assessment instruments & activate participants’ curiosity about them (e.g. their willingness to dig deeper).
- To illustrate that different instruments measure different aspects of or constructs within the multi-faceted definition(s) of intercultural competence.
- To illustrate that validated instruments for intercultural assessment can be cost-free.
- To “bust the myth” that there is one true ICL assessment instrument that “rules them all.”

Appropriate Audience & Size of Group:

Individuals who want to know more about assessing learning outcomes. Size of group has no impact on effectiveness of learning objectives.

Time Needed:

15 to 30 minutes (About 2 or 3 minutes per instrument, plus time for brief intro and post-exercise questions)

Materials Needed:

- At least two presenters who are conversant with multiple assessment instruments used for measuring intercultural competence. One presenter per instrument is ideal, if possible.
- Sense of Humor (on the part of the presenters).
- Optional: HubICL sign-up cards or thought-processing worksheet (template provided)
- Optional: Funny Hats (one per instrument; for use in case # of presenters ≠ to # of instruments)
- **NOTE: It is extremely important NOT to issue ANY explanatory handouts about the instruments prior to full completion of this expository exercise!**

Activity Set-Up & Description:

This activity has these phases:

- 1) **Presenter Team-building:** Presenters meet to discuss instrument selection, who will represent each specific instrument & who will produce the optional thought-processing worksheet.
- 2) **Introduction of the exercise to audience (2-5 minutes):** Lead presenter provides a brief intro, stating that several proven, valid and reliable intercultural assessment instruments are about to be briefly introduced by the assembled experts. There are two possible formats for the intro, described further on the following page.

- a) **Format One (Competitive):** If this format is chosen, it is the role of the lead presenter to state during the intro that the purpose of the exercise is satirical, and that two (or more) presenters will take turns representing successive instruments in a partisan and competitive manner. Donning a funny hat with each new instrument as it is being described is intended to increase the irony quotient of the competitive performance. Audience may be encouraged to show partisan reactions by clapping or booing after each instrument.
 - b) **Format Two (Cooperative):** In this format, the lead presenter’s intro states that, while the presenters were at first tempted to be competitive and partisan due to their attachment to a specific instrument or instruments, they have decided it is more valuable to model approaching cross-cultural value differences (such as instrument choice) with civility and courtesy. (Presenters still take turns describing instruments; just more nicely.) In this case use of the optional funny hats would be described as helping the audience recognize when the presenter has “shifted perspectives” and is finding value in a different instrument.
- 3) **Selection of an official time keeper:** Depending on format chosen, the official timekeeper may be a volunteer audience member or one of the “competing” instrument presenters. The goal is to keep each presentation to 2 minutes or less. (We have found that 90 seconds is not unreasonable, with the 5 bullet-point format described below, for a well-prepared presenter.)
 - 4) **Presentation of each Instrument (About 2 minutes each):** Following the intro, presenters alternate describing an instrument, each with the same bullet-point format, as noted below.
 - Name of instrument
 - What it is designed to measure
 - Is it free or is there a use cost (state cost per use)?
 - An advantage it offers over other intercultural instruments
 - A disadvantage it offers as compared to other instruments

The goal of this phase is to describe each instrument in 2 minutes or less. See next page for discussion of adding optional thought-processing worksheet & post-exposition pair-share to the basic smack down exercise.

- 5) **Hand-out distribution:** At the conclusion of phase four of this exercise, a handout is shared with the audience. The handout may take one of two forms:
 - i) A list of instrument names plus HubICL sign-up info
 - ii) A chart of instruments, their five bullet-point description & where to find additional info (either their individualized HubICL location/URL or the instrument provider’s webpage).

Extending the learning:

The smack down activity was created to be a simple and fun introduction to assessment instruments. It's not intended to be complex, active-learning-oriented or a complete catalog of instrument possibilities. It has been shown to be effective in raising curiosity of practitioners about assessment.

For situations where the timing permits a bit more reflection and the possible concomitant development of learner agency, we recommend the following:

1. Introduce a **thought-processing worksheet** as part of Phase Two. This would be a simple check-off list or table with the names of the instruments and a space or spaces after each to allow the individual learner to indicate her/his/their degree of interest in using this instrument. (See visual below for a template.) Pause after each instrument description for a 30 second period to allow filling out of the form.

Item	Degree of interest (circle one only)				
Instrument name #1	Loved it	Mildly Positive	Neutral	Mildly Negative	Hated it
Instrument name #2	Loved it	Mildly Positive	Neutral	Mildly Negative	Hated it
Instrument name #3	Loved it	Mildly Positive	Neutral	Mildly Negative	Hated it

2. Introduce a 5-minute pair/share about favorite and least favorite instrument (of those discussed) based on the thought-processing worksheets, as phase six of the exercise (after distributing handouts with the bullet points).

Footer:

CILMAR info
Your contact info