Global Business Languages

Volume 25 Article 1

Co-Constructed Rubrics for Languages for Specific Purposes Assessment: Enhancing Student Engagement

Qiaona Yu
Wake Forest University

Recommended Citation

Yu, Qiaona. (2025). Co-Constructed Rubrics for Languages for Specific Purposes Assessment: Enhancing Student Engagement. *Global Business Languages*, 25, 1-18.
Available at (DOI): https://doi.org/10.4079/gbl.v25.2

Qiaona Yu
Wake Forest University

Co-Constructed Rubrics for Languages for Specific Purposes Assessment: Enhancing Student Engagement

Abstract: Implementing student-involved assessments in the context of languages for specific purposes (LSP) curricula necessitates collaboration among students, language instructors, and domain experts, due to the interdisciplinary nature of LSP. This article presents the design of a research-informed series of assessment rubrics used to evaluate tasks completed in an undergraduate Business Chinese course, including practicing job interviews, organizing multilingual community events, and delivering business proposals to domain experts. As students progressed through these performance-based assessments, the series sequentially increased students' involvement with rubric "co-construction" alongside the language instructor and domain experts. Students moved through the stages of being recipients, contributors, and finally creators of rubrics. The assessment series incorporated students' self- and peer-evaluations as well as self-reflections to further enhance student involvement. Throughout the assessment series, the LSP instructor served as the director and facilitator to provide crucial guidance. This article summarizes the strengths and challenges of the LSP assessment series, along with suggestions for further applications.

Keywords: business Chinese, interdisciplinary, languages for specific purposes, rubrics, self- and peer-evaluations, student engagement, student-involved assessment

Introduction

Languages for specific purposes (LSP) curricula address learners' need to use a second language in professional contexts by integrating language skills and content knowledge (e.g., Dursun, 2023; Lafford, 2012; Lear, 2019). Compared with general-purpose language courses, language learning in LSP curricula comes with immediate relevance to specified purposes. Language skills are contextualized in specific and professional settings and integrated with a particular subset of tasks and skills. Past decades have seen LSP courses greatly evolve, with increasingly diverse LSP course offerings such as Medical Spanish, Business Chinese, Legal Arabic, Diplomatic Korean, and so on (Long & Uzcinski, 2012; Trace, et al., 2015). Such LSP courses realize their real-life relevance through an interdisciplinary approach that involves collaboration between language instructors and domain experts from various fields to design courses, develop materials, and implement performance-based assessments (Nekrasova-Beker & Becker, 2017; Sánchez-Lopez et al., 2017).

While striving to connect closely with real-world contexts, language teaching has also aimed to foster greater student engagement within the classroom. Student-involved assessment has been widely implemented and long proven beneficial for engaging students and enhancing learning (Brown & Harris, 2014; Panadero et al., 2016; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011). Student involvement may be implemented throughout the assessment process of goal setting, task design, criteria composition, scoring, results interpretation, and feedback provision. One of the challenges in implementing student-involved assessment is to clearly communicate expectations to students. Involving students in rubric construction has been used to address this challenge. By

setting up the expected outcomes themselves, students are better able to understand those expected outcomes, have an increased sense of ownership, and ultimately demonstrate improved overall performance (e.g., Becker, 2016; Chamcharatsri, 2016; Li & Linsey, 2015). In the context of LSP curricula, student-involved assessments should build upon the existing collaboration between language instructors and domain experts. The collaborations among three stakeholders (i.e., students, instructors, and domain experts) add new dynamics to the implementation of LSP assessments. For instance, the rubric construction typically involves a time-consuming process which can lead to challenges in a time-limited classroom application (Stevens & Levi, 2005). Collaborative rubric construction by students, language instructors, and domain experts can exacerbate these challenges, requiring a deliberate design for plausible implementation.

The pedagogical innovation presented here therefore explores student-involved assessment in the LSP context by designing a co-constructed assessment series situated in a Business Chinese course. The approach featured four performance-based and rubric-referenced assessments where students complete mock job interviews, plan and host multilingual community events, and present multinational business proposals to domain experts. The assessment series integrated a rubric design which allowed domain experts, language instructors, and students to assume interactive roles in assessment design and delivery. The article concludes with a discussion of the strengths and challenges of the proposed assessment series and offers suggestions for its application.

Student-involved Assessment for Learning

Students are central decision makers in their education and should actively participate in assessments to ensure clarity, sound design, and effective communication (Chappuis & Stiggins, 2016). Student involvement in assessment can generally be described as any activity where students collect, interpret, and respond to information regarding their own learning (Chappuis, 2022). Language classrooms have widely implemented student-involved assessments to foster learning. Such assessments may take a diversified form ranging from students checking their own understanding during instruction, evaluating a peer's performance against a shared rubric, to tracking, reflecting on, and sharing learning progress and achievement. Student-involved assessments have been consistently linked to benefits like improved metacognitive skills, greater self-efficacy, and higher achievement (Andrade, 2019; Andrade & Du, 2007; Kearney, 2013). Through student involvement, the focus of assessments shifts from the instructor assigning students grades to students attaining knowledge through collaboration and mutual understanding of expectations (Shepherd, 2000). However, student-involved assessment is not always implemented appropriately. In some cases, it may not improve the quality of students' performance and could even negatively influence students' attitudes toward instruction (Covill, 2010). Andrade (2019) thus emphasized that self-assessment should be placed in a formative assessment setting to generate feedback for learners' adjustment and correction. After all, involving students in the assessment may lose its purpose if the opportunity to improve is not also provided.

Colbert and Cumming (2014) discussed student-involved assessment as a vehicle for learning within the convergence of five theoretical or paradigmatic frameworks. First, performance assessment aims to reduce inference between the assessment results in the classroom and the interpretation of students' transferable skills outside of the classroom. Second,

in performance assessment, criteria and standards are used to help students further understand expectations of quality performance and become self-directed learners in the evaluation process. Third, the effective implementation of performance-based assessment referring to clear criteria and standards necessitates viewing assessment as socially constructed. Assessments are not objective or neutral; rather, they reflect the cultural and social dynamics of the classroom as well as those of the broader society in which it operates. Fourth, the shared intentionality of criteria and standards in a socially interactive process enhances student self-regulated learning, drawing on a cognitive psychology framework for individual learning. Last, by transforming all students from passive recipients into active participants, learners are provided more equal and positive opportunities in assessment and learning.

One thread that runs through the five theoretical frameworks for student-involved assessment proposed by Colbert and Cumming (2014) is the active engagement of students in developing or updating criteria and standards. Student-involved criteria and standards construction provides an equitable socially constructed process to communicate the expectations of the performance assessment and guide students' self-regulated learning. Such criteria and standards construction often takes the form of rubric co-construction. A rubric typically lists evaluative dimensions vertically with assigned weights and lists developmental descriptors horizontally, using numerical values such as points or percentages ranging from 0% to 100%. Li and Lindsey (2015) found that students generally favor assessment that involves rubric use because rubrics help clarify expectations and thus have a positive effect on their motivation. Involving students in the rubric construction raised students' awareness of expectations, activation of learning strategies, and overall performance (Becker, 2016; Eshun & Osei-Poku, 2013; Fraile et al., 2017). In addition to progress with performance, involving students in rubric construction also shaped a democratic assessment where the power shift in the classroom was meaningful for students' ownership and involvement (Chamcharatsri, 2016; Rosenow, 2014). Besides having students co-create or solely create the rubrics, Stevens and Levi (2012) also suggested involving teaching assistants, tutors, and colleagues in rubric construction to enhance consistency in terms of expectation and evaluation, providing space for further collaboration and negotiation. They suggested four stages for the rubric construction process: reflecting, listing, grouping and labeling, and application. The rubric creators first take time to reflect on the goal of the project and the expected performance from students. Such goals and expectations may then be listed as specific learning objectives and further grouped and labeled as rubric dimensions. For each dimension, achievement levels ranging from lowest to highest (e.g., not meeting, meeting, and exceeding expectations) are then identified to construct developmental descriptors. The rubric dimensions (typically listed horizontally) and developmental descriptors (typically listed vertically) may finally be presented in a grid for application.

While involving students in rubric construction has shown a variety of benefits, it has also come with challenges. Students can perceive rubrics, as part of the assessment, as stressful and confusing (Värlander, 2008). Creating rubrics for assessment is often the instructor's sole responsibility, and thus involving students in the construction of rubrics can be perceived as shifting the burden (Masland & Gizdarka, 2018). Compared with having students contribute to the construction of rubrics, the use of exemplars to support rubrics has been found to be a more effective strategy (Bacchus, et al., 2020). The exemplars provide concrete examples which facilitate students' comprehensive understanding of the expectations. Moreover, in practice, involving different parties in such rubric construction stages can be time consuming as it may take one to two full class periods (Stevens & Levi, 2005). With the involvement of domain

experts in LSP curricula, it can take even longer and is likely to present further scheduling conflicts for rubric co-construction.

Student Involvement in Interdisciplinary LSP Assessment

The interdisciplinary nature of LSP curricula, through an integration of language skills and content knowledge, has strengthened the relevance of world language programs with real-world practices in a globalized era (Yu et al, 2020). However, the integration of language skills and content knowledge has also presented challenges to LSP instructors who are not necessarily experts in both language teaching and the respective content area. In response, LSP research and practice has investigated various approaches to facilitate the interdisciplinary design of LSP curricula. Needs analysis, driven by a task-based language teaching approach, addresses LSP instructors' lack of interdisciplinary expertise by including different stakeholders (e.g., domain experts, language learners, and school administrators) from the very early stage of identifying target tasks to teach (Long, 2014). Domain analysis, though driven by test validity, shares a similar practice of including experts from the target domain. By doing so, domain analysis systematically identifies the knowledge, skills, and abilities that LSP education should include, in order to make evidence-based assessment claims about the target domain (Riconscente et al., 2016).

Moving from curricular design to delivery, varied forms of interdisciplinary collaborations during course delivery have also been investigated (Gonglewski & Helm, 2020; Huempfner, 2020). At the course design level, Yu et al. (2020) outlined an interdisciplinary collaboration taxonomy that categorized and explicated LSP collaborations at resource, project, course, and program levels. In their provided examples, LSP instructors conducted intra- and extra-institutional collaboration with different partners at varying scales to increase the interdisciplinarity of Business Chinese, Business French, and Medical Spanish courses, as well as a minor in Latin American Studies for technical applications. Exploring interdisciplinary practice in a Business Chinese course, Yu (2019) advocated for sustained collaboration from course design to assessment delivery between language instructors and domain experts following a task-based and community-engaged model. Yu argued that domain experts should not only contribute during course development by identifying key teaching content but also participate in co-constructing assessment rubrics, administering performance-based assessments, and evaluating student performance.

Student-involved assessment in the LSP context requires a deliberate design considering the existing collaboration between language instructors and domain experts. On the one hand, like general-purpose language classes, students are given opportunities to share their perspectives and assess their own performance by participating in rubric construction, conducting self- and peer-evaluations, and reflecting on their own performance. On the other hand, students may encounter increased challenges in participating in rubric co-construction and regulating their learning while developing both language skills and domain expertise. In addition, the inclusion of domain experts may complicate the dynamics of social construction and equity of assessment. Student-involved interdisciplinary LSP assessment therefore requires an iterative design to sequentially incorporate students' voices in rubric constructions. Tasks for students should also be sequentially scaffolded to develop LSP rubrics for which they may not necessarily be equipped with expertise.

An Interdisciplinary Co-constructed LSP Assessment Series

The design of a co-constructed assessment series presented here was crafted referring to the theoretical review on student involvement in LSP assessment, outlined above. It was implemented as a pilot project in a Business Chinese course at a mid-sized private research university with around 60 students enrolled in the undergraduate Chinese program. The course counts as an elective towards the Chinese major and minor, as well as a minor in global trade and commerce studies. The course appeals to students who are interested in using Chinese language in professional development. All enrolled students (ranging from 4-10 students each semester) are required to have completed the third-year college level Chinese courses, and their proficiency levels ranged from intermediate-mid to advanced-low on American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Proficiency Guidelines (ACTFL, 2024). During the semester when the assessment series was piloted, a total of four students were enrolled.

Interdisciplinary Performance Assessment Series

The pilot of the interdisciplinary LSP assessment series consisted of four performance-based projects (see Table 1) that reflect real-world applications. In Project 1, *Mock Interview*, every student was interviewed to compete for a position at the Event Planning/Activities Department in a multinational corporation based in China. The one-on-one mock interviews were administered by an invited domain expert with experience working as a multinational business professional. The evaluation of students' performance was a collaboration between the instructor and the domain expert.

Table 1
An Outline of the Performance Assessment and Students' Role in the Rubric Co-construction

Projects	Students' Role in the Rubric Co-construction
Project 1. *Mock Interview*	Recipients of Rubric 1
Project 2. *Chinese Culture Club Weekly Event Proposal*	Contributors (edited Rubric 2)
Project 3. *Chinese Culture Club Weekly Event Hosting*	Creators (solely created Rubric 3)
Project 4. *Multinational Business Proposal*	Students' choice (students could choose to co-edit, solely create, or receive an edit-ready Rubric 4)

To progress through the series, each student was assumed to have accepted the position in the Event Planning/Activities Department, and Projects 2 and 3 were designed in sequence for event planning and hosting. Students worked in pairs to each claim one weekly event on the Chinese Culture Club (CCC) event schedule, based on their time availability. At the university where the course is offered, the CCC is a student organization that hosts events mainly involving Chinese learners and Chinese international students on campus. It organizes weekly events such as a scavenger hunt, where student groups search on campus to retrieve the hidden items (e.g., an inspiring Chinese proverb) following the provided bilingual clues; a mahjong workshop, where students learn to recognize the mahjong tiles and play the game; and a dumpling DIY event where students wrap, cook, and enjoy dumplings together. For Project 2, *CCC Weekly Event Proposal*, each student pair chose one of the CCC events to plan and then gave a 15-minute

presentation on their event proposals followed by a 5-minute Q&A session. Students could seek and incorporate feedback from Project 2 to improve their performance on Project 3. As for Project 3, *CCC Weekly Event Hosting*, students actually executed their plan from Project 2 to host their CCC event.

Upon completion of Projects 2 and 3, students then transitioned from the Event Planning/Activities Department to the Marketing Department within the same multinational corporation. For Project 4, *Multinational Business Proposal*, students switched partners to develop and present a 20-minute business proposal followed by a 5-minute Q&A. The proposal required students to identify a product or service that is not shared between the Chinese and American market, so they could either introduce a Chinese product to American consumers or an American product to Chinese consumers.

Increased Student Involvement in Assessment

All four interdisciplinary performance-based projects (Projects 1-4) were designed to involve students before, during, and after the assessment. Before the assessment, students participated in the rubric co-construction and sequentially increased their involvement as they progressed from the role of recipient to contributor and then to creator of rubrics across the four projects. During the assessment, students conducted self- and peer-evaluations referring to the respective rubrics, starting with Project 2. After they performed each project but before receiving their grade, students completed self-reflections on their performance and involvement in assessments.

Student Co-constructed Rubrics

Student performance in the four interdisciplinary projects was evaluated by referring to the co-constructed rubrics. The sequenced rubric co-construction approach allowed students to use previous rubrics as models that they could build on, instead of having to develop each rubric anew following each stage—reflection, listing, grouping and labeling, and application (Stevens & Levi, 2012)—gradually allowing them a greater role in the construction process.

To guide students' preparation for Project 1, they were provided with Rubric 1, designed by the instructor in collaboration with an experienced bilingual business manager who also served as the interviewing officer. The rubric emphasized both job interview skills in a business context and communicative effectiveness using Chinese. The rubric dimensions range from "appearance appropriate for a job interview," valued at 5 points, to "answers emphasize how the applicant matches the position," valued at 30 points (see the full rubric in Appendix A, adapted from the "Job Interview Rubric" in Yu (2019, p.182).

At the beginning of Project 2, students were provided with an incomplete version of Rubric 2. Specifically, this rubric had dimensions listed and weights assigned but was missing the developmental descriptors (see Appendix B). The dimensions and weights ranged from "attire and appearance appropriate for a professional presentation," valued at 10 points, to "delivery (e.g., Chinese speaking, facial expression, eye contact, body language) is clear and engaging for the presentation and Q&A," valued at 40 points. Students worked collaboratively on a Google Doc to fill out the developmental descriptors along the dimensions from 0-100%. The instructor decided on the granularity of the developmental descriptors. One option is to provide four scales of 0-40%, 41-60%, 61-80%, and 81-100%. In this case, students could be

advised to compose the developmental descriptors from the two ends at the scales of 0-40% and 81-100% and then work towards the middle to compose descriptors on the scales of 41-60% and 61-80%. Alternatively, the rubric may provide fewer scales. For example, a three-scale version could include *approaching the expectation*s, *meeting the expectations*, and *exceeding the expectations*, or a two-scale version could include *not meeting the expectation*s and *meeting the expectations*. Scales with higher granularity may provide students more differentiation of performance expectation and push them to further envision how their actual performance may look. Scales with lower granularity may reduce the time required for descriptor composition when there are constraints.

Since Projects 2 and 3 are close-knit in nature, students were later asked to create Rubric 3 on their own while they were still working on completing Project 2. Students were given time in class to collaboratively create Rubric 3 by referring to their experience attending and/or organizing student events, as well as their knowledge of exemplar rubrics from this and other classes. The rubric creation started with identifying the evaluative dimensions, and then filling in the developmental descriptors from the ends to the middle. The instructor provided suggestions during the students' rubric creation. Upon students' completion of Rubric 3, the instructor suggested further edits based on feedback received from domain experts at the Project 2 proposal presentation.[1]

During their editing and creating of Rubrics 2 and 3, students used both Chinese and English to communicate in order to fully utilize their bilingual resources. After experiencing different roles in rubric construction from Projects 1-3, students could choose to co-edit, solely create, or receive an edit-ready Rubric 4. Rubrics for Projects 1-3 were all written in English. For Rubric 4, students were given the option to create Rubric 4 in English, Chinese, or a translanguaging version mixing English and Chinese; however, all students opted to co-edit Rubric 4 in English using the Rubric 2 model. (An example of Rubric 4, adapted from Yu (2019) can be found in Appendix C.)

Self- and Peer-Evaluations

For Project 1, *Mock Interview*, students were provided with Rubric 1 (see Appendix A) in advance to prepare for their performance. All students conducted their interview individually without seeing others' performance. Student performance was evaluated by the interviewing officer and language instructor using Rubric 1. Students were not involved in the evaluation of their Project 1 performance.

For Projects 2-4, students paired up to collaborate inside and outside of class with different domain experts present in the audience. For Project 2, students' event proposal presentations, including Q&As, were attended not only by the language instructor and classmates, but also by Chinese teaching assistants who facilitate the Chinese Culture Club, Chinese-speaking executive board members of student clubs, and Chinese faculty with experience in student event organization. For Project 3, students executed their Project 2

[1] Potential Rubric 3 evaluative dimensions may consist of (1) advertisement: timeline, mediums, reached population, information (20 points); (2) event implementation: event structure and timing, room reservation, food/prizes (25 points); (3) engagement materials: handouts, clues, multimedia materials (15 points); (4) host delivery: speaking, facial expressions, eye contact (20 points); (5) attendees' feedback (20 points); and (6) creativity and collaboration (up to 5 extra points).

proposals and hosted events designed for Chinese speakers and learners across the campus. The language instructor, domain experts, and/or other classmates also attended the events. For Project 4, students presented their multinational business proposals that aimed to introduce an American product to the Chinese market or vice versa, with an audience including the instructor, domain experts (e.g., business school faculty, multinational business professional), and the class.

For Projects 2-4, the involved domain experts, the instructor, and students all evaluated the performance of different groups referring to the corresponding rubrics. Evaluations by the instructor and domain experts were weighted at 70% of the students' final grade, while students' rubric-referenced self- and peer-evaluations counted for 30% of their final grades. While the evaluations by domain experts and students were group-based, the instructor's evaluations were individually-based. In addition to numeric grading referring to the rubrics, every evaluator, including the students, was required to provide constructive feedback.

Self-Reflections

In addition to conducting self- and peer-evaluations by referring to the co-constructed rubrics, students also carried out self-reflections throughout the assessment series. Similar to the rubric co-construction process and rubrics themselves, the reflections could be completed in English, Chinese, or a translanguaging version in order to allow students to take advantage of their bilingual resources.

Student reflections could take a variety of forms to cover the overall learning experience or focus on specific issues. General reflections on the learning experience were completed monthly throughout the semester. The instructor provided a few prompting questions for students to reflect on their achieved progress and encountered challenges. Students also used the reflections as an opportunity to communicate with the instructor the support they hoped to receive and their suggestions for the class. The instructor responded to students' reflections in text or audio comments on the Canvas learning management system. Such comments typically included encouraging feedback and answers to students' questions.

In addition to general reflections, students were prompted to reflect on specific issues. For instance, students reflected on their involvement in assessment through collaborative rubric co-construction and self-/peer-assessment. Different from the general reflections, the specific reflections were completed anonymously via an online survey tool to encourage honest opinions. Anonymity enhanced equity by encouraging students to express different and even opposing opinions from what was practiced in the class.[2] Students were prompted to reflect on their experience with rubric construction and rubric-referenced assessments multiple times throughout the process. Reflection tasks were typically short with mostly close-ended questions, which allowed students to complete them within a few minutes.

Instructor as Director and Facilitator

Through this pedagogical approach to involving students in self-/peer-review, rubric co-construction, and self-reflection, students gain sequentially increased control as they proceed

[2] The timing of such specific reflection also matters. Reflections on the student-involved assessment experience may be conducted after students complete projects but before they receive their grades. Such sequencing may help students to focus more on their experience and less on the grades.

with the assessment series. As a result, the instructor can step back from the center of the classroom to serve the vital role of a director and facilitator, in the following ways.

The instructor first coordinated the involvement of intra- and extra-institutional domain experts and partner organizations. For Project 1, the instructor identified and invited a multinational business professional in the local community to collaboratively compose Rubric 1. The instructor then scheduled a class period that also worked for the domain expert to come in and conduct the mock interviews. For universities located in areas with less available domain experts, remote interviews conducted virtually may be an alternative. Prior to the mock interviews, it is important for the instructor to introduce and establish the domain expert's qualifications, in order to get student buy-in for the domain expert's aptitude and competency in the interview process. After the mock interviews, if the schedule allows, the instructor may invite the domain expert back, in person or virtually, to debrief students on their performance for future improvement. For Projects 2-4, the instructor identified domain experts on campus among teaching assistants, who facilitate students' event hosting, as well as faculty and staff members in the same language program, business school, entrepreneurship center, or other related programs. In addition to identifying and coordinating with domain experts, the instructor also assisted with coordination between students and the CCC. Since the Business Chinese course counts towards the Chinese major and minor, it is likely that some students in the class also serve on the Executive Board of the CCC and can greatly facilitate the communication between the two groups.

In addition to communicating with domain experts and partner organizations, the instructor also directed and facilitated students' involvement in the assessment with a focus on rubric co-construction. For Project 1, the instructor guided students' comprehension of Rubric 1 by asking them to use the rubric to jointly evaluate interview samples from previous classes and then their own interview rehearsals in class. As students moved on to collaboratively edit and create Rubrics 2 and 3, it was crucial for them to receive guidance from the instructor regarding category identification, weight assignment, and developmental description composition. The instructor first reminded students to refer to the previous rubrics as exemplars, identify the differences between the projects and rubrics, and adapt the rubric accordingly. Next, during students' collaborative rubric co-construction process, the instructor asked questions to remind students of important issues, encouraged deliberations and discussions on disagreements, and monitored the process to increase time efficiency. When students struggled between a manageable rubric (for better grades) and a valid rubric (for better performance guidance), the instructor played a key role of director and facilitator to mediate different perspectives. After domain experts attended the Project 2 presentation, the instructor then elicited and summarized domain experts' input on Rubric 3. Finally, the instructor communicated with students to decide whether and how to incorporate domain experts' input in order to further revise Rubric 3. For Rubric 4, the instructor provided students with reflection questions to compare their different experiences regarding rubrics and reach an agreement about its co-construction format.

Strengths and Challenges

Piloting the design-in-progress assessment series in the Business Chinese class demonstrated its potential strengths in fostering student involvement, supported by student feedback from the anonymous course evaluation, student reflections, as well as the instructor's observation. First, students reported feeling engaged in their learning, seeing that the

interdisciplinary performance assessments facilitated their bridging LSP classroom learning with real life applications. One student comment stated, "*We are given activities that mirror real-life circumstances that we may meet in our professional development rather than just testing our mastery of vocabulary and grammar standards.*" Another student noted, "*This class tied class concepts to the Chinese business world and the Chinese market very well. Using Chinese to complete projects and presentations greatly prepared me for working in China in the future if I choose to.*" Second, the student-involved rubric co-construction enhanced assessment equity in criteria and standards setting by facilitating students' increased autonomy and sense of ownership, as one commented, "*If my thoughts and ideas are included in the rubric that we are using to grade, my preparation and ownership will likely be higher due how I perceive the event. For instance, I would think of the event as more than simply an assignment I need to complete for a class and take more ownership in its overall success*." Third, the sequential design effectively gave students a formative process to increase their involvement from rubric recipients, to contributors, to creators. As reflected by students, assignments were scaffolded so that students could tap into their multidisciplinary knowledge, including their "*experience attending and/or organizing events*," "*knowledge of rubrics from other classes (e.g., business management, marketing)*," and "*knowledge of rubrics from this course*". This way, not all the stakeholders (i.e., domain experts, instructor, students) were required to be present at the same time and to go through the time-consuming four stages of reflecting, listing, grouping and labeling, and application, as outlined by Stevens and Levi (2012). Fourth, students were able to fully tap into their multilingual resources in rubric co-constructions, self- and peer-evaluations, and self-reflections. Indeed, students were continuously engaged by being prompted to reflect on their experience multiple times and to communicate with the instructor throughout the assessment series.

The assessment series pilot project undoubtedly faced challenges. By stepping back from the center of the classroom, for example, the instructor took on additional responsibilities as a director and facilitator. During the rubric co-construction process, the instructor strived for a balance between allowing the students to take control and providing guidance considering the time-consuming nature of rubric construction and students' lack of experience. Such a balance may be achieved by reminding students of the important aspects, steering the rubric co-construction process, and updating the rubric by incorporating the input from domain experts. Overall, the key is for the instructor to build trust with students. Trust enables the instructor to be confident in students' pursuit of better performance and improved skills rather than merely higher grades. The trust also enables students to believe that the instructor's suggested revisions to the rubric will guide their achievement for improved performance despite the potential for increased assessment difficulty or lowered grades.

Conclusion

Aligned with the student-centered approach inherent in interdisciplinary LSP curricular design (Long, 2017), this article presented an interdisciplinary rubric co-constructed LSP assessment series piloted with the aim of enhancing student involvement in LSP courses. The assessment series design is a work in progress that utilizes the theoretical framework of student-involved assessment in LSP courses, with preliminary insights from its pilot implementation in one Business Chinese course with limited student enrollment. This assessment approach may be adaptable to various LSP courses that require multidisciplinary collaboration involving domain

experts alongside the language instructor. By tailoring the performance assessment to suit other interdisciplinary contexts (e.g., Business French, Medical Spanish), the complete series can be implemented. This includes sequential student-involved rubric co-construction with the language instructor and domain experts, students' self-/peer-evaluations and self-reflections, and the evolving role of the language instructor as a director and facilitator. Studies are needed to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of this approach, using comprehensive data from a range of LSP courses where language intersects with different disciplines.

Acknowledgement: This manuscript is part of a project that was funded by a 2023 Centers for International Business Education and Research (CIBER) Business Language Research and Teaching grant. The author's profound gratitude goes to the 16 CIBER US Department of Education grants.

References

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2024). *Proficiency guidelines.* https://www.actfl.org/uploads/files/general/Resources-Publications/ACTFL_Proficiency_Guidelines_2024.pdf

Andrade, H. L. (2019). A critical review of research on student self-assessment, *Frontiers in Education*, *4*(87), 1–13.

Andrade, H., & Y. Du. (2007). Student responses to criteria-referenced self-assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *32*(2), 159–181.

Andrade, H. L., & Brown, G. T. L. (2016). Student self-assessment in the classroom. In G. T. L., Brown & L. R. Harris (Eds.), *Handbook of human and social conditions in assessment* (pp. 319–334). Routledge.

Bacchus, R., Colvin, E., Knight, E. B., & Ritter, L. (2020). When rubrics aren't enough: Exploring exemplars and student rubric co-construction. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, *17*(1), 48–61.

Becker, A. (2016). Student-generated scoring rubrics: Examining their formative value for improving ESL students' writing performance. *Assessing Writing*, *29*, 15–24.

Brown, G. T. L., & Harris, L. R. (2014). The future of self-assessment in classroom practice: reframing self-assessment as a core competency. *Frontline Learning Research, 3*, 22–30.

Chappuis, J. (2022). *Student involvement in assessment.* Routledge.

Chamcharatsri, B. (2016). Student-generated rubric assessment: A meaningful literacy practice. *Journal of Assessment & Teaching of English Language Learners*, *1*, 50–60.

Colbert, P., & Cumming, J. J. (2014). Enabling all students to learn through assessment: A case study of equitable outcomes achieved through the use of criteria and standards. In C. Wyatt-Smith, V. Klenowsi, & P. Colbert (Eds.), *Designing assessment for quality learning* (pp. 211-231). Springer.

Covill, A. E. (2010). Comparing peer review and self-review as ways to improve college students' writing. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *42*(2), 199–226.

Dursun, A. (2023). Domain analysis as a multidimensional research framework: Evidence-based alignment for LSP research, assessment, and curricula. *Global Business Languages*, *23*, 1–13.

Eshun, E. F., & Osei-Poku, P. (2013). Design students perspectives on assessment rubric in studio-based learning. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *10*(1), 1–13.

Fraile, J., Panadero, E., & Pardo, R. (2017). Co-creating rubrics: The effects on self-regulated learning, self-efficacy and performance of establishing assessment criteria with students. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *53*, 69–76.

Gonglewski, M., & Helm, A. H. (2020). Real-client projects in the LSP classroom: Business and German students teamworking across disciplines. *Global Business Languages*, *20*, 110–123.

Huempfner, L. (2020). Designing an intermediate-level introductory legal Spanish course. *Global Business Languages*, *20*(1), 86–107.

Kearney, S. (2013). Improving engagement: the use of 'Authentic self-and peer-assessment for learning' to enhance the student learning experience. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *38*(7), 875–891.

Lafford, B. A. (2012). Languages for specific purposes in the United States in a global context: Commentary on Grosse and Voght (1991) revisited. *The Modern Language Journal*, *96*, 1–27.

Lear, D. (2019). *Integrating career preparation into language courses*. Georgetown University Press.

Li, J., & Lindsey, P. (2015). Understanding variations between student and teacher application of rubrics. *Assessing writing*, *26*, 67–79.

Long, M. (2014). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. John Wiley & Sons.

Long, M. K. (2017). Introduction: LSP studies and the creation of translingual and transcultural competence. In M. Long (Ed.), *Language for specific purposes: Trends in curriculum development* (pp. 1-12). Georgetown University Press.

Long, M. K., & Uzcinski, I. (2012). Evolution of language for specific purposes programs in the United States: 1990-2011, *Modern Language Journal*, *96*(s1), 173–189.

Masland, L., & Gizdarska, S. (2018). "Then what am I paying you for?". Student attitudes regarding pre-class activities for the flipped classroom. *International Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education*, *30*, 234–244.

Nekrasova-Beker, T., & Becker, A. (2017). Integrating project-based learning into English for specific-purposes classrooms. In M. Long (Ed.), *Languages for specific purposes: Trends in curriculum development* (pp.101–126). Georgetown University Press.

Panadero, E., Brown, G. L., & Strijbos, J.-W. (2016). The future of student self-assessment: a review of known unknowns and potential directions. *Educational Psychology Review*, *28*(4), 803–830.

Riconscente, M. M., Mislevy, R. J., & Corrigan, S. (2016). Evidence-centered design. In S. Lane, M. R. Raymond, & M. Haladyna (Eds.), *Handbook of test development* (2nd Edition) (pp. 40–63). Routledge.

Rosenow, C. 2014. Collaborative design: Building task-specific rubrics in the honors classroom. *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council*, *15*(2), 31–34.

Sánchez-Lopez, L., Long, M., & Lafford, B. (2017). New directions in LSP research in US higher education. In M. Long (Ed.), *Languages for specific purposes: Trends in curriculum development* (pp.13–36). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Shepherd, L.A. (2000). The role of assessment in learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, *29*(7), 4–14.

Stevens, D. D., & Levi, A. (2005). Leveling the field: Using rubrics to achieve greater equity in teaching and grading. *Essays on Teaching Excellence, Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education*, *17*(1), 1–30.

Stevens, D. D., & Levi, A. J. (2012). *Introduction to rubrics: An assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback, and promote student learning* (2nd Edition). Routledge.

Trace, J., Hudson, T., & Brown, J. D. (2015). *Developing courses in languages for specific purposes*. NFLRC University of Hawai'i.

Värlander, S. (2008). The role of students' emotions in formal feedback situations. *Teaching in Higher Education, 13*(2), 145–156.

Yu, Q. (2019). Designing a task-based and community-engaged business Chinese course. In H. Chen & H. Tao (Eds.), *Chinese for specific and professional purposes: Theory, pedagogical applications, and practices* (pp. 167–186). Singapore: Springer.

Yu, Q., Vincent, A. S., Merfeld-Langston, A., & Pérez-Muñoz, C. (2020). Collaborating across organizational lines in language for specific purposes, *Global Business Languages*, *20*, 2–17. http://dx.doi.org/10.4079/gbl.v20.1

Zimmerman, B.J., & Schunk, D. H. (2011). Self-regulated learning and performance: an introduction and overview. In D.H. Schunk, & B.J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 1–14). New York, NY: Routledge.

Appendix A

Rubric 1 for Project 1 Job Interview
(Adapted from Appendix A. Job Interview Rubric in Yu (2019, p.182)

Criteria	0-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81%-100%
Appearance appropriate for a job interview (5%)	Overall appearance is untidy; choice in clothing is inappropriate	Appearance is somewhat untidy; choice in clothing is inappropriate	Overall neat appearance; choice in clothing is acceptable	Overall appearance and clothing are very neat and professional
Demonstrates confidence and appropriate etiquette (e.g., handshake, seat taking, room exiting) (15%)	Displays little confidence, demonstrates no courteousness or knowledge of interview etiquette	Demonstrates limited interview etiquette in a generally confident manner	Demonstrates average interview etiquette in a generally confident manner	Demonstrates great etiquette in an enthusiastic, motivating and engaging manner
Attitude shows interviewees' engagement to the interview process (20%)	Lacks interest in the employer; passive and indifferent about the interview	Shows some interest in the employer; shows little enthusiasm about the interview	Shows average interest in the employer and some enthusiasm about the interview	Shows great interest in the employer and enthusiasm about the interview process
Answers emphasize how the applicant matches the position (30%)	Answers show no knowledge of the position and employer	Answers randomly touch upon the match between the applicant and the position	Answers provide some facts how the applicant is a fit for the position and employer	Answers provide evident facts how the applicant is a good fit for the position and employer
Communication is clear and concise (15%)	Speaking is unclear; very difficult to gain the message of what is being said	Conveys some ideas with low accuracy in vocabulary, grammar, and style	Speaking is mostly clear with some mistakes in vocabulary, grammar, and style	Speaks clearly and distinctly with minimal errors in vocabulary, grammar, and style
Answers are well structured and concise; Do not sound as rehearsed or unsure (15%)	Answers with "yes" or "no" and fails to elaborate or explain; talks negatively about past employers	Gives well-constructed responses, but sounds rehearsed or unsure	Gives well-constructed responses, does not sound rehearsed, student somewhat hesitant or unsure	Gives well-constructed, confident responses that are genuine

Appendix B

Rubric 2 for Project 2

Criteria	0-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81%-100%
Attire and appearance appropriate for a professional presentation (10%)				
Content emphasizes a thorough background research, effective advertising, organized plan for the event, and applicable timeline (30%)				
Quality of visual aids (e.g., slides, flyer, mini-video for social media) (20%)				
Delivery (e.g., Chinese speaking, facial expression, eye contact, body language) is clear and engaging for the presentation and Q&A (40%)				
Creativity and collaboration (extra 5%)				

Appendix C

Rubric for Multinational Marketing Proposal Presentation
(Adapted from Yu, 2019, p. 183)

策划人 [*Planner*][3] _____ 评分人 [*Reviewer*] _____

	强烈同意 [*Strongly agree*] (5 分)	比较同意 [*Somewhat agree*] (4 分)	同意 [*Agree*] (3 分)	比较反对 [*Somewhat disagree*] (2 分)	强烈反对 [*Strongly disagree*] (1 分)
1. 该营销方案有很清楚的公司业务和目标 [*The proposal demonstrates clear business goals and objectives*]					
2. 该营销方案有很清楚的产品用途和好处 [*The proposal clearly introduces the function and value of the product*]					
3. 该组同学的营销方案对当地的市场和消费心理了解得很清楚 [*The proposal shows a comprehensive understanding of the local market and consumers*]					
4. 该营销方案使用了合适的销售渠道和销售策略 [*The proposal engages applicable sales channels and strategies*]					
5. 该营销方案中的宣传方案 (海报、视频广告、网络宣传等) 很吸引人 [*The advertising plan engages effective means (e.g., poster, video, internet)*]					
6. 该营销方案报告的语言使用很准确 [*The presentation uses accurate language*]					
7. 该营销方案报告使用了有表现力的语言 [*The presentation uses sophisticated and expressive language*]					
8. 该组同学在报告后的问答环节中清楚地回答了提问 [*The presenters clearly answer the questions in the Q&A*]					
总分 [*Total score*]**：**					
其他评论或建议 [*Other comments and suggestions*]:					

[3] The rubric students receive in class may be written in Chinese with some glossaries added. The English translation was added in Yu (2019).