



LAS Links® Español
ACTFL-Aligned Cut Scores
Standard Setting
Methodology and Results

LAS Links Español
Grades 6–12

Version 2.0

Version 1.0 of this document was published in April 2023. Version 2.0 was published in May 2026.

Developed and published by Data Recognition Corporation, 13490 Bass Lake Road, Maple Grove, MN 55311. Copyright © 2023–2026 by Data Recognition Corporation. All rights reserved. LAS and LAS Links are registered trademarks of Data Recognition Corporation. No part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

ACTFL is a registered trademark of the American Council on Teaching of Foreign Language. LAS Links Español and the LAS Links Español ACTFL-aligned cut scores are not sponsored by or affiliated with ACTFL.

Table of Contents

Summary	4
Background.....	4
About LAS Links Español.....	5
About the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines	5
The Standard Setting.....	5
Yes/No Angoff Method	5
ACTFL Proficiency Threshold Students	6
Materials	6
Staff	6
Workshop Participants	6
Workshop Process.....	7
Results.....	9
Participants' Recommendations After Round 2	9
Suggested Uses of the ACTFL-Aligned Cut Scores.....	10
LAS Links Español and ACTFL.....	10
Considerations for Novice Low.....	10
Application of Cut Scores to Grade Span 6–8.....	11
References.....	12
Appendix A: Domain-Specific Cut Scores	13
LAS Links Español and ACTFL.....	13

Summary

On October 24–28, 2022, Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) sponsored a standard setting study for LAS Links® Español. The purpose of the study was to develop cut scores (passing scores) for LAS Links Español that align to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL®) proficiency guidelines. Specifically, the study sought to develop cut scores that aligned to the proficiency levels *Novice Low (Principiante Bajo)* through *Advanced High (Avanzado Alto)*.

The standard setting study engaged an international committee of six language educators in the Yes/No Angoff procedure (Impara & Plake, 1997) to recommend ACTFL-aligned cut scores for the test.

During the online, five-day workshop, educators (a) discussed the expectations for students in each ACTFL proficiency level and (b) recommended cut scores. Their domain-specific cut score recommendations were combined into a single set of *Overall* cut scores, which may be applied to two grade spans: grade span 9–12 and grade span 6–8. The *Overall* scale score ranges associated with each ACTFL proficiency level are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. ACTFL-aligned scale ranges for the LAS Links Español Overall composite score

Test Score	Scale Ranges							
	Novice Low & Mid	Novice High	Inter. Low	Inter. Mid	Inter. High	Adv. Low	Adv. Mid	Adv. High
Overall	0–417	418–450	451–475	476–526	527–568	569–612	613–670	671–999

This document describes the standard setting process and results. Guidance for how to properly interpret the results of ACTFL-aligned cut scores for LAS Links Español are found at the conclusion of the document.

Background

In the United States, Spanish is the most studied world language: nearly 70% of K–12 student enrollments in world language programs are for those in Spanish (American Councils for International Education, 2017). The successful acquisition of an additional language calls for careful monitoring as students progress in their learning. One way schools monitor students' Spanish-language proficiency is by administering LAS Links Español, the leading test of Spanish-language proficiency currently available.

Although LAS Links and LAS Links Español have their own proficiency standards with associated cut scores and proficiency level definitions, many educators and administrators seek to describe students' language proficiency using the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. Therefore, DRC implemented the standard setting described in this white paper to provide LAS Links Español users with cut scores that are linked to the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines.

About LAS Links Español

LAS Links Español is a research-based assessment of Spanish-language proficiency. Two parallel forms of the test have been published: Form Español A and Form Español B. These forms are available in five different grade spans: K–1, 2–3, 4–5, 6–8, and 9–12. The test items for each grade span are designed to measure developmentally appropriate language skills with special emphasis on academic language, the language needed to access instruction in the K-12 classroom. To this end, LAS Links Español measures students' language proficiency in four key domains: listening (*escuchando*), speaking (*hablando*), reading (*lectura*), and writing (*escrita*). Students' scores from these four domains are averaged to create a single composite score called Overall.

DRC, along with former publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill, has published language assessments for K–12 students for decades, starting with the Language Assessment Scales (LAS®) and then LAS Links® (CTB/McGraw-Hill, 2013). The Second Edition of LAS Links was published in 2013 in both English and Spanish. LAS Links Español has the same structure and measurement philosophy as the English-language version, LAS Links. However, LAS Links Español is not a simple translation of LAS Links. Although the two testing programs share many commonalities, one may view LAS Links Español as a *transadaptation* of LAS Links: the test items and the language skills measured by LAS Links Español specifically reflect the types of Spanish-language skills that students acquire in both social and academic settings.

About the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines

The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines have been informing language learning in the United States since 1986 (ACTFL, 2012). The Guidelines describe an individual's language abilities in terms of speaking, writing, listening, and reading, and identifies five major levels of proficiency: Novice, Intermediate, Advanced, Superior, and Distinguished. Within the levels Novice, Intermediate, and Advanced, there are sublevels of Low, Mid, and High. The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines span the full continuum of Spanish language proficiency, and presents a valuable instrument for the evaluation of functional language ability.

At the standard setting, DRC sought to establish cut scores that: (a) reflected the expectations summarized in the ACTFL proficiency guidelines, (b) linked students' scores on the tests to these expectations, and (c) were appropriate for each domain and grade span.

A total of eight cut scores were established to define nine performance levels: *Novice Low*, *Novice Mid*, *Novice High*, *Intermediate Low*, *Intermediate Mid*, *Intermediate High*, *Advanced Low*, *Advanced Mid*, and *Advanced High*.

The Standard Setting

Yes/No Angoff Method

The Yes/No Angoff method was selected for the LAS Links Español ACTFL standard setting. The Yes/No Angoff method is a modification of the modified Angoff (1971) procedure, one of the most frequently

implemented methods to establish performance standards on educational assessments. In the Yes/No method, panelists are directed to make a dichotomous (“yes” or “no”) judgment about whether the hypothetical threshold examinees would be able to answer each question correctly. The Yes/No Angoff method is well-suited to assessments like the LAS Links Español.

The materials used at the standard setting workshop were based on empirical test data from LAS Links Español, as well as English- and Spanish-language versions of the ACTFL proficiency guidelines.

ACTFL Proficiency Threshold Students

The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines have three major levels Novice, Intermediate, and Advanced, that are subdivided into Low, Mid, and High, (e.g., Novice Low, Novice Mid, and Novice High). Each major level describes a specific range of abilities in terms of speaking, writing, listening, and reading.

At the standard setting workshop, participants thought deeply about the skills and abilities of the eight threshold students (Novice Mid, Novice High, Intermediate Low, Intermediate Mid, Intermediate High, Advanced Low, Advanced Mid, and Advanced High). A threshold student is a student that is just entering a proficiency level.

Materials

Participants were provided support materials to successfully engage in the Yes/No Angoff process. Materials included: student test forms of 17-30 items, item maps summarizing information about the items in a test form (item number and answer key), rubrics and associated scoring guides, the ACTFL proficiency guidelines, and a collaborative space to draft threshold descriptors.

As participants studied these items, they considered the Spanish-language skills that students needed to answer an item correctly. The test also contains constructed-response items worth multiple points. As participants studied these items, they used the items and associated scoring guides (rubrics) to consider the Spanish-language skills that students needed to earn the first score point, and then they considered the additional knowledge and skills needed to earn two points, and so on.

Staff

Staff members from DRC served as facilitators and in support roles throughout the standard setting. These staff members did not contribute to the cut score recommendations during the workshop. They were responsible for facilitating the workshop, training participants, entering participant results into a database, performing data analyses, and tracking secure materials. Experts in language testing from DRC were present throughout the workshop and worked with participants to provide specialist support.

Workshop Participants

The committee comprised a purposeful mix of educators with a variety of backgrounds. Special care was taken to promote diversity among participants in terms of background and location.

Before the workshop, participants were asked to describe their background and demographics. Based on these self-reported characteristics, all six of the participants were women; five were white and one preferred not to indicate her race; and two were of Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin. All six were proficient in both Spanish and English.

Of the six participants, four were currently employed as educational consultants, one as a Spanish-language teacher, and one as a school-level administrator. All six participants held a bachelor's degree or higher, and five held a master's or professional degree. Four of the participants had worked in education for more than 20 years, and all six worked in education for more than 10 years.

Workshop Process

The standard setting workshop took place over a five-day period on Zoom. All participants began the workshop with an opening session and training led by DRC. Participants understood that they would consider the Spanish-language skills expected of students in each proficiency level, and they would engage in the Yes/No Angoff method to make cut score judgments.

The participants read the ACTFL proficiency guidelines to consider the Spanish-language skills that students were expected to demonstrate at the threshold of each proficiency level and engaged in discussions about the Spanish-language skills they expected to be demonstrated by each of the eight threshold students. The eight threshold students were just in each ACTFL proficiency level, from just *Novice Mid* to just *Advanced High*. Participants recorded their expectations for students at the thresholds of each ACTFL proficiency level on electronic whiteboards. Participants were encouraged to review these descriptions frequently throughout the workshop and to consider the threshold students when they made their Yes/No ratings. By the end of this discussion, participants had thoroughly considered the ACTFL proficiency guidelines and threshold students; and they reached an understanding of the types of skills that the threshold student for each proficiency level should have.

Participants then examined the tests in terms of what each item measured. Participants were instructed to take notes on the item maps about the Spanish-language skills required to answer the items correctly.

On the morning of day 2, DRC gave additional training for Yes/No Angoff ratings. Participants were reminded how to make Yes/No Angoff ratings, and how these ratings could be transformed into cut score recommendations. This was followed by a *mid-process evaluation* and all six participants indicating that they were ready to proceed with Round 1.

Individually, participants made their Round 1 Yes/No Angoff ratings. They referred to their test books, item maps, threshold student descriptions, and the ACTFL proficiency guidelines. Following Round 1, DRC calculated the Yes/No Angoff cut score recommendations and presented the results to participants. Specifically, participants were shown their calculated cut score recommendations, as well as the overall median cut score recommendation for the group. Participants were also shown a histogram of the range of the group's Round 1 cut score recommendations.

The Round 1 discussion focused on items where participants disagreed in their Yes/No ratings. Participants referred to their test books, item maps, threshold student descriptions, and the ACTFL proficiency guidelines throughout the discussions. To further inform participants' work, DRC shared a crosswalk drafted by DRC Test Development that illustrated in broad strokes where the ACTFL proficiency levels and LAS Links Español grade-span proficiency level descriptors may intersect. This illustration provided no instructional information and was only meant to further participants conversations.

Following this discussion, participants made their Round 2 Yes/No Angoff ratings. Participants were reminded that Yes/No Angoff rating is an individual activity. Participants were also reminded that they would be free to retain their Yes/No Angoff ratings for any/all items from Round 1 or to change one or more of them; however, in either case, participants would need to have content-based rationales for their decisions.

DRC calculated the Yes/No Angoff cut score recommendations for Round 2, and participants were presented with their calculated cut score recommendation. The presentation included the overall median cut score recommendation for the group and histogram representation of the range of their cut score recommendations. After participants completed the process for reading, they repeated the process for listening, writing, and speaking.

After making their cut score recommendations, participants were presented with the cut score recommendations for all four domains. Participants were informed that they could recommend adjustments to the cut scores, if needed, had their conceptualizations of the threshold students changed over the course of the workshop. However, the committee indicated it was generally satisfied with its recommendations.

Participants indicated their perceived validity of the workshop and their recommendations as part of the post-workshop evaluation. Hambleton (2001) noted that evaluations are important evidence for establishing the validity of performance levels. Throughout the standard setting process, participants completed multiple evaluations to assess their understanding of the workshop goals, Yes/No Angoff method, readiness to proceed, and their confidence in their recommendations. Generally, participants were satisfied with their recommendations and with the workshop as a whole. Particularly, participants understood the connection between their conceptions of threshold students and their corresponding cut score recommendations. Participants generally agreed that the final recommendations reflected the work of the standard setting committee.

Results

Participants' Recommendations After Round 2

Table 2 shows participants' *Overall* recommendation from Round 2 of the Yes/No Angoff procedure, as expressed on the test scale. The *Overall* cut score is the average of the cut scores for the four domains. The *Overall* cut scores are rounded down, when applicable, benefitting students very near the cut score.

During the workshop, participants made Yes/No Angoff recommendations on the raw-score metric for each domain. To calculate the group's *Overall* recommendation, each participant's raw-score cut score recommendation was transformed onto the test scale, and then the median of those cut scores was taken.

Table 2. Recommendations from Round 2 of the standard setting, scale score metric

Test Score	Scale-Score Cut-Score Recommendations							
	Novice Mid	Novice High	Inter. Low	Inter. Mid	Inter. High	Adv. Low	Adv. Mid	Adv. High
Overall	362	418	446	465	527	569	613	672

After the standard setting, DRC reviewed participants' cut score recommendations, and noted that (a) the standard setting had been conducted according to industry best practices, and (b) that the cut scores were recommended in a defensible manner. They also noted that DRC has the latitude to adjust cut score recommendations within a band defined by conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM) and that such adjustments for technical reasons are very common.

The adjustments made by DRC were all within a range of ± 1 CSEM of the cut scores recommended by participating educators. Adjustments made within a range of ± 2 CSEM are typically seen as being consistent with standard setting participants' content-based expectations, given the expected variability surrounding the recommendation process.

Table 3 shows the adjusted cut scores, as developed after the standard setting by DRC, expressed on the scale-score metric.

Table 3. Adjusted cut scores, scale score metric

Test Score	Scale-Score Cut-Scores							
	Novice Mid	Novice High	Inter. Low	Inter. Mid	Inter. High	Adv. Low	Adv. Mid	Adv. High
Overall	362	418	451	476	527	569	613	671

In response to participants' feedback, DRC collapsed the lowest two levels into a single level, *Novice Low & Mid*. This decision is described in the next section. Table 4 shows the scale ranges, as based on the

adjusted cut scores from Table 3, developed after the standard setting by DRC. These scale ranges are expressed on the Overall composite metric.

Table 4. ACTFL-aligned scale ranges for LAS Links Español for the Overall composite score

Test Score	Scale Ranges							
	Novice Low & Mid	Novice High	Inter. Low	Inter. Mid	Inter. High	Adv. Low	Adv. Mid	Adv. High
Overall	0–417	418–450	451–475	476–526	527–568	569–612	613–670	671–999

Suggested Uses of the ACTFL-Aligned Cut Scores

LAS Links Español and ACTFL

LAS Links Español provides important information for determining Spanish language proficiency and subsequently for planning instructional programs and making decisions about language dominance, identification, classification, eligibility, and placement. The test results can also be used to identify students who would benefit from taking assessments in the native language, to identify difficulties in the native language, and to monitor and track progress in attaining Spanish language proficiency.

The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines have been informing language learning in the United States since 1986 (ACTFL, 2012). The Guidelines describe an individual's language abilities in terms of speaking, writing, listening, and reading. The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines span the proficiency continuum of little to no ability to a fluent individual, and they present a valuable instrument for the evaluation of functional language ability.

At the standard setting, DRC sought to establish cut scores that: (a) reflected the expectations summarized in the ACTFL proficiency guidelines, (b) linked students' scores on the tests to these expectations, and (c) were appropriate for each domain and grade span.

Considerations for Novice Low

After the standard setting, DRC determined that LAS Links Español does not provide an interpretable distinction between students in the Novice Low and Novice Mid levels of ACTFL. As part of the standard setting, participants noted that the skills expected of students in these ACTFL levels are only very slightly different. Moreover, DRC noted that LAS Links Español measurement error was higher among items at this point on the test scale. For these reasons, an ACTFL-aligned Novice Low cut score should not be applied to LAS Links Español results. Instead, one can interpret test performances below the Novice High cut score (i.e., below 418) as being consistent with the Novice Low & Novice Mid levels.

Application of Cut Scores to Grade Span 6–8

To evaluate the possibility of applying the ACTFL-aligned scale ranges to grades 6–8, the committee examined the hardest items from grade span 6–8, and they found that the structure and overall difficulty of these items was comparable with grade span 9–12, albeit with somewhat less complex stimuli used in the grades 6–8 assessment. Study participants verified the appropriateness of applying most of the ACTFL-aligned scale score ranges from the grades 9–12 recommendations to grade span 6–8 in their responses to a post-workshop survey where this question was formally posed again. Participants and DRC staff members agreed, however, that Advanced High should not be reported for grade span 6–8. That is, students who take the grade span 6–8 test can use the same cut scores as their peers in high school, but the highest proficiency level that they can achieve is Advanced Mid. For example, if a student scores 671 in grade 8, they should be considered “Advanced Mid or higher.” LAS Links Español tests below grade span 6–8. LAS Links users who need ACTFL levels for highly-skilled students in grades 4 or 5, should consider administration of the tests for grade span 6–8.

References

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2012). ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012. <https://www.actfl.org/educator-resources/actfl-proficiency-guidelines>.
- American Councils for International Education. (2017). The national K–12 foreign language enrollment survey report. <https://www.americancouncils.org/sites/default/files/FLE-report-June17.pdf>
- Angoff, W.H. (1971). Scales, norms and equivalent scores. In R.L. Thorndike, (Ed.), *Educational Measurement*, 2nd Ed. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 508-600.
- Cizek, G. J., & Bunch, M. B. (2007). Standard setting: A guide to establishing and evaluating performance standards on tests. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- CTB/McGraw-Hill. (2013). LAS Links second edition technical manual: Español, form B. Maple Grove, MN: Data Recognition Corporation.
- Egan, K.L., Schneider, M.C., & Ferrara, S. (2012). Performance level descriptors: History, practice, and a proposed framework. In G. J. Cizek (Ed.), *Setting performance standards: Foundations, methods, and innovations* (2nd ed., pp. 79–106). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hambleton, R. K. (2001). Setting performance standards on educational assessments and criteria for evaluating the process. In G. J. Cizek (Ed.), *Setting performance standards: Concepts, methods, and perspectives* (pp. 89–116). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Impara, J.C., & Plake, B.S. (1997). Standard setting: An alternative approach. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 34, 353–366. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1435114>
- Livingston, S. A., & Zieky, M. J. (1982). Passing scores: A manual for setting standards of performance on educational and occupational tests. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/passing_scores.pdf
- McClarty, K.L., Way, W.D., Porter, A.C., Beimers, J.N., & Miles, J.A. (2013). Evidence-based standard setting: Establishing a validity framework for cut scores. *Educational Researcher* (42), 2, 78–88. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12470855>
- Phillips, G.W. (2012). The benchmark method of standard setting. In G. J. Cizek (Ed.), *Setting performance standards: Foundations, methods, and innovations* (2nd ed., pp. 232–346). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zieky, M. J. (2012). So much has changed. In G. J. Cizek (Ed.), *Setting performance standards: Foundations, Methods, and Innovations*, 2nd Ed. New York: Routledge, 15-32.

Appendix A: Domain-Specific Cut Scores

DRC recommends that students' Overall scores be used to link their performances to the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. However, DRC recognizes that some test users may benefit from applying domain-specific cut scores *in conjunction with* the Overall cut scores. Two examples of potential uses of domain-specific cut scores are shown here.

- A school would like to allow students to test-out of Spanish 1 by taking LAS Links Español. However, the school is concerned that a student might be strong in three language domains (e.g., reading, listening, writing) but particularly weak in another (e.g., speaking), and this weakness could make an advanced course placement unsuitable. Before deciding on a course placement, the school determines the student's ACTFL level based on their Overall composite score *and* for each of the four LAS Links Español domains. The school only allows students to test-out of Spanish 1 if they score sufficiently high on each domain *and* Overall.
- A school system would like to consider awarding credit-by-examination for Spanish 2 by taking LAS Links Español. However, the course description indicates that students must have sufficient Spanish-language skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing to pass. The school system gathers multiple pieces of information to consider awarding credit-by-examination (e.g., prior course performance, future course registration). The school system only allows students to receive credit-by-examination for Spanish 2 if they score sufficiently high on each domain of LAS Links Español *and* Overall.

This appendix presents ACTFL-aligned cut scores by domain for LAS Links Español. The appendix also includes results from a study that presents validity evidence for the connection between LAS Links Español scores and Spanish course success. Lastly, limitations of the cut scores are discussed.

ACTFL-Aligned Cut Scores by Domain

During the standard setting process, educators recommended ACTFL-aligned cut scores for the LAS Links Español tests by domain. These domain-specific cut scores are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. ACTFL-aligned cut scores for LAS Links Español, by domain and Overall

Test Score	Scale-Score Cut-Scores by Domain and Overall							
	Novice Mid	Novice High	Inter. Low	Inter. Mid	Inter. High	Adv. Low	Adv. Mid	Adv. High
Reading	355	401	458	471	555	583	612	644
Writing	320	447	502	539	563	602	664	721
Listening	340	340	341	375	460	536	589	685
Speaking	435	485	507	519	531	556	588	637
Overall	362	418	451	476	527	569	613	671

The domain-specific cut scores presented in Table 5 were recommended by participants at the 2022 standard setting. As described earlier in this document, selected cut scores were later adjusted (within a range of ± 1 CSEM) for technical reasons. After the standard setting, the lowest two proficiency levels were collapsed into a single level, Novice Low & Mid, with the acknowledgment that LAS Links Español does not provide an interpretable distinction between these Novice Low and Novice Mid.

Notably, the Listening cut scores for Novice Mid, Novice High, and Intermediate Low are equal to the lowest-obtainable scale-score (LOSS). At the standard setting, participants acknowledged that a fair amount of Spanish-language skill was needed to earn a score above the LOSS on the Listening test. They agreed that it was unlikely that students would score above 340 until they were beyond the threshold (point-of-entry) of the Intermediate Low level. Accordingly, students who score 340 have not yet demonstrated sufficient Spanish-language listening skills to be classified as Intermediate Low. Students who score 340 on listening can be considered Novice in that domain. However, the test cannot provide meaningful information about whether the student's performance is Novice Low, Novice Mid, or Novice High: the score of 340 on listening is simply considered below the ACTFL level of Intermediate Low.

The scale ranges associated with each ACTFL level, by domain and Overall, are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. ACTFL-aligned scale ranges for LAS Links Español, by domain and Overall

Test Score	Scale Ranges							
	Novice Low & Mid	Novice High	Inter. Low	Inter. Mid	Inter. High	Adv. Low	Adv. Mid	Adv. High
Reading	0–400	401–457	458–470	471–554	555–582	583–611	612–643	644–999
Writing	0–446	447–501	502–538	539–562	563–601	602–663	664–720	721–999
Listening	0–340		341–374	375–459	460–535	536–588	589–684	685–999
Speaking	0–484	485–506	507–518	519–530	531–555	556–587	588–636	637–999
Overall	0–417	418–450	451–475	476–526	527–568	569–612	613–670	671–999

Comparing Test Performance and Course Success


Schools may be interested in using LAS Links Español to inform decisions about course placement, credit-by-examination, or both. (Important caveats about such uses of the tests are described in the next section.) Using the tests in this way presupposes a relationship between students' performances on LAS Links Español and their success in Spanish-language courses. To evaluate this relationship, DRC conducted a small-scale validity study in May 2026 using data from actual Spanish-language students. The study sought to answer two primary questions, as shown here.

- 1) Is there a relationship between students' LAS Links Español *Overall* score and Spanish-language course performance?
- 2) Do students in higher ACTFL levels tend to perform better in Spanish-language courses than students in lower ACTFL levels?

To address these questions, DRC obtained the LAS Links Español test results and end-of-course classroom grades for 50 students¹ who recently completed Spanish 2. The students all attended the same school in a large southwestern state in the U.S. The data represent the scores and grades for three classrooms of Spanish 2.

Figure 1 shows the relationship between students' course grades (expressed on a 0–100 scale) and their scores on LAS Links Español (expressed on the test scale). As shown in the figure, there was a positive relationship between students' course grades and LAS Links Español performance. Approximately 23% of the variability in students' *Overall* scores could be explained by their course grade.

Figure 1. Students' Spanish 2 course grades vs. LAS Links Español *Overall* scores



Students earning higher letter grades in Spanish 2 also tended to perform better on LAS Links Español. Students who earned an “A” in the course (i.e., 90–100; N = 39) had an average LAS Links Español *Overall* score of 556. Students earning a “B” (i.e., 80–89; N = 10) had an average *Overall* score of 537. One student earned a “C” (i.e., 70–79) and had a score of 452. Considering the first study question, these results showed that there was a positive relationship between LAS Links Español *Overall* performance and their course performance.

To address the second question, students' LAS Links Español *Overall* scores were transformed into ACTFL levels using the scale ranges presented in Table 1. Table 7 shows students average Spanish 2 course grades. As shown in the table, students' average course grades are higher for students who earned higher ACTFL levels based on their LAS Links Español *Overall* score.

¹ DRC extends its appreciation to the school that gave its kind permission to participate in this study, to the teacher who made these data available, and to the hardworking students on whose data this study is based.

Table 7. Students' average Spanish 2 course grades by ACTFL level

ACTFL Level	Average Spanish 2 Course Grade	SD	N
Advanced Mid	97.0	4.2	2
Advanced Low	94.4	4.5	16
Intermediate High	92.6	3.7	17
Intermediate Mid	91.0	5.7	14
Intermediate Low	75.0	N/A	1

This study shows there is a relationship between students' LAS Links Español *Overall* scores and their course performance. These results show that course-related decisions (e.g., placement) using LAS Links Español scores are reasonable in certain circumstances. However, the study has two primary limitations. First, the study was based on a small sample of 50 students from a single school. If the study were repeated with another group of students, then the results may be somewhat different. Second, the study was based on students who successfully completed Spanish 2. If the study were repeated with students who had completed another course (e.g., Spanish 1), then the results could also be different. However, this small-scale study shows the relationship between test performance and course success.

Limitations for Using the Domain-Specific Cut Scores

The domain-specific cut scores presented in this section are designed for schools and systems that are considering using LAS Links Español scores to inform course-related decisions for students (e.g., placement, credit-by-examination). When using these cut scores, users should keep three important caveats in mind.

First, the ACTFL-aligned domain-specific cut scores are always designed to be used *in conjunction with* the Overall cut scores, not in isolation. Although the LAS Links Español test for each domain is designed to measure students' domain-specific skills in a robust way, the Overall score will always yield the most precise estimate of students' general Spanish-language proficiency. Accordingly, users are encouraged to first evaluate students' Overall scores to see a snapshot of their Spanish-language proficiency; then, if desired, use the domain-specific cut scores to see if they have demonstrated sufficient Spanish-language skills in each domain.

Second, users should always use multiple pieces of information to make course-related decisions for students. LAS Links Español is a reliable and highly defensible assessment of students' Spanish-language proficiency, but it relies on a single point-in-time measurement. When making decisions about students' course placement or whether to award course credit, users should take into account all available information about the student (e.g., prior course performance, future course registration).

Third, one must consider the Spanish-language skills measured by LAS Links Español when considering using the test to inform course-related decisions for students. The assessment covers a broad array of language skills, and tests has been aligned to a variety of major language proficiency frameworks. However, the skills are measured in the context of the middle- or high-school classroom, and LAS Links Español does not measure certain content that might be covered in an advanced Spanish-language course (e.g., cultural information about Spanish-speaking countries). Before deciding to use LAS Links

Español to award advanced course placement or course credit, users should compare the LAS Links Español blueprints against the applicable course descriptions to evaluate the amount of alignment or overlap between the two.



LAS Links Español
ACTFL-Aligned
Cut Scores
Standard Setting
Methodology and
Results

LAS Links Español
Grades 6–12

Version 2.0

