Одним из основных положений Болонского процесса является увеличение роли преподавателя, который средствами современных информационных, компьютерных и педагогических технологий в объединении с традиционными формами и методами организации учебного процесса, создает образовательную и учебную среду. Данный подход характерный именно для европейской системы высшего образования, должен быть внедрен и в отечественную систему высшего образования при подготовке специалистов финансистов.

Процесс создания образовательной и учебной среды современного высшего учебного заведения средствами информационных технологий целесообразно условно поделить на несколько промежуточных этапов:

- разработка методик обучения по финансовым дисциплинам на основе применения информационных технологий;
- адаптация существующих и разработка новых рабочих и учебных программ, тематических планов в соответствии с модульным принципом;
- создание компьютерных средств представления и контроля уровня усвоения учебного материала (электронных пособий, учебных презентаций, тестов) по специальным курсам;
- формирование у будущих финансистов современной концепции информатизации будущей профессиональной деятельности, которая должна объединяться с высокой информационной культурой.

Как и любой специалист, работающий в современной рыночной экономике, для которой характерно повсеместное внедрение новейших информационных технологий и коммуникационных каналов, финансист с высшим образованием должен профессионально пользоваться средствами информационных технологий.

Применение информационных технологий в учебном процессе в различных вариантах позволяет говорить об определенных преимуществах подобных форм организации учебного процесса:

- становится возможной принципиально новая организация самостоятельной работы студентов;
- возрастает интенсивность учебного процесса;
- у студентов появляется дополнительная мотивация к познавательной деятельности;
- доступность учебных материалов в любое время;
- возможность самоконтроля степени усвоения материала по каждой теме неограниченное количество раз.

Мировая практика свидетельствует, что применение информационных технологий в образовании, в частности, создания электронных

средств представления учебного материала, использование тестовых программ для контроля знаний студентов, имеет ряд преимуществ перед традиционными формами представления учебного материала и контроля знаний. Для повышения эффективности применения новых информационных технологий в учебном процессе необходимо повышать качество электронных учебных пособий и программного обеспечения, для чего необходимо развивать сотрудничество вузов по этой проблематике. По мере накопления образовательных информационных ресурсов инновационные технологии займут достойное место в образовательном процессе вуза.

L.V. Hnapovs'ka, *Candidate of Sciences in Philology, Associate Professor, SHEI "Ukrainian Academy of Banking of the NBU"*

ASSESSING LANGUAGE SKILLS IN ESP:
KEY CONCEPTS VS COMMON MISCONCEPTIONS

Modern Europe encourages mobility of labour and of students across the frontiers of the European Union and beyond. In order to be able to take up study places or work opportunities, knowledge of a foreign language is essential. In the modern Europe, it is increasingly important not only to be able to use a foreign language, especially a widespread and widely learned language like English, but also to be able to prove that one can use the language at the level required by employers, schools, universities and other agencies.

Modern European language examinations focus upon assessing a learner's ability to use the language, and do not concentrate on testing whether learners can recite the rules of the language, or how many words they have learned, or whether they sound like a perfect native speaker. Modern language tests are more concerned to present testees with tasks that involve them in reading, listening to, speaking or writing in the target language, and evaluating how well they can do this. Of course, an important component in assessing how effectively the learner can use the language is how accurately (s)he can produce and understand texts written or spoken in the language. But the key to this assessment is to challenge the test-takers with the tasks that in some way resemble the things they may have to do with the language in real life: what matters to users of examination results – employers, universities, foreign institutions – is how well the candidates can get their meaning across or understand others' meanings in relevant real life situations.

Thus modern language tests are not interested in whether students can transform isolated sentences into paraphrased versions, or whether they can

give a definition of a word out – or even within – context. Modern examinations are rarely interested in whether the learner can translate sentences in their first language into the target language, or, indeed, whether they can give the mother tongue equivalent of an underlined word in an English passage. What matters in modern language exams is whether learners can communicate in the target language in order to achieve their aims, to understand and to be understood, to get their message across and achieve everyday needs in that target language, even if, at the lower levels, students may do this without 100 % accuracy or fluency. What is imperative in modern language testing is not whether students are 100 % perfect, but whether they can meet their own needs to communicate and be understood in both written and spoken modes.

The key concept of this paper is language testing as "a method of measuring a person's ability or knowledge in a given domain" (Brown 2001). The fundamental tenet of the report is the claim that it is only by trying to operationalize our theories and our understandings of the constructs through our assessment instruments that we can explore and develop our understanding of the ways that are appropriate for a given purpose, context, and group of test-takers (Alderson 2005: 2; Bachman & Palmer 2000: 9).

The purpose of this paper is to share the insights about assessing language skills in ESP gained from everyday practices of teaching Business English at the Ukrainian Academy of Banking, i.e. to provide personal reflections on how and to what extent the knowledge of key concepts of language assessment has been operationalised so far in the Ukrainian language testing situation as well as what implications have been brought about.

As a matter of fact, Academy teachers of Business English (as well as language teachers at large) have some beliefs about what language testing is and what language tests are like. Most of us are sure that testing is just a part of teaching English, there is nothing difficult or problematic about testing, and all in all we feel happy enough about the ideas that Bachman and Palmer (2000) identified as "the most common misconceptions of language testing". In brief, the latter may be explained in the following way.

We *believe that there is one "best" test for any given situation*: we as language teachers do consider that if we follow the model of a test that has been designed and developed by the "expert" in the field and the test has been was widely recognized and used, it would automatically be useful for our particular needs.

We *misunderstand the nature of language testing and language test development and the nature of correlation between language testing, language teaching and language use*: we rarely consider the dichotomy language testing: language learning with respect to the possibility for these

concepts to have different laws and regulations. Besides, we do realize that cognitive processes involved in language use and, correspondingly, language learning are not the same for all learners and vary with different language activities. But we rarely (if ever) doubt whether similar testing procedures require similar cognitive efforts and strategies from different individuals whom they have for their target audience. So we practically never analyze if a single model would provide the most suitable test for the variety of our particular test-takers, particular uses and areas of language ability that are to be measured in our particular situation.

We *have unreasonable expectations about what language tests can do and what they should be, and place blind faith in the technology of measurement*: we do always want an "expert" to offer us some ready-made recipe of an "ideal" language test as well as to teach how to create such "good" test. But for the majority of language teachers the very concept of a "good" language test is vague and abstract enough for we have no idea of what is supposed to be good about the test to make it really "good" – should that be its layout; the text selected; the task format chosen; the correlation between the task format and the skill we intend to measure; the language of the rubric – whatever?!

In fact, the seeming "simplicity" of testing is rather misleading. As language teachers who are also involved in the process of measuring language skills we should realize that the testing cycle is long and very complicated for it embraces a lot of stages – conducting needs analysis; working out test specification; identifying the construct for each of the skills measured; designing, developing and calibrating items as long as they fully correspond to the norms of test appropriateness (usefulness); administering the test; doing with the performance statistics; reporting on test results and getting feedback on the test. There are a lot more ideas we are still to find out about language assessment, but the major thing for us to keep in mind is that there are no "trifles" in testing – every single detail matters.

In general, the nature of testing in ESP can be best expressed in terms of Bachman & Palmer's philosophy of language testing (Bachman & Palmer's 2000:18), and can in brief be formulated in the following way.

Language testing should necessarily be related to language teaching and language use. If we claim that the score from a language test is an indicator of individual's language ability and can be used to make certain decisions, we must make sure that performance on it is related to language use in non-test situations – test tasks and situations should correlate with the language use tasks and situations, while characteristics of a test taker (background knowledge, cognitive schemata, language ability) should correspond to those of a language user.

What should be built into testing are considerations of fairness (fairness is treated as being related to both the validity of a specific test as an index of certain ability and to the testing process as a whole). Those who are in test design and test administration are to be accountable for the way the test and its results are used: being a tester (the person in charge of measuring the final product – testee's level of language abilities) one should forget that (s)he is a teacher (the one accountable for the process of learning the language and developing these abilities). Awareness of your functional status (that of either a teacher or a tester) will help to avoid "over-nursing" the students: they should be treated as independent and responsible individuals rather than helpless kids in constant need for assistance. Any kind of a "halo-effect" or other cases of being subjective in interpreting test results should also be a strong "taboo" in testing.

Test-takers should be provided with as complete information about the entire testing procedure as possible. This will help to humanize the testing process in at least two possible ways – encouraging and enabling testees to perform at their highest level of ability on the one hand, and creating conditions for washback to follow in language teaching process, on the other hand.

Test usefulness should be an overriding consideration for quality control throughout the process of designing, developing and using a particular language test. The individual test qualities cannot be evaluated independently, but must be evaluated in terms of their combined effect on the overall usefulness of the test.

So, the conclusions about the nature of language testing may be put like this: if you're in assesment and think that you've designed the item (or the test) that is perfect or ideal, you'd better quit testing for there can never be the item (or test) of this kind: the test should be useful (rather than ideal) through being

- *reliable:* it should be a consistent instrument of measuring the target language ability across different characteristics of the testing situation;
- *valid:* the interpretations that testers make on the basis of test scores are to be meaningful and appropriate;
- *authentic:* the characteristics of a given language test task should correspond to the features of a target language use task;
- *interactive:* test taker's individual characteristics are to be involved in accomplishing a test task;
- *practical:* the design, development and use of the test should not require more time and resources (both human and material) than are available.

References

1. Alderson, Ch.J. (2005) *Assessing Reading.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Bachman, L.F. and A. Palmer (2000) *Language Testing in Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Brown, H.D. (2001) Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy. White Plains, NJ: Addison, Wesley, Longman.

М.С. Головань, канд. пед. наук, доц.,
ДВНЗ "Українська академія банківської справи НБУ"

ПЕДАГОГІЧНІ ВИМОГИ ДО ОСВІТНІХ СТАНДАРТІВ У КОНТЕКСТІ БОЛОНСЬКОГО ПРОЦЕСУ

Проблема якості освіти проходить червоною ниткою через усі документи, підписані міністрами, відповідальними за вищу освіту в рамках Болонського процесу. Забезпечення якості освіти при формуванні зони європейської освіти є однією з головних умов довіри, мобільності, мотивації студентів, сумісності й привабливості європейської вищої освіти. Тому однією з умов забезпечення якості вищої освіти є якісні освітні стандарті. Виділимо основні педагогічні вимоги до освітніх стандартів, які сприятимуть забезпеченню якості вищої освіти.

В контексті Болонського процесу в основу розробки освітніх стандартів мають бути покладені характеристики, що відображують якісні результати освітнього процесу в термінах компетенцій, які, як зазначає В.І. Байденко, "виступають активним ядром норми якості освіти, його стандартів" [2, с. 14]. Компетентнісний підхід до проектування освітніх стандартів вищої професійної освіти передбачає формулювання результатів освіти в системному й цілісному вигляді; формування результатів як ознак готовності випускника продемонструвати відповідні компетенції; визначення структури останніх [2, с. 77-78]. Такий підхід "вимагає переорієнтації на студентоцентрований характер освітнього процесу, використання ЕСТS ... і модульних технологій організації освітнього процесу" [1, с. 9]. Отже, компетенції є обов'язковим компонентом структурно-логічної схеми проектування ступеневої підготовки. Тому опис освітньо-кваліфікаційних характеристик майбутніх фахівців має здійснюватися на основі визначеної структури, класифікації та складу основних професійних задач у термінах професійних компетенцій.

Компетентнісні моделі бакалавра і магістра мають ґрунтуватися на рівневій структурі кваліфікацій Європейського простору вищої освіти, прийнятій на Бергенській конференції міністрів, що відповідають за вищу освіту. Ця структура базується на п'яти дескрипторах: знання і розуміння; застосування знань і розуміння; здатність до логічно

Hnapovska, L. V. Assessing language skills in ESP: key concepts vs common misconceptions [Text] / L. V. Hnapovska // Фінансова освіта: сучасний стан та перспективи розвитку: збірник матеріалів Міжнародної навчально-методичної конференції (м. Севастополь, 29-30 квітня 2010 р.). - Суми : УАБС НБУ, 2010. - С. 75-79.