

**Second Language Proficiency
Examination
For Modern Languages

Test Changes and Sampler**

**The University of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
Albany, New York 12234**

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
Regents of The University

CARL T. HAYDEN, <i>Chancellor</i> , A.B., J.D.	Elmira
DIANE O NEILL MCGIVERN, <i>Vice Chancellor</i> , B.S.N., M.A., Ph.D.	Staten Island
ADELAIDE L. SANFORD, B.A., M.A., P.D.	Hollis
SAUL B. COHEN, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	New Rochelle
JAMES C. DAWSON, A.A., B.A., M.S., Ph.D.	Peru
ROBERT M. BENNETT, B.A., M.S.	Tonawanda
ROBERT M. JOHNSON, B.S., J.D.	Lloyd Harbor
ANTHONY S. BOTTAR, B.A., J.D.	Syracuse
MERRYL H. TISCH, B.A., M.A.	New York
ENA L. FARLEY, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	Brockport
GERALDINE D. CHAPEY, B.A., M.A., Ed.D.	Belle Harbor
RICARDO E. OQUENDO, B.A., J.D.	Bronx
ARNOLD B. GARDNER, B.A., LL.B.	Buffalo
CHARLOTTE K. FRANK, B.B.A., M.S.Ed., Ph.D.	New York
HARRY PHILLIPS, 3 rd , B.A., M.S.F.S.	Hartsdale

President of The University and Commissioner of Education

RICHARD P. MILLS

Chief Operating Officer

RICHARD H. CATE

Deputy Commissioner for Elementary, Middle, Secondary, and Continuing Education

JAMES A. KADAMUS

Assistant Commissioner for Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

ROSEANNE DEFABIO

The State Education Department does not discriminate on the basis of age, color, religion, creed, disability, marital status, veteran status, national origin, race, gender, genetic predisposition or carrier status, or sexual orientation in its educational programs, services, and activities. Portions of this publication can be made available in a variety of formats, including braille, large print or audio tape, upon request. Inquiries concerning this policy of nondiscrimination should be directed to the Department's Office for Diversity, Ethics, and Access, Room 152, Education Building, Albany, NY 12234.



May 2000

Dear Colleague:

We are continuing to revise State examinations to assess the learning standards established by the Board of Regents. For over a year a group of foreign language teachers met with State Education Department curriculum and assessment specialists to review the existing Second Language Proficiency Examination. Under the guidance of Dr. Marie Warchol of the Otsego-Northern Catskills BOCES, the group made changes that better align the examination with current standards.

Passing the new Second Language Proficiency Examination will satisfy the graduation requirement for Checkpoint A proficiency in a language other than English. The examination will be based on the content included in the New York State syllabus *Modern Languages for Communication*. In preparation for the examination, I am pleased to provide the enclosed Second Language Proficiency Examination Test Sampler Draft. A copy is being sent to each foreign language teacher in the State. The Test Sampler provides examples of the types of questions, the formatting, and the scoring rubrics that are being developed for the actual test. It also includes examples of student work. There may be additional refinements to the examination as a result of the field tests. The sampler provided may be duplicated for use in your classroom.

If you wish to respond to these materials, please direct your comments to:

Al Martino, Foreign Language Associate
New York State Education Department
Office of Curriculum and Instruction
Room 671 EBA
Albany, New York 12234

Sincerely,

Roseanne DeFabio

Acknowledgments

The New York State Education Department acknowledges the significant contributions made by teachers, supervisors and other educators in developing changes in the Second Language Proficiency Examination for modern languages. These contributions include new scoring rubrics for both the writing and speaking portions of the exam, developing and field-testing new items, and facilitating the statewide turnkey training.

Dr. Marie Warchol, Project Facilitator
Dr. Lorraine Sleezer, Goals 2000 Manager

Otsego-Northern Catskills BOCES
Hamilton-Fulton-Montgomery BOCES

Committee Members

Ana Aguiar
Magali Alvarez
Donna Ehmann
Jeff Feyerabend
Hanna Hickey
Marisa Bel Holtz
Toni Johnson
Connie Lais
Suzanne Schermerhorn
Ann Spies
Corina Sprinceanu
Brenda Sugarman

North Shore School District
JHS 210 Q, New York City
Troy School District
Susquehanna Valley School District
Guilderland Central School District
East Greenbush School District
Penn Yann School District
Johnstown High School
Mayfield School District
Ogdensburg Free Academy
Guilderland Central School District
Shenendehowa Central School District

New York State Education Department Staff

Ron Dygert
Karen Kolanowski
Al Martino
Mary Pillsworth

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	iv
Foreword	vi
Introduction	1
Overview	
The Second Language Proficiency Exam: Descriptions/Changes	2
Blueprint of Modern Language Proficiency Exam Changes	3
Rubrics	
A Tool for Scoring: Performance (Tasks)	6
Part 1A Speaking	
How to Use the Informal Speaking Rubric	8
Informal Speaking Rubric	9
Informal Speaking Checklist	10
Explanations, Definitions, and Examples	11
Part 1B Speaking: Quality Point	
Scoring the Formal Speaking Tasks	14
Quality Point Guidelines	15
Part IV Writing	
Sample Revised Writing Tasks	18
Writing Rubric	19
Writing Checklist	20
Word Count Guidelines	21
Anchor Papers and Commentary Sheets	
French	24
German	36
Italian	48
Spanish	60

FOREWORD

In 1998, a Goals 2000 grant was awarded to the Hamilton-Fulton-Montgomery BOCES for the purpose of preparing teachers to assist students in achieving the new standards for languages other than English (LOTE). A number of activities were undertaken to achieve this goal.

One activity involved the convening of a group of Checkpoint A level foreign language teachers to review the Second Language Proficiency Examination. These practitioners, known as the Foreign Language Assessment Committee, recommended changes which they believe align the examination more closely with the standards. They also developed rubrics for scoring the examination with the expectation that the rubrics would provide better consistency in the scoring process across the State. Their work was facilitated by Marie Warchol of the Otsego Northern Catskills BOCES.

Once the changes were made in the examination and the rubrics were developed, it became clear that a process was needed to raise the awareness of teachers. With the cooperation of the Staff and Curriculum Development Network, a process for turnkey training was initiated that would assure statewide dissemination of the information and regional-level training in administering and scoring the Second Language Proficiency Examination. The process begins with State-level training on June 28, 1999, with trainers nominated by their BOCES or large city school districts. These trainers will continue the process with regional training scheduled throughout the year.

The Training Manual for the Second Language Proficiency Examination was developed as part of the Goals 2000 grant. The publication is the collaborative effort of Hamilton-Fulton-Montgomery BOCES; the State Education Department; the Foreign Language Assessment Committee; and Marie Warchol, the State-level trainer.

INTRODUCTION

Aligning Standards and Assessments

In June 1998, with the standards movement in New York State in full swing, it became necessary to take a step back and take a critical look at our well-established, highly successful, and performance-based State assessments. For this reason, a committee of teacher experts was called in to make sure that our second language proficiency (SLP) examinations in modern foreign languages are indeed aligned with the standards. Almost ten years after the first administration of the SLP, it was time to be sure that the test still measured what it was intended to measure.

After reviewing the exam, the committee decided that in essence, the exam has stood up to the test of time and to the standards movement. However, the committee determined that two sections of the exam needed some improvement. These two areas are the speaking and writing sections of the SLP Examination.

The committee, under the guidance of Dr. Marie Warchol, Director of Curriculum and Instruction at the Otsego-Northern Catskills BOCES, concluded that new scoring guidelines would help teachers to assess the informal *daily in-class speaking performance* of their students. Likewise, the committee determined it necessary to improve the guidelines for awarding the *quality point* on the formal speaking tasks. Note that the essence of the speaking portion is unchanged; it is still the foundation upon which we continue to build our syllabus and local curriculum.

The committee recommended considerable changes to the writing section to make it both a better assessment tool and one that is more closely aligned to the standards. The committee created rubrics to assess new writing tasks. The tasks and rubrics were tested and used in several schools. It is hoped that these rubrics will be used by all teachers of Checkpoint A LOTE in their classrooms once they have been disseminated and are clearly understood by the teachers. While the changes in the writing tasks recommended by the committee are considerable, the tasks still reflect the daily practice of teachers in New York State teaching Checkpoint A in alignment with the syllabus and the standards documents.

The committee also considered modifications to the reading section of the examination. Committee members generally agreed that the use of authentic documents is a useful way to assess a student's ability to comprehend the written word in authentic and realistic situations. However, the committee recommended that an additional component be included that would provide more information and assist in the transition from Checkpoint A to Checkpoint B. This piece has not yet been finalized, but will continue to receive attention at the State Education Department.

The committee also looked carefully at the second standard, *cultural understanding*, with an eye to both the State and National standards. It was the conclusion of the committee that cultural understandings were embedded within the authentic reading materials, the speaking tasks, and the contextualized writing tasks. Therefore, the second standard will not be subjected to discrete item testing.

This document represents the changes which we expect to see on the SLP Examination in June 2001.

The Second Language Proficiency Exam: *A descriptive overview*

Speaking

Part 1a

Assessment of student performance in daily classroom activities **from February 1 until five days** prior to the date of the written exam
10 credits

A new rubric has been designed to help teachers in the assessment of the students performance.

Part 1b

A sourcebook of formal speaking tasks will be provided by the State Education Department. The tasks will be administered **from February 1 until five calendar days** prior to the written date of the exam.

20 credits

Teachers will receive a packet of all the tasks and will need to choose 20 tasks per language function for each test administration.

The nature of the tasks will remain the same.

However, new guidelines for the awarding of the quality point are now made available.

Listening

Part 2a

This part has remained unchanged.
20 credits

Part 2b

This part has remained unchanged.
10 credits

Part 2c

This part has remained unchanged.
10 credits

Reading

Part 3a

This part has remained unchanged.
12 credits

Part 3b

This part has remained unchanged.
8 credits

Writing

Students will write two out of three notes, each one worth 5 credits. Rubrics will be used for the rating. A writing checklist is also provided.
10 credits

Blueprint of Modern Language Proficiency Exam Changes

Part 1A	Informal speaking <i>New scoring rubric</i>	10 points
Part 1B	Formal speaking <i>New guidelines for the quality point</i>	20 points
Part 2A	Listening questions in English	20 points
Part 2B	Listening questions in target language	10 points
Part 2C	Listening answer in pictures	10 points
Part 3	Reading 6 realia with questions in English 4 realia with questions in target language	12 points 8 points
Part 4	Writing <i>New scoring rubrics</i> <i>2 notes 30 words</i> <i>No list</i>	5 points 5 points

Total points 100

(Changes in *italics*)

Rubrics

A TOOL FOR SCORING: PERFORMANCE (TASKS)

As with many real-world tasks, performance tasks do not have a single right answer; there are a variety of ways to successfully complete them. Consequently, students' performance on the tasks cannot be machine-scored. They must be judged by one or more persons guided by well-defined criteria. This approach is similar to that used in judging performances in gymnastics or diving. (The same thinking applies to evaluating media performances.)

One vehicle used to guide human judgment is a *rubric*, a term which has its origins in the Latin *rubrica terra*, referring to the use of red earth centuries ago to mark or signify something of importance. Today, we maintain the spirit of this original meaning, since the term commonly means an authoritative or established rule.

Specifically, a rubric is a scoring device which differentiates between levels of performance. It consists of a **fixed scale** and a list of **characteristics** (or **criteria**) which describe the performance at each point along the scale. Because rubrics describe levels of performance, they provide useful information to teachers, students, parents, and others interested in understanding both the quality of a performance and how, in the future, that performance might be improved.

Rubrics come in many forms. The two most frequently used are (1) holistic, which considers a performance as a whole and (2) analytical, which examines a performance by breaking it into its component parts. Generally speaking, one designs the holistic rubric first, in order to articulate the big picture of a quality performance. Holistic rubrics can then be converted into analytic rubrics, which are easier for students to apply and interpret.

Finally, rubrics are powerful tools for evaluating subjective performance tasks. Rubrics do not, however, eliminate subjectivity. Rather they make explicit the criteria which the evaluator values and the standards for performance he or she holds. For that reason, it is critical to share rubrics with students before they begin a performance task. Once a student or other performer knows what is important or valued by a rater, he or she can focus attention purposefully rather than try to guess what will be important. Thus, rubrics are also powerful tools for improving performance.

Adapted from M. Thompson, *Teacher s Toolkit* (1993)

Part 1A
Speaking

HOW TO USE THE INFORMAL SPEAKING RUBRIC

Part 1A

Part 1a: Informal Classroom Evaluation (as currently administered)

Scores for Part 1a of the examination are based on students' performance in daily classroom activities during the designated assessment period. This assessment presumes that instruction routinely includes frequent opportunities for students to engage in a variety of realistic oral communications. These communications must be consistent with functions, topics, and situations for listening/speaking outcomes at Checkpoint A in the State syllabus. **Reading aloud and recitation or memorized text do not constitute oral communication for the purpose of this assessment.**

Presently, the criterion for this assessment is frequency/consistency: how often students express themselves in a manner consistent with the speaking proficiency level for Checkpoint A in the State syllabus. Scores must be expressed in whole numbers according to the following table: All the time: 10; Most of the time: 7-9; Half of the time: 4-6; Seldom: 1-3; Never: 0.

Features of the Rubric:

- ¥ The rubric describes a continuum of performances from Level 4 (most proficient) to Level 1 (least proficient).
- ¥ There are six criteria (called dimensions) in the informal speaking rubric: initiation; response; conversational strategies; vocabulary; structure; and cultural appropriateness.
- ¥ The dimensions are articulated in the left column of the rubric.
- ¥ Explanation and examples of terms are attached.
- ¥ The rubric is presented in two forms. The Informal Speaking Rubric describes the characteristics of a performance at each level. The Informal Speaking Checklist is simply another format of the same information. Scorers who prefer the checklist should refer to the Informal Speaking Rubric for definitions at each level.

Applying the Dimensions:

- ¥ Scores are determined by matching evidence from exchanges with students to the language of the rubric.
- ¥ Students are assigned a score for their performance in informal speaking on each of the six dimensions.
- ¥ The raw scores for each dimension represent the extent to which the student exhibits proficiency on that dimension; that is to say, the individual scores recognize a student's strength in the areas of initiation, response, conversational strategies, vocabulary, structure, and cultural appropriateness.
- ¥ The scores for each dimension are then added to determine a total raw score.
- ¥ The raw score is converted to a score ranging from 0 to 10 points, using the chart provided on each rubric.

Student Name _____

Total Raw Score _____

Total Score _____

**Part IA
Informal Speaking Rubric**

DRAFT

Dimension	The student: 4	3	2	1
Initiation	Eagerly initiates speech, utilizing appropriate attention-getting devices. Easily asks questions and speaks spontaneously.	Is willing to initiate speech, utilizing appropriate attention-getting devices. Asks questions and speaks evenly.	Sometimes initiates speech, using attention-getting devices. Sometimes asks questions and speaks hesitantly.	Is reluctant to initiate speech and struggles to ask questions. Speech is halting.
Response	Almost always responds appropriately to questions/statements.	Frequently responds appropriately to questions/statements.	Sometimes responds appropriately to questions/statements.	Rarely responds appropriately to questions/statements.
Conversational Strategies	Clarifies and continues conversation, using all or some of the following strategies: ¥ circumlocution ¥ survival strategies ¥ intonation ¥ self-correction ¥ verbal cues	Uses all or some strategies, but may need occasional prompting.	Uses some strategies and needs frequent prompting to further the conversation.	Uses few strategies. Relies heavily on conversation partner to sustain conversation. Rarely responds even with frequent prompting.
Vocabulary	¥ Incorporates a variety of old and new vocabulary. ¥ Uses idiomatic expressions appropriate to topic. ¥ Speaks clearly and imitates accurate pronunciation.	¥ Utilizes a variety of old and limited new vocabulary. ¥ Attempts to use idiomatic expressions appropriate to topic. ¥ Speaks clearly and attempts accurate pronunciation.	¥ Relies on basic vocabulary. ¥ Speech is comprehensible in spite of mispronunciations.	¥ Uses limited vocabulary. ¥ Mispronunciations impede comprehensibility.
Structure	Makes few errors in the following areas: ¥ verbs in utterances when necessary with appropriate subject/verb agreement ¥ noun and adjective agreement ¥ correct word order and article adjectives Errors do not hinder comprehensibility.	Makes several errors in structure which do not affect overall comprehensibility.	Makes several errors which may interfere with comprehensibility.	Makes utterances which are so brief that there is little evidence of structure and comprehensibility is impeded.
Cultural Appropriateness	Almost always uses/interprets cultural manifestations when appropriate to the task (e.g., greeting, leave taking, gestures, proximity, etc.).	Frequently uses/interprets cultural manifestations when appropriate to the task.	Sometimes uses/interprets cultural manifestations when appropriate to the task.	Rarely uses/interprets cultural manifestations when appropriate to the task.

A zero can be given in any of the above dimensions when the student's performance falls below the criteria described for 1.

Conversion Chart

22-24	10	12-13	6	3-4	2
19-21	9	10-11	5	1-2	1
17-18	8	7-9	4		
14-16	7	5-6	3		

Student Name _____

**Part 1A
Informal Speaking Checklist**

Please refer to the informal speaking rubric for definitions of each level.

	4	3	2	1	0
Initiation ¥ Initiates speech and asks questions ¥ Uses appropriate attention-getting devices ¥ Speaks spontaneously					
Response ¥ Responds appropriately to questions/statements					
Conversational Strategies to Clarify and Continue Conversations Using: ¥ Circumlocution ¥ Survival strategies ¥ Intonation ¥ Self-correction ¥ Verbal cues					
Vocabulary ¥ Incorporates variety of old and new vocabulary ¥ Uses idiomatic expressions appropriate to topic ¥ Speaks clearly and imitates accurate pronunciation					
Structure ¥ Uses verbs in utterances when necessary with appropriate subject/verb agreement ¥ Makes nouns and adjectives agree ¥ Uses correct word order and article adjectives					
Cultural Appropriateness ¥ Uses/interprets cultural manifestations appropriate to the task (e.g., greeting, leave taking, gestures, proximity, etc.)					

Total Raw Score

Total Informal Speaking Score

22-24	10	12-13	6	3-4	2
19-21	9	10-11	5	1-2	1
17-18	8	7-9	4		
14-16	7	5-6	3		

EXPLANATIONS, DEFINITIONS, AND EXAMPLES

Part 1A

Conversational Strategies ways to clarify and continue a conversation. Student will use all or some, as appropriate to conversation.

CIRCUMLOCUTION

- ¥ Uses familiar vocabulary and structures to express meaning beyond his/her current level of knowledge.
Example: tiger (a big cat with stripes in the zoo)

SURVIVAL SKILLS

- ¥ Uses learned expressions in appropriate situations to sustain conversation
Examples: please explain, please repeat, how do you say, I don t understand
- ¥ Uses nonverbal cues to clarify meaning.
Examples: facial expression, body language

INTONATION

- ¥ Uses language-appropriate inflection to indicate purpose of utterance.
Example: rising pitch to show question

SELF-CORRECTION

- ¥ Uses self-correction to clarify meaning.
Example: You go ... no, / go

RESPONDS TO VERBAL CUES

- ¥ Uses utterances of conversation partner as a clue or resource for unfamiliar vocabulary and structures to use in his/her own utterances, to self-correct, clarify, or restate.
Example: A - Give me a thing to write with.
B - OK. Do you want a pen or a pencil?
A - I need a pencil.

ATTENTION-GETTING DEVICES

- ¥ Uses strategies to initiate a conversation.
Example: A - Hello!
B - Excuse me.
C - Good morning.

Part 1B
Speaking:
Quality Point

SCORING THE FORMAL SPEAKING TASKS

Part 1B

As the rater of the formal speaking task, the teacher gives a maximum of *five* credits for each task according to the following criteria:

- ¥ One credit for *each of the four student utterances that is comprehensible and appropriate.*
(Comprehensibility means that the utterance would make sense to native speakers who know no English but are used to foreigners trying to speak their language. Appropriateness means that the utterance contributes to the completion of the task.)
- ¥ One credit for the quality of all four comprehensible and appropriate student utterances. (Quality means overall spontaneity, fluency, and accuracy *within the scope of the Checkpoint A proficiency statement in the State syllabus.*)

As the conversation partner and rater, the teacher may make two attempts at eliciting each of the four student utterances. If the student produces no comprehensible and appropriate utterance after the teacher's first two eliciting attempts at the very beginning of the conversation, the student receives no credit for the entire task. However, during the conversation, if a student produces no comprehensible and appropriate utterance after the teacher's second eliciting attempt, the student receives no credit for that utterance, and the teacher shifts to another aspect of the task.

To facilitate rating while acting as the conversation partner, the teacher should use a score sheet to keep track of the student's comprehensible and appropriate utterances, to record the number of eliciting attempts for each, and to determine whether the quality credit is warranted. A sample score sheet is provided on page ----. Certain teacher-student interactions, although natural in the course of a conversation, do not provide evidence of the student's ability to produce language. They should be disregarded for rating purposes. Examples of such interactions include:

- ¥ yes-no responses
- ¥ restatements of all or essential parts of what the teacher has said
- ¥ proper names used in isolation
- ¥ socializing devices (Hello, How are you, etc.) *except* in socializing tasks when appropriate.

QUALITY POINT GUIDELINES

Part 1B

For each task, students who require three or more second attempts **do not** qualify for the quality point (i.e., a student with three or more checkmarks in the second column of the scoring sheet is not eligible for the quality point).

Responses eligible for a quality point contain evidence from each of the following categories as appropriate to Checkpoint A: **FLUENCY, COMPLEXITY, and ACCURACY.**

FLUENCY

may be demonstrated by, but not limited to, ability to sustain the conversation, spontaneity, efficiency of task completion, intonation, pronunciation, and exclusive use of target language.

COMPLEXITY

may be demonstrated by, but not limited to, ability to initiate/direct conversation, risk taking, creativity, choice and variety of vocabulary, and grammatical structures.

ACCURACY

may be demonstrated by, but not limited to, correct grammatical structure, use of self-correction strategies, and cultural appropriateness.

Part IV
Writing

SAMPLE REVISED WRITING TASKS

Part IV

Directions to the students:

In the spaces provided, complete the following *writing task*. This *writing task* should be written entirely in the **target language** and should contain a minimum of **30 words**. Names of people **do not count**. Be sure that you satisfy the purpose of the task. The structure or expressions used should be connected logically and should demonstrate a wide range of vocabulary.

Task 1

Your language class is giving an end-of-the-year party. You are in charge of organizing the party. Write a letter to your teacher, telling him or her about the plans for the party. You **may** wish to include the following ideas:

- ¥ food/beverage served
- ¥ who is preparing what food
- ¥ when/where the party will take place
- ¥ a request for suggestions on what to serve
- ¥ a request for suggestions on party activities

Task 2

Your family will be hosting an exchange student next year. Write a note to this exchange student telling a little about yourself. You may also wish to ask for information about that student. You might include questions/statements about:

- ¥ age
- ¥ physical description
- ¥ likes/dislikes
- ¥ hobbies
- ¥ nationality
- ¥ where he or she lives

**Part IV
Writing Rubric**

DRAFT

Dimension	The student: 4	3	2	1
Purpose/Task	Satisfies the task, connects all ideas to task/purpose, and exhibits a logical and coherent sequence of ideas throughout.	Satisfies the task; connections are implied with few irrelevancies.	Satisfies the task; connections may be unclear with some irrelevancies.	Makes at least one statement which satisfies the task. Remaining statements are irrelevant to the task.
Vocabulary	Utilizes a wide variety of vocabulary which expands the topic in the statement/question to include nouns, verbs, and/or adjectives as appropriate to the task.	Utilizes a variety of vocabulary relevant to the topic in statements/questions to include nouns, verbs, and/or adjectives as appropriate to the task.	Utilizes vocabulary, some of which is inaccurate or irrelevant to the task.	Utilizes limited vocabulary, most of which is inaccurate or irrelevant to the task.
Structure/Conventions ¥ Subject/verb agreement ¥ Noun/adjective agreement ¥ Correct word order ¥ Spelling	Exhibits a high degree of control of structure/conventions: ¥ subject/verb agreement ¥ noun/adjective agreement ¥ correct word order ¥ spelling Errors <i>do not</i> hinder overall comprehensibility of the passage.	Exhibits some control of structure/conventions: ¥ subject/verb agreement ¥ noun/adjective agreement ¥ correct word order ¥ spelling Errors <i>do not</i> hinder overall comprehensibility of the passage.	Exhibits some control of structure/conventions: ¥ subject/verb agreement ¥ noun/adjective agreement ¥ correct word order ¥ spelling Errors <i>do</i> hinder overall comprehensibility of the passage.	Demonstrates little control of structure or convention, or errors impede overall comprehensibility of passage.
Word Count	Uses 30 or more comprehensible words in target language that contribute to the development of the task.	Uses 25 - 29 comprehensible words in target language that contribute to the development of the task.	Uses 20 - 24 comprehensible words in target language that contribute to the development of the task.	Uses 15 - 19 comprehensible words in target language that contribute to the development of the task.

A zero can be given in any of the above dimensions when the student's performance falls below the criteria described for 1.

If a paper scores a zero on purpose/task, the entire response receives a zero.

Conversion Chart

- 14-16 = 5
- 11-13 = 4
- 8-10 = 3
- 5-7 = 2
- 2-4 = 1
- 0-1 = 0

Student Name _____

**Part IV
Writing Checklist**

Please refer to the full writing rubric for definitions of each level.

	4	3	2	1	0
Purpose/Task ¥ Satisfies the task ¥ Connects ideas to task/purpose ¥ Exhibits a logical and coherent sequence of ideas					
Vocabulary (in statements/questions) ¥ Incorporates a range of nouns, verbs, and/or adjectives as appropriate to task ¥ Uses relevant and accurate words					
Structure (degree to which errors hinder overall comprehensibility) ¥ Subject/verb agreement ¥ Noun/adjective agreement ¥ Correct word order ¥ Spelling					
Word Count ¥ Comprehensible ¥ In target language ¥ Contributes to the development of the task	30+	25-29	20-24	15-19	<15

Total Raw Score

Total Informal Writing Score

Conversion Chart

- 14-16 = 5
- 11-13 = 4
- 8-10 = 3
- 5-7 = 2
- 2-4 = 1
- 0-1 = 0

A zero can be given in any of the above dimensions when the student's performance falls below the criteria described for 1.

If a paper scores a zero on purpose/task, the entire response receives a zero.

WORD COUNT GUIDELINES

Part IV

Definition: A word is a letter or collection of letters, surrounded by space, that in the target language is comprehensible, and contributes to the development of the task.

This definition holds even when words are grammatically incorrect.

Example: le (French) = 2 words; de el (Spanish) = 2 words

✖ Names of people do not count.

✖ Place names and brand names from the target culture count as one word; all other places (*K-Mart*) and brand names (*Coke, Pepsi*) are disregarded.

✖ Contractions are one word.

✖ Salutations and closings in notes written in the target language are counted. (There is no penalty if students do not use salutations or closings.)

✖ Commonly used abbreviations in target language are counted.

English	French	German	Italian	Spanish
New York City = 0 words	9le St. Louis = 3 words La Tour Eiffel = 3 words La Eiffel Tower = 2 words Paris = 1 word L h pital = 1 word Jacques = 0 words des tats-Unis = 2 words les Galleries Lafayette = 3 words J ai = 1 word (verb contractions = 1 word)	Auf Wiedersehen = 2 words Wie geht s = 2 words Deutschland = 1 word M nchen = 1 word Marktplatz = 1 word Fanta = 1 word Sprite = 0 words Josef = 0 words	Giuseppe = 0 words Il Colosseo = 2 words Venezia = 1 word nell aula = 1 word la Coca-cola = 1 word fare lo shopping = 3 words all una = 1 word alle tre = 2 words d estate = 1 word in primavera = 2 words	Nueva York = 2 words el Corte Ingls = 3 words La Universidad de Salamanca = 4 words Jos = 0 words La Torre Pendente = 3 words

USING THE NEW SCORING RUBRICS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO HAVE A SPELLING EXEMPTION LISTED ON THEIR IEP OR ON THE 504 PLAN

The following procedures must be followed when rating the writing section of the Second Language Proficiency Examination as well as the Comprehensive Regents Examination in Languages Other Than English.

In order to rate the student's paper in a fair and objective manner, begin by reading over the entire sample. Then reread the sample and in the space above any misspelled word, write the correct spelling. In the case of a word having no resemblance to the correct target language word, leave the student's response as is. Rate the sample accordingly. The dimension that contains *conventions of language* is not to be ignored as it is possible that the word order or the use of words will affect your rating after correcting the spelling errors. This allows the student a fair chance to display written expression in the target language.

Target Language: French

Writing Checklist

Please refer to the full writing rubric for definitions of each level.

	4	3	2	1	0
Purpose/Task	✓				
☒ Satisfies the task					
☒ Connects ideas to task/purpose					
☒ Exhibits a logical and coherent sequence of ideas					
Vocabulary (in statements/questions)	✓				
☒ Incorporates a range of nouns, verbs, and/or adjectives as appropriate to task					
☒ Uses relevant and accurate words					
Structure (degree to which errors hinder overall comprehensibility)	✓				
☒ Subject/verb agreement					
☒ Noun/adjective agreement					
☒ Correct word order					
☒ Spelling					
Word Count					
☒ Comprehensible		25-	20-	15-	
☒ In target language		30+	29	24	19 <15
☒ Contributes to the development of the task	✓				

Total Raw Score 16

Final Task Score 5

DIMENSION COMMENTARY

Purpose/Task	Fulfills the task. Even though the writer does not use the word <i>late</i> , it is clear that the note is to let someone know where the writer will be and at what time s/he will return. All ideas are logically connected to the task.
Vocabulary	The writer uses a variety of vocabulary. S/he is telling the host parent where s/he will be and what s/he will be doing (topic expansion).
Structure/ Conventions	The writer controls all of the targeted structural areas in the rubric for this dimension. The only errors are those of accentuation (these errors are not considered in this dimension at Checkpoint A and do not hinder comprehensibility of the note) and minor errors of noun gender and prepositions (which have no negative effect on comprehension and which are typical of Checkpoint A writing). In addition, this writer uses the future tense correctly!
Word Count	34 (more than the required 30 words). Do not count <i>Jenny</i> because it is a proper noun.