



INFORMATION BOOKLET FOR SCORING THE REGENTS EXAMINATION IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AUGUST 2017 ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL INFORMATION

The general procedures to be followed in administering Regents Examinations are provided in the publications *Directions for Administering Regents Examinations* (DET 541) and the *School Administrator's Manual*. The *Directions for Administering* are made available on the Department's website at <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/hsgen/>. The *School Administrator's Manual* is available on the Department's website at <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/sam/secondary/>.

Questions about **general administration procedures** for Regents Examinations should be directed to the Office of State Assessment (OSA) at 518-474-5902 or 518-474-5900. For information about the **rating** of the Regents Examination in English Language Arts, contact Rosemarie Heinegg or Laura LaPan of OSA at 518-474-5900.

School administrators should print or photocopy this information booklet and distribute copies to all school personnel who will be scoring this examination.

SCORING THE EXAMINATION

NOTE: Teachers are **not** permitted to score their own students' answer papers.

The Scoring Key and Rating Guide

Printed copies of scoring keys and rating guides will **not** be sent to schools for any of the Regents Examinations. Instead, scoring keys and rating guides will be posted on the Department's website at <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/scoring/> at approximately 11:30 a.m. for morning examinations and 3:30 p.m. for afternoon examinations in August. Schools must print sufficient copies to supply one to each rater.

All scoring keys and rating guides posted on the Department's website will be password protected by two levels of password protection. In order to access the scoring keys and rating guides, schools will be required to enter the online request system (portal) using the same username and password that was used to order test materials.

The portion of the rating guide for the 6-credit essay contains:

- Scoring rubric
- Two to three prescored anchor papers at each score level with commentary (**Note:** Anchor papers are ordered from high to low within each score level.)
- Five prescored practice papers

The portion of the scoring key and rating guide for the 4-credit response contains:

- Scoring rubric
- Two to three prescored anchor papers at each score level with commentary (**Note:** Anchor papers are ordered from high to low within each score level.)
- Five prescored practice papers

Rating the Examination

The reliability of the scores is a fundamental concern in the measurement of the student's achievement. Therefore, the 6-credit essays and the 4-credit responses must each be rated by two qualified raters and by a third qualified rater only in certain specified instances. Qualified raters include teachers of English, reading, English as a second language, and special education who know the English curriculum and have previously received training. Training is provided online in two webcast presentations (one for Part 2 and one for Part 3) available at <http://www.engageny.org/resource/regents-exams-english-language-arts-webcasts>.

In order to ensure reliable scoring, the principal of each high school administering the Regents Examination in English Language Arts must appoint a scoring coordinator who will:

- Manage the training and logistics of the scoring process.
- Provide task-specific training immediately before scoring.
- Assign two teachers to rate each 6-credit essay independently, with a third rater available to resolve discrepant scores (as explained on pages 4 and 5).*
- Assign two teachers to rate each 4-credit response independently, with a third rater available to resolve discrepant scores (as explained on pages 4 and 5).*

*No teacher may be assigned to rate the responses of his or her own students. For August examinations, student responses may not be scored by the student's summer school teacher or the 2016–17 school year teacher.

Organizing the Rating and Recording

Before student responses can be read and rated, each school must set up a procedure for collecting, arranging, and processing the answer papers and for maintaining records of the examination results. The procedure used in a particular school should be designed to produce a reliable score for each student and to facilitate maintenance of the school's records of each student's score and of the participation of each rater in the scoring process. A suggested procedure for managing the mechanics of the rating process is described on pages 3, 4, and 5.

Rating Sheets, Record Sheets, and other forms used during the rating process must be retained for one year.

Scoring the Multiple-Choice Questions

For the August 2017 Regents Examination in English Language Arts, all schools must use uniform scannable answer sheets. These answer sheets are provided to schools either by the regional information center or the large-city scanning center. (Schools may not require students to record their responses for the same multiple-choice questions on more than one answer sheet.) **If the students' responses for the multiple-choice questions are being hand scored prior to being scanned, the scorer must be careful not to make any marks on the front of the answer sheet except to record the scores in the designated score boxes. Marks elsewhere on the front of the answer sheet will interfere with the accuracy of the scanning.**

Before scannable answer sheets are machine scored, several samples must be both machine and manually scored to ensure the accuracy of the machine-scoring process. All discrepancies must be resolved before student answer sheets are machine scored. When machine scoring is completed, a sample of the scored answer sheets must be scored manually to verify the accuracy of the machine-scoring process.

Detailed Directions for Training Raters to Score Student Responses

In training raters to score student responses for each part of the examination, follow the procedures outlined below:

Introduction to the Tasks

The introduction to each task may take place once the administration of the examination has begun. However, use of the actual scoring key and rating guide for the examination may *not* begin until after the

Uniform Statewide Admission Deadline has passed and the scoring key and rating guide has been obtained from the Department's website.

- Raters read the task and summarize it.
- Raters read the passage or passages and plan a response to the task.
- Raters share response plans and summarize expectations for student responses.

Introduction to the Rubric and Anchor Papers

- Trainer reviews rubric with reference to the task. For Part 2, raters should also be directed to the additional scoring considerations printed at the bottom of the 6-credit rubric. For Part 2, since the task specifies using evidence from at least three texts, if a student addresses fewer than three texts, the essay can be scored no higher than a 3. If a student writes only a personal essay response and makes little or no reference to the text(s) or task, the essay response can be scored no higher than a 1. An essay that is totally copied from the task and/or text(s) with no original student writing must be scored a 0. An essay that is totally unrelated to the task, illegible, incoherent, blank, or unrecognizable as English must be scored as a 0.
- For Part 3, raters should also be directed to the additional scoring considerations printed at the bottom of the 4-credit rubric. For Part 3, if a student writes only a personal response and makes little or no reference to the task or text, the response can be scored no higher than a 1. A response that is totally copied from the text with no original writing must be given a 0. A response that is totally unrelated to the task, illegible, incoherent, blank or unrecognizable as English must be scored as a 0.
- Trainer reviews procedures for assigning holistic scores (i.e., by matching evidence from the response to the language of the rubric and by weighing all qualities equally).
- Trainer leads review of each anchor paper and commentary.

Practice Scoring Individually

- Raters score a set of five practice papers individually. Raters should score the five papers independently without looking at the scores provided after the five papers.
- Trainer records scores and leads discussion until raters feel comfortable enough to move on to actual scoring.

Suggested Rating Procedure

The following procedure is recommended for managing the mechanics of the rating process. The Rating Sheets and the Record Sheet are included in the Appendix. You may photocopy as many copies as needed.

1. Designate one person as the coordinator of the rating process. The scoring coordinator will be responsible for coordinating the movement of papers and recording of examination scores on the answer sheets.
2. Set aside one room as a central rating room for collecting, sorting, circulating, and storing answer sheets/essay booklets and for preparing and maintaining records.
3. Provide a suitable location for the rating of responses.
4. Assign each rater who will score any part of any student's examination a single letter designation from A–J. If there are more than 10 raters, committees of no more than 10 raters each must be formed, with each committee member assigned a letter designation from A–J. (The master for the rating committee can be found on page 14.)
5. Allow time to provide training for scoring the specific task for all raters immediately before the rating of the students' responses (about three hours for the essay task and about one and a half hours for the response task).
6. Provide adequate time for rating (4–5 minutes per response for the argument essay and 2 minutes per response for the literary analysis response).
7. After the examination has been administered, verify that the student has entered his or her name and the school name on each page of the essay booklet.

8. Arrange the essay booklets in a sequence, using whatever order is most convenient, e.g., class period, alphabetical, or local identification number. Divide the essay booklets into bundles of 20–25.
9. For each bundle of 20–25 booklets, separate the responses for Part 2 from those for Part 3. Staple together all the pages for each student’s Part 2 essay and Part 3 response.
10. For Part 2 (the essay), divide raters into two-person teams for rating the 6-credit essays. Designate one team member as Rater 1 and the other as Rater 2. No teacher may rate the responses of his or her own students. For the August examinations, student responses may not be scored by the student’s summer school teacher or the student’s 2016–17 school year teacher.
11. Beginning with the first paper of the sequence for Part 2, enter each student’s name on the Rating Sheet for Part 2. (The master for rating appears on page 15.)
12. After recording the students’ names on the Rating Sheet, photocopy the Rating Sheet. Each rater will need a separate rating sheet for each bundle of essay papers he or she rates.
13. Distribute the bundles of essay papers to the rating teams, making sure that each rating team receives two rating sheets for each bundle. Each rater on a team should rate one of the bundles and record his or her ratings on one of the rating sheets. The two raters should retain their own completed rating sheets and exchange bundles. The second rater should record his or her scores on the second rating sheet. **No scores or corrections should be indicated on the student papers.**
14. After each team has completed rating a bundle, the team should return those essay papers and the completed rating sheets to the central rating area. Remove the rating sheets completed by each rater from the bundles and enter the scores and raters’ assigned letters on the Record Sheet for Part 2. Make sure each essay has two independent ratings. Enter the resolved scores in the appropriate columns on the Record Sheet. (The master for the Record Sheet for Part 2 appears on page 17.)
15. Review the two scores for each student to determine if the student’s scores are discrepant, i.e., a difference of two or more points between the two scores. Separate the students’ responses with the discrepant scores and make another bundle. Prepare a separate rating sheet for those discrepant papers. List the names of the students on a new rating sheet and attach the sheet to the corresponding bundle of student responses. Assign each of these bundles to a rater to obtain a third independent rating of the students’ responses. Make sure that the third rater is not one of the original two raters of that essay.
16. After the necessary third ratings have been obtained, remove the rating sheets from the bundles of student responses and determine the resolved scores by using the method for resolving discrepant scores described on page 6. Enter the resolved scores in the appropriate column on the Record Sheet.
17. For Part 3 (the response), divide raters into two-person teams for rating the 4-credit responses. Designate one team member as Rater 1 and the other as Rater 2. No teacher may rate the responses of his or her own students. For the August examinations, student responses may not be scored by the student’s summer school teacher or the student’s 2016–17 school year teacher.
18. Beginning with the first paper of the sequence for Part 3, enter each student’s name on the Rating Sheet for Part 3. (The master for rating appears on page 16.)
19. After recording the students’ names on the Rating Sheet, photocopy the Rating Sheet. Each rater will need a separate rating sheet for each bundle of essay papers he or she rates.
20. Distribute the bundles of essay papers to the rating teams, making sure that each rating team receives two rating sheets for each bundle. Each rater on a team should rate one of the bundles and record his or her ratings on one of the rating sheets. The two raters should retain their own completed rating sheets and exchange bundles. The second rater should record his or her scores on the second rating sheet. **No scores or corrections should be indicated on the student papers.**
21. After each team has completed rating a bundle, the team should return those responses and the completed rating sheets to the central rating area. Remove the rating sheets completed by each rater from the bundles and enter the scores and raters’ assigned letters on the Record Sheet for Part 3. Make sure each essay has two independent ratings. Enter the resolved scores in the

appropriate columns on the Record Sheet. (The master for the Record Sheet for Part 3 appears on page 18.)

22. Review the two scores for each student to determine if the student's scores are discrepant, i.e., a difference of two or more points between the two scores. Separate the students' responses with the discrepant scores and make another bundle. Prepare a separate rating sheet for those discrepant papers. List the names of the students on a new rating sheet and attach the sheet to the corresponding bundle of student responses. Assign each of these bundles to a rater to obtain a third independent rating of the students' responses. Make sure that the third rater is not one of the original two raters of that essay.
23. After the necessary third ratings have been obtained, remove the rating sheets from the bundles of student responses and determine the resolved scores by using the method for resolving discrepant scores described on page 7. Enter the resolved scores in the appropriate column on the Record Sheet.
24. Complete the School Record of Students' Examination Scores. Be sure to multiply the student's resolved score for Part 2 by 4 and record this result in the column labeled "Weighted Raw Score" for Part 2. Be sure to multiply the student's resolved score for Part 3 by 2 and record this result in the column labeled "Weighted Raw Score" for Part 3. Do NOT round up resolved scores for Part 2 or Part 3 that end in a decimal of .5, such as 3.5, prior to multiplying that score by its weighting factor, X 4 for Part 2 and X 2 for Part 3. (The master for recording scores is on page 19.)

Method for Determining the Score for the Argument Essay (Part 2)

Two Ratings:

1. Compare the two ratings.
2. If the two ratings agree, the student receives that score.
3. If the two ratings are contiguous, average the two scores.
4. If the two ratings are not contiguous, a third rating is necessary.

Three Ratings:

1. Compare the three ratings.
2. If two of the three ratings agree, the student receives that score.
3. If the three ratings are different, the student receives the middle score.

Examples:

| Rater 1 Letter | Rater 1 Score | Rater 2 Letter | Rater 2 Score | Rater 3 Letter | Rater 3 Score | Resolved Score | Reason |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---|
| A | 2 | B | 2 | — | — | 2 | Two ratings agree. Use that score. |
| A | 2 | B | 3 | — | — | 2.5 | Two ratings are contiguous. Average the two scores. |
| A | 2 | B | 4 | J | 4 | 4 | Two ratings are two or more points apart. Third rating is done. Two of the three ratings agree. Use that score. |
| A | 2 | B | 5 | J | 4 | 4 | Two ratings are two or more points apart. Third rating is done. Three ratings differ. Use the middle score. |
| A | 0 | B | 1 | — | — | 0.5 | Two ratings are contiguous. Average the two scores. |

Method for Determining the Score for the Literary Analysis Response (Part 3)

Two Ratings:

1. Compare the two ratings.
2. If the two ratings agree, the student receives that score.
3. If the two ratings are contiguous, average the two scores.
4. If the two ratings are not contiguous, a third rating is necessary.

Three Ratings:

1. Compare the three ratings.
2. If two of the three ratings agree, the student receives that score.
3. If the three ratings are different, the student receives the middle score.

Examples:

| Rater 1 Letter | Rater 1 Score | Rater 2 Letter | Rater 2 Score | Rater 3 Letter | Rater 3 Score | Resolved Score | Reason |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---|
| A | 2 | B | 2 | — | — | 2 | Two ratings agree. Use that score. |
| A | 2 | B | 3 | — | — | 2.5 | Two ratings are contiguous. Average the two scores. |
| A | 2 | B | 4 | J | 4 | 4 | Two ratings are two or more points apart. Third rating is done. Two of the three ratings agree. Use that score. |
| A | 2 | B | 4 | J | 3 | 3 | Two ratings are two or more points apart. Third rating is done. Three ratings differ. Use the middle score. |
| A | 0 | B | 1 | — | — | 0.5 | Two ratings are contiguous. Average the two scores. |

Entering Essay Scores on the Record Sheet — Part 2

The examples below show how students' scores and raters' code letters should be recorded on the Record Sheet.

| Student's Name | Part 2 Essay Scores | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| | Rater 1 Letter | Rater 1 Score | Rater 2 Letter | Rater 2 Score | Rater 3 Letter | Rater 3 Score | Resolved Score |
| <i>Student A</i> | A | 4 | B | 4 | — | — | 4 |
| <i>Student B</i> | A | 0 | B | 1 | — | — | .5 |
| <i>Student C</i> | A | 4 | B | 6 | J | 5 | 5 |
| <i>Student D</i> | A | 4 | B | 2 | J | 5 | 4 |

Entering Response Scores on the Record Sheet — Part 3

The examples below show how students' scores and raters' code letters should be recorded on the Record Sheet.

| Student's Name | Part 3 Response Scores | | | | | | |
|------------------|------------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| | Rater 1 Letter | Rater 1 Score | Rater 2 Letter | Rater 2 Score | Rater 3 Letter | Rater 3 Score | Resolved Score |
| <i>Student A</i> | A | 4 | B | 4 | — | — | 4 |
| <i>Student B</i> | A | 0 | B | 1 | — | — | .5 |
| <i>Student C</i> | A | 4 | B | 3 | — | — | 3.5 |
| <i>Student D</i> | A | 4 | B | 2 | J | 3 | 3 |

**Determining the Student’s Final Examination Score
for the Regents Examination in English Language Arts**

The format of the conversion chart is illustrated below. The chart provided on the Department’s website for each administration of this examination will include scale scores ranging from 0 to 100 within the cells of the chart. It is *crucial* that, for each administration, *only* the conversion chart provided for that specific administration be used to determine the student’s final examination score.

If the determination of each student’s final examination score (scale score) is being done by hand, find the student’s total test weighted raw score in the column labeled “Weighted Raw Score” and then locate the scale score that corresponds to that weighted raw score. The scale score is the student’s weighted final examination score. Enter this score in the space labeled “Scale Score” on the student’s answer sheet.

Schools are **not permitted** to rescore any of the open-ended questions on this examination after each question has been rated the required number of times, regardless of the final examination score. Schools are required to ensure that the raw scores have been calculated correctly and that the resulting scale score has been determined accurately.

Chart for Converting Total Weighted Raw Scores to Final Examination Scores (Scale Scores)

| Weighted Raw Score | Scale Score | Level |
|--------------------|-------------|-------|
| 56 | 100 | 5 |
| 55 | | |
| 54 | | |
| 53 | | |
| 52 | | |
| 51 | | |
| 50 | | |
| 49 | | |
| 48 | | |
| 47 | | |
| 46 | | |
| 45 | | |
| 44 | | |
| 43 | | |
| 42 | | |
| 41 | | |
| 40 | | |
| 39 | | |
| 38 | | |
| 37 | | |
| 36 | | |
| 35 | | |
| 34 | | |
| 33 | | |
| 32 | | |
| 31 | | |
| 30 | | |
| 29 | | |
| 28 | | |

| Weighted Raw Score | Scale Score | Level |
|--------------------|-------------|-------|
| 27 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 1 | | |
| 0 | 0 | 1 |

When the teacher scoring committee completes the scoring process, test scores must be considered final and must be entered onto students' permanent records. In addition, each rater must sign the Examination Scoring Certificate attesting that he or she fully and faithfully observed the rules and regulations for scoring the examination. The principal or collaborative site scoring leader must also sign to attest that the rules and regulations for scoring were fully and faithfully observed.

Principals and other administrative staff in a school or district do not have the authority to set aside the scores arrived at by the teacher scoring committee and rescore student examination papers or to change any scores assigned through the procedures described in this manual and in the scoring materials provided by the Department. Any principal or administrator found to have done so, except in the circumstances described below, will be in violation of Department policy regarding the scoring of State examinations. Teachers and administrators who violate Department policy with respect to scoring State examinations may be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with Sections 3020 and 3020-a of Education Law or to action against their certification pursuant to Part 83 of the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education.

On rare occasions, an administrator may learn that an error occurred in the calculation of a final score for a student or in recording students' scores in their permanent records. For example, the final score may have been based on an incorrect summing of the student's raw scores for parts of the test or from a misreading of the conversion chart. When such errors involve the final scores of no more than 5% of the school's takers for that examination or five students, whichever is greater, and when they are detected within four months of the test date, the superintendent of a public school district or the chief administrative officer of a nonpublic or charter school may arrange for the corrected score to be recorded in the student's permanent record. However, in all such instances, the superintendent or chief administrative officer must advise OSA in writing that the student's score has been corrected. The written notification to the Department must be signed by the superintendent or chief administrative officer and must include the initials or student identification numbers (at the discretion of the principal) of the students whose scores have been corrected, the examination title, the students' original and corrected scores, and a brief explanation of the nature of the scoring error that was corrected.

If an administrator has substantial reason to believe that the teacher scoring committee has failed to accurately score the answer papers for more than 5% of the school's test takers for that examination or five students, whichever is greater, or when errors are detected more than four months after the test date, the administrator must first obtain permission in writing from OSA before arranging for or permitting a rescoring of student papers. The written request to OSA must come from the superintendent of a public school district or the chief administrative officer of a nonpublic or charter school and must include the examination title, date of administration, and number of students whose papers would be subject to such rescoring. This request must also include a statement explaining why the administrator believes that the teacher scoring committee failed to score appropriately and, thus, why he or she believes rescoring the examination papers is necessary. As part of this submission, the school administrator must make clear his or her understanding that such extraordinary re-rating may be carried out only by a full committee of teachers constituted in accordance with the scoring guidelines presented above and fully utilizing the scoring materials for this test provided by the Department.

The Department sometimes finds it necessary to notify schools of a revision to the scoring key and rating guide for an examination. Should this occur after the scoring committee has completed its work, the principal is authorized to have appropriate members of the scoring committee review students' responses only to the specific question(s) referenced in the notification and to adjust students' final examination scores when appropriate. Only in such circumstances is the school not required to notify or obtain approval from the Department to correct students' final examination scores.

Appendix

**Rubrics
Rating Sheet
Record Sheet**



THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT / THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK / ALBANY, NY 12234

New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)
Part 2 Rubric
Writing From Sources: Argument

| Criteria | 6 Essays at this Level: | 5 Essays at this Level: | 4 Essays at this Level: | 3 Essays at this Level: | 2 Essays at this Level: | 1 Essays at this Level: |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| Content and Analysis: the extent to which the essay conveys complex ideas and information clearly and accurately in order to support claims in an analysis of the texts | -introduce a precise and insightful claim, as directed by the task -demonstrate in-depth and insightful analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims | -introduce a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task -demonstrate thorough analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims | -introduce a precise claim, as directed by the task -demonstrate appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims | -introduce a reasonable claim, as directed by the task -demonstrate some analysis of the texts, but insufficiently distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims | -introduce a claim -demonstrate confused or unclear analysis of the texts, failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims | -do not introduce a claim -do not demonstrate analysis of the texts |
| Command of Evidence: the extent to which the essay presents evidence from the provided texts to support analysis | -present ideas fully and thoughtfully, making highly effective use of a wide range of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis -demonstrate proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material | -present ideas clearly and accurately, making effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis -demonstrate proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material | -present ideas sufficiently, making adequate use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis -demonstrate proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material | -present ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis -demonstrate inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material | -present ideas inconsistently and/or inaccurately, in an attempt to support analysis, making use of some evidence that may be irrelevant -demonstrate little use of citations to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material | -present little or no evidence from the texts -do not make use of citations |
| Coherence, Organization, and Style: the extent to which the essay logically organizes complex ideas, concepts, and information using formal style and precise language | -exhibit skillful organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay -establish and maintain a formal style, using sophisticated language and structure | -exhibit logical organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay -establish and maintain a formal style, using fluent and precise language and sound structure | -exhibit acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay -establish and maintain a formal style, using precise and appropriate language and structure | -exhibit some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay -establish but fail to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure | -exhibit inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay -lack a formal style, using some language that is inappropriate or imprecise | -exhibit little organization of ideas and information -are minimal, making assessment unreliable -use language that is predominantly incoherent, inappropriate, or copied directly from the task or texts |
| Control of Conventions: the extent to which the essay demonstrates command of conventions of standard English grammar, usage, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling | -demonstrate control of conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language | -demonstrate control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors only when using sophisticated language | -demonstrate partial control, exhibiting occasional errors that do not hinder comprehension | -demonstrate emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors that hinder comprehension | -demonstrate a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors that make comprehension difficult | -are minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable |

- An essay that addresses fewer texts than required by the task can be scored no higher than a 3.
- An essay that is a personal response and makes little or no reference to the task or texts can be scored no higher than a 1.
- An essay that is totally copied from the task and/or texts with no original student writing must be scored a 0.
- An essay that is totally unrelated to the task, illegible, incoherent, blank, or unrecognizable as English must be scored as a 0.



New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)
Part 3 Rubric
Text Analysis: Exposition

| Criteria | 4 Responses at this Level: | 3 Responses at this Level: | 2 Responses at this Level: | 1 Responses at this Level: |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Content and Analysis: the extent to which the response conveys complex ideas and information clearly and accurately in order to respond to the task and support an analysis of the text | -introduce a well-reasoned central idea and a writing strategy that clearly establish the criteria for analysis -demonstrate a thoughtful analysis of the author's use of the writing strategy to develop the central idea | -introduce a clear central idea and a writing strategy that establish the criteria for analysis -demonstrate an appropriate analysis of the author's use of the writing strategy to develop the central idea | -introduce a central idea and/or a writing strategy -demonstrate a superficial analysis of the author's use of the writing strategy to develop the central idea | -introduce a confused or incomplete central idea or writing strategy and/or -demonstrate a minimal analysis of the author's use of the writing strategy to develop the central idea |
| Command of Evidence: the extent to which the response presents evidence from the provided text to support analysis | -present ideas clearly and consistently, making effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis | -present ideas sufficiently, making adequate use of relevant evidence to support analysis | -present ideas inconsistently, inadequately, and/or inaccurately in an attempt to support analysis, making use of some evidence that may be irrelevant | -present little or no evidence from the text |
| Coherence, Organization, and Style: the extent to which the response logically organizes complex ideas, concepts, and information using formal style and precise language | -exhibit logical organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent response -establish and maintain a formal style, using precise language and sound structure | -exhibit acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent response -establish and maintain a formal style, using appropriate language and structure | -exhibit inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent response -lack a formal style, using language that is basic, inappropriate, or imprecise | -exhibit little organization of ideas and information -use language that is predominantly incoherent, inappropriate, or copied directly from the task or text -are minimal, making assessment unreliable |
| Control of Conventions: the extent to which the response demonstrates command of conventions of standard English grammar, usage, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling | -demonstrate control of the conventions with infrequent errors | -demonstrate partial control of conventions with occasional errors that do not hinder comprehension | -demonstrate emerging control of conventions with some errors that hinder comprehension | -demonstrate a lack of control of conventions with frequent errors that make comprehension difficult -are minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable |

- A response that is a personal response and makes little or no reference to the task or text can be scored no higher than a 1.
- A response that is totally copied from the text with no original writing must be given a 0.
- A response that is totally unrelated to the task, illegible, incoherent, blank, or unrecognizable as English must be scored as a 0.

Rating Committee Sheet

Regents Examination in English Language Arts

Examination Date: _____
(Month/Year)

Part 2 or 3 (circle one)

School: _____

Date: _____

Committee # _____

| Assigned Letter | Rater's Name (Print) |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| A | |
| B | |
| C | |
| D | |
| E | |
| F | |
| G | |
| H | |
| I | |
| J | |

Committee # _____

| Assigned Letter | Rater's Name (Print) |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| A | |
| B | |
| C | |
| D | |
| E | |
| F | |
| G | |
| H | |
| I | |
| J | |

Retain this form with examination scoring records for one year.

