



Prior to Marking:

- Review the following guidelines for holistic scoring:
 1. Remember that this is a draft work. Look for what students can do and focus on what students do well. Mark what is on the paper, not what you think students might have done with more time or more elaborations.
 2. Read and mark. Read for a general impression of the paper. Read every paper straight through once, and assign a mark. Do not second-guess yourself.
 3. Mark holistically. Make an initial judgment and place the paper in one of three categories: high (5,6), medium (3,4) or low (1, 2). Then determine if the paper is high or low within the category. A response may or may not show all of the features of any single scale point.
 4. Don't correct the paper. It slows you down and interrupts the holistic judgment. As well, correcting errors makes the marker overly attentive to conventional elements rather than balancing all criteria in the scoring rubric.
 5. Use all scale points. Any given scale point does not reflect the wide range of student performance. When in doubt, refer to the scoring rubric and the paper.
 6. Your professional judgment must be guided by the provincial standards of the examination in order to give each paper a fair and reliable reading. Be aware of your personal biases.

Using the Training Papers

Reading Comprehension

- Read the reading passage(s) and the Reading Comprehension written-response question in the Training Papers document.
- Review the list of possible responses for the Reading Comprehension question and add additional responses to the list.

! **Tip:** No matter how many possible responses you may add, there will be many more acceptable ones from various students. You may wish to increase the response list as you mark.

- Review the Reading Comprehension - Written Response Rubric.

! **Tip:** Highlight key words: e.g.,

- at scale point 2: misreading or significant misunderstanding
- at scale point 3: some understanding at a literal level
- at scale point 4: some understanding at an interpretive level
- at scale point 5: clear, accurate, complete understanding at an interpretive level
- at scale point 6: insightful understanding at an interpretive or inferential level

- Mark the training papers for Reading Comprehension.

! **Tip:** Mark a few papers at a time.

- Compare your mark with the pre-assigned mark, and review the rationale for each paper.

Writing

- Read the writing prompt in the Training Papers document.
- Review the Writing Rubric.

! Tip: Highlight key words: e.g., with regards to vocabulary,

- at scale point 2: colloquial
- at scale point 3: limited
- at scale point 4: basic
- at scale point 5: appropriate
- at scale point 6: effective.

- Mark the training papers for writing.

! Tip: Mark a few papers at a time.

- Compare your mark with the pre-assigned mark, and review the rationale for each paper.

During Marking:

- Decide on marking individually, in pair or in group.
- Make sure you have the following documents:
 - the student exam booklet;
 - the written-response booklets;
 - the list of possible answers;
 - the Training Papers;
 - the scoring rubrics.
- Read the June 2004 exam student booklet.
- Review the possible answers for Reading Comprehension listed in the list of possible answers, and add additional responses to the list.
- Follow the guidelines for holistic scoring listed above and mark student papers.
- Use the Reading Comprehension-Written Response rubric to mark the reading question. Use the list of possible answers to assist in marking.
- Use the Writing rubric to mark the writing question.
- Record mark on student booklet cover. Make sure the score is bubbled in correctly.
- Review the scoring rubric regularly to refresh and refocus.

After Marking:

- Verify that all marks have been correctly recorded on the response booklet cover.
- Send all response forms, response booklets and student booklets to the principal's office to be returned to the Ministry of Education.

Reading Comprehension – Written Response Rubric

6

Demonstrates an insightful understanding of the texts at an interpretive or inferential level. May show understanding of literary techniques appropriate to genre. Support, explicit or implicit, is thoughtful and well-integrated. Despite its clarity, response need not be error-free.

5

Demonstrates a clear, accurate, complete understanding of the texts at an interpretive level. May show understanding of literary techniques appropriate to genre. Support, explicit or implicit, is convincing and relevant to the task.

4

Demonstrates some understanding of the texts at an interpretive level. There are no significant errors in comprehension. Response addresses the task in an organized, straightforward manner, but may miss subtle or complex ideas. Supported by relevant details from the texts.

3

Demonstrates some understanding of the texts at a literal level. Response may be unclear, incomplete or lack detail, but still addresses the task. Ideas are often listed or developed unevenly. Support may consist of long references to the texts which are not clearly connected to the central idea.

2

Demonstrates a misreading or significant misunderstanding of the texts and/or task. Response may be irrelevant or incomplete. Ideas are not developed or are restatements of texts. Support is absent or flawed, with little evidence of relationships or connections.

1

Compounds the problems of “2”. May be too short to meet the requirements of the task.

0

No attempt to address the topic or a complete misunderstanding of the text/task.

Notes: This is a first-draft response and should be assessed as such.

The use of paragraph structure should be assessed holistically with reference to the clarity of organization and expression.

This scoring rubric is derived from the BC Performance Standards for Reading.

Writing Rubric

6

Ideas are fully developed and supported with some originality, individuality or maturity. Accomplishes the purpose. Effective word choice and sentence variety. Voice and tone engage the audience throughout. Structure is logical and the writing as a whole may appear effortless. Errors are not distracting.

5

Ideas are fully developed and supported. Has a clear sense of purpose. Appropriate word choice and sentence variety. Voice and tone generally engage the audience. Structure is logical and the writing demonstrates control. Errors are not distracting.

4

Ideas are generally straightforward and clear, with some support and sense of purpose. Basic vocabulary, some sentence variety. Attempts to engage the audience, but lacks a consistent voice. Structure may be formulaic. Errors generally do not impede meaning.

3

Ideas are often listed or developed unevenly, with little support or sense of purpose. Limited vocabulary and sentence variety. Lacks a sense of audience and voice. Structure may be weak. Errors may distract and impede meaning.

2

Ideas are often broad generalizations with little support, and no clear purpose. Colloquial vocabulary, weak sentence structure. Writing reflects little understanding of language conventions. Inappropriate tone or language for audience. Structure may seem illogical. Frequent noticeable errors interfere with meaning.

1

Ideas are not developed. Has no discernable purpose. May be too brief to accomplish the task. Lacks structure. Frequent serious errors.

0

No attempt to address the topic or is a restatement of the topic.

Notes: This is a first-draft response and should be assessed as such.
The use of paragraph structure should be assessed holistically with reference to the clarity of organization and expression.

This scoring rubric is derived from the BC Performance Standards for Impromptu Writing.