



**INFORMATION BOOKLET FOR SCORING  
THE REGENTS EXAMINATION IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS  
(COMMON CORE)  
JUNE AND AUGUST 2014 ADMINISTRATIONS**

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

The general procedures to be followed in administering Regents Exams are provided in the publications *Directions for Administering Regents Examinations, June and August 2014 Administrations* (DET 541) and the *School Administrator's Manual*. The *Directions for Administering* are made available on the Department's web site at <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/hsgen/>. The *School Administrator's Manual* is available on the Department's web site at <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/sam/secondary/>.

Questions about **general administration procedures** for Regents Exams 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 (Common Core), 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 exam.

**SCORING THE EXAM**

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

**The Scoring Key and Rating Guide**

In June, the scoring key and rating guide for this exam will be posted on the Department's web site at <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/scoring/> on the date of the exam at approximately 3:00 p.m. In August, the scoring key and rating guide for this exam will be posted on the Department's web site at <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/scoring/> on the date of the exam at approximately 2:30 p.m. Schools must print sufficient copies to supply one to each rater.

The conversion chart for the June exam will be posted by the Rating Day, June 26, 2014. The conversion chart for the August exam will be posted on the day of the exam.

**All scoring keys and rating guides posted on the Department's web site will be password protected. The school principal will receive an e-mail from the Department on the day of the exam that provides the passwords to be used to access all scoring keys and rating guides being posted that day. In order to access these documents, all schools will be required to enter the passwords sent by the Department.**

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 Exam

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 (Common Core) 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 exams, student responses may not be scored by the student's summer school teacher or the 2013–14 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 exam 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 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

A sample of schools statewide has been selected for and received notification of their selection for a score collection project to support the standard setting of the June 2014 Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core). These schools will administer the exam using answer sheets that were provided by the Department's contractor, Data Recognition Corporation. Data Recognition Corporation will also be providing scanning services for only those answer sheets that it has furnished to the schools participating in the score collection project.

For the June 2014 Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core), all schools must use uniform scannable answer sheets. These answer sheets are provided to schools either by the regional information center, the large-city scanning center, or, only for those schools that have been selected for the Department's score collection project, by the Department's contractor, Data Recognition Corporation. (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 exam, follow the procedures outlined below:

### *Introduction to the Tasks*

The introduction to each task may take place once the administration of the exam has begun. However, use of the actual scoring key and rating guide for the exam 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 web site.

- 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 exam 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 exam 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 exam 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 exams, student responses may not be scored by the student's summer school teacher or the student's 2013–14 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 exam, student responses may not be scored by the student's summer school teacher or the student's 2013–14 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' Exam 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
<b>A</b>	2	<b>B</b>	2	—	—	2	Two ratings agree. Use that score.
<b>A</b>	2	<b>B</b>	3	—	—	2.5	Two ratings are contiguous. Average the two scores.
<b>A</b>	2	<b>B</b>	4	<b>J</b>	4	4	Two ratings are two or more points apart. Third rating is done. Two of the three ratings agree. Use that score.
<b>A</b>	2	<b>B</b>	5	<b>J</b>	4	4	Two ratings are two or more points apart. Third rating is done. Three ratings differ. Use the middle score.
<b>A</b>	0	<b>B</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>	<b>A</b>	4	<b>B</b>	4	—	—	4
<i>Student B</i>	<b>A</b>	0	<b>B</b>	1	—	—	.5
<i>Student C</i>	<b>A</b>	4	<b>B</b>	6	<b>J</b>	5	5
<i>Student D</i>	<b>A</b>	4	<b>B</b>	2	<b>J</b>	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>	<b>A</b>	4	<b>B</b>	4	—	—	4
<i>Student B</i>	<b>A</b>	0	<b>B</b>	1	—	—	.5
<i>Student C</i>	<b>A</b>	4	<b>B</b>	3	—	—	3.5
<i>Student D</i>	<b>A</b>	4	<b>B</b>	2	<b>J</b>	3	3

**Determining the Student’s Final Exam Score  
for the Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)**

The format of the conversion chart is illustrated below. The chart provided on the Department’s web site for each administration of this exam 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 exam score.

If the determination of each student’s final exam 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 exam 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 exam after each question has been rated the required number of times, regardless of the final exam score. Schools are required to ensure that the raw scores have calculated correctly and that the resulting scale score has been determined accurately.

**Chart for Converting Total Weighted Raw Scores to Final Exam 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 exam. 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 exam 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 exams. Teachers and administrators who violate Department policy with respect to scoring State exams 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 exam 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 names of the students whose scores have been corrected, the exam 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 exam 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 exam 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 exam 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 exam. 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 exam scores when appropriate. Only in such circumstances is the school not required to notify or obtain approval from the Department to correct students' final exam 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:
<b>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</b>	-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
<b>Command of Evidence: the extent to which the essay presents evidence from the provided texts to support analysis</b>	-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
<b>Coherence, Organization, and Style: the extent to which the essay logically organizes complex ideas, concepts, and information using formal style and precise language</b>	-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
<b>Control of Conventions: the extent to which the essay demonstrates command of conventions of standard English grammar, usage, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling</b>	-demonstrate control of the 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.



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

- 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 (Common Core)

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 exam scoring records for one year.*









