



MATRIC ENGLISH FIRST ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE PAPER 3 MEMORANDUM

NOTE:

All the rubrics included in this memo are taken from the examination Guideline 2009.

APPENDIX B: ASSESSMENT RUBRICS FOR FIRST ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE **SECTION A: RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING AN ESSAY – FIRST ADDITIONAL** **LANGUAGE (50 marks)**

	Code 7: Outstanding 80-100%	Code 6: Meritorious 70-79%	Code 5: Substantial 60-69%	Code 4: Adequate 50-59%	Code 3: Moderate 40-49%	Code 2: Elementary 30-39%	Code 1: Not achieved 0-29%
CONTENT & PLANNING 32 MARKS	26-32 -Content shows impressive insight into topic. -Ideas thought-provoking, mature. -Planning &/or drafting has produced a virtually flawless, presentable essay.	22½-25½ -Content shows thorough interpretation of topic. -Ideas imaginative, interesting. - Planning &/or drafting has produced a well-crafted & presentable essay.	19½-22 -Content shows a sound interpretation of the topic. -Ideas interesting, convincing. - Planning &/or drafting has produced a presentable & very good essay.	16-19 -Content an adequate interpretation of topic. -Ideas ordinary, lacking depth. - Planning &/or drafting has produced a satisfactorily presented essay.	13-15½ -Content ordinary. Gaps in coherence. -Ideas mostly relevant. Repetitive. - Planning &/or drafting has produced a moderately presentable & coherent essay.	10-12½ -Content not always clear, lacks coherence. -Few ideas, often repetitive. -Inadequate evidence of planning/drafting. Essay not well presented.	0-9½ -Content irrelevant. No coherence. -Ideas repetitive. -Non-existent planning/drafting. Poorly presented essay.
LANGUAGE, STYLE & EDITING 12 MARKS	10-12 -Critical awareness of impact of language. -Language, punctuation effectively used. Uses figurative language. -Choice of words highly appropriate. -Style, tone, register highly suited to topic. -Virtually error-free following proof-reading & editing.	8½-9½ -Critical awareness of impact of language. -Language, punctuation correct; able to include figurative language correctly. -Choice of words varied & correctly used. -Style, tone, register appropriately suited to topic. -Largely error-free following proof-reading, editing.	7½-8 -Critical awareness of language evident. -Language & punctuation mostly correct. -Choice of words suited to text. -Style, tone, register suited to topic in most of the essay. -By and large error-free following proof-reading, editing.	6-7 -Some awareness of impact of language. -Language simplistic, punctuation adequate. -Choice of words adequate. -Style, tone, register generally consistent with topic requirements. -Still contains errors following proof-reading, editing.	5-5½ -Limited critical language awareness. -Language ordinary & punctuation often inaccurately used. -Choice of words basic. -Style, tone register lacking in coherence. -Contains several errors following proof-reading, editing.	4-4½ -Language & punctuation flawed. -Choice of words limited. -Style, tone, register inappropriate. -Error-ridden despite proof-reading, editing.	0-3½ -Language & punctuation seriously flawed. -Choice of words inappropriate. -Style, tone, register flawed in all aspects. -Error-ridden & confused following proof-reading, editing.

STRUCTURE 6 MARKS	<u>5-6</u> -Coherent development of topic. Vivid detail. -Sentences, paragraphs coherently constructed. -Length in accordance with requirements of topic.	<u>4½</u> -Logical development of details. Coherent. -Sentences, paragraphs logical, varied. -Length correct.	<u>4</u> -Several relevant details developed. -Sentences, paragraphs well constructed. -Length almost correct.	<u>3-3½</u> -Some points, necessary details developed. -Sentences, paragraphing might be faulty in places but essay still makes sense. -Length correct.	<u>2½</u> -Some necessary points evident. -Sentences, paragraphs faulty but ideas can be understood. -Length - too long/short.	<u>2</u> -Sometimes off topic. General line of thought difficult to follow. -Sentences, paragraphs constructed at an elementary level. -Length - too long/short.	<u>0-1½</u> -Off topic. -Sentences, paragraphs muddled, inconsistent. Length - far too long/short.
------------------------------	---	---	--	---	--	--	--

SECTION B: RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING LONGER TRANSACTIONAL TEXTS
– FIRST ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE
(30 marks)

	Code 7: Outstanding 80-100%	Code 6: Meritorious 70-79%	Code 5: Substantial 60-69%	Code 4: Adequate 50-59%	Code 3: Moderate 40-49%	Code 2: Elementary 30-39%	Code 1: Not achieved 0-29%
CONTENT, PLANNING & FORMAT 20 MARKS	<u>16-20</u> -Specialised knowledge of requirements of the text. -Disciplined writing – maintains thorough focus, no digressions. -Text fully coherent in content & ideas & all detail support the topic. -Evidence of planning &/or drafting has produced a virtually flawlessly presentable text. -Has applied all the necessary rules of format/outstanding .	<u>14-15½</u> -Good knowledge of requirements of the text. -Disciplined writing – learner maintains focus, hardly any digressions. -Text is coherent in content & ideas, with all details supporting the topic. -Evidence of planning &/or drafting has produced a well crafted, presentable text. -Has applied the necessary rules of format/meritorious.	<u>12-13½</u> -Fair knowledge of requirements of the text. -Writing – learner maintains focus, with minor digressions. -Text is coherent in content & ideas, and details support the topic. -Evidence of planning &/or drafting has produced a presentable & good text. -Has applied most of the necessary rules of format/substantial.	<u>10-11½</u> -Adequate knowledge of requirements of the text. -Writing – learner digresses from topic but does not impede overall meaning. -Text adequately coherent in content & ideas & some details support the topic. -Evidence of planning &/or drafting has produced a satisfactorily presented text. -Has applied an adequate idea of the requirements of the format.	<u>8-9½</u> -Moderate knowledge of requirements of the text. Response to writing task reveals a narrow focus. -Writing – learner digresses, meaning is vague in places. -Text moderately coherent in content & ideas and has basic details which support the topic. -Evidence of planning &/or drafting has produced a moderately presentable & coherent text. -Has a moderate idea of requirements of format – some critical oversights.	<u>6-7½</u> -Elementary knowledge of requirements of the text. Response to writing task reveals a limited focus. -Writing – learner digresses, meaning is obscure in places. -Text not always coherent in content & ideas, and has few details which support the topic. -Inadequate planning &/or drafting. Text not well presented, -Has vaguely applied the necessary rules of format.	<u>0-5½</u> -No knowledge of requirements of the text. -Writing – learner digresses, meaning is obscure in places. -Text not coherent in content & ideas, too few details to support topic. -Planning/ drafting non-existent. Poorly presented text. -Has not applied the necessary rules of format.
LANGUAGE, STYLE & EDITING 10 MARKS	<u>8-10</u> -Text is grammatically accurate & well constructed. -Vocabulary is very appropriate to purpose, audience & context. -Style, tone, register very appropriate. -Text virtually error-free following proof-reading, editing. -Length correct.	<u>7- 7½</u> -Text is well constructed & accurate. -Vocabulary is mostly appropriate to purpose, audience & context. -Style, tone and register mostly appropriate -Text largely error-free following proof-reading, editing. -Length correct.	<u>6-6½</u> -Text is well constructed & easy to read. -Vocabulary is appropriate to purpose, audience & context. -Style, tone, register generally appropriate. -Text mostly error-free following proof-reading, editing. -Length correct.	<u>5-5½</u> -Text is adequately constructed. Errors do not impede flow. -Vocabulary is adequate for the purpose, audience & context. -Style, tone, register adequately appropriate. -Text still contains a few errors following proof-reading, editing. -Length almost correct.	<u>4-4½</u> -Text is basically constructed. Several errors. -Vocabulary is limited & not very suitable for the purpose, audience & context. -Lapses in style, -Text contains several errors following proof-reading, editing. -Length – too long/short.	<u>3-3½</u> -Text is poorly constructed & difficult to follow. -Vocabulary requires remediation & not suitable for purpose, audience & context. -Style, tone & register inappropriate. -Text error-ridden despite proof-reading, editing. -Length – too long/short.	<u>0- 2½</u> -Text is poorly constructed and muddled. -Vocabulary requires serious remediation & not suitable for purpose. -Style, tone & register do not correspond with topic -Text error-ridden and confused following proof-reading, editing. -Length – far too long/short.

**SECTION C: RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING SHORTER
TRANSACTIONAL/REFERENCE/INFORMATIONAL TEXTS –
FIRST ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE (20 marks)**

	Code 7: Outstanding 80-100%	Code 6: Meritorious 70-79%	Code 5: Substantial 60-69%	Code 4: Adequate 50-59%	Code 3: Moderate 40-49%	Code 2: Elementary 30-39%	Code 1: Not achieved 0-29%
CONTENT, PLANNING & FORMAT 13 MARKS	<u>10½-13</u> -Specialised knowledge of requirements of text. -Disciplined writing – learner maintains thorough focus, no digressions. -Text fully coherent in content & ideas, and all details support topic. -Evidence of planning &/or drafting has produced a virtually flawless, presentable text. -Has applied all the necessary rules of format.	<u>9½-10</u> -Good knowledge of requirements of text. -Disciplined writing – learner maintains focus, hardly any digressions. -Text is coherent in content & ideas with all details supporting the topic. -Evidence of planning &/or drafting has produced a well crafted & presentable text. -Has applied the necessary rules of format.	<u>8-9</u> -Fair knowledge of requirements of the text. -Writing – learner maintains focus, with minor digressions. -Text is coherent in content & ideas, and details support topic. -Evidence of planning &/or drafting has produced a presentable and good text. -Has applied most of the necessary rules of format.	<u>6½-7½</u> -Adequate knowledge of requirements of text. -Writing – learner digresses but does not impede overall meaning. -Text adequately coherent in content & ideas and some details support topic. -Evidence of planning &/or drafting has produced a satisfactorily presented text. -Has applied an adequate idea of the requirements of format.	<u>5½-6</u> -Moderate knowledge of requirements of the text. Response to writing task reveals a narrow focus. -Writing – learner digresses, meaning vague in places. -Text moderately coherent in content & ideas and has basic details which support the topic. -Evidence of planning &/or drafting that has produced a moderately presentable & coherent text. -Has a moderate idea of requirements of the format – some critical oversights.	<u>4-5</u> -Elementary knowledge of requirements of the text. Response to writing task reveals a limited focus. -Writing – learner digresses, meaning obscure in places. -Text not always coherent in content & ideas, and has few details which support the topic. -Planning/drafting inadequate. Text not well presented. -Has vaguely applied the necessary rules of format.	<u>0-3½</u> -No knowledge of requirements of the text. -Writing – learner digresses, meaning is obscure in places. -Text not coherent in content & ideas and too few details to support the topic. -Planning and drafting non-existent. Poorly presented text. -Has not applied the necessary rules of format.
LANGUAGE, STYLE & EDITING 7 MARKS	<u>6-7</u> -Text is grammatically accurate and well constructed. -Vocabulary is very appropriate to purpose, audience and context. -Style, tone, register very appropriate. -Text virtually error-free following proof-reading and editing. -Length correct.	<u>5-5½</u> -Text is well constructed and accurate. -Vocabulary is mostly appropriate to purpose, audience and context. -Style, tone and register mostly appropriate. -Text largely error-free following proof-reading, editing. -Length correct.	<u>4½</u> -Text is well constructed and easy to read. -Vocabulary is very appropriate to purpose, audience and context. -Style, tone, register generally appropriate. -Text mostly error-free following proof-reading, editing. -Length correct.	<u>3½-4</u> -Text is adequately constructed. Errors do not impede flow. -Vocabulary is adequate for purpose, audience & context. -Style, tone and register adequately appropriate. -Text still contains few errors following proof-reading, editing. -Length almost correct.	<u>3</u> -Text is basically constructed. Several errors. -Vocabulary is limited and not very suitable for purpose, audience and context. -Lapses in style, tone and register. -Text contains several errors following proof-reading, editing. -Length – too long/short.	<u>2½</u> -Text is poorly constructed and difficult to follow. -Vocabulary requires some remediation and not suitable for purpose, audience and context. -Style, tone and register inappropriate. -Text error-ridden despite proof-reading, editing. -Length – too long/short.	<u>0-2</u> -Text is poorly constructed and muddled. -Vocabulary requires serious remediation & not suitable for purpose. -Style, tone & register do not correspond with topic -Text error-ridden and confused following proof-reading, editing. -Length – far too long/short.