

## SCORING RUBRIC FOR THE FOUNDATIONS OF READING TEST

### Performance Characteristics:

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Purpose                  | The extent to which the response achieves the purpose of the assignment.     |
| Subject Matter Knowledge | Accuracy and appropriateness in the application of subject matter knowledge. |
| Support                  | Quality and relevance of supporting details.                                 |
| Rationale                | Soundness of argument and degree of understanding of the subject matter.     |

### Scoring Scale:

| Score Point | Score Point Description   |
|-------------|---|
| <b>4</b>    | <p><b>The "4" response reflects a thorough knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of the assignment is fully achieved.</li> <li>• There is a substantial, accurate, and appropriate application of subject matter knowledge.</li> <li>• The supporting evidence is sound; there are high-quality, relevant examples.</li> <li>• The response reflects an ably reasoned, comprehensive understanding of the topic.</li> </ul> |
| <b>3</b>    | <p><b>The "3" response reflects an adequate knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of the assignment is largely achieved.</li> <li>• There is a generally accurate and appropriate application of subject matter knowledge.</li> <li>• The supporting evidence is adequate; there are some acceptable, relevant examples.</li> <li>• The response reflects an adequately reasoned understanding of the topic.</li> </ul>     |
| <b>2</b>    | <p><b>The "2" response reflects a limited knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of the assignment is partially achieved.</li> <li>• There is a limited, possibly inaccurate or inappropriate, application of subject matter knowledge.</li> <li>• The supporting evidence is limited; there are few relevant examples.</li> <li>• The response reflects a limited, poorly reasoned understanding of the topic.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>1</b>    | <p><b>The "1" response reflects a weak knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of the assignment is not achieved.</li> <li>• There is little or no appropriate or accurate application of subject matter knowledge.</li> <li>• The supporting evidence, if present, is weak; there are few or no relevant examples.</li> <li>• The response reflects little or no reasoning about or understanding of the topic.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>U</b>    | <b>The response is unrelated to the assigned topic, illegible, primarily in a language other than English, not of sufficient length to score, or merely a repetition of the assignment.</b>   |
| <b>B</b>    | <b>There is no response to the assignment.</b>  |

## FIRST SAMPLE WEAK RESPONSE FOR OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #1

One of Tyler's strengths relating to reading comprehension is that she understands how people feel in the story. She says that "Aunt Evelyn seems really happy" and she picks up on that because of the clues about how she is smiling and laughing throughout the passage.

One of Tyler's weaknesses in reading and comprehending the story would be her lack in understanding the vocabulary. When she does not understand what "spangles" are and she tries to relate it to a word that rhymes with it. Because of this Tyler does not fully understand what she is reading or how to explain it to her teacher.

## ANALYSIS FOR FIRST WEAK RESPONSE TO OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #1

*This is an example of a weak response because it is characterized by the following:*

**Purpose:** The candidate has provided a limited response to this prompt. The strength and the weakness given are relatively unimportant aspects of reading comprehension to derive from Tyler's retelling of the story.

**Subject Matter Knowledge:** The candidate does not use specific reading comprehension terminology, e.g., literal and inferential comprehension. The phrases used—"she understands how people feel in the story" and "lack in understanding the vocabulary"—are too vague to demonstrate subject knowledge. If the candidate had discussed the specific passages where Tyler must have inferred meaning in order to conclude that Emma "understands how people feel," or noted the impact that not understanding the word "spangles" may have had on Tyler's comprehension of this passage, the response would have been stronger.

**Support:** Supporting evidence is limited. For example, the candidate overestimates Tyler's strength in "understanding how people feel in the story." Tyler's description of Aunt Evelyn is misquoted as "smiling and laughing throughout the passage." At the same time, the candidate does not discuss more subtle feelings Tyler may have missed in phrases like, "Emma felt sorry for Aunt Evelyn," and "Aunt Evelyn sighed." Similarly, Tyler's unfamiliarity with one word, "spangles," is cited as a vocabulary weakness, when there are no other indications that Tyler's silent reading is hampered by lack of vocabulary. Noting *how* a child responds to an unknown word, especially a single unknown word, is more important than noting that they did not know a word. Tyler does demonstrate an appropriate approach to understanding the unfamiliar word, reasoning that spangles must be smaller than bangles if Aunt Evelyn needs to worry about the baby eating them.

**Rationale:** The overall response reflects limited reasoning about reading comprehension. The candidate has not connected Tyler's retelling of the passage to recognizing or strengthening her comprehension strategies. How does the fact that Tyler "understands how people feel" specifically connect to her strength in reading comprehension? How did the candidate determine Tyler's overall vocabulary development needs through silent reading?

## SECOND SAMPLE WEAK RESPONSE FOR OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #1

Tyler definitely has some strengths and weaknesses as seen in her retelling of the story. She gave many details but didn't tell the main idea.

Tyler's focus on details shows she was following the story and had good comprehension. She was able to recall such things as the purple booties had spangles and were traded for the pink and blue ones. She knew the names of the characters Aunt Evelyn and Emma. But she left out the relationship between them which was very important.

Some of Tyler's reading comprehension is weak. She tells more about details instead of focusing on the main idea. She needs to learn to look at other key elements in the story rather than including the color of the booties, such as why Emma wanted the purple booties that the aunt was knitting for her baby. Tyler really needs help with this kind of comprehension. Her teacher should give the class a mini-lesson on how to summarize a story. The teacher should explain that details are important, but the point of a summary is to shorten it and tell what the ideas are. Then the teacher should explain that when you re-tell a story you can put in details that go with the main points. These are Tyler's strengths and weaknesses.

## ANALYSIS FOR SECOND WEAK RESPONSE TO OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #1

*This is an example of a weak response because it is characterized by the following:*

**Purpose:** The candidate's response fails to fulfill the purpose of the assignment in several ways. Though the candidate does choose a strength, reading for details, and a weakness, missing the main idea, the candidate misses the significant comprehension skills, such as literal and inferential comprehension. The evidence cited only partially explains the aspects of comprehension he has addressed.

**Subject Matter Knowledge:** In both tasks of the assignment, the candidate's knowledge is limited. Tyler's strength, contrary to the candidate's statements, is not remembering details; she misses many details that might have led her to understand the underlying meaning of the conversation. In addition, the reference to the main idea is faulty; it is not only the main idea that Tyler missed, but also the inferential understanding of why Emma has the exchange with her aunt. The candidate should have noticed that Tyler missed the big picture, the underlying meaning, that Aunt Evelyn was probably knitting the booties for Emma and that Emma wanted the purple booties for herself.

**Support:** The evidence that the candidate provides is not particularly strong. For example, the details cited are limited and many more important details are not addressed, such as Emma's reference to the problem with the spangles and the aunt and Emma's conversation that resulted in the trade. Secondly, though the candidate's choice of Tyler's weakness misses the main idea, the candidate does not provide support or explanation for it.

**Rationale:** The response is poorly reasoned; the candidate does not make clear in his explanation or support what Tyler's comprehension level is. His lack of terminology of reading comprehension skills, such as her "reading comprehension is weak" and she "had good comprehension," result in vague notions about Tyler's reading ability. Precise reading terminology would refer to literal comprehension in the first section and inferential comprehension in the second, which are what the candidate was actually discussing.

## FIRST SAMPLE STRONG RESPONSE FOR OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #1

Tyler's interpretation of the story is obviously a basic one but displays some strengths and weaknesses in the area of reading comprehension. One of Tyler's strengths lies in her inferential comprehension. After reading the story, Tyler tells the teacher that Emma wanted the purple spangled booties for herself and traded her old pink and blue booties with Aunt Evelyn. Tyler understood that Emma wasn't just being nice by giving her aunt advice about the new baby. She picked up on the part of the story where Emma agreed with her aunt that the booties would fit her, by saying "I knew that." This shows that Tyler understood Emma's ulterior motive. However, Tyler misses a more subtle idea that the aunt probably intended the purple booties to be for Emma in the first place.

Another strength that Tyler has is self-monitoring her understanding. She doesn't know what spangles are but relates them to bangles. "Maybe they're like bangles but much smaller."

On the other hand, one of Tyler's weaknesses is literal comprehension. She left out essential details that were part of the story. She left out that Aunt Evelyn is pregnant and is knitting booties for her baby. She left out the fact that Emma gave Aunt Evelyn advice about babies: that babies will "wet and spit up milk and cry," and that babies "will eat spangles," and that the booties she was making were too big for a baby. These omitted literal aspects may have been why Tyler missed some of the inferences in the story.

## ANALYSIS FOR FIRST STRONG RESPONSE TO OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #1

*This is an example of a strong response because it is characterized by the following:*

**Purpose:** The candidate addresses the assignment fully by focusing on reading comprehension and explaining Tyler's demonstration of a strength and a weakness. The response cites specific evidence from both the passage and the retelling that Tyler gives after reading silently.

**Subject Matter Knowledge:** The application of subject knowledge is accurate and substantial, including the correct use of terminology. The distinction between *inferential* ("understood Emma's ulterior motive") and *literal* comprehension ("left out essential details") is clearly stated. The candidate notes that Tyler is *self-monitoring* through questioning the meaning of spangles. The overall discussion is appropriate because a third grader typically begins to include inferential with literal comprehension. The candidate takes the discussion a step further by noticing that Tyler may have missed a more subtle inference, in part due to missing several important details.

**Support:** The candidate provides examples that are both relevant and important to the discussion ("she picked up on the part of the story where Emma agreed," and "she doesn't know what spangles are but relates them to bangles"). The response cites a critical piece of inferential understanding: "Tyler understood that Emma wasn't just being nice by giving her aunt advice about the new baby." Support is sound and the examples are of high quality.

**Rationale:** The response is ably reasoned and relates each part of the discussion to the whole picture of Tyler's comprehension of this silently read passage. The conclusion ties together the two main threads of the discussion: "These omitted literal aspects may have been why Tyler missed some of the inferences in the story."

## SECOND SAMPLE STRONG RESPONSE FOR OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #1

Tyler's retelling reveals quite a bit about her development in reading thus far. As a third grade reader she appears to be right where she should be. Her literal comprehension is fairly strong as she grasps the main idea of the story, while her inferential reading needs attention, which is not unusual at this age. Reading at a below-the-surface level calls for more reading comprehension ability.

Tyler is able to give an overview of the story. Her summary hits the main events: she relates that Aunt Evelyn has some purple booties, that Emma really likes them, and that the two of them make a trade and both are happy with the results. Her retelling, though brief, shows a good grasp of a situation, the problem and the ending. Tyler is aware that she doesn't know what spangles are but after that aside, she returns to telling the rest of the story. So her literal comprehension is her strong strategy at this time.

Where she has difficulty is in the deeper meaning of it all. She is not able to infer the meaning of the conversation between the 7-year-old girl and her aunt. She is not able to grasp that this story is told from the child's point of view, that Emma is giving advice to someone who understands far more than she lets on. When Emma worries that the aunt's baby will eat the spangles, Aunt Evelyn humors her by saying, "I don't know much about babies." Emma takes this at face value (as does Tyler) by responding, "They will eat spangles on booties, and wet and spit up milk and cry. . . ." Also, Tyler doesn't understand that Aunt Evelyn has planned to give the booties to Emma: "I think the . . . booties will fit you."

## ANALYSIS FOR SECOND STRONG RESPONSE TO OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #1

*This is an example of a strong response because it is characterized by the following:*

**Purpose:** The candidate fully responds to the charge of the prompt by pointing to significant reading comprehension skills. A strength, literal comprehension, and a weakness, inferential comprehension, are identified and supported thoroughly with evidence from the prompt.

**Subject Matter Knowledge:** The first paragraph immediately demonstrates the candidate's knowledge about reading comprehension skills. The comments are appropriate to a third grader who is unable to read at a deeper level of comprehension. The candidate picks up on Tyler's missing the significance of the conversation, that Emma is relating it from her seven-year-old perspective.

**Support:** Support is ample throughout the response. The candidate provides pertinent evidence from the prompt, in his own words and by quoting it directly. The explanations supply the context that is needed to understand how the reading attribute and the examples are related.

**Rationale:** The response is ably reasoned and clearly focused on reading comprehension. The choice of strength/weakness to discuss, the explanations given, and the examples provided all show a comprehensive understanding of reading comprehension.

## FIRST SAMPLE WEAK RESPONSE FOR OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #2

To understand Daniel's reading capabilities, I made observation of his teacher's notes on a particular reading performance. From these notes, I will identify one strength and one weakness as demonstrated by Daniel.

One weakness that is evident in his reading is repetition. Though it only occurred twice, it shows that he still can have a tendency to rush to get through the assignment. When he repeats himself, there is a word that he had just struggled with saying out loud. It could be possible that he is repeating the phrase so that he can hear the word aloud again in the same phrase.

Daniel is very diligent about correcting himself. There are an observed nine instances of him giving himself a short pause to think about the word. It is good that he takes time to try to say the word correctly, rather than getting frustrated and giving up. Daniel is strong in recognizing when he does not know a word. Only once did he mispronounce a word without realizing it.

Overall, Daniel is working at a good pace, taking the time to self-correct when he needs to. Daniel needs to work on not repeating himself, so his reading will have a better flow.

## ANALYSIS FOR FIRST WEAK RESPONSE TO OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #2

*This is an example of a weak response because it is characterized by the following:*

**Purpose:** The candidate attempts to address Daniel's "reading capabilities" in a general way and does not focus on the topic of word identification. Consequently, this response fails to identify one specific word identification strategy that is a weakness and one that is a strength.

**Subject Matter Knowledge:** The response shows ambiguity about whether Daniel's reading behaviors are helping or hindering his performance. For example, "repetition," an inaccurate and inappropriate term to use for word identification, is cited as a weakness. Later, the candidate wonders if Daniel is repeating a phrase "so that he can hear the word aloud again in the same phrase," which suggests that repetition might help Daniel's performance. The candidate's assertion that Daniel "can have a tendency to rush to get through the assignment" is unsupported by the record and unrelated to a specific word identification strategy. The candidate accurately observes that Daniel's record shows many instances of self-correcting, but the response uses the vague phrase, "to think about the word," as the reason for this behavior, rather than citing the accompanying word-identification skills shown in the record.

**Support:** The candidate uses vague descriptions of Daniel's reading without citing related instances from the reading record. For example, the statement "When he repeats himself, there is a word that he had just struggled with saying out loud" would have been stronger if the candidate had given examples of Daniel repeating himself and cited some of the words he had just struggled with. Similarly, the candidate states, "There are an observed nine instances of him giving himself a short pause to think about the word." Without specific examples from the passage, and without a specific connection to word identification strategies, it is difficult to know for certain what the candidate means.

**Rationale:** The rationale is weak because the candidate has been unable to draw conclusions about Daniel's word identification skills from the passage. The closing paragraph attempts to summarize Daniel's general reading capabilities but makes no connection to word identification strategies. On the one hand, the candidate says it is good that Daniel "is taking the time to self-correct when he needs to." However, this is followed by a contradictory phrase, that Daniel "needs to work on not repeating himself." Similarly, the candidate says Daniel has a "good pace" but needs a "better flow." As a result, it's unclear how the candidate would approach Daniel's reading instruction.



## SECOND SAMPLE WEAK RESPONSE FOR OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #2

Daniel shows strength in his inference reading. He can figure out what most of the words are. He rereads words that don't make sense so that they can improve the meaning of the sentence. He can read and understand what is there in the story and correct any words that don't go along with the meaning he is making. That is his strength.

He is a good reader for someone in the third grade. It is hard to see any important weaknesses. He got the main plot of the story. Emily ran home and talked to her goldfish and gave him food. Some of the words were hard for him to say so I think he needs to work on his pronunciation. He might be expected to know how to say some of the words he said incorrectly like *forever*. Daniel left out the word *daydreamed* but he might not have seen that word before. He left the *-ing* off bubble but it still made sense.

Daniel should go over the pronunciation of the words he said incorrectly and try to remember how the letters sound. It will be a good idea, then he can read faster and not have to slow down. This will help him to be a better reader.

## ANALYSIS FOR SECOND WEAK RESPONSE TO OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #2

*This is an example of a weak response because it is characterized by the following:*

**Purpose:** The candidate makes little effort to fulfill the purpose of the assignment: he identifies a strength and a weakness but provides little evidence to support his statements. Most importantly, he does not have a clear understanding of the prompt's charge to identify a strength and a weakness centered on word identification strategies.

**Subject Matter Knowledge:** The candidate's subject knowledge about word identification skills is severely limited. The reference to inference reading is inappropriate in a discussion about a child's oral reading performance. The candidate's reluctance to find a weakness, "it is hard to see any . . . weaknesses" and his identification of a problem with pronunciation is further proof of his inadequate knowledge about word identification strategies.

**Support:** The candidate does not provide any real support for the identified strength, only a vague notion of Daniel's ability to reread to correct words that don't make sense. The statement, "he can read and understand what is there in the story," is so limited that its meaning is not clear. The examples given to support the identified weakness do not provide a clear connection to pronunciation.

**Rationale:** The candidate's confusion yields a weak rationale. His inability to use correct terminology or to provide an accurate diagnosis reflects limited knowledge and reasoning about word identification strategies.

## FIRST SAMPLE STRONG RESPONSE FOR OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #2

Daniel shows both strengths and weaknesses in reading this passage aloud to his teacher. He is able to use context clues to correct himself and that is his strength. However, his greatest weakness appears to be in the analysis of word structure.

Daniel's use of context clues is strong. He often says an unknown word incorrectly but then relies on the meaning of the words around it to correct himself. For example, when he reads the word "container" as counter in the phrase "container of fish food," Daniel realizes that it doesn't make sense and reads the phrase correctly. Also, the use of context clues can be seen when he corrects golish for "goldfish" and fib for "fishbowl." He is taking in the meaning of the sentence. He did not self-correct when he read spilled for "sprinkled" because his guess still works within the context.

There are many miscues in this passage that really point to Daniel's weakness. He doesn't seem to have another way to deal with unknown words. His analysis of word structure is lacking, especially with compound words. He paused and misread "backpack," "sunshine," "goldfish," "fishbowl," "forever," and "homework" but then was able to read them correctly using context. It would help Daniel if he learned to break up compound words into their smaller words. This weakness is hurting his overall reading and comprehension.

## ANALYSIS FOR FIRST STRONG RESPONSE TO OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #2

*This is an example of a strong response because it is characterized by the following:*

**Purpose:** This response addresses the assignment fully by focusing on specific and important word identification strategies Daniel used to read this passage aloud. The candidate thoroughly explains how a particular strength and a particular weakness in word identification are revealed and why they are important.

**Subject Matter Knowledge:** The candidate uses specific knowledge of word identification strategies, appropriate to teaching third grade reading, to determine the meaning behind Daniel's efforts to identify words. Aspects of Daniel's word identification are correctly identified and defined, such as the use of context clues ("relies on the meaning of the words around it"), and analysis of word structure (compound words). Several specific examples are provided (e.g., *golish* for *goldfish* as a word in context; *homework* as a compound word), and each one is relevant to the discussion of Daniel's word identification strategies. The candidate even takes the time to offer a plausible explanation for why Daniel did not change one word (*spilled*) that he guessed incorrectly from context clues.

**Support:** The candidate provides substantial and accurate support for the particular word identification skills discussed, citing specific instances of the use of context clues by pointing to Daniel's self-corrections of *counter*, *golish*, and *fib* (*container*, *goldfish*, and *fishbowl*). The candidate further supports Daniel's difficulty with compound words by correctly citing *sunshine*, *forever*, and *homework*, among others. These examples are critical evidence of Daniel's word identification strategies.

**Rationale:** The strength of the rationale is in the candidate's analysis of Daniel's use of context clues from two different perspectives: as a weakness, Daniel "doesn't seem to have another way," and as a strength, Daniel "is taking in the meaning of the sentence" through the context. The candidate demonstrates how breaking down compound words into smaller words would give Daniel an additional word identification strategy. Each part of the discussion demonstrates the candidate's reasoning about Daniel's word identification skill.



## SECOND SAMPLE STRONG RESPONSE FOR OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #2

Though Daniel appears to be quite a competent reader, noted in his familiarity with sight words and his ability to self-correct when constructing meaning, there are some underlying needs. Daniel is overrelying on context clues to the extent that his ability to employ phonics as a word identification strategy is impaired.

His sight word vocabulary is quite extensive which allows him to read with a certain fluency. He does not hesitate with most sight words but identifies them readily. These are words that have to be in his word identification since they cannot be broken down by phonics. From the passage, it can be seen that Daniel readily identifies *there, faster, only, brought, when* and *after*. Several words that might have become high frequency words for him reveal his problem with phonics. He has not readily learned these words, such as *difficult* and *forever*. But the strength of his sight word as well as his high-frequency vocabulary is a real plus for it allows him to read several sections smoothly, such as the last line — "letting her mind float while she watched Sunshine glide through the water."

The weakness with phonics skills can be seen in the words that he must go back and self-correct; these impede the fluency he could be capable of. For example, in the word "fishbowl" which he at first reads as *fib*, it can be seen that Daniel misses the word's structure and its medial phonemes that could reveal to him that this is a compound word, and he fails to notice that it contains both a consonant digraph (sh) and a diphthong (ow). There are so many clues that he is missing in his haste to read using context only as his initial word attack skill.

## ANALYSIS FOR SECOND STRONG RESPONSE TO OPEN-RESPONSE ITEM ASSIGNMENT #2

*This is an example of a strong response because it is characterized by the following:*

**Purpose:** The candidate fulfills the assignment fully by describing a significant strength and weakness. He cites evidence from the prompt of a reading record to support what he says. The candidate's response is thorough, with clear explanations. The information is accurate and appropriate for a prompt focused on word identification strategies.

**Subject Matter Knowledge:** The response shows a more than adequate understanding of the reading process. The candidate identifies a clear strength, sight words, and a significant weakness, phonics. The discussion reveals a thorough knowledge of the subject matter and is accurate for a third grader who has this specific weakness and this specific strength as a developing reader. The candidate uses accurate subject matter terminology (consonant digraphs and diphthongs) to explain Daniel's difficulty with phonics.

**Support:** The response provides examples and explanations for each task. The support is substantial—the candidate cites several sight words to demonstrate Daniel's facility with sight word vocabulary, explains the problems Daniel has with the words *difficult* and *forever*, uses a specific sentence from the passage to demonstrate Daniel's fluency, and analyzes the skills needed to break down the word *fishbowl*. These examples are precise and relevant to the discussion of Daniel's strengths and weaknesses.

**Rationale:** This response reflects a comprehensive knowledge of word identification skills. It is ably reasoned and goes beyond a simple discussion of fluency to demonstrate how fluency is enhanced by sight words and is impeded by problems in phonics.