

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
4	<p>The "4" response reflects a thorough knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the assignment is fully achieved. • There is a substantial, accurate, and appropriate application of subject matter knowledge. • The supporting evidence is sound; there are high-quality, relevant examples. • The response reflects an ably reasoned, comprehensive understanding of the topic.
3	<p>The "3" response reflects an adequate knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the assignment is largely achieved. • There is a generally accurate and appropriate application of subject matter knowledge. • The supporting evidence is adequate; there are some acceptable, relevant examples. • The response reflects an adequately reasoned understanding of the topic.
2	<p>The "2" response reflects a limited knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the assignment is partially achieved. • There is a limited, possibly inaccurate or inappropriate, application of subject matter knowledge. • The supporting evidence is limited; there are few relevant examples. • The response reflects a limited, poorly reasoned understanding of the topic.
1	<p>The "1" response reflects a weak knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the assignment is not achieved. • There is little or no appropriate or accurate application of subject matter knowledge. • The supporting evidence, if present, is weak; there are few or no relevant examples. • The response reflects little or no reasoning about or understanding of the topic.
U	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	There is no response to the assignment.

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.