

Technical Report # 45

Writing at Level 5—6 of the New Zealand English Curriculum: Development of Progress Indicators & Tasks

Abstract: This report overviews the procedures and results of a study in the development of progress indicators and writing tasks for curriculum levels 5 to 6. Progress indicators have been drafted for seven writing purposes (analyse, persuade, instruct, describe, narrate, explain, recount) and for seven scoring dimensions (audience, content, structure, language, grammar, punctuation, and spelling). Lessons learned from the process of reviewing these workshops are documented and issues for further research identified.



Submitted by the Assessment Tools for Teaching and Learning team,

Auckland UniServices Ltd

University of Auckland

December 2003

Writing at Level 5—6 of the New Zealand English Curriculum: Development of Progress Indicators & Tasks

asTTle is funded by the Ministry of Education to Auckland UniServices at the University of Auckland to research and develop an assessment application for Reading, Writing, Mathematics, Pānui, Pāngarau, and Tuhituhi for Years 5-11 (Levels 2-6) for New Zealand schools. We acknowledge this funding, and thank the Ministry of Education for their continued assistance in the development of this project.

This report overviews the procedures and results of a study in the development of progress indicators and writing tasks for curriculum levels 5 to 6. Progress indicators have been drafted for seven writing purposes (analyse, persuade, instruct, describe, narrate, explain, recount) and for seven scoring dimensions (audience, content, structure, language, grammar, punctuation, and spelling). Lessons learned from the process of reviewing these workshops are documented and issues for further research identified.

I would like to thank all the students and teachers in the Auckland secondary schools who piloted the draft tasks and the seven teachers who gave up part of their holiday to constructively review and critique the progress indicators and tasks. Their contribution was invaluable.

Dr Gavin Brown managed the process, facilitated the workshop, and wrote this report. The draft tasks and progress indicators were developed by Diane Pipe, Marcellin College. Raewyn Higginson summarised the teacher evaluation material and Earl Irving assisted with the workshop reviewing processes.



John Hattie
Project Director, asTTle
December, 2003

The bibliographic citation for this report is:

Brown, G.T.L., Pipe, D., & Higginson, R. (2003, December). *Writing at Level 5—6 of the New Zealand English Curriculum: Development of Progress Indicators & Tasks*. asTTle Technical Report 45, University of Auckland/Ministry of Education.

Table of Contents

Issues Arising	4
Workshop Evaluation	7
Discussion	9
Appendix 1. Progress Indicators Levels 4—6.....	11

Consistent with the approach taken by asTTle in developing materials for levels 5—6 in reading and mathematics, preparation for this workshop required the development of draft progress indicators and tasks. This work was carried out by Diane Pipe, Assistant HOD English Marcellin College, managed by Dr Gavin Brown, with feedback and advice from Raewyn Higginson and Irene Andersen. Approximately five tasks per purpose were drafted and, after artwork was done, 20 of the 35 tasks were piloted in 20 classrooms in approximately 12 Auckland region secondary school Year 10 classrooms. From November 10, 2003, on full-time secondment from her school, Diane began developing rubrics for the deep features for the 7 purposes and the common surface features dimensions. Diane referenced the Level 4 asTTle indicators, the ARB, Exemplar, and NCEA progress indicators, as well as a sample of available text books and web sites on writing. It is worth noting that there is little New Zealand work available beyond the qualifications system resources on writing at this level.

Once a set of progress indicators was drafted, the student writing in response to the pilot tasks was reviewed to elicit further refinement in the scale. This review also identified exemplary scripts for characteristics of progress within the purpose and exemplary snippets of language to elucidate each dimension and level. Further, the review indicated any tasks that needed further improvement to ensure that students were guided appropriately in writing to both the standard and purpose expected. It is worth noting that, as may be expected of Year 10 students, little of the writing in the small samples collected exhibited characteristics of Level 6. The draft indicators and exemplary tasks were assembled into manuals for review in a workshop.

A three day writing workshop was held with the aims of critiquing draft Level 5 and 6 writing progress indicators and reviewing draft writing tasks to ensure they meet appropriate quality standards. Seven secondary school English and literacy teachers participated in the workshop in the first week of the secondary end-of-year break (8th-10th December 2004) at the Jet Inn, Mangere, Manukau City. The workshop was led Dr. Gavin Brown, and facilitated by Earl Irving and Diane Pipe. In reviewing the progress indicators and tasks, panellists were asked to ensure that they were consistent with the appropriate level curriculum objectives for both functions and processes and that the language and illustrations of the tasks were accurate and suitable to elicit appropriate responses from the students.

Issues Arising

In the process of reviewing the scoring rubrics for curriculum levels 5—6, several important points became apparent. The first point, perhaps obvious, was that there are two higher curriculum levels of writing that are expected of students; to wit, levels 7 and 8. It was clearly assumed by panellists that the cognitive, linguistics, and content complexity and sophistication expected of students in Years 12 and 13 doing the highest levels of English courses formed a clear reference point in the design of these rubrics. This awareness that there were higher standards yet to be expected or achieved also had impact on the panellists' analysis of the current asTTle V2 rubrics for curriculum level 4. The experience of these teachers (ranging from low to high decile) was that many of the indicators for Level 4 were overly ambitious and that many of the words better fitted Levels 5 or 6 depending on purpose or dimension. Thus, asTTle V4 rubrics that will be used for Levels 5—6 will have differences in criteria for Level 4—some investigation into the impact of that on the validity of asTTle norms and the comparability of asTTle progress indicators with other government projects is recommended.

A second important point was the expected relationship of curriculum levels to NQF levels. It became readily apparent that teachers associated NCEA 1 with curriculum level 5

rather than assuming NCEA 1 standard equated with Level 6. Although consistent with the advice in the asTTle level 5—6 writing curriculum map, the implications for this approach need to be examined. Discussions with a group of MOE, NZQA, PPTA officials in Wellington earlier this year, seemed to support this analysis. Ratification from a wider range of sources is merited; but more importantly, an explicit empirically-driven study of equivalences across the two frameworks is necessary (e.g., cross mark scripts from asTTle and NZQA on both scales and determine nature of scoring relationships).

Written comments from six teachers at the end of the workshop were made regarding NCEA (n= 4) and NQF (n = 2). Several teachers wrote identifying the complementary roles of asTTle to NCEA by providing formative and diagnostic information to teachers and students prior to the summative assessment of NCEA:

- *“asTTle at levels will match NCEA L1, L2 and L3. [it] Would be useful as formative assessment in order to find out what is lacking. This would help in reporting to student and parents, selecting appropriate resources and focus teaching . I see NCEA at the senior school as summative assessment and much teaching is required to get to that point. asTTle would provide some fine tuning. It would link to the curriculum and be a helpful benchmark for what is expected at that curriculum level. Also curriculum levels could be matched to NCEA assessments. But best of all the purposes, skills would be broken down and that is useful for everyone.”*
- *“Some clear and useful links with L1, especially useful in helping students to see how they can improve”.*
- *“asTTle will be very helpful as a formative tool to give a strong indication to teachers of strengths and weaknesses of students in order to aid their teaching in preparing students for summative tasks”.*
- *“This [asTTle] will mean I teach better at the levels where the NQF kicks in”.*

Another identified a significant difference between asTTle and NCEA; *“I don ’t think the link (NQF) is explicit as the approach is different. This is the fault of NCEA especially, not of asTTle (e.g. not best fit, not specific or perspective)”* that appears to suggest approval of the asTTle approach. Another teacher requested *“clearer connections with Secondary Qual. Frameworks”* as a useful addition to asTTle. Thus, there appears to be a very positive reception of asTTle vis a vis the work of secondary English teachers preparing students for secondary school qualifications assessments.

A third point was the interaction of levels and purposes. Based on the scoring data from asTTle V2, one could be forgiven for arguing that the six asTTle purposes are not highly differentiated in scoring and that separate rubrics are not justified bar their pedagogical value. However, in approaching the Recount purpose after having previously reviewed the Narrate purpose, it was expected there would be a high degree of similarity between the progress indicators. Upon close inspection of the inherent characteristics of the recount purpose and upon review of the rate of progress teachers experience students making in that type of writing an interesting difference was noted. The indicators for Level 5 narrate were transferred to Level 4 Recount and several significant wording changes were made; fundamentally although both types of writing have similar purposes the characteristics of progress are different in terms of level and dimension.

This leads to a fourth important finding from the workshop. Notwithstanding variation between purposes, there was a noticeable pattern in linking levels to characteristics of performance. The following terms were associated as essentials of each level as each dimension within each purpose was reviewed and found helpful in constructing appropriate rubrics:

Level 4 → adequate, list-like grouping

Level 5 → generalised, partial, inconsistent

Level 6 → targeted, sustained, consistent

A close inspection of the asTTle rubrics would reveal other level consistent patterns of language used to describe progress in writing performance.

Because asTTle has taken a deliberately cross-curriculum approach to writing (i.e., purposes beyond traditional English classroom writing are assessed), one participant commented that the “*cross-curricular tasks may need to be reviewed by content specific teachers*”. This would include all tasks under the purposes Instruct, Explain, and Describe. The same teacher felt that other subjects have a legitimate role in teaching writing and that, in her words, she would “*hate to think asTTle puts responsibility for all writing on English teachers*”. This is

consistent with the movement from ‘literacy as the responsibility of the English department’ to ‘literacy being all teachers’ responsibility’ advocated by the Ministry of Education’s interventions in literacy leadership.

A further point was the issue of the new secondary school purpose of analysis. This purpose is the early stages of literary analysis and criticism. The difficult issue with this purpose, notwithstanding its ubiquity in secondary English classrooms, is that the audience and purpose is somewhat artificial. The traditional audience for analysis writing is the teacher/assessor who knows better than the student what the text is about and thus for students the purpose may be to simply rehearse what the teacher already knows. In order to address this uncertainty, it was determined that each task would specify that the audience as an adult who has already read the text and that the purpose would be to help this generalised other to understand the ‘text’ in a new, different, more complete, better, deeper, or fresher way. As there were no progress indicators for this purpose already extant in asTTle, extensive discussion and debate ensued in the crafting of these objectives.

It was also determined that in the time available and the number of dimensions for which objectives were necessary (7 purposes x 4 deep + surface features x 3 = 31 dimensions), that the workshop would revise the Proficient level descriptor for each of curriculum levels 4 to 6 only. It was determined that the development of rules and protocols for assigning performance into Basic or Advanced categories, would best be done with a further group of teachers using the current drafts in conjunction with the pilot scripts already collected.

Workshop Evaluation

At the end of the workshop all teacher participants ($n = 7$) were asked to complete a satisfaction survey about important aspects of the workshop. An agreement response scale was used with six response points (two negative and four positive). Mean and standard deviation (*SD*) were calculated using 1 for strongly disagree, and 6 for strongly agree. Aggregated data for the workshop are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Ratings of Teacher Participant Satisfaction

Statement	Total <i>M (SD)</i>
1. My work was explained and directed well.	6 (0)
2. The training for this workshop gave me a clearer understanding about writing curriculum levels 5 and 6.	6 (0)
3. Reviewing instructions were clear.	6 (0)
4. The location was conducive to our work.	5.43 (.79)
5. Understandings gained from this workshop about writing curriculum levels 5 and 6 will help me plan my teaching better.	5.86 (.38)
6. The workload of the workshop was just right.	5.86 (.38)
7. I will encourage my colleagues to participate in Project asTTle activities next year.	6 (0)
8. The rubrics used were consistent with NZ curriculum levels 5 and 6 and bands within each level.	5.71 (.49)
9. The food and beverages were satisfactory	5.71 (.49)
10. Understandings gained from this workshop about writing curriculum levels 5 and 6 will help me assess students better.	5.86 (.38)

Venues

Venues refer to Statements 4 and 9, along with comments about the venues and sustenance. On the whole the participants were relatively positive about the venues (M 5.43, SD .79), although this statement did rate the lowest of all ten. One participant explained that the venue was *a long way for those who live in West/North*.

The food and beverages (M 5.71, SD .49) did cause some comment, most of it positive (*Excellent food*). However there was one person who found the morning teas too ‘sweet’. Another two people who requested a variety of lollies be placed on the tables as was done by the Quality Inn, Wellington.

Workshop activities

Workshop activities includes information on the professional development for the workshop in order for the participants to complete the required task, and the workload. Statements 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8 pertain to this area of the evaluation report. These statements consistently rated the highest with very strong agreement.

The participants were extremely positive towards the explanation of work (*M 6, SD 0*), clear reviewing of instructions (*M 6, SD 0*) and training (*M 6, SD 0*), and the participants also found the workload to be highly satisfactory (*M 5.86, SD .38*). There were no comments from participants to explain these high ratings.

Application of asTTle

This last set of statements (5, 7, 8, and 10) asks the participants their thoughts about the use of asTTle and asTTle related activities after the completion of the workshop. Participants strongly agreed that they would encourage their colleagues to be involved in future asTTle projects (*M 6, SD .0*). The participants perceived the categories used to rate items as consistent with the NZ curriculum (*M 5.71, SD .49*). Participants were asked to comment on the use of asTTle writing rubrics relative to the National Qualifications Framework assessment.

Discussion

The venues used for asTTle workshops in Auckland is always troublesome for participants especially as traffic congestion and location remains an issue no matter where in Auckland the workshops are held. The Jet Inn remains a convenient location as parking is on site and free with easy access off the airport motorway, the food is usually very good and the conference room is well equipped and a good size for asTTle workshops. In addition the service remains efficient and we are now known to them.

It is encouraging that all participants agreed that they would encourage other colleagues to participate in asTTle work especially with the upcoming literacy trials and subsequent marking for the writing trial papers in Easter 2004 where asTTle will need to recruit significant

numbers of teacher/markers. The comments from a couple of teacher and the ratings for statements 8 and 10 indicate that most teachers find the workshop a valuable exercise for their own professional development and they were able to see a way they may apply the lessons from the workshop into their own teaching practices and classrooms.

We further assert that part of the success in this workshop in developing appropriate rubrics is that the workshop did not begin with a blank page. Teachers of writing, as those of reading and mathematics, appear to be powerful contributors to the development of sound classroom, curriculum-based materials when presented with first efforts to which they react, respond, and critique.

Appendix 1. Progress Indicators Levels 4—6 Analyse

Dimension	Level 4 Proficient	Level 5 Proficient	Level 6 Proficient
Audience Awareness and Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language use and writing style is appropriate to the needs of audience. • Little evidence of writer's awareness of audience expertise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audience expertise is acknowledged by relevant selection of content and language but this may not always be sustained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audience expertise is acknowledged by largely sustained, appropriate selection and interpretation of content. • Intended audience's needs are met consistently.
Content / Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal response predominates. • Straightforward description of literary text is given. • Student text may include unnecessary repetition or retelling of literary text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses literary text analysis (e.g., plot, character, theme, setting) to explain topic. • Relevant details (incl. quotations) are given and writer attempts to explain their importance to their analysis. • Writer may analyse making some use of appropriate personal response or reference to other texts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses literary text analysis (i.e., character, theme, setting, language, content) to interpret topic. • Analyses making use of appropriate personal responses and / or reference to other texts. • Details (incl. quotations) are used consistently and appropriately.
Structure / Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning provides orientation and may provide context for writing • Attempts are evident of grouping or sequencing of analysis (e.g., thematic grouping). • Across the text there is a sense of an attempt to organise content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Straightforward conventional structure is apparent (introduction, body, conclusion). • Ideas are structured and organised in paragraphs with topic sentences to signpost key ideas. • Some appropriate ordering and linking between paragraphs is evident. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concise introduction to topic and structure overview of student's own text is given. • Strong organisational structures / transitions are evident within and between paragraphs. • Consistent selection, placement and ordering of relevant material in paragraphs and throughout the text.
Language Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer uses appropriate language to give clarity to the analysis. • Attempts to use specialised literary terminology appropriately. • Simple linking language is used (e.g., conjunctions) to link ideas within and across sentences. • May be restricted to simple sentences and repetitive structures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic specialised literary terminology is accurately used. • Straightforward linking language is evident but may not be used consistently. • Appropriate formality is evident but may not be used consistently. • Control of complex sentences is evident. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate and varied linking language is sustained throughout text. • Appropriate formality is sustained. • Writer integrates textual evidence into text. • Control of a variety of sentence structures is evident.

Describe

Dimension	Level 4 Proficient	Level 5 Proficient	Level 6 Proficient
Audience Awareness and Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer does not provide background /context for intended audience. • Basic, simplistic information provided. • Some awareness of audience/purpose evident in introduction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer provides adequate background and little reader inference is required. • Audience included directly /indirectly in text and referred to at beginning and end. • Description / report is set in context of task • Text content sufficient to meet audience's needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer provides appropriate background/context for audience • Consistent / sustained reference to audience needs and own purpose throughout text. • Appropriate response to intended audience needs
Content / Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic simplistic information / task handled adequately • Almost all material is related to the topic of the given task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some elaboration in description • Complexity of content / perspectives (two or more) • Selects and organises material relevant to task and audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes and adds some interpretation/evaluation • May include poetic detail • Consistent elaboration • Elaborated, information laden, and relevant to task and audience
Structure / Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Straight-forward / simplistic, obvious framework • Some list-like grouping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly organised • Intro. and conclusion are used to develop focus to topic • Orientation • Paragraphs used with main ideas and supporting details • Sequence evident • Beginning/end with coherent structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherent, logical structure throughout. • Introduction and conclusion enhance writer's purpose. • Description has shape -begins with general statement then moves to particular • Structure enhances and strengthens ideas in text
Language Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Straight-forward tasks handled with adequate command of task appropriate language • Uses complete sentences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competent but plain prose used • May be inappropriate or uncontrolled "purple prose" • Complex sentences used appropriately • Some figurative language used • Attempts to give vivid description • Attempts to use higher level vocabulary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Controlled/rich vocabulary evident. • Figurative language deliberately used. • Largely controlled / sustained variety of sentence structure for effect. • Richness of vocabulary evident. • Uses a range of language techniques to create an effect in text

Explain

Dimension	Level 4 Proficient	Level 5 Proficient	Level 6 Proficient
Audience Awareness and Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of a straightforward task is clear and can stand alone Language use and writing style is appropriate to the explanation and directed to the reader / audience (e.g., evidence that the reader's needs are being considered). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation is directed to the audience and rationale appropriate to the intended audience for explanation is given but not always developed. Task complexity may prevent writer from meeting intended audience needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation is directed to the audience and rationale appropriate to the intended audience for explanation is developed. Acknowledgment of audience is sustained throughout text and in conclusion. Intended audience needs met consistently despite task complexity.
Content / Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writer identifies the phenomenon process clearly, and may also give contextualising information. Body of text contains a sequenced account of straightforward aspects / processes, and gives associated reasons for 'how it occurs'. These tasks tend to be ordered or time-oriented explanations Little explanation of 'why' is proffered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content is clear, adequately detailed and relevant to topic sentences / paragraphs. Simplistic single chain-like immediate causes are used to explain why phenomenon occurs Generalised level of relevant, accurate details provided for each stage. Complexity of task partially handled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content is clear, comprehensive, and relevant to topic sentence Multiple causes / aspects of phenomenon are acknowledged and explained. Specific relevant, accurate details selected and targeted to support explanation. Complexity of task consistently handled.
Structure / Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beginning provides orientation and may provide context. Attempts at grouping or sequencing explanation (e.g., thematic grouping) across the text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Straightforward conventional structure apparent (intro, body, conclusion) Expresses causal relationships through links. Inconsistent sequencing within or between paragraphs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concise introduction to topic and structure overview of student's own text given Strong sequential structures / transitions evident within and between paragraphs - Consistent selection, placement and ordering of relevant material in paragraphs and throughout the text
Language Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple linking language used (e.g., conjunctions) to link ideas within and across sentences. Reference links clear (pronoun use). Most sentences correct. Uses complete sentences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Straightforward linking language used but may not be used consistently. Technical / specialised language (jargon) is accurately used. Control of complex sentences evident. Appropriate formality attempted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate and varied linking language sustained in use. Satisfactory control of passive voice (as appropriate) Control of a variety of sentence structures is evident. Appropriate formality sustained.

Surface Features

<u>Grammatical conventions</u>	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses complete sentences • subject verb agreement and appropriate word order controlled for straightforward sentences • Uses basic sentence types correctly (Simple, Affirmative, Active, Declarative, Negative, Interrogative) • Some control of Compound and complex sentences • Inconsistent control of tense • Sufficient command evident for writer to communicate with reader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control of complex sentences evident (including embedded interrogatives) • subject verb agreement and appropriate word order controlled for compound/complex sentences • control may not be evident in all parts of written text • Maintains consistent tense • Few errors to interfere with communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustained control of all sentence grammar evident throughout piece with only few errors • Control enhances communication
<u>Punctuation</u> <u>To assist reader's understanding</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple sentence types punctuation correct (period, capital letter, question mark). • Evidence of attempt at correct use of some examples of complex punctuation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent evidence of control of commas, colons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control of comma, colon,
<u>Spelling</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few errors within HFW (Lists 1-7) and common spelling patterns evident • Evidence of ability to attempt multi-syllabic, irregular, or technical words 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts complex multi-syllabic, irregular, or technical words with inconsistent success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely sustained control of complex multi-syllabic, irregular, or technical words

Instruct

Dimension	Level 4 Proficient	Level 5 Proficient	Level 6 Proficient
Audience Awareness and Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little audience inference is required for task to be done. • Writer does not make allowances for prior knowledge of audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal experience of writer forms basis of rationale. • Some awareness that audience may have already done task or similar (or never done such a task before). • Speaks directly to audience. • Gives comprehensive information to audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience, background, purpose, motivation, needs (including psychological and emotional) of audience taken into account. • Gives / explains rationale for instruction. • Empathy shown for reader's needs.
Content / Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most content is relevant. • Task can be followed because enough content / accuracy / precision is provided. • List-like instructions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides general advice on method/ procedure/ support & rationale. • Sub-steps elaborated. • May include diagram/ illustration as appropriate. • Procedure elements show developed content knowledge. • Main and supporting ideas given with evidence of selection to suit audience interest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted advice. • Running commentary/rationale provided to give psychological and emotional support. • Effective and judicious excision/ selection of detail (not over-detailed). • Conditional steps included.
Structure / Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate grouping of content. • Adequate use of headings and numbering. • Conventional paragraphing. • Elements of procedure grouped or sequenced appropriately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses headings and categories effectively. • Deliberate use of ordering devices for effect. • Subheadings used. • Clear, coherent structure. • Expansions placed logically. • Introduction sets tone, gives parameters and justification for writing. • Sequence indicated in paragraph links. • Combination of organisation methods may be evident. • Effective conclusion –often uses an imperative. • Material is logically organised- • Clever linking of ideas from 1 paragraph to another. • Evidence of some attempt to select material tailored to task rather than all relevant material on topic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May extend / manipulate conventional structures. • Strong links between paragraphs used to hold readers attention. • Variety of effective, appropriate methods used to organise material (Itinerary, list, subject group paragraphs). • Strong concluding address to reader.

Language Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistently refers to reader in generalised way (one/you). • Most sentences correct. • Control of complex sentences evident, where appropriate. • Uses complete sentences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate use of specialised language evident but not always sustained. • Topic specific language used. • Shows a variety of address which develops relationship with reader depending on purpose of text. • Evidence of use of language techniques to write task effectively. • May adjust language to both instruct and advise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Controlled and consistent use of register. • Developing skill evident in language choices / style. • Sustained use of specialised language. • -Rich in adjectives / positives to convey enthusiasm. • Variety of sentence structure used for effect. • Range of language techniques used to effect purpose. • Ability to manage verb tense consistently.
---------------------------	--	---	--

Narrate

Dimension	Level 4 Proficient	Level 5 Proficient	Level 6 Proficient
Audience Awareness and Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text attempts to entertain Beginning of text attracts attention and provides adequate context for narrative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audience is entertained by text but not consistently. The writer's 'voice' is evident in parts of the text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text entertains audience and sustains reader attention. The writer's 'voice' permeates the text and may address reader directly
Content / Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text contains some elements (e.g., orientation, complication, resolution, and sometimes coda) but often the ending is inadequately controlled. Story is largely plot driven, Characters and setting are developed to a skeletal level only. Content may be undisciplined; lacks selection, organisation and interest for reader (dumping) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Necessary elements of story are present Some focus on and development of specific events, characters, or settings. May experiment with unconventional structures (with limited success) Some control of story elements including dialogue and description 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear focus on and appropriate development of specific events, characters, and settings. Largely sustained control of a range of story elements including dialogue, description, tension, emotion, etc
Structure / Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple story element arrangement managed well, yet may have a sense of disjunction between beginning and end. Use of simple linking devices (e.g., conjunctions of time:(after, next, later, then, etc.) make the story progress. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complex story element arrangement managed inconsistently (e.g., effective plot or development of events). Inconsistent control of pacing and proportion of elements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complex story element arrangement largely sustained (e.g., effective plot or development of events). May attempt unconventional story structures with increasing success Pacing and proportion largely controlled. Clear thematic connection between beginning and ending Ending provides completion
Language Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May use language devices (e.g., figurative language) and descriptors (e.g., adverbials, adjectives) to give detail to plot Uncontrolled use of dialogue (where included). Uses complete sentences Some attempt to experiment with vocabulary, though largely restricted to a relatively limited range (up to 5,000? most common words) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some appropriate matching of vocabulary to narrative May use language devices (e.g., figurative language) and descriptors (e.g., adverbials, adjectives) to give detail to plot, characters, and settings Control of complex sentences evident, where appropriate. Inconsistent control of tense, point of view 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate matching of vocabulary to narrative Largely sustained control of tense, voice, point of view, sentence structures, etc. Largely controlled use of descriptive/ figurative language to show physical, emotional, psychological states rather than just naming them (show not tell)

Persuade

Dimension	Level 4 Proficient	Level 5 Proficient	Level 6 Proficient
Audience Awareness and Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer aware audience may hold a different point of view but tends to assume one different generalised point of view • Some success in being persuasive, usually at start • Writing attempts to persuade reader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies & relates to a concrete / specific audience • Awareness at beginning & end, but is inconsistent in middle sections • Language use is appropriate and has elements which begin to be persuasive to audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implicit awareness that audience may hold a range of points of view • Fully persuasive throughout– persuades intended audience • Tone likely to impact on or effect change or manipulate the intended audience towards author's purpose
Content / Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elements (e.g. position statement, main points, illustration / evidence of main points, restatement) of argument are identifiable and simple. • List-like presentation of ideas. • Some relevant support for ideas may be evident but is inadequate or inconsistent. • Conclusion restates position. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Argument domain elements (e.g. plausible position statement, main points, illustration / evidence of main points, restatement) are somewhat developed and nearing comprehensive. They may draw some conclusions which expand the argument • Support / reasons show strong link to argument. • Support is usually consistent & somewhat developed with examples / reasons etc. • Conclusion reflects points made for position 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples are well chosen to support writer's purpose. • Consistent support given to main points. • Points made are considered, selected, relevant and elaborated • Conclusion integrates argument
Structure / Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content is grouped logically at main idea level • Ideas not necessarily sequenced • Linkages simple if present 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schema evident but may not contribute to intended effect or argument. • Paragraphs structured with main ideas and support for argument. • Simple connectives /linkages inconsistently used • Relevant material is selected to support identified key ideas (and to persuade the audience) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit schema and overall structure is logical and apparent. It enhances argument • Convincing structure of content evident through the logical arrangement of reasoned ideas in well crafted paragraphs and the use of strong topic sentences to guide the reader's understanding of the writer's argument • Consistent use of a variety of connectives / linkages
Language Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language is appropriate & straightforward 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language choices influence audience towards argument • Use of persuasive language techniques for the deliberate effect of involving reader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate matching of vocabulary to task • Language choices are considered and show selection for effect with intention to manipulate / influence audience • Tone underpins language selection and strengthens argument (Sarcastic, threatening, humorous, emotive...)

Recount

Dimension	Level 4 Proficient	Level 5 Proficient	Level 6 Proficient
Audience Awareness and Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text attempts to entertain / inform. Beginning of text attracts attention and provides adequate context for recount. The text is complete for audience's understanding. First person recount speaks to audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May experiment with point of view or voice (e.g., use a 'hook'/ quote to engage reader's interest). Writer's developing awareness of audience is seen in reflective comments on the action. Writer explains things for the audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speaks directly / indirectly to audience making strong connections and drawing audience into recount. Adjusts voice to bridge gap between writer and audience. Writer's awareness of audience is seen in ending of text
Content / Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Necessary elements of recount are present. Some focus on and development of specific events and interest areas. Some control of recount elements including dialogue and description. Content is relevant but is 'dumped' rather than selected. Skeletal presentation of events or interests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Orientation is comprehensive, yet succinct. Clear focus on and development of specific events and interest areas but not always edited for relevance or focus Thematic understanding / or interpretation of recount is attempted Some evidence of interpretive reflection on events in recount, possibly through sharing thoughts and feelings with the audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Writer's sense of looking back and analysing event is integrated fully through the recount.</i> Recount is enriched with interpretive comments, evaluation and observation, and sustained appropriate selection of details. <i>Conclusion is linked thematically to recount content.</i>
Structure / Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Events are in time order, and sequencing is managed well. Paragraphs support the structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narrative structure is carefully used to convey and integrate writer's emotional response to events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed organisation of events interwoven with interpretive reflection / observation
Language Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May use language devices (e.g., figurative language) and descriptor (e.g., adverbials, adjectives) to give detail to events. Some controlled use of dialogue (where included). Uses complete sentences Some attempt to experiment with vocabulary, though largely restricted to a relatively limited range (up to 5,000? most common words) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May use language devices (e.g., figurative language) and descriptors (e.g., adverbials, adjectives) to give detail to events, persons, and experiences Some appropriate matching of vocabulary to recount Control of complex sentences evident, where appropriate. Relatively consistent control of tense, point of view 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate matching of vocabulary to narrative Controlled use of descriptive / figurative language to show physical, emotional and psychological states rather than just naming them (show not tell) Largely sustained control of tense, voice, point of view, sentence structures, etc.