



## INFORMATION BOOKLET FOR SCORING THE REGENTS COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION IN ENGLISH

### GENERAL INFORMATION

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

Questions about **general administration procedures** for Regents Exams should be directed to the Office of State Assessment (OSA) at 518-474-5902 or 518-474-8220. For information about the **rating** of the Regents Comprehensive Examination in English, contact Rosemarie Heinegg or Laura LaPan of OSA at 518-474-5900.

School administrators should print or photocopy this information booklet and distribute copies to all school personnel who will be scoring this exam.

### SCORING THE EXAMINATION

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

#### The Scoring Key and Rating Guide

The scoring key and rating guide for this examination will be posted on the Department's web site at <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/scoring/> on the date of the examination. Schools must print sufficient copies to supply one to each rater.

**All scoring keys and rating guides posted on the Department's web site will be password protected by two levels of password protection. In order to access the scoring keys and rating guides, schools will be required to enter the online request system (portal) using the same user name and password that was used to order test materials.**

The portion of the rating guide for 6-credit essay contains:

- Scoring rubric
- Two to three prescored anchor papers at each score level with commentary (**Note:** Anchor papers are ordered from high to low within each score level.)
- Five prescored practice papers

The portion of the scoring key and rating guide for 2-credit responses contains:

- Scoring rubrics
- One to two prescored anchor papers at each score level, with commentary
- Five prescored practice papers, with commentary

## Rating the Exam

The reliability of the scores is a fundamental concern in the measurement of the student's achievement. Therefore, the 6-credit essay responses must be rated by two qualified raters and by a third qualified rater only in certain specified instances. The 2-credit short constructed responses are to be rated only once, by one qualified rater. Qualified raters include teachers of English, reading, English as a second language, and special education who know the English curriculum and have received training. Raters who have experience rating the 6-credit critical lens essay and 2-credit short constructed responses will not be required to receive any training prior to the task-specific training on the actual administration of the exam. If raters are new to scoring the critical lens essay, they should be trained using the critical lens materials in the Spring 2010 Test Sampler. If raters are new to scoring the 2-credit short constructed responses, training is provided in an online PowerPoint presentation based on the Spring 2010 Test Sampler available at <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/english/#hs>.

In order to ensure reliable scoring, the principal of each high school administering the Regents Comprehensive Examination in English must appoint a scoring coordinator who will:

- Manage the training and logistics of the scoring process.
- Provide task-specific training immediately before scoring.
- Assign one teacher to rate each 2-credit short constructed-response question.\*
- Assign two teachers to rate each 6-credit essay independently, with a third rater available to resolve discrepant scores (as explained on pages 5 [items 18–20] and 6).\*

\*No teacher may be assigned to rate the responses of his or her own students.

## Organizing the Rating and Recording

Before student responses can be read and rated, each school must set up a procedure for collecting, arranging, and processing the answer papers and for maintaining records of the exam results. The procedure used in a particular school should be designed to produce a reliable score for each student and to facilitate maintenance of the school's records of each student's score and of the participation of each rater in the scoring process. A suggested procedure for managing the mechanics of the rating process is described on pages 4 and 5.

Rating Sheets, Record Sheets, and other forms used during the rating process must be retained for one year.

## Scoring the Multiple-Choice Questions

For this exam all schools must use uniform scannable answer sheets provided by the regional information center or large-city scanning center. (Schools may not require students to record their responses for the same multiple-choice questions on more than one answer sheet.) **If the students' responses for the multiple-choice questions are being hand scored prior to being scanned, the scorer must be careful not to make any marks on the front of the answer sheet except to record the scores in the designated score boxes. Marks elsewhere on the front of the answer sheet will interfere with the accuracy of the scanning.**

Before scannable answer sheets are machine scored, several samples must be both machine and manually scored to ensure the accuracy of the machine-scoring process. All discrepancies must be resolved before student answer sheets are machine scored. When machine scoring is completed, a sample of the scored answer sheets must be scored manually to verify the accuracy of the machine-scoring process.

## Detailed Directions for Training Raters to Score Student Responses

In training raters to score student responses for each part of the exam, follow the procedures outlined below:

### *Introduction to the Tasks*

The introduction to each task may take place once the administration of the exam has begun. However, use of the actual scoring key and rating guide for the exam may *not* begin until after the Uniform Statewide Admission Deadline has passed and the scoring key and rating guide has been obtained from the Department's web site.

- Raters read the task and summarize it.
- Raters read the passages (if applicable) and plan a response to the task.
- Raters share response plans and summarize expectations for student responses.

### *Introduction to the Rubric and Anchor Papers*

- Trainer reviews rubric with reference to the task. For Questions 27 and 28, raters should also be directed to the additional scoring considerations printed at the bottom of the rubric. For Question 27, since the question specifies choosing one of the authors, if the student responds using both passages, score the portion of the response that would give the student the higher score. For Question 28, if a student addresses only one text, the response can be scored no higher than a 3. If a student writes only a personal response and makes no reference to the text(s), the response can be scored no higher than a 1. Responses totally unrelated to the topic, illegible, incoherent, or blank should be given a 0. A response totally copied from the text(s) with no original student writing should be scored a 0.
- Trainer reviews procedures for assigning holistic scores (i.e., by matching evidence from the response to the language of the rubric and by weighing all qualities equally).
- Trainer leads review of each anchor paper and commentary. (*Note:* Anchor papers are ordered from high to low within each score level.)

### *Practice Scoring Individually*

- Raters score a set of five practice papers individually. Raters should score the five papers independently without looking at the scores provided after the five papers.
- Trainer records scores and leads discussion until raters feel comfortable enough to move on to actual scoring.

## Suggested Rating Procedure

The following procedure is recommended for managing the mechanics of the rating process. The Rating Sheets and the Record Sheet are included in the Appendix. You may photocopy as many copies you need.

1. Designate one person as the coordinator of the rating process. The scoring coordinator will be responsible for coordinating the movement of papers and recording of exam scores on the answer sheets.
2. Set aside one room as a central rating room for collecting, sorting, circulating, and storing answer sheets/essay booklets and for preparing and maintaining records.
3. Provide a suitable location for the rating of responses.
4. Assign each rater who will score any part of any student's exam a single letter designation from A–J. If there are more than 10 raters, committees of no more than 10 raters each must be formed, with each committee member assigned a letter designation from A–J. (The master for the rating committee can be found on page 15.)
5. Allow time to provide training for scoring the specific task for all raters immediately before the rating of the students' responses (about one hour for each of the short constructed-response tasks and about two hours for the essay task).
6. Provide adequate time for rating (1–2 minutes per response for each of the short constructed responses and 3–4 minutes per response for the critical lens essay).
7. After the exam has been administered, verify that the student has entered his or her name and the school name on each page of the essay booklet.
8. Arrange the essay booklets in a sequence, using whatever order is most convenient, e.g., class period, alphabetical, or local identification number. Divide the essay booklets into bundles of 20–25.
9. For each bundle of 20–25 booklets, separate the responses for Question 28 from those for Questions 26 and 27. Staple together all the pages of each student's Question 28 response.
10. Beginning with the first paper of the sequence for Question 26, enter each student's name on a copy of the Rating Sheet for Question 26. (The master for rating appears on page 16.)
11. Distribute the bundles of responses to each rater. Ensure that no teacher is assigned responses written by his or her own students. The rater should record his or her ratings on the Rating Sheet.
12. Repeat steps 10 and 11 for Question 27 using the Rating Sheet for Question 27. (The master for rating appears on page 17.)
13. The short constructed responses (Questions 26 and 27) should only be rated by one rater. Scores ending in .5 may not be assigned to a 2-credit short constructed response. If the same rater is scoring responses to Question 26 and 27, the rater should first score all the responses to Question 26 and then all the responses to Question 27.
14. For Question 28 (the essay), divide raters into two-person teams for rating the 6-credit responses. Designate one team member as Rater 1 and the other as Rater 2. No teacher may rate the responses of his or her own students.
15. Beginning with the first paper of the sequence for Question 28, enter each student's name on the Rating Sheet for Question 28. (The master for rating appears on page 18.)
16. After recording the students' names on the Rating Sheet, photocopy the Rating Sheet. Each rater will need a separate rating sheet for each bundle of essay papers he or she rates.
17. Distribute the bundles of essay papers to the rating teams, making sure that each rating team receives two rating sheets for each bundle. Each rater on a team should rate one of the bundles and record his or her ratings on one of the rating sheets. The two raters should retain their own completed rating sheets and exchange bundles. The second rater should record his

or her scores on the second rating sheet.. **No scores or corrections should be indicated on the essay papers.**

18. After each team has completed rating a bundle, the team should return those essay papers and the completed rating sheets to the central rating area. Remove the rating sheets completed by each rater from the bundles and enter the scores and raters' assigned letters on the Record Sheet for Question 28. Make sure each essay has two independent ratings. Enter the resolved scores in the appropriate columns on the Record Sheet. (The master for the Record Sheet for Question 28 appears on page 19.)
19. Review the two scores for each student to determine if the student's scores are discrepant, i.e., a difference of two or more points between the two scores. Separate the students' responses with the discrepant scores and make another bundle. Prepare a separate rating sheet for those discrepant papers. List the names of the students on a new rating sheet and attach the sheet to the corresponding bundle of student responses. Assign each of these bundles to a rater to obtain a third independent rating of the students' responses. Make sure that the third rater is not one of the original two raters of that essay.
20. After the necessary third ratings have been obtained, remove the rating sheets from the bundles of student responses and determine the resolved scores by using the method for resolving discrepant scores described on page 6. Enter the resolved scores in the appropriate column on the Record Sheet.
21. Complete the School Record of Students' Exam Scores. (The master for recording scores is on page 20.)

## Method for Determining the Score for the Essay (Question 28)

### Two Ratings:

1. Compare the two ratings.
2. If the two ratings agree, the student receives that score.
3. If the two ratings are contiguous, average the two scores.
4. If the two ratings are not contiguous, a third rating is necessary.

### Three Ratings:

1. Compare the three ratings.
2. If two of the three ratings agree, the student receives that score.
3. If the three ratings are different, the student receives the middle score.

### Examples:

Rater 1 Letter	Rater 1 Score	Rater 2 Letter	Rater 2 Score	Rater 3 Letter	Rater 3 Score	Resolved Score	Reason
A	2	B	2	—	—	2	Two ratings agree. Use that score.
A	2	B	3	—	—	2.5	Two ratings are contiguous. Average the two scores.
A	2	B	4	J	4	4	Two ratings are two or more points apart. Third rating is done. Two of the three ratings agree. Use that score.
A	2	B	5	J	4	4	Two ratings are two or more points apart. Third rating is done. Three ratings differ. Use the middle score.
A	0	B	1	—	—	0.5	Two ratings are contiguous. Average the two scores.

## Entering Essay Scores on the Record Sheet — Question 28

The examples below show how students' scores and raters' code letters should be recorded on the Record Sheet.

Student's Name	Q. 28 Essay Scores						
	Rater 1 Letter	Rater 1 Score	Rater 2 Letter	Rater 2 Score	Rater 3 Letter	Rater 3 Score	Resolved Score
<i>Student A</i>	<b>A</b>	4	<b>B</b>	4	—	—	4
<i>Student B</i>	<b>A</b>	0	<b>B</b>	1	—	—	.5
<i>Student C</i>	<b>A</b>	4	<b>B</b>	6	<b>J</b>	5	5
<i>Student D</i>	<b>A</b>	4	<b>B</b>	2	<b>J</b>	5	4

## Determining the Student's Final Exam Score

If the determination of each student's final exam score is being done by hand, record the student's scores for the multiple-choice questions, constructed-response questions, and essay on the designated lines on the School Record of Students' Exam Scores (page 20) and in the designated spaces of the answer sheet. Add the total number of correct answers for the multiple-choice questions. Write that score in the appropriate place. (The maximum total multiple-choice score is 25.)

Add the Total Score for Questions 26, 27, and 28. ***If the score ends in .5 round that score up to the nearest whole number.*** Write that score in the appropriate place. (The maximum total score for these questions is 10.)

To determine the student's final exam score, use the chart provided on the day of the exam on the Department's web site at <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/concht/>. Locate the student's total constructed-response score (Questions 26, 27, and 28) across the top of the chart and the student's total multiple-choice score down the left side of the chart. The point where those two scores intersect is the student's final exam score. The format of the chart is illustrated below. The chart provided for each administration will include scores ranging from 0 to 100 within the cells of the chart. Because scale scores corresponding to raw scores in the conversion chart may change from one exam administration to another, it is *crucial* that, for each administration, *only* the conversion chart provided for that administration be used to determine the student's final exam score.

		<b>Regents Comprehensive Examination in English Chart for Determining the Final Examination Score</b>										
<b>Total Score for Questions 26, 27, and 28 ➡</b>		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Total Multiple-Choice Score	0											
	1											
	2											
	3											
	4											
	5											
	6											
	7											
	8											
	9											
	10											
	11											
	12											
	13											
	14											
	15											
	16											
	17											
	18											
	19											
	20											
	21											
	22											
	23											
	24											
	25											

Schools are **not permitted** to rescore any of the open-ended questions on any Regents Exam after each question has been rated the required number of times as specified in the rating guide, regardless of the final exam score. Schools are required to ensure that the raw scores have been added correctly and that the resulting scale score has been determined accurately.

When the teacher scoring committee completes the scoring process, test scores must be considered final and must be entered onto students' permanent records. In addition, each rater must sign the Examination Scoring Certificate attesting that he or she fully and faithfully observed the rules and regulations for scoring the exam. The principal must also sign to attest that the rules and regulations for scoring were fully and faithfully observed.

Principals and other administrative staff in a school or district do not have the authority to set aside the scores arrived at by the teacher scoring committee and rescore student exam papers or to change any scores assigned through the procedures described in this manual and in the scoring materials provided by the Department. Any principal or administrator found to have done so, except in the circumstances described below, will be in violation of Department policy regarding the scoring of State exams. Teachers and administrators who violate Department policy with respect to scoring State exams may be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with Sections 3020 and 3020-a of Education Law or to action against their certification pursuant to Part 83 of the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education.

On rare occasions, an administrator may learn that an error occurred in the calculation of a final score for a student or in recording students' scores in their permanent records. For example, the final score may have been based on an incorrect summing of the student's raw scores for parts of the test or from a misreading of the conversion chart. When such errors involve the final scores of no more than 5% of the school's takers for that exam or five students, whichever is greater, and when they are detected within four months of the test date, the superintendent of a public school district or the chief administrative officer of a nonpublic or charter school may arrange for the corrected score to be recorded in the student's permanent record. However, in all such instances, the superintendent or chief administrative officer must advise OSA in writing that the student's score has been corrected. The written notification to the Department must be signed by the superintendent or chief administrative officer and must include the initials or student identification numbers (at the discretion of the principal) of the students whose scores have been corrected, the exam title, the students' original and corrected scores, and a brief explanation of the nature of the scoring error that was corrected.

If an administrator has substantial reason to believe that the teacher scoring committee has failed to accurately score the answer papers for more than 5% of the school's test takers for that exam or five students, whichever is greater, or when errors are detected more than four months after the test date, the administrator must first obtain permission in writing from OSA before arranging for or permitting a rescoring of student papers. The written request to OSA must come from the superintendent of a public school district or the chief administrative officer of a nonpublic or charter school and must include the exam title, date of administration, and number of students whose papers would be subject to such rescoring. This request must also include a statement explaining why the administrator believes that the teacher scoring committee failed to score appropriately and, thus, why he or she believes rescoring the exam papers is necessary. As part of this submission, the school administrator must make clear his or her understanding that such extraordinary re-rating may be carried out only by a full committee of teachers constituted in accordance with the scoring guidelines presented above and fully utilizing the scoring materials for this test provided by the Department.

The Department sometimes finds it necessary to notify schools of a revision to the scoring key and rating guide for an exam. Should this occur after the scoring committee has completed its work, the principal is authorized to have appropriate members of the scoring committee review students' responses only to the specific question(s) referenced in the notification and to adjust students' final exam scores when appropriate. Only in such circumstances is the school not required to notify or obtain approval from the Department to correct students' final exam scores.



# **Appendix**

**Rubrics  
Rating Sheet  
Record Sheet**

## Question 26

(used for 2-credit responses that refer to two texts)

### **Score Point 2**

- presents a well-developed paragraph
- demonstrates a basic understanding of the texts
- establishes an appropriate controlling idea
- supports the controlling idea with clear and appropriate details from both texts
- uses language that is appropriate
- may exhibit errors in conventions that do not hinder comprehension

### **Score Point 1**

- has a controlling idea  
or
- implies a controlling idea  
or
- has an unclear controlling idea  
AND
- supports the controlling idea with partial and/or overly general information from the texts
- uses language that may be imprecise or inappropriate
- exhibits errors in conventions that may hinder comprehension

### **Score Point 0**

- is off topic, incoherent, a copy of the task/texts, or blank
- demonstrates no understanding of the task/texts
- is a personal response

## Question 27

(used for 2-credit responses that refer only to one text)

### **Score Point 2**

- presents a well-developed paragraph
- provides an appropriate explanation of the literary element or technique chosen
- supports the explanation with clear and appropriate evidence from the text
- uses language that is appropriate
- may exhibit errors in conventions that do not hinder comprehension

### **Score Point 1**

- provides an explanation of the literary element or technique  
or
- implies an explanation of the literary element or technique  
or
- has an unclear explanation of the literary element or technique  
AND
- supports the explanation with partial and/or overly general information from the text
- uses language that may be imprecise or inappropriate
- exhibits errors in conventions that may hinder comprehension

### **Score Point 0**

- is off topic, incoherent, a copy of the task/text, or blank
- demonstrates no understanding of the task/text
- is a personal response

**Note:** Since the question specifies choosing **one** of the authors, if the student responds using both passages, score the portion of the response that would give the student the higher score.

**QUESTION 28 – SCORING RUBRIC – CRITICAL LENS**

<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>6 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>5 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>4 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>3 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>2 Responses at this level:</b>	<b>1 Responses at this level:</b>
<b>Meaning: the extent to which the response exhibits sound understanding, interpretation, and analysis of the task and text(s)</b>	-provide an interpretation of the "critical lens" that is faithful to the complexity of the statement and clearly establishes the criteria for analysis -use the criteria to make insightful analysis of the chosen texts	-provide a thoughtful interpretation of the "critical lens" that clearly establishes the criteria for analysis -use the criteria to make a clear and reasoned analysis of the chosen texts	-provide a reasonable interpretation of the "critical lens" that establishes the criteria for analysis -make implicit connections between criteria and the chosen texts	-provide a simple interpretation of the "critical lens" that suggests some criteria for analysis -make superficial connections between the criteria and the chosen texts	-provide a confused or incomplete interpretation of the "critical lens" -may allude to the "critical lens" but do not use it to analyze the chosen texts	-do not refer to the "critical lens" -reflect minimal or no analysis of the chosen texts
<b>Development: the extent to which ideas are elaborated using specific and relevant evidence from the text(s)</b>	-develop ideas clearly and fully, making effective use of a wide range of relevant and specific evidence and appropriate literary elements from both texts	-develop ideas clearly and consistently, with reference to relevant and specific evidence and appropriate literary elements from both texts	-develop some ideas more fully than others, with reference to specific and relevant evidence and appropriate literary elements from both texts	-develop ideas briefly, using some evidence from the text -may rely primarily on plot summary	-are incomplete or largely undeveloped, hinting at ideas, but references to the text are vague, irrelevant, repetitive, or unjustified	-are minimal, with no evidence of development
<b>Organization: the extent to which the response exhibits direction, shape, and coherence</b>	-maintain the focus established by the critical lens -exhibit a logical and coherent structure through skillful use of appropriate devices and transitions	-maintain the focus established by the critical lens -exhibit a logical sequence of ideas through use of appropriate devices and transitions	-maintain a clear and appropriate focus -exhibit a logical sequence of ideas but may lack internal consistency	-establish, but fail to maintain, an appropriate focus -exhibit a rudimentary structure but may include some inconsistencies or irrelevancies	-lack an appropriate focus but suggest some organization, or suggest a focus but lack organization	-show no focus or organization
<b>Language Use: the extent to which the response reveals an awareness of audience and purpose through effective use of words, sentence structure, and sentence variety</b>	-are stylistically sophisticated, using language that is precise and engaging, with a notable sense of voice and awareness of audience and purpose -vary structure and length of sentences to enhance meaning	-use language that is fluent and original, with evident awareness of audience and purpose -vary structure and length of sentences to control rhythm and pacing	-use appropriate language, with some awareness of audience and purpose -occasionally make effective use of sentence structure or length	-rely on basic vocabulary, with little awareness of audience or purpose -exhibit some attempt to vary sentence structure or length for effect, but with uneven success	-use language that is imprecise or unsuitable for the audience or purpose -reveal little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect	-are minimal -use language that is incoherent or inappropriate
<b>Conventions: the extent to which the response exhibits conventional spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, capitalization, grammar, and usage</b>	-demonstrate control of the conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language	-demonstrate control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors only when using sophisticated language	-demonstrate partial control, exhibiting occasional errors that do not hinder comprehension	-demonstrate emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors that hinder comprehension	-demonstrate a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors that make comprehension difficult	-are minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable -may be illegible or not recognizable as English

- If the student addresses only one text, the response can be scored no higher than a 3.
- If the student writes only a personal response and makes no reference to the text(s), the response can be scored no higher than a 1.
- Responses totally unrelated to the topic, illegible, incoherent, or blank should be given a 0.
- A response totally copied from the text(s) with no original student writing should be scored a 0.

# Rating Committee Sheet

## Regents Comprehensive Examination in English

Examination Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Month/Year)

School: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee # \_\_\_\_\_

Assigned Letter	Rater's Name (Print)
A	
B	
C	
D	
E	
F	
G	
H	
I	
J	

Committee # \_\_\_\_\_

Assigned Letter	Rater's Name (Print)
A	
B	
C	
D	
E	
F	
G	
H	
I	
J	

**Retain this form with exam scoring records for one year.**









