



**California
Subject
Examinations for
Teachers®**

TEST GUIDE

**ENGLISH
SUBTEST III**

**Sample Questions and Responses
and Scoring Information**

Copyright © 2005 by National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES®)

"California Subject Examinations for Teachers," "CSET," and the "CSET" logo are registered trademarks of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES®).

"NES®" and its logo are registered trademarks of National Evaluation Systems, Inc.™

CS-TG-QR107X-02

Sample Test Questions for CSET: English Subtest III

Below is a set of constructed-response questions that are similar to the questions you will see on Subtest III of CSET: English. You are encouraged to respond to the questions without looking at the responses provided in the next section. Record your responses on a sheet of paper and compare them with the provided responses.

1. Complete the exercise that follows.

Write a critical essay in which you analyze the following selections, supporting your conclusions with specific evidence from the texts. Assume that you are writing for an educated audience knowledgeable about literary criticism. In your essay:

- identify a significant theme that the two texts share;
- compare and contrast the two writers' perspectives on the theme you have identified;
- examine how the two writers use literary techniques, including genre features, literary elements, and rhetorical devices, to express their perspectives on this theme; and
- draw a conclusion that explains how the literary techniques you have identified affect the ideas conveyed in the texts.

Selection I: "Self-Dependence" (1852), a poem by Matthew Arnold

Weary of myself, and sick of asking
What I am, and what I ought to be,
At this vessel's prow I stand, which bears me
Forwards, forwards, o'er the starlit sea.

And a look of passionate desire
O'er the sea and to the stars I send:
"Ye who from my childhood up have calmed me,
Calm me, ah, compose me to the end!"

"Ah, once more," I cried, "ye stars, ye waters,
On my heart your mighty charm renew;
Still, still let me, as I gaze upon you,
Feel my soul becoming vast like you!"

From the intense, clear, star-sown vault of heaven,
Over the lit sea's unquiet way,
In the rustling night air came the answer:
"Wouldst thou *be* as these are? *Live* as they.

"Unaffrighted by the silence round them,
Undistracted by the sights they see,
These demand not that the things without them
Yield them love, amusement, sympathy.

"And with joy the stars perform their shining,
And the sea its long moon-silvered roll;
For self-poised they live, nor pine with noting
All the fever of some differing soul.¹

"Bounded by themselves, and unregardful
In what state God's other works may be,
In their own tasks all their powers pouring,
These attain the mighty life you see."

O air-born voice! long since, severely clear,
A cry like thine in mine own heart I hear:
"Resolve to be thyself; and know that he,
Who finds himself, loses his misery!"

¹**nor . . . soul:** The sea and the stars do not jealously wish for the feverish activities of natural elements different from themselves.

Selection II: Excerpt from "A Vision Beyond Time and Place" (1971), a nonfiction text by N. Scott Momaday

When my father was a boy, an old man used to come to [my grandfather] Mammedaty's house and pay his respects. He was a lean old man in braids and was impressive in his age and bearing. His name was Cheney, and he was an arrowmaker. Every morning, my father tells me, Cheney would paint his wrinkled face, go out, and pray aloud to the rising sun.

I often think of old man Cheney, and of his daily devotion to the sun. He was a man who saw very deeply into the distance, I believe, one whose vision extended far beyond the physical boundaries of his time and place. In his mind's eye he could integrate all the realities and illusions of the earth and sky; they became for him profoundly intelligible and whole.

Most Indian people are able to see in these terms. It is indeed the basis upon which they identify themselves as individuals and as a race. When old man Cheney looked into the sunrise, he saw as far into himself, I suspect, as he saw into the distance. He knew certainly of his existence and of his place in the scheme of things.

In contrast, most of us in this society are afflicted with a kind of cultural nearsightedness. . . . [W]e do not see beyond the buildings and billboards that seem at times to be the monuments of our civilization, and consequently we fail to see into the nature and meaning of our own humanity. Now, more than ever, we might do well to enter upon a vision quest of our own, that is, a quest after vision itself.

2. Complete the exercise that follows.

Write a critical essay in which you analyze the passage below from "Can't You Hear the Whistle Blowing?", an article by Lance Morrow published in *Time* magazine in August 2002. Assume that you are writing for an educated audience, and make sure to support your conclusions with evidence from the text. In your essay:

- summarize, in your own words, the author's main argument in this passage;
- evaluate the author's reasoning;
- describe the author's methods of persuasion and use of rhetorical devices;
- identify the audience for which the author is most likely writing; and
- describe the extent to which the passage is likely to be effective in persuading this audience, and explain why.

- 1 The answer to the nation's transportation problems clearly lies neither in an expansion of aviation nor in putting more cars on additional highways. My choice would be the oldest mode of the three: rail. It is not a sentimental or nostalgic choice. The aviation industry, like the vast infrastructure for cars, is dangerously overbuilt. In recent years aviation has sucked regional boosters into ill-conceived drives for more airports and more flights, even short ones—all at immense expense.
- 2 Airplanes are indispensable for long trips over oceans, over a continent or half a continent. But air travel makes no sense over short distances. In any case, the evolution of cell phones and e-mail and the Internet and videoconferencing means that people need to travel less on business, not more. When ideas and images fly so magically, then our clumsy, inconvenient bodies need not do so—or not so much.
- 3 Would it be possible for the U.S., with its great distances, to divide and organize itself for rail? To reinvent its railroads in order to make them fast, efficient and attractive in regional systems, aiming for a European scale and speed and coherence in each region? (For example: Sacramento-San Francisco-Los Angeles-San Diego; Chicago-Milwaukee-Detroit-Cincinnati-Cleveland-Minneapolis; Boston-New York-Philadelphia-Baltimore-Washington; and so on.) Yes.
- 4 Critics of expanding the American rail system make three key arguments: 1) Amtrak is hopeless; 2) building a viable rail system—upgrading old roadbeds and laying new track, clearing new right of way, buying new equipment—could cost as much as \$100 billion; and 3) it would be irresponsible for government to pour so much money into a service that the market has shown it will not support. People don't ride the trains as it is, the critics say; that's why the railroads are dying.
- 5 It is true that Amtrak has been badly run, but let new regional rail systems be set up on their own and forget Amtrak. Comparisons have been loaded to denigrate trains in favor of cars and air travel. It is true the rehabilitation of the nation's railroads would cost billions. But the arithmetic on costs and energy efficiency argues, in the long term, in favor of boldly creative, high-speed regional rail systems that would take the environmental and traffic pressures off highways and airports.

- 6 Trains are two to eight times as fuel efficient as planes. As things stand, passenger trains receive only 4% as much in federal subsidies as the \$13 billion given annually to the airline industry. Highways receive \$33 billion in federal funds. Both airlines and highways have dedicated sources of federal funding: gasoline and ticket taxes. Rail systems should receive equivalent sources of income.
- 7 A halfhearted, partly realized plan will only validate the criticisms and doom the new railroads. What is needed is leadership of the kind that Charles de Gaulle demonstrated in backing France's immensely successful high-speed rail, and vision on the scale of President Eisenhower's push for the interstate highway system. The 21st century paradox is that it is not railroads that are old-fashioned and retrograde but rather those essentially inefficient flying machines.

Acknowledgments

Question Number

1. **Selection I:** Arnold, Matthew. "Self-Dependence." As appears in G. Armour Craig, Frank M. Rice, and Edward J. Gordon (Eds.), (1979) *English Literature* (p. 597). Lexington, MA: Ginn and Co.
Selection II: Momaday, N. Scott. "A Vision Beyond Time and Place." *Life Magazine* (1971), © Time-Warner. Reprinted with permission.
2. "Can't You Hear the Whistle Blowing?" TIME 8/26/02. © 2002 TIME Inc. reprinted by permission.

CONTINUE YOUR RESPONSE HERE

DO NOT WRITE OUTSIDE THESE MARGINS

DO NOT WRITE OUTSIDE THESE MARGINS

DO NOT WRITE OUTSIDE THESE MARGINS

B PAGE 2

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

CONTINUE YOUR RESPONSE HERE

DO NOT WRITE OUTSIDE THESE MARGINS

DO NOT WRITE OUTSIDE THESE MARGINS

DO NOT WRITE OUTSIDE THESE MARGINS

B PAGE 3

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE



CONTINUE YOUR RESPONSE HERE

DO NOT WRITE OUTSIDE THESE MARGINS

DO NOT WRITE OUTSIDE THESE MARGINS

DO NOT WRITE OUTSIDE THESE MARGINS

B PAGE 4

STOP. END OF ASSIGNMENT 1

Examples of Responses to Sample Constructed-Response Questions for CSET: English Subtest III

Composition and Rhetoric; Literature and Textual Analysis

Question #1 (Score Point 4 Response)

Both N. Scott Momaday, in this excerpt from "A Vision Beyond Time and Place," and Matthew Arnold, in his poem "Self-Dependence," are writing about a transcendent awareness that must underlie wisdom and inner peace. The two writers characterize this transcendent awareness somewhat differently. Momaday's exemplar is "a lean old man in braids . . . impressive in his age and bearing," whose daily practice of prayer to the sun is an expression, and a source, of his spiritual integration. "All the realities and illusion of the earth and sky . . . became for him profoundly intelligible and whole." This kind of vision is at the heart of Indian culture and identity, Momaday tells us; but most of us do not achieve it, especially amid the distractions of the modern world. It is something that should be actively sought.

The speaker in Matthew Arnold's poem is actively, even desperately, seeking transcendence. At sea, at night, he also looks to the sky, and appeals to the stars to let his soul become vast. A voice answers him, presumably God's, instructing him to be as the stars: unaffrighted, undistracted, undemanding, shining "with joy," "in their own tasks all their powers pouring." This comes to sound as his own voice in his mind, the instruction distilled into "Be thyself," a precept that will free him from misery. The path to transcendence thus seems almost opposite to Momaday's: instead of being based on an encompassing view of time and the

continued on next page

Question #1 (Score Point 4 Response) *continued*

world, in which a single person is meaningfully located, Arnold might seem to be recommending a kind of solipsism, a retreat into the boundaries of the self. His speaker, after all, is not located in a tradition of vision quests, but is alone on the sea in the dark.

I believe, however, that Arnold's idea of transcendence is not really fundamentally different from Momaday's. Both the old Indian man, Cheney, and Arnold's unnamed speaker look to the sky, that place where we see furthest, that offers us the clearest sense of creation's scale. Though Cheney gazes at the benign sun, at hopeful sunrise, while the sailor looks to the colder clarity of the stars, their longing is the same. Cheney "knew certainly of his existence and of his place in the scheme of things." The sailor is "sick of asking/What I am, and what I ought to be." And the language in which the voice of God describes the stars evokes not solipsism but rather contentment, and very much a sense of place: "self-poised they live, nor pine with noting/All the fever of some differing soul." Further, at the end of the poem, Arnold's sailor has internalized the voice of God. He has not necessarily found peace; the voice is still issuing instructions, and is "severely" clear; but he understands what will relieve misery, and there is a hopeful note in this that helps to release the reader from the poem's anguish.

The real difference, of course, is in the level of wisdom and peace achieved. Momaday's excerpt is narrative, an anecdote, grounded in the everyday, and enlarged by reflective commentary, as the writer draws back from Cheney and places him in his cultural context; the writer's voice is clear, calm, and

continued on next page

Question #1 (Score Point 4 Response) *continued*

appreciative, as would be consonant with inner peace and insight. It serves well the description of a wise man carrying on in a wise tradition. Arnold's poem is not only set in darkness, but is punctuated with exclamations, cries, and onrushing rhythms that convey desperation: "Forwards, forwards, o'er the starlit sea"; "Ah, once more . . . ye stars, ye waters . . . Still, still let me . . ." Even the rhyme scheme contributes to a sense of conflict and disquiet, as only lines 2 and 4 of each stanza rhyme, while the other terminal words obey no pattern (until the resolving final stanza, which soothes us with AABB closure). At the end of Momaday's piece, Cheney has dropped from the foreground into a wider, more sweeping vision. At the end of Arnold's poem, we are still focussed on a solitary, if self-dependent, man.

Question #1 (Score Point 3 Response)

In both Matthew Arnold's poem "Self-Dependence" and the excerpt from the nonfiction work "A Vision Beyond Time and Place" by N. Scott Momaday, there is a quest for special vision or insight into living life. However, the narrator of Arnold's poem is searching desperately for insight, "... a look of passionate desire o'er the sea and to the stars I send," whereas Momaday's old Indian arrowmaker Cheney already possesses it. "He knew certainly of his existence and of his place in the scheme of things," says Momaday.

Arnold's narrator admits to being "sick of asking what I am, and what I ought to be" when he sets forth to seek counsel from "ye stars, ye waters." He receives an answer, "from the intense, clear, star-sown vault of heaven," which tells him to live "self-poised" like the stars and waters, "bounded by themselves, and unregardful in what state God's other works may be, in their own tasks all their powers pouring." Rather than agonizing and comparing oneself with others, one should devote oneself to one's own work. The poem's narrator tries to follow this advice later but has not lost his self-absorption. He still cannot simply "live" as does the sea or the stars but must keep telling himself, "... know that he who finds himself, loses his misery!"

In contrast, Momaday's Cheney, "a lean old man in braids ... impressive in his age and bearing," would go out every morning "and pray aloud to the rising sun." Clearly Cheney's "daily devotion to the sun" was quite unlike the plea the narrator of the Arnold poem makes to the sea and the stars. For Cheney, this daily ritual was an integral part of his existence. Momaday explains that

continued on next page

Question #1 (Score Point 3 Response) *continued*

Cheney's "... vision extended far beyond the physical boundaries of time and place ... he could integrate all the realities and illusions of the earth and sky. ..."
Momaday notes that wisdom like Cheney's is sadly lacking from our modern society.

The rolling quality of the lines of Arnold's poem emulate that of the sea where it is set; the poem creates a mental image of vast darkness lit by shining stars and the "moon-silvered" sea which mirrors the mental state of the narrator. In Momaday's narrative, Cheney looks into the distance of the sunrise--the light of day. Indeed, Momaday's concluding recommendation to "us" to enter upon "a quest after vision itself" to help us understand "the nature and meaning of our own humanity" is illuminated by the daylight of distance and reflection. Arnold's narrator remains essentially isolated and in darkness, still admonishing himself, "Resolve to be thyself."

Question #1 (Score Point 2 Response)

The speaker in Matthew Arnold's poem and the character Cheney in the piece by N. Scott Momaday are very different from each other. The man in the poem sounds young--he sends "a look of passionate desire" to the stars. Cheney is "a lean old man in braids." Still, both characters look for an understanding greater than themselves.

Except, the man in the Arnold poem does end up dwelling on himself, and the title of the poem is "Self-Dependence." The man goes out in a boat on the sea at

continued on next page

Question #1 (Score Point 2 Response) *continued*

night and talks to the stars. "... let me, as I gaze upon you, Feel my soul becoming vast like you!" he says, apparently concerned that he is too small-minded. A voice from the sky answers him, saying that he should do his own thing and stop worrying about what other people do. At the end of the poem, the man says he still hears that voice in his heart, telling him "Resolve to be thyself; and know that he, who finds himself, loses his misery!"

Momaday's character Cheney goes out every day to pray to the sun. He is a wise old Indian who can "integrate all the realities and illusions of the earth and sky," like most Indian people, according to Momaday. I guess the man in the Arnold poem is a little like Cheney because they both look to the sky to find their identities.

The Arnold poem is from 1852 and is written in formal, poetic language, with the second and fourth line of each stanza rhyming. Maybe the stars are supposed to symbolize the light of God. The Momaday is a nonfiction text from 1971. It is a factual recollection of a memory from the author's life. The Arnold poem comes across as frantic, like the man crying to the stars for help, while the Momaday piece is just factual.

Question #1 (Score Point 1 Response)

At first glance this essay and poem do not seem to have a lot in common. The poem is English or American and quite dated, using words like "ye" and "thou," with rhymes. The story at first I thought was Indian but then I realized the writer meant Native American because the old man is an arrow-maker, he has braids, and vision quests are part of Native American tradition. It is modern because of the reference to billboards and buildings. In the poem a man on a ship at night asks the stars for guidance, because he is having an identity crisis, or possibly some kind of mental breakdown. They answer him that he should try to live as they do. But then man, being a man, can't be a star, but he is able to understand the metaphor that he must be true to himself. However, the Native American story is very different, because the character there, whose name is Cheney, is very far from having an identity crisis. He is a kind of mystical seer who meditates daily and sees deeply into the heart of all things. These two people have nothing in common unless it's being opposites.

The one thing they do have in common, however, is religion. Cheney is praying daily to the sun, which is at the center of many Earth-based traditions. The man at sea in the poem hears the stars talk to him about God.

Of the two the story by N. Scott Momaday is much better written, although this may just be because it's more modern and therefore more understandable. The poem is confusing: who is this man, what ship is he on, is he dying or contemplating suicide? The whole technique of having a conversation with the stars is a pathetic fallacy. You end up wondering whether it's all a hallucination.

Question #2 (Score Point 4 Response)

This article, "Can't You Hear the Whistle Blowing?" by Lance Morrow, was written for the readership of Time magazine - that is, a reasonably educated, though non-expert, audience of American adults who are interested in being informed about current events and social issues.

Morrow argues that to improve American transportation, money and government support should be invested in rail travel, rather than in airlines. He envisions regional systems that would be more efficient for mid-distance travel than airplanes, both in cost and energy. This would require government vision and planning, such as de Gaulle provided for high-speed rail in France, and Eisenhower provided in the U.S. for the interstate highway system.

Morrow writes with an appealing clarity. Both his sentences and paragraphs are concise, without being choppy. Where he does use a one-word sentence, at the end of paragraph 3, it is after posing a series of questions anyone skeptical of rail development might ask; he then answers simply, "Yes." It's crisp and self-assured.

He continues to follow this challenge-and-rebuttal form in the next two paragraphs, acknowledging the unpopularity of Amtrak, and the expense of revamping the nation's rail system, but then answering these points. He also sets up a rhythm with parallel sentences that begin, "It is true . . ." "But . . ." "It is true . . ." "But . . ." This is a very persuasive rhetorical device, giving the content of the argument more power. Not only is the rhythm persuasive, but so is the essential reasonableness of squarely meeting the objections.

continued on next page

Question #2 (Score Point 4 Response) *continued*

Yet Morrow does not have an argumentative tone; he uses a friendly, informal diction. Though he begins authoritatively: "The answer . . . clearly . . ." he undercuts this with a more modest "My choice would be . . .," and winningly concedes that his advocacy of rail may be seen as sentimental or nostalgic (he has to distinguish himself from mere train buffs). This is followed by a concession to the irreplaceable usefulness of planes for long-distance or intercontinental travel.

Grace of rhetoric, however, cannot redeem a faulty argument. Morrow's logic is for the most part good. He states his view, notes possible objections, then defends rail travel on the grounds of speed, efficiency, ultimate cost, and environmental effects. He points out the disparities between the levels of government funding for airlines, highways, and rail (rail is dramatically underfunded by comparison). He also holds up the example of France's high-speed rail system, which travellers to Europe cannot help but admire. There are a few points he elides. He doesn't really address the advantages of rail over automobile travel or the problems inherent in automobile travel that beg for solution. He doesn't begin to consider the problems of right-of-way where former railbeds have been given over to bike paths and other uses. Nor does he really tackle the American prejudice against trains in favor of autonomous cars. However, he was writing for Time magazine, where articles are not meant to exhaust a subject, but to open it.

Question #2 (Score Point 3 Response)

Lance Morrow argues in the article "Can't You Hear the Whistle Blowing?" that "the answer to the nation's transportation problems . . . lies . . . in . . . rail." He states that expanding the railroads is preferable to building new highways and airports, because both "are dangerously overbuilt." He also asserts that ". . . boldly creative, high-speed regional rail systems . . . would take the environmental and traffic pressures off highways and airports" and notes that "trains are two to eight times as fuel efficient as planes."

Morrow makes a good case for the feasibility of establishing regional rail systems, provided that sufficient leadership and vision were provided at the national level. He states that the railroads could be funded if they received federal subsidies equivalent to those given to the airline industry and highways and asserts that railroads would be more cost efficient in the long term. But, Morrow does not explain how the federal budget could be made to accommodate billions of dollars in new railroad subsidies. Also, although Morrow mentions that "People don't ride the trains as it is," he does not address why that is or discuss how expanding the railroads would change it.

The question-and-answer technique that Morrow uses builds momentum for his argument, but whether or not readers of Time magazine are convinced will depend on their own predispositions. The American love-affair with the automobile is far from over, and Morrow's talk of "energy efficiency" and "traffic pressures" is likely to do little to promote a transfer of affection to railroads.

Question #2 (Score Point 2 Response)

In his article in the August 2002 issue of Time magazine, "Can't You Hear the Whistle Blowing?" Lance Morrow says that America should expand its railroads in order to solve its transportation problems. He criticizes the aviation industry and cars for being dangerously overbuilt and suggests creating fast, efficient, attractive regional rail systems.

Morrow builds his argument step by step. First, he shows that trains are better than airplanes for relatively short distances and explains his idea of reinventing railroads into speedy regional systems. Would it be possible? Yes. Next, he sets out the three main arguments made by critics of the American railroads, and then he answers each argument in turn. Finally, he provides some hard dollar figures on where the money could come from to fund new railroads. Morrow concludes the article by calling for great national leadership like what "Charles de Gaulle demonstrated in backing France's immensely successful high-speed rail."

I think that Morrow makes an iron-clad case. Everything he says makes sense. We do have too many cars on too many highways using up too much gas and creating too much pollution, and airlines are a silly way to transport people short distances. Why, it can take more time getting in and out of the airport than it would to drive or take a train!

The readers of Time magazine would definitely be mostly persuaded by Morrow's article, because it describes the advantages of rail transportation so clearly.

Question #2 (Score Point 1 Response)

"Can't You Hear the Whistle Blowing?" by Lance Morrow was written for Time magazine. Its main point is that the country should support trains. He says that although airplanes are best for travel over oceans or long distances, trains are better for short distances; also people now need to travel less, because they can communicate electronically. He suggests that the country could be divided into regional systems, one on the west coast, one in the midwest, and one on the east coast. He says although Amtrak has been a disaster we should forget Amtrak, and build something new, although it would be very expensive. Just as airlines and highways receive government funding, trains should also get their fair share. Boldly creative, high-speed regional rails systems would relieve congestion on the roads and in airports.

The article is not very clear on what is wrong with airlines or highways. The article was written in August 2002, so this was after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, yet nothing is said about the impact of terrorism on the airline industry. Trains could easily also be a terrorist target, as much as a plane. They might even be carrying even more people. This is a logical flaw. Why would people prefer to ride trains over driving in their own cars? When you get somewhere, you still need to be able to get around. A car is private and you can stop whenever you wish. Yes, there are effective high-speed rail systems in Europe and Japan, but these are very different from America. We are people who love the open road, as evidenced in movies and songs.

continued on next page

Question #2 (Score Point 1 Response) *continued*

I do not think this author is very effective in persuading his audience. The airline industry may have its problems, especially after the events of 9/11, but these could be worked on, especially to reduce waiting times in airports and to reassure the American people that it is safe to fly. There is no real reason to switch to trains, and the author admits it would cost 100 billion dollars for upgrading old roadbeds and laying new track, clearing new right of way, and buying new equipment. That's 100 billion dollars we can ill afford in today's economy.

Scoring Information for CSET: English Subtest III

There are two constructed-response questions in Subtest III of CSET: English. Each of these constructed-response questions is designed so that a response can be completed within approximately 45–60 minutes. Responses to the constructed-response questions are scored by qualified California educators using focused holistic scoring. Scorers will judge the overall effectiveness of your responses while focusing on the performance characteristics that have been identified as important for this subtest (see below). Each response will be assigned a score based on an approved scoring scale (see page 24).

Your performance on the subtest will be evaluated against a standard determined by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing based on professional judgments and recommendations of California educators.

Performance Characteristics for CSET: English Subtest III

The following performance characteristics will guide the scoring of responses to the constructed-response questions on CSET: English Subtest III.

PURPOSE	The extent to which the response addresses the constructed-response assignment's charge in relation to relevant CSET subject matter requirements.
SUBJECT MATTER KNOWLEDGE	The application of accurate subject matter knowledge as described in the relevant CSET subject matter requirements.
SUPPORT	The appropriateness and quality of the supporting evidence in relation to relevant CSET subject matter requirements.
DEPTH AND BREADTH OF UNDERSTANDING	The degree to which the response demonstrates understanding of the relevant CSET subject matter requirements.

Scoring Scale for CSET: English Subtest III

Scores will be assigned to each response to the constructed-response questions on CSET: English Subtest III according to the following scoring scale.

SCORE POINT	SCORE POINT DESCRIPTION
4	<p>The "4" response reflects a thorough command of the relevant knowledge and skills as defined in the subject matter requirements for CSET: English.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the assignment is fully achieved. • There is a substantial and accurate application of relevant subject matter knowledge. • The supporting evidence is sound; there are high-quality, relevant examples. • The response reflects a comprehensive understanding of the assignment.
3	<p>The "3" response reflects a general command of the relevant knowledge and skills as defined in the subject matter requirements for CSET: English.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the assignment is largely achieved. • There is a largely accurate application of relevant subject matter knowledge. • The supporting evidence is adequate; there are some acceptable, relevant examples. • The response reflects an adequate understanding of the assignment.
2	<p>The "2" response reflects a limited command of the relevant knowledge and skills as defined in the subject matter requirements for CSET: English.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the assignment is partially achieved. • There is limited accurate application of relevant subject matter knowledge. • The supporting evidence is limited; there are few relevant examples. • The response reflects a limited understanding of the assignment.
1	<p>The "1" response reflects little or no command of the relevant knowledge and skills as defined in the subject matter requirements for CSET: English.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the assignment is not achieved. • There is little or no accurate application of relevant subject matter knowledge. • The supporting evidence is weak; there are no or few relevant examples. • The response reflects little or no understanding of the assignment.
U	<p>The "U" (Unscorable) is assigned to a response that is unrelated to the assignment, illegible, primarily in a language other than English, or does not contain a sufficient amount of original work to score.</p>
B	<p>The "B" (Blank) is assigned to a response that is blank.</p>