



California Subject Examinations for Teachers®

TEST GUIDE

ENGLISH

General Examination Information

Copyright © 2004 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-ENGXGI-02

Test Structure for CSET: English

CSET: English consists of four separate subtests, each composed of either multiple-choice or constructed-response questions. Each subtest is scored separately.

The structure of the examination is shown in the table below.

CSET: English			
Subtest	Domains	Number of Multiple-Choice Questions	Number of Constructed-Response Questions
I*	Literature and Textual Analysis	40	none
	Composition and Rhetoric	10	none
	Subtest Total	50	
II	Language, Linguistics, and Literacy	50	none
	Subtest Total	50	
III	Composition and Rhetoric	none	Subtest III consists of 2 constructed-response questions— 1 based on literary text, 1 on nonliterary text. (extended responses)
	and Literature and Textual Analysis		
IV	Communications: Speech, Media, and Creative Performance	none	4 (short responses)

*Subtest I is a multiple-choice test that covers the two domains of Literature and Textual Analysis and Composition and Rhetoric. Subtest III is a constructed-response test that covers the same domains.

Annotated List of Resources for CSET: English

This list identifies some resources that may help candidates prepare to take CSET: English. While not a substitute for coursework or other types of teacher preparation, these resources may enhance a candidate's knowledge of the content covered on the examination. The references listed are not intended to represent a comprehensive listing of all potential resources. Candidates are not expected to read all of the materials listed below, and passage of the examination will not require familiarity with these specific resources. A brief summary is provided for each reference cited. Resources are organized alphabetically and by content domain in subtest order.

Literature and Textual Analysis

Buss, Kathleen; Karnowski, Lee; and Granum, O. Alfred. (2002). *Reading and Writing Nonfiction Genres*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Instruction of nonfiction texts designed for teachers to bring into the classroom. Uses teacher modeling and student discussions and includes student writing samples in all chapters.

California Department of Education. (1990). *Recommended Literature, Grades Nine Through Twelve*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

As cited in *Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools* (1999). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Donelson, K. L., and Nilsen, A. P. (2000). *Literature for Today's Young Adults* (6th edition). New York, NY: Longman.

This text discusses the merits and impact of young adult literature within a literary, historical, and social context.

Hall, Donald E. (2001). *Literary and Cultural Theory: From Basic Principles to Advanced Applications*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

This book provides an overview of literary schools of criticism from formalism to post-colonial analysis, and includes examples of ways those theories are applied to typical literary texts.

Olson, Carol Booth. (2003). *The Reading/Writing Connection: Strategies for Teaching and Learning in the Secondary Classroom*. New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon/Longman.

Designed for induction-level teachers, this text provides a series of individual reading/writing strategies, activities, and mini-lessons that focus on a wide range of culturally diverse literature. The text models how to scaffold guided practice activities into coherent lesson sequences. It integrates reading and writing instruction, blending theory and process to foster critical thinking through writing. Showcased throughout the text are the practices of teachers from the UCI, California, and National Writing Projects. The book also includes samples of student work and an extensive companion Web site with additional resources.

Composition and Rhetoric

Buss, Kathleen; Karnowski, Lee; and Granum, O. Alfred. (2002). *Reading and Writing Nonfiction Genres*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Instruction of nonfiction texts designed for teachers to bring into the classroom. Uses teacher modeling and student discussions and includes student writing samples in all chapters.

Fowler, H. Ramsey; Aaron, Jane E.; and Anderson, Daniel. (2000). *The Little, Brown Handbook* (8th edition). New York, NY: Longman.

A good resource to refresh learning. Includes chapters on the writing process, critical thinking, and using computers critically.

Graves, R. (1990). *Rhetoric and Composition: A Sourcebook for Teachers and Writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

As cited in *Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools* (1999). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Harris, Joseph. (1996). *A Teaching Subject: Composition Since 1966*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.

This text traces the development of composition as an academic discipline distinct from literature and in the process defines concepts central to understanding the role of writing in learning.

Moore, David; Moore, Sharon; Cunningham, Patricia; and Cunningham, James. (2003). *Developing Readers and Writers in the Content Area* (4th edition). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Designed for induction-level teachers, this text provides a practical guide for teaching reading and writing in the content area.

Olson, Carol Booth. (2003). *The Reading/Writing Connection: Strategies for Teaching and Learning in the Secondary Classroom*. New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon/Longman.

Designed for induction-level teachers, this text provides a series of individual reading/writing strategies, activities, and mini-lessons that focus on a wide range of culturally diverse literature. The text models how to scaffold guided practice activities into coherent lesson sequences. It integrates reading and writing instruction, blending theory and process to foster critical thinking through writing. Showcased throughout the text are the practices of teachers from the UCI, California, and National Writing Projects. The book also includes samples of student work and an extensive companion Web site with additional resources.

Villanueva, Victor. (1997). *Cross Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

This collection of essays by composition experts presents the various arguments and discussions that are currently debated in the field.

Language, Linguistics, and Literacy

Berko Gleason, Jean (Ed.). (2000). *The Development of Language* (5th edition). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

This text provides a collection of articles addressing language acquisition and the development of language from infancy through adulthood. Topics covered include syntax, morphology, semantics, phonology, and pragmatics.

Cooper, J. David. (2000). *Literacy: Helping Children to Construct Meaning* (4th edition). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

This resource includes complete, authentic reprints of children's stories as well as extended literacy lessons that demonstrate how to plan activities using literature.

English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve. (1998). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

As cited in *Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools* (1999). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Hoff, Erika. (1996). *Language Development*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

This text provides a comprehensive introduction to the study of language development. It also includes chapters on second language learning and bilingual development, the biological bases of language, and language development in special populations.

Lightbown, Patsy M., and Speda, Nina. (1993). *How Languages Are Learned*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

This book provides an excellent introduction to first and second language acquisition.

Moore, David; Moore, Sharon; Cunningham, Patricia; and Cunningham, James. (2003). *Developing Readers and Writers in the Content Area* (4th edition). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Designed for induction-level teachers, this text provides a practical guide for teaching reading and writing in the content area.

Olson, Carol Booth. (2003). *The Reading/Writing Connection: Strategies for Teaching and Learning in the Secondary Classroom*. New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon/Longman.

Designed for induction-level teachers, this text provides a series of individual reading/writing strategies, activities, and mini-lessons that focus on a wide range of culturally diverse literature. The text models how to scaffold guided practice activities into coherent lesson sequences. It integrates reading and writing instruction, blending theory and process to foster critical thinking through writing. Showcased throughout the text are the practices of teachers from the UCI, California, and National Writing Projects. The book also includes samples of student work and an extensive companion Web site with additional resources.

Yopp, Ruth Helen, and Yopp, Hallie Kay. (2001). *Literature-Based Reading Activities* (3rd edition). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

This text is designed for induction-level teachers and presents research-based literacy activities for the classroom.

Other Resources of Interest

Copi, Irving M., and Cohen, Carl. (1990). *Introduction to Logic* (8th edition). New York, NY: Macmillan.

As cited in *English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve* (1998). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources. (2001). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Frameworks are developed by the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission, which also reviews and recommends textbooks and other instructional materials to be adopted by the State Board. Can be found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/cfir/index.aspl>.

Donoahue, Z.; Tassell, M.; and Patterson, L. (Eds.). (1996). *Research in the Classroom: Talk, Texts, and Inquiry*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Work presented in this book uses oral and computer-based conversation as a method for teaching and learning.

Scoring Information for CSET: English

Responses to the multiple-choice questions are scored electronically. Scores are based on the number of questions answered correctly. There is no penalty for guessing.

Responses to constructed-response questions are scored by qualified California educators using focused holistic scoring.

Because the constructed-response questions on CSET: English are of two types—one type requiring a shorter response taking approximately 10–15 minutes to complete, and another type requiring an extended response taking approximately 45–60 minutes to complete—two sets of performance characteristics and two scoring scales will be used to score responses to the constructed-response questions. Scorers will judge the overall effectiveness of your responses while focusing on the appropriate performance characteristics that have been identified as important for this examination (see below and page 7). Each response will be assigned a score based on an approved scoring scale (see pages 7–8).

Your performance on each 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 and Scoring Scales for CSET: English

A. SHORT-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

Performance Characteristics. The following performance characteristics will guide the scoring of responses to the short-response constructed-response questions (Subtest IV) on CSET: English.

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.

Scoring Scale. Scores will be assigned to each response to the short-response constructed-response questions (Subtest IV) on CSET: English according to the following scoring scale.

SCORE POINT	SCORE POINT DESCRIPTION
3	<p>The "3" response reflects a 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 an accurate application of relevant subject matter knowledge. • There is appropriate and specific relevant supporting evidence.
2	<p>The "2" 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. • There is acceptable relevant supporting evidence.
1	<p>The "1" response reflects a limited 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 only partially or not achieved. • There is limited or no application of relevant subject matter knowledge. • There is little or no relevant supporting evidence.
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>

B. EXTENDED-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

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

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. Scores will be assigned to each response to the extended-response constructed-response questions (Subtest III) on CSET: English 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>