

## Assessment criteria for writing coursework

Mark	Communication and content
9-10	Very detailed and fully relevant response to the stimulus. Shows a clear ability to narrate, describe, express opinions and expand, as appropriate to the task. Communicates with no ambiguity. Excellent linking of the piece into a whole. Coherent and pleasant to read.
7-8	Detailed response to the stimulus but there may be minor omissions. Provides evidence of description, opinion and expansion, as appropriate to the task. Communicates generally clearly, with some lapses. Reasonable attempt to link the piece into a whole. Generally coherent. Pedestrian or alternatively somewhat over-ambitious.
5-6	Most of the task is completed and relevant information is conveyed, although there may be some omissions and/or irrelevancies. Provides evidence of an ability to go beyond a minimal response. Begins to expand ideas and express opinions, as appropriate to the task. Comprehensible overall with some lapses, sometimes leading to ambiguity, especially if more ambitious language is attempted. Some attempt at linking piece into a whole.
3-4	Relevant key information is given but there may be may be major omissions and/or irrelevance, repetition. The level of response is minimal with no evidence of description or opinions (other than simple likes/dislikes). Some ambiguity. Just about comprehensible overall. Sentences mostly written in isolation. Not easy to read.
1-2	Little relevant information is conveyed. Much ambiguity and omission. The level of response is very limited. Substantial degree of irrelevance and incoherence. Except for isolated items, would not be comprehensible to a native speaker.
0	No relevant communication.

<b>Mark</b>	<b>Knowledge and application of language</b>
5	Wide range of vocabulary and structures, fully appropriate to the task and used effectively. Little or no repetition. Confident use of more complex structures, such as pronouns, negatives, superlatives and range of tenses, with very few lapses. Clear ability to manipulate language and to produce longer, fluent sentences with ease.
4	Quite a wide range of vocabulary and structures appropriate to describe and to express and justify opinions. Some attempt to use ambitious structures (subordinate clauses, pronouns, tenses, etc) with a fair measure of success. Tenses are generally correctly used. Some ability to manipulate language although not always successful.
3	Vocabulary and structures are generally appropriate to the task. Correct syntax when using simple, short sentences. Some longer sentences where syntax is not always correct. Attempts enhancement of fact with adjectives and adverbial phrases with some success. . Some evidence of correct use of a range of tenses, with some lapses. Attempts to use subordinate clauses/simple linking with some success.
2	Limited vocabulary and structures, often repetitive and stereotyped. Language is basic and sometimes inappropriate to the task. Pre-learnt, set phrases predominate but there are some short simple sentences, which are more or less correct. Some attempts at tenses, but many mistakes. Some attempt to use adjectives. Occasional subordination.
1	Very limited vocabulary, with occasional correct words. Very little understanding of language structures. There may be the occasional correct phrase or short sentence but they are likely to be pre-learnt or 'lifted'.
0	No language worthy of credit.

<b>Mark</b>	<b>Accuracy</b>
5	High level of accuracy, though not necessarily faultless. Spellings, genders, agreements, verb forms mastered with the odd slip. Secure when using more complex language with only a few minor errors.
4	Generally accurate language. Most verb forms correct, secure in genders, agreements but the odd lapse. Spellings mostly accurate. Accuracy can be more variable when more complex structures are attempted.
3	Fairly accurate in straightforward language, but some lapses with more complex language. Inconsistency in verb forms but more correct than incorrect. Spelling of common words generally accurate. The piece is clearly more accurate than inaccurate. Language errors do not hinder communication. In accuracy increases if attempts more complex structures
2	Many basic errors. Some correct phrases but frequent misspellings, inaccurate genders, incorrect verb forms.
1	Frequent basic errors and inaccuracies prevent communication. Isolated examples of correct language. Spellings and genders very weak. Little or no evidence of correct verb formation.
0	No language worthy of credit.