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# APPENDICES

* + 1. **Appendix**. Scoring Rubrics ff Writing

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Aspect of**  **Writing** | **Score** | **Category** | **Criteria** |
| Content | 30-27 | Excellent to very good | knowledgeable; substantive; through development of thesis; and relevant to assigned topic |
|  | 26-22 | Good to average | some knowledge of subject; adequate range; limited development of thesis; mostly relevant to topic but lacks detail |
|  | 21-17 | Fair to poor | limited knowledge of subject; little substance; inadequate development of topic |
|  | 16-13 | Very poor | does not show knowledge of subject; non-substantive; not pertinent; or not enough to evaluate |
| organisation | 20-18 | Excellent to very good | fluent expression; ideas clearly stated/supported; succinct; well- organised; logical sequencing; cohesive |
|  | 17-14 | Good to average | somewhat choppy; loosely organized but main ideas stand out; limited support; logical but incomplete sequencing |
|  | 13-10 | Fair to poor | non-fluent; ideas confused or disconnected; lacks logical sequencing and development |
|  | 9-7 | Very poor | does not communicate; no organisation; or not enough to evaluate |
| Vocabulary | 20-18 | Excellent to good | sophisticated range; effective word/idiom choice and usage; word form mastery; appropriate register |
|  | 17-14 | Good to average | adequate range; occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured |
|  | 13-10 | Fair to poor | limited range; frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage; meaning confused or obscured |
|  | 9-7 | Very poor | essentially translation; little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form; or not enough to evaluate |
| Language use | 25-22 | Excellent to very good | effective complex constructions; few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions |
|  | 21-18 | Good to average | effective but simple constructions; minor problems in complex constructions; several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning seldom obscured |
|  | 17-11 | Fair to poor | major problems in sample/complex constructions; frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions; meaning confused or obscured |
|  | 10-5 | Very poor | virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules; dominated by errors; does not communicate; or not enough to evaluate |
| Mechanics | 5 | Excellent to very good | demonstrate mastery of conventions; few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalisation, paragraphing |
|  | 4 | Good to average | occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalisation paragraphing but meaning not obscured |
|  | 3 | Fair to poor | frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalisation, paragraphing; poor handwriting; meaning confused or obscured |
|  | 2 | Very poor | no mastery of conventions; dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalisation, paragraphing; handwriting illegible; or not enough to evaluate |

* + 1. **Appendix**. Student Learning Process



Image 4 – Student Learning Process



Image 5 – The Learning Process of Class A Students



Image 6 – Class B Learning Process



