

Interpreting and Sharing CLA+ Performance Task Data With Students



Students receive an overall score for the Performance Task (PT) section and three subscores for Analysis and Problem Solving (APS), Writing Effectiveness (WE), and Writing Mechanics (WM). The subscores are based on a scoring rubric (see page 2 of this document) in which 1 is the lowest level of performance and 6 is the highest level of performance.

ABOUT THE SKILLS MEASURED BY CLA+ 60



Analysis and Problem Solving

- Identifying facts or ideas and correctly understanding them
- Computing values to solve a problem
- Identifying information that is connected and conflicting
- Analyzing logic and being able to recognize assumptions in arguments
- Evaluating if information is true or false
- Gathering and including information from multiple sources
- Deciding how you are going to solve a problem
- Selecting the strongest data to support a decision
- Recognizing that a text may leave some things uncertain



Writing Effectiveness

- Clearly stating a position
- Presenting evidence to support an argument
- Explaining facts or ideas in detail
- Creating an argument that is organized and logical
- Including the use of effective transitions
- Considering opposing arguments and seeing the weaknesses in them



Writing Mechanics

- Using vocabulary correctly
- Using varied and complex vocabulary
- Writing sentences with correct grammar and syntax
- Writing sentences with varied structure and complexity
- Writing effectively

	1	2	3	4	5	6
<p>Analytic Reasoning & Evaluation</p> <p>Interpreting, analyzing, and evaluating the quality of information. This entails identifying information that is relevant to a problem, highlighting connected and conflicting information, detecting flaws in logic and questionable assumptions, and explaining why information is credible, unreliable, or limited.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not identify facts or ideas that support or refute arguments presented in the Document Library (salient features of objects to be classified) or provides no evidence of analysis. Disregards or severely misinterprets important information. Does not make claims about the quality of evidence and bases response on unreliable information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies very few facts or ideas that support or refute arguments presented in the Document Library (salient features of objects to be classified). Disregards or misinterprets much of the Document Library. May restate information "as is." Does not make claims about the quality of information and presents some unreliable information as credible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies a few facts or ideas that support or refute several arguments presented in the Document Library (salient features of several objects to be classified). Disregards important information or makes minor misinterpretations of information. May restate information "as is." Rarely, if ever, makes claims about the quality of information and may present some unreliable evidence as credible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies a few facts or ideas that support or refute all major arguments presented in the Document Library (salient features of all objects to be classified). Briefly demonstrates accurate understanding of important Document Library content, but disregards some information. Makes very few accurate claims about the quality of information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies several facts or ideas that support or refute all major arguments presented in the Document Library (salient features of all objects to be classified). Demonstrates accurate understanding of much of the Document Library content. Makes a few accurate claims about the quality of information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies most facts or ideas that support or refute all major arguments presented in the Document Library (salient features of all objects to be classified). Provides original analysis that draws on several relevant resources. Demonstrates accurate understanding of a large body of information from the Document Library. Makes several accurate claims about the quality of information.
<p>Writing Effectiveness</p> <p>Constructing organized and logically cohesive arguments. Strengthening the writer's position by providing elaboration on facts or ideas (e.g., explaining how evidence bears on the problem, providing examples, and emphasizing especially convincing evidence).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not develop convincing arguments. Writing may be disorganized and confusing. Does not provide elaboration on facts or ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides limited, invalid, overstated, or very unclear arguments. May present information in a disorganized fashion or undermine own points. Any elaboration on facts or ideas tends to be vague, irrelevant, inaccurate, or unreliable (e.g., based entirely on writer's opinion). Sources of information are often unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides limited or somewhat unclear arguments. Presents relevant information in each response, but that information is not woven into arguments Provides elaboration on facts or ideas a few times, some of which is valid. Sources of information are sometimes unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizes response in a way that makes the writer's arguments and logic of those arguments apparent but not obvious. Provides valid elaboration on facts or ideas several times and cites sources of information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizes response in a logically cohesive way that makes it fairly easy to follow the writer's arguments. Provides valid elaboration on facts or ideas related to each argument and cites sources of information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizes response in a logically cohesive way that makes it very easy to follow the writer's arguments. Provides valid and comprehensive elaboration on facts or ideas related to each argument and clearly cites sources of information.
<p>Writing Mechanics</p> <p>Facility with the conventions of Standard Written English (agreement, tense, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling) and control of the English language, including syntax (sentence structure) and diction (word choice and usage).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates minimal control of grammatical conventions with many errors that make the response difficult to read or provides insufficient evidence to judge. Writes sentences that are repetitive or incomplete, and some are difficult to understand. Uses simple vocabulary, and some vocabulary is used inaccurately or in a way that makes meaning unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates poor control of grammatical conventions with frequent minor errors and some distracting errors. Consistently writes sentences with similar structure and length, and some may be difficult to understand. Uses simple vocabulary, and some vocabulary may be used inaccurately or in a way that makes meaning unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates fair control of grammatical conventions with frequent minor errors. Writes sentences that read naturally but tend to have similar structure and length. Uses vocabulary that clearly communicates ideas adequately but lacks variety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates good control of grammatical conventions with few errors. Writes well-constructed sentences with some varied structure and length. Uses vocabulary that clearly communicates ideas but lacks variety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates very good control of grammatical conventions. Consistently writes well-constructed sentences with varied structure and length. Uses varied and sometimes advanced vocabulary that effectively communicates ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates outstanding control of grammatical conventions. Consistently writes well-constructed, complex sentences with varied structure and length. Displays adept use of vocabulary that is precise, advanced, and varied.

Have Questions?

To discuss your results with CAE experts, please email support@cae.org to schedule a meeting.