

English 10
2009/10 Released Exam
August 2010 — Form A
 Provincial Examination — Answer Key

Cognitive Processes	Weightings	Topics	Question Types
W = Retrieve Information	14%	1 = Literary Prose	29 = Multiple Choice (MC)
X = Recognize Meaning	14%	2 = Poetry	2 = Written Response (WR)
Y = Interpret Texts	14%	3 = Informational	
Z = Analyze Texts	21%	4 = Synthesis	
C = Writing	37%	5 = Composition	

Question Number	Keyed Response	Cognitive Process	Mark	Topic	PLO	Question Type
1.	A	X	1	3	—	MC
2.	A	W	1	3	—	MC
3.	B	X	1	3	—	MC
4.	B	W	1	3	—	MC
5.	C	X	1	3	—	MC
6.	D	Y	1	3	—	MC
7.	B	W	1	3	—	MC
8.	A	Y	1	3	—	MC
9.	C	Y	1	3	—	MC
10.	B	X	1	2	—	MC
11.	D	W	1	2	—	MC
12.	A	W	1	2	—	MC
13.	C	W	1	2	—	MC
14.	C	X	1	2	—	MC
15.	C	X	1	2	—	MC
16.	B	Y	1	2	—	MC
17.	B	Y	1	2	—	MC
18.	B	Y	1	2	—	MC
19.	B	X	1	1	—	MC
20.	B	W	1	1	—	MC
21.	A	W	1	1	—	MC
22.	B	X	1	1	—	MC
23.	A	W	1	1	—	MC
24.	D	X	1	1	—	MC
25.	D	Y	1	1	—	MC
26.	B	Y	1	1	—	MC
27.	C	Y	1	1	—	MC
28.	D	Z	1	4	—	MC
29.	A	Z	1	4	—	MC

Question Number	Keyed Response	Cognitive Process	Mark	Topic	PLO	Question Type
30.	–	Z	12	4	–	WR
31.	–	C	24	5	–	WR

English 10
2009/10 Released Exam
August 2010 — Form A

Provincial Examination — List of Possible Responses

This is a guideline only. Students may make direct or indirect reference to some of these ideas in their response. Use the holistic rubric to assess the student response.

30. Compare and contrast the relationships between the students and their teacher in “Students” and “Crow Lake.” In your response, you **must** discuss **both** passages. **(12 marks)**

In both passages the teachers reflect on the reactions of students to the lessons they present. In varying ways the students demonstrate their indifference to the efforts to inspire them. Wayman whimsically analyses the different reactions of many students while the narrator in “Crow Lake” feels a sense of failure and isolation.

“Students”	“Crow Lake”
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wayman first points out the generation gap as a barrier to forming a connection with his students (stanza 1) • Wayman says, “The wisdom of the students / hadn’t altered,” indicating that this is the usual behaviour from students (lines 9 and 10) • Wayman is accepting of this situation unlike the narrator in “Crow Lake” who takes student apathy personally (stanza 2) • Wayman uses a series of humorous metaphors to describe his amusement with the reactions of his students (stanzas 2–4) • Wayman concludes that no matter how hard he tries to inspire his students, they are most concerned about the marks they earn (stanza 5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The narrator prefers research over teaching and states this openly (par 5) • She finds it hard to relate to her students because, unlike Wayman, she does not understand their inability to take things seriously (par 5 and 6) • She resents the time teaching takes away from her research (par 5) • She does recognize that teachers like Daniel and Matt are able to form connections with the students (par 5 and 17) • The narrator takes the students’ apparent boredom personally and ultimately gives up (par 13–20) • She does not understand why they would not feel the excitement about the subject that she feels (par 17)

Note: Students who do not discuss both passages will receive a maximum scale point of 4. However, students should not be penalized for focusing predominantly on one passage. Students should not be penalized if they only provide comparisons or only provide contrasts.

Note: Other answers are possible.

Making Connections Through Reading

Written-Response Rubric

6

The six response is **superior** in its depth of discussion and synthesis of ideas. Demonstrates an insightful understanding of the texts at an interpretive level. May make inferences. May show understanding of literary techniques appropriate to genre. Support from texts, explicit or implicit, is thoughtful and well-integrated. Despite its clarity, response need not be error-free.

5

The five response is **proficient** in its depth of discussion and synthesis of ideas. Demonstrates a clear understanding of the texts at an interpretive level. May show understanding of literary techniques appropriate to genre. Support from texts, explicit or implicit, is convincing and relevant.

4

The four response is **competent** in its discussion of ideas. Demonstrates some understanding of the texts at an interpretive level. Response is organized and straightforward, but may miss subtle or complex ideas. Support from texts is relevant.

3

The three response is **adequate**. Demonstrates some understanding of the texts at a literal level. Response may be unclear, incomplete or lack detail. Assertions are often simplistic or unevenly developed. Support may consist of long references to the texts which are not clearly connected to the central idea.

2

The two response is **inadequate**. May demonstrate a misreading or misunderstanding of the texts or task. Response may be incomplete or restatements of texts, or consist of underdeveloped, limited ideas. Support is absent or flawed, with little evidence of relationships or connections. Does not meet the expectations of the task.

1

The one response is **unacceptable**. Demonstrates a misreading or significant misunderstanding of the texts or task. Response may be irrelevant. No evidence of support or connections between ideas. May be too short to meet the requirements of the task.

0

Makes no attempt to address the task or simply restates the question.

Note: This is a first-draft response and should be assessed as such.

The response is to be assessed holistically.

Writing conventions are to be considered only to the extent that they impede meaning.

A variety of types of responses such as graphic representations, tables or lists are acceptable and shall be assessed according to the rubric.

Students who do not discuss both passages will receive a maximum scale point of 4.

This scoring rubric is derived from the BC Performance Standards for Reading.

Writing Rubric

6

Ideas are fully developed and supported. Accomplishes the purpose with some originality, individuality or maturity. Effective word choice and sentence variety. Voice and tone engage the audience throughout. Structure is logical and the writing as a whole may appear effortless. Errors are not distracting.

5

Ideas are well-developed and supported. Has a clear sense of purpose. Appropriate word choice and sentence variety. Voice and tone generally engage the audience. Structure is logical and the writing demonstrates control. Errors are not distracting.

4

Ideas are generally straightforward and clear, with some support and sense of purpose. Basic vocabulary, some sentence variety. Attempts to engage the audience, but lacks a consistent voice. Structure may be formulaic. Errors generally do not impede meaning.

3

Ideas are often listed or developed unevenly, with little support or sense of purpose. Limited vocabulary and sentence variety. Lacks a sense of audience and voice. Structure may be weak. Errors may distract and impede meaning.

2

Ideas are often broad generalizations with little support, and no clear purpose. Colloquial vocabulary, weak sentence structure. Writing reflects little understanding of language conventions. Inappropriate tone or language for audience. Structure may seem illogical. Frequent noticeable errors interfere with meaning.

1

Ideas are not developed. Has no discernible purpose. May be too brief to accomplish the task. Lacks structure. Frequent serious errors.

0

No attempt to address the topic or is a restatement of the topic.

Note: This is a first-draft response and should be assessed as such.

The use of paragraph structure should be assessed holistically with reference to the clarity of organization and expression.

The connection to the topic may be explicit or implicit.

The students are writing to a PROMPT and considerable leeway can be given before a paper should be deemed “off-topic.”

This scoring rubric is derived from the BC Performance Standards for Impromptu Writing.