

SCORING RUBRIC FOR LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS: The following rubric will be used to score the linguistic analysis. Its criteria are based on the WIDA performance definitions for levels of English language proficiency.

	Target (5 pts)	Acceptable (3 pts)	Unacceptable (1 pt)
Contextual background	Targeted performance is evidenced by an analysis that demonstrates candidate’s awareness of impact of a full range of contextual factors on language development, e.g., age, language background, educational background, quality of input, and exposure.	Acceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis that demonstrates candidate’s awareness of the impact of at least three contextual factors on language development.	Unacceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis that lacks sufficient detail of contextual information related to language development.
Phonological variation and language control	Targeted performance is evidenced by candidate’s ability to fully understand, describe, and compare English phonology and the phonological system of the language learner’s L1 and to assess learner’s control of English phonology.	Acceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis that demonstrates candidate’s ability to understand, describe, and compare some features of English phonology and the phonological system of the language learner’s L1 and to adequately assess learner’s control of English phonology.	Unacceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis that lacks detail or is partly inaccurate. It is unclear whether or not the candidate understands the features of English phonology or the system of the language learner’s L1 and can assess phonological control.
Suprasegmental phonology and language control	Targeted performance is evidenced by an analysis that demonstrates candidate’s ability to understand, describe, and compare several suprasegmental features of English, such as tone, pitch, stress, and loudness, and the features of the learner’s L1 and to assess learner’s control of English suprasegmentals.	Acceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis that demonstrates candidate’s ability to identify language learner’s use of one or more suprasegmental features of English and to adequately assess learner’s control of English suprasegmentals.	Unacceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis that lacks detail and fails to identify suprasegmental features in learner language.

Morphological variation and language control	Targeted performance is evidenced by candidate's ability to fully understand, describe, and compare English morphology and the morphological system of the learner's L1 and to assess learner's control of English morphology.	Acceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis that demonstrates candidate's ability to understand, compare and describe some features of English morphology and the morphological system of the learner's L1 and to adequately assess learner's control of English morphology.	Unacceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis that lacks detail or is partly inaccurate. It is unclear whether or not the candidate understands the morphological features of English and is able to describe systematic errors made by language learners in a given sample.
Syntactic variation, language control, and linguistic complexity	Targeted performance is evidenced by an analysis that demonstrates the candidate's ability to fully understand, describe, and compare English syntax and the syntactic system of the learner's L1 and to assess learner's control of English syntax and learner's use of structures appropriate to specific genres.	Acceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis that demonstrates the candidate's ability to understand, describe, and compare some aspects of English syntax and the system of the learner's L1 and to adequately assess learner's control of English syntax and learner's use of structures appropriate to specific genres.	Unacceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis that lacks sufficient detail or is partly inaccurate. It is unclear whether or not the candidate understands English syntax or is able to describe syntactical errors made by English language learners.
Idiomatic speech and communicative competence	Targeted performance is evidenced by an analysis that demonstrates candidate's ability to fully describe learner's comprehension and use of idiomatic speech and assess degree to which learner achieves communicative competence.	Acceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis in which the candidate attempts to describe one or more instances of the learner's comprehension and use of idiomatic speech. Candidate may fail to link idiomatic speech of the learner to communicative competence.	Unacceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis that omits a discussion of the language learner's comprehension or use of idiomatic speech, or it is unclear that the candidate understands the concepts of idiomatic speech and communicative competence.
Pragmatic and sociolinguistic features of learner speech	Targeted performance is evidenced by an analysis that demonstrates the candidate's ability to analyze several pragmatic or sociolinguistic features of language learner's speech and relate these to communicative competence.	Acceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis in which the candidate identifies and analyzes at least two pragmatic or sociolinguistic features of speech and discusses their relationship to communicative competence and language proficiency.	Unacceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis that lacks sufficient detail concerning pragmatic and sociolinguistic features, is partly inaccurate, and fails to discuss relationship of features to communicative competence.

Vocabulary	Targeted performance is evidenced by a candidate's ability to fully describe a learner's vocabulary, both conversational and academic.	Acceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis in which the candidate analyzes only one aspect of a learner's vocabulary, conversational or academic.	Unacceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis that lacks sufficient detail. It is unclear whether candidate considered vocabulary or is aware of different types.
Depth of description and analysis	Targeted performance is evidenced by candidate's thorough description and analysis of learner language and a detailed, complete transcription. Candidate uses many examples from the transcript to support conclusions about language proficiency based on the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards.	Acceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis of learner language that is sufficiently detailed but which could be more thorough. Transcript is complete, though there may be some inaccuracies. Appropriate terminology is sometimes used to describe learner language. Candidate provides some examples from the transcript to support conclusions about the language learner's proficiency based on the WIDA ELP standards.	Unacceptable performance is evidenced by an analysis of learner language that lacks detail and that is too often inaccurate. Appropriate terminology is seldom used to describe learner language and the candidate provides few examples from the transcript to support conclusions about the learner's proficiency and fails to base conclusions on WIDA ELP standards.
Adherence to conventions	Targeted performance is evidenced by the presentation of a paper that closely follows academic conventions concerning format, citation of sources, style, and mechanics.	Acceptable performance is evidenced by the presentation of a paper that sometimes deviates from academic conventions but whose deviations are relatively minor.	Unacceptable performance is evidenced by the presentation of a paper that generally does not adhere to academic conventions concerning format, citation of sources, style, and mechanics.