ENGLISH (READING)

	AO1	AO2	AO3a	AO3b	AO4
	Lang: Identify and interpret explicit/ implicit information and ideas. Select and synthesise evidence from different texts. **Lit:** Read, understand and respond to texts. Use textual references, including quotations, to support and illustrate interpretations.	**Lang:** Explain, comment on and analyse how writers use language and structure to achieve effects and influence readers, using relevant subject terminology to support their views. **Lit:** Analyse the language, form and structure used by a writer to create meanings and effects, using relevant subject terminology where appropriate	**Lang:** Compare writers' ideas and perspectives, as well as how these are conveyed, across two or more texts	**Lit:** Show understanding of the relationships between texts and the contexts in which they were written.	**Lang:** Evaluate texts critically and support this with appropriate textual references. **Lit:** Maintain and develop an informed personal response.
PLATINUM	I can identify the most relevant points, including summarising and synthesizing information. I can make inferences and deductions about texts with clear textual reference and quotation (sometimes at word level). My inferences are based in textual evidence and I can sometimes identify different layers of meaning, with some attempt to explore these meanings in detail. My inferences might make links to other places in the text.	I sometimes explain structural choices support the writer's theme or purpose. I can identify a range of specific features relating to organisation of a text. I can give some explanation of how language is used for specific effect(s). I sometimes comment on how the writer's language choices contribute to the overall effect on the reader, e.g. 'all the images of flowers make the events seem less horrific and makes it even sadder'. I make clear use of subject terminology but not always accurately.	I sometimes compare individual words in two texts or use of a specific language feature, e.g. alliteration or repetition. I can compare two writers' viewpoints and can explain my ideas I can compare the effect of a text on the reader.	I begin to compare genre conventions or features as used by writers from different periods, e.g. comparing examples of sonnet form, dramatic monologue, or biography or travel writing. I can provide some discussion of how the contexts in which texts are written and read affect meaning	I can make a clear and personal response to the focus of the task. I begin to evaluate the effect(s) on the reader. I begin to evaluate the writer's methods in some detail. I select relevant textual references including quotations.
GOLD	I can identify accurate points. I can make inferences (read between the lines) and deductions and support them using quotation or references. My inferences are mostly clear. My inferences are usually accurate.	I can comment on structural choices, showing some general awareness of the writer's craft. I can identify some features relating to organisation at text level. I can comment on a writer's use of language, with some explanation. My comments show some awareness of the effect of the writer's language choices, e.g. '"inked up" is a good way of describing how the blackberries go a bluey black colour as they ripen'. I make some use of subject terminology but might make mistakes.	I can compare the main ideas in a text, usually through a general overview. I can identify the viewpoint in each text and might make links, e.g. 'the writer is strongly against war but the second writer supports it.' I have some understanding of the effect on the reader in each text but might not compare them.	My comments identify similarities and differences in genre features e.g. narrative conventions in traditional tales or stories from different cultures, ballads, and newspaper reports. I might give some explanation of how the contexts in which texts are written and read contribute to meaning, e.g. how a novel relates to when/where it was written.	I can respond to the task giving my opinion and reasons why I think this. I can make some evaluative comment(s) on effect(s) on the reader. I show some understanding of writer's methods. I can select some textual reference(s) or quotations.
SILVER	I can identify some accurate points. My interpretations are supported by some references to a text but sometimes my points are a bit vague. I sometimes make straightforward inferences on evidence from different points in the text. My inferences can be correct.	I can identify some structural choices. I can identify some basic features of organisation at text level, e.g. 'the writer uses bullet points for the main reasons'. I can identify some basic features of a writer's use of language, e.g. 'all the questions make you want to find out what happens next'. I can make straightforward comments on the writer's choices, e.g. 'disgraceful" is a good word to use to show he is upset'. I make limited use of subject terminology.	I can identify the main purpose of each text but might write about them separately (no comparison) I can show some awareness of each writer's viewpoint but might not compare. I can make straightforward comment(s) on the overall effect of the text on the reader.	I might compare different features common to different texts or versions, e.g. characters, settings, presentational features. I can make straightforward comments on the context but might write about them separately.	I can respond to the task giving my opinion. I can make straightforward evaluative comment(s) on effect(s) on reader. I can make straightforward comments on the writer's methods. I can use straightforward textual reference(s).
BRONZE	I can sometimes identify the most obvious points although there may be some misunderstanding. I usually paraphrase ideas from a text. I can make some comments about important characters or events in a text. My inferences are straightforward and not always correct.	I can identify basic structural features e.g. paragraphing, etc. My points about a text show I have a limited understanding of it. I can sometimes identify a few basic features of a writer's use of language, but I don't explain why the words are used, e.g. 'there are lots of adjectives.' I might attempt to use subject terminology.	I sometimes understand the viewpoint of one or more texts. I can give my personal opinion about the content of the writing but I sometimes forget to say what the writer thinks.	I might make some limited connections between texts, e.g. similarities in plot, topic, or books by same author, about same characters. I can recognize some ideas about when the text was set or whether the text is similar or different to my life.	I give my opinion which is sometimes relevant I can make limited comments on the effect(s) on the reader. I can identify the writer's methods. I can use limited textual reference(s)