The CEFR Grids for Writing, developed by ALTE members

CVCL Sample Test Tasks

Report on analysis of	Certificato di lingua italiana – Livello 1 (CELI 1) Writing
Target language of this test	Italian
Target level (CEFR) of this test	A2
Task number/name	B.2

General Information about the writing component *

3	Number of tasks in the writing paper	2
4	Integration of skills	Writing (with written/visual inputs)
5	Total test time	120 minutes inc. Reading section
6	Target performance level	A2
7	Channel	Handwritten
8	Purpose	General proficiency

* The numbers in the left hand column of the tables refer to the categories in the ALTE CEFR Writing Grid

Background to the Examination

CELI 1 is a general Italian qualification which is part of the Perugia CVCL Main-suite examinations. Set at level A2 of the CEF, CELI 1 recognises the ability to cope with everyday written and spoken communications. CELI 1 is designed for learners who have basic Italian skills adequate for many practical purposes which require a basic use of language.

Candidature
CELI 1 is taken by around 500 candidates per year in 16 countries. Around 29% of CELI 1 candidates are aged under 18 and 37% are in the 18-27 age group. The remaining 34% are over 27.

Structure of the Test
CELI 1 tests the skills of Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking. Listening and Speaking are equally weighted at 30% each, reflecting the importance of oral skills for communication at elementary levels; Reading is weighted at 25% due to the importance attributed to understanding signs, notices, instructions, etc. and to coping with everyday life situations. As a result of the importance attached to the other skills, the writing component is only weighted 15%. CELI 1 is administered in three separate papers. Paper 1 Reading and Writing, Paper 2 Listening and Paper 3 Speaking. There are two possible grades in CELI 1: pass and fail. Results are based on candidates' aggregate scores across the four skills.

CELI 1 Reading and Writing Paper – (Paper 1)
The paper has a fixed format, with Part A (from A.1 to A.5) testing reading skills through a variety of texts ranging from very short notices to longer texts. Part B tests **Writing Skills** in two formats: B.1 and B.2. Candidates are assessed on their ability to produce written Italian at word and sentence and text level. They should show a basic control of structure, vocabulary and spelling as indicated in CELI 1 specifications.

B.1 is a gap filling task with ten items, where candidates are required to fill in the missing parts of short simple texts of a descriptive or narrative kind (postcards, short informal letters, messages, short news) which deal with everyday topics and situations.

B.2 is a guided report (who can take the form of a chart, a schedule, a page of a personal agenda, a short informal letter) between 70-80 words in length, where candidates are required to give basic information about themselves, their environment, and to write short basic descriptions of events, past activities and personal experiences.

Specific Information about the example task
In this task (B.2), candidates are asked to write a short report for a diary, following some basic instructions. The task requires an answer of about 80 words. For the report (this sample), the candidates are given some suggestions about how to organise a picnic. Candidates are given the first sentence in the first person and in the past and they will need to construct their report accordingly.

Mark distribution

There are a maximum of 20 marks for the Writing component. Both Task B.1 and B.2 carry 10 marks. Candidates at this level are not expected to produce faultless Italian, but, to gain full marks they should fulfil the task, with few grammatical and spelling errors. Errors which interfere with communication or cause a breakdown in communication will be treated more seriously.

Task Rating

The rating scale takes the form of a set of 4 band descriptors from 0 - 10, giving a total of 10 available marks. The descriptors take into account, the task fulfilment, the spelling, the vocabulary, the grammatical form. The exam is marked by trained examiners (teachers at the University with a postgraduate degree in Italian L2) under the supervision of a Principal Examiner and Team Leaders. The Principal Examiner guides and monitor constantly the marking process. Examiners are required to refer to the band descriptors when they are working.

Effective Level

All CELI 1 Writing tasks are constructed on the basis of expert judgments (experienced teachers of Italian L2 at the University on staff at the University) and according to the CELI 1 specifications relating both to the A2 Can-Do statements in the CEFR and to ALTE Can-Do statements. Several meetings are run by Team Leaders with the Item Writers to decide the writing tasks most suitable for the level, before the final exam version is produced.

Sample task:

The task, instructions and rubric are all in English, the target language.
The time allocated to the complete test paper (Paper 1) is 2 hours (Paper 1 consists of reading and writing tasks) No time allocation is specified for individual tasks/components.

B.2   Scrivere un racconto. Usare il passato.

Scrivere nello spazio riservato a B.2 nel Foglio delle Risposte
(da un minimo di 70 ad un massimo di 80 parole)

- Lei ha letto questa tabella che contiene alcuni consigli per organizzare un picnic.
- Nella tabella ci sono le cose da fare (SÌ) e le cose da non fare (NO).

SÌ	NO
In aperta campagna	Vicino alle strade
Sedersi sull'erba	Tavolino e sedie pieghevoli
Radio e musica	Televisore e computer
Vino e bibite fresche. Panini e piatti con verdure. Frutta	Superalcolici, preparazioni grasse e pesanti

- Ha seguito questi consigli per organizzare un picnic e ora racconta in una pagina del Suo diario come è andato.

- Iniziare così:

Domenica scorsa siamo andati a fare un picnic. Ho scelto un posto fresco in aperta campagna

i) Task input/prompt

9	Rubrics and instructions are in…	Italian
10	Language level of rubric	A2 – same level as test
11	Time for this task	Not specified
12	Control/guidance	Controlled
13	Content	Content is specified
14	Discourse mode	Story
15	Audience	Page of diary
16	Type of prompt	Textual
17	Topic	Daily life
18	Integration of skills	Reading

ii) Response (description of written response elicited by the prompt(s)/input)

19	Number of words expected	Between 70 and 80
20	Rhetorical function(s)	Description (events)
21	Register	Informal
22	Domain	Personal
23	Grammar	Only simple grammatical structures
24	Vocabulary	Only frequent vocabulary
25	Cohesion	Extremely limited use of cohesive devices
26	Authenticity: situational	Medium
27	Authenticity: interactional	Low
28	Cognitive processing	Reproduction of known ideas only
29	Content knowledge	Personal/daily life/
30	Task purpose	Referential (telling)

iii) Rating of Task		
31	Known criteria	Not on paper – can be viewed in publications and website
32	Task rating method	Band descriptors (4)
33	Assessment criteria	Holistic
34	Number of raters	1 + moderation

iv) Feedback to candidates		
35	Quantitative feedback	Raw score on the front page of the Paper
36	Qualitative feedback	None. Provided when required

Example answer

Domenica scorsa siamo andati a fare un picnic. Ho scelto un posto fresco in aperta campagna che mi ha piaciuto molto. L'ho scelto non vicino alle strade, molto silenzioso. Ci siamo seduti sull'erba e non abbiamo avuto ne tavolino, ne sedie pieghevoli. Io e i miei amici abbiamo ascoltato la radio e la musica per molto tempo e abbiamo dimenticato il televisore e il computer. Abbiamo bevuto vino e delle bibite fresche, abbiamo mangiato panini e piatti con verdure e abbiamo finito mangiare con la frutta. Non abbiamo portato superalcolici o piatti grassi e pesanti.

Commentary
All the parts in the prompt are communicated, there is one spelling error. 'ne' instead of 'né', one grammar error 'ha piaciuto' instead of 'è piaciuto', one incorrect use of prepositions, for instance: 'finito mangiare' instead of 'finito di mangiare' and one incorrect use of past tenses: 'abbiamo avuto' instead of 'avevamo'; nevertheless the errors do not impede the overall communication.

Score allocated
Band 4: 8 points out of a maximum possible of 10.

The CEFR Grids for Writing, developed by ALTE members

CVCL Sample Test Tasks

Report on analysis of	Certificato di Lingua Italiana - Livello 2 (CELI 2) (Writing)
Target language of this test	Italian
Target level (CEFR) of this test	B1
Task number/name	B.3

General Information about the writing component *

3	Number of tasks in the writing paper	3
4	Integration of skills	Writing (with written/visual inputs)
5	Total test time	120 minutes inc. Reading section
6	Target performance level	B1
7	Channel	Handwritten
8	Purpose	General proficiency

* The numbers in the left hand column of the tables refer to the categories in the ALTE CEFR Writing Grid

Background to the Examination

CELI 2 is a general Italian qualification which is part of the Perugia CVCL Main-suite examinations. Set at level B1 of the CEF, CELI 2 recognises the ability to cope with everyday written and spoken communications. CELI 2 is designed for learners whose English skills are adequate for many practical purposes, including work, study and social situations which require a predictable use of language in relation to everyday situations.

Candidature
CELI 2 is taken by around 2000 candidates per year in 26 countries and in 59 Examination Centres. Around 69% of CELI 2 candidates are in the 18-30 age group and only 11% are aged under 18; the remaining 20% are in the age group 30-55.

Structure of the Test
CELI 2 tests the skills of Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking, with each skill equally weighted at 25%. CELI 2 is administered in three separate papers. Paper 1, Reading and Writing; Paper 2, Listening; and Paper 3, Speaking. There are five possible grades in CELI 2: three pass grades (A-B-C) and two fail grades (D-E). Results are based on candidates' aggregate scores across the four skills.

CELI 2 Reading and Writing Paper – (Paper 1)
The paper has a fixed format, with Part A (from A.1 to A.5) testing reading skills through a variety of texts ranging from very short notices to longer continuous texts. Part B is divided in three parts: B.1, B.2, B.3 testing **Writing Skills** in a variety of formats. Candidates are assessed on their ability to produce written Italian at word and sentence and whole text level.

B.1 requires candidates to fill in common forms or questionnaires, notes on personal agendas giving routine factual information and reporting personal events of immediate relevance.

B.2 requires candidates to write effectively short, informal, transactional letters or announcements relating to daily needs.

B.3 requires candidates to write short personal letters, informal reports or short stories on a range of familiar subjects, describing events, experiences, feelings and reactions in some detail.

Specific Information about the example task
In this task (B.3), candidates have to write an informal letter describing an event real or imagined. The task requires an answer between 90 and 100 words. For the letter (this sample), the candidates are given the description of the situation they have to refer to, and of the operations they should accomplish. In the answer candidates are expected to fulfil the task, writing a simple connected letter in the proper register.

Mark distribution
There are a maximum of 40 marks for the Writing component. Task B.1 carries a maximum of 5 marks (1/2 mark for each complete answer); task B.2 a maximum of 15 marks and task B.3 a maximum of 20 marks. A mark scheme is used, both for task B.2

and 3, which focuses on four criteria (Lexical Competence, Grammatical Competence, Coherence and Socio-cultural Competence) and a set of band descriptors (5) for each of the above criteria. Candidates are penalised for inadequately dealing with the requirements of the mark scheme.

Task Rating
The exam is marked by trained examiners (teachers at the University with a postgraduate degree in Italian L2) under the supervision of a Principal Examiner and Team Leaders. The Principal Examiner guides and monitor constantly the marking process. Examiners are required to refer to the mark scheme when they are working.

Effective Level
All CELI 2 Writing tasks are constructed on the basis of expert judgements (experienced teachers of Italian L2 at the University on staff at the University) and according to CELI 2 specifications relating both to the B1 Can-Do statements in the CEF and to the ALTE Can-Do statements. Several meetings are run by Team Leaders with the Item Writers to decide the writing tasks most suitable for the level, before the final exam version is produced.

Sample task:

The task, instructions and rubric are all in English, the target language.

The time allocated to the complete test paper (Paper 1) is 2 hours (Paper 1 consists of reading and writing tasks) No time allocation is specified for individual tasks/components.

B.3 Scrivere una lettera
  Scrivere nello spazio riservato a B.3 nel Foglio delle Risposte
  (da un minimo di 90 ad un massimo di 100 parole)

Scrivere nello spazio riservato a B.2 nel Foglio delle Risposte
(da un minimo di 70 ad un massimo di 80 parole)

- Lei ha organizzato qualcosa (un viaggio, una festa, una gara sportiva, una mostra...) che ha avuto molto successo.
- Scrive a un amico italiano, che sapeva del Suo impegno, per raccontare la Sua esperienza.

Nella lettera:

- descrive alcuni particolari interessanti
- ringrazia l'amico per i consigli (o i materiali) che Le aveva dato
- scrive che gli invierà qualcosa (ad esempio foto, articoli di giornale...) dell'evento organizzato.

i) Task input/prompt

9	Rubrics and instructions are in...	Italian
10	Language level of rubric	B1- same level as test
11	Time for this task	Not specified
12	Control/guidance	Controlled
13	Content	Content is specified
14	Discourse mode	Letter (personal)
15	Audience	Friend, acquaintance
16	Type of input	Textual
17	Topic	Free time, entertainment
18	Integration of skills	Reading

ii) Response (description of written response elicited by the prompt(s)/input)

19	Number of words expected	Between 90 and 100
20	Rhetorical function(s)	Description (events), expressing pleasure/displeasure, gratitude
21	Register	Informal
22	Domain	Personal
23	Grammar	Mainly simple structures
24	Vocabulary	Only frequent vocabulary
25	Cohesion	Limited use of cohesive devices
26	Authenticity: situational	High
27	Authenticity: interactional	High
28	Cognitive processing	Reproduction of known ideas only
29	Content knowledge	Personal/daily life/basic communication needs
30	Task purpose	Referential (telling)

iii) Rating of Task

31	Known criteria	Not on paper-can be viewed in publications and website
32	Task rating method	Analytic
33	Assessment criteria	Lexical Competence, Grammatical Competence, Coherence, Socio-cultural Competence
34	Number of raters	1 + moderation

iv) Feedback to candidates

35	Quantitative feedback	Raw score on the front page of the Paper
36	Qualitative feedback	None. Provided only when required

Example answer

```
Caro Mario,
ieri siamo tornati da quello splendido viaggio del quale
ti ho già parlato poco tempo fa. Ci siamo divertiti
tanto, mi dispiace solo perché non potevi venire anche
tu.

Abbiamo visto anche quel vecchio monastero, e il museo
del qale hai parlato spesso. Grazie per i consigli, ci
sono stati molto utili. La più bella cosa era il
casttello dal tredicesimo secolo, mi è piaciuto tanto.
Che piacere sarebbe stato vivere lì!.

Ho fatto delle fotografie splendide. Te le manderò tutte
la prossima volta.

Con speranza che ti abbracio presto ti mando un grande
bacio.
```

Commentary

- **Lexical Competence**

The candidate shows a sufficient vocabulary to express him/herself. No effort is required by the reader even if there are some spelling errors: 'qale' instead of 'quale', 'casttello' instead of 'castello', 'abbracio' instead of 'abbraccio'.

- **Grammatical Competence**

The grammatical forms are simple, but sufficiently accurate. Two errors are due to a wrong use of past tenses: and one incorrect use of past tenses: 'non potevi' instead of 'non sei potuto' and to the absence of the article: 'con speranza' instead of 'con la speranza'.. The candidate shows some ambition in using more complex forms: 'Che piacere sarebbe stato vivere lì'. The cohesion is acceptable (a part from a wrong construction: che ti abbracio presto' instead of 'di abbracciarti presto') due to the correct use of simple connective devices (pronouns) and to a reasonable control of punctuation. Anyway, errors do not impede the communications.

- **Socio-cultural Competence**

Simple, but well formulated expressions generally appropriate to the context.

- **Coherence**

The content of the letter is well organised and developed

Score allocated

17 out of a maximum possible score of 20

The CEFR Grids for Writing, developed by ALTE members

CVCL Sample Test Tasks

Report on analysis of	Certificato di Lingua Italiana - Livello 3 (CELI 3) (Writing)
Target language of this test	Italian
Target level (CEFR) of this test	B2
Task number/name	B.1

General Information about the writing component *

3	Number of tasks in the writing paper	2
4	Integration of skills	Writing (with written inputs)
5	Total test time	135 minutes inc. Reading section
6	Target performance level	B2
7	Channel	Handwritten
8	Purpose	General proficiency

* The numbers in the left hand column of the tables refer to the categories in the ALTE CEFR Writing Grid

Background to the Examination

CELI 3 is a general Italian qualification which is one of the Perugia CVCL Main-suite Examinations. Set at level B2 of the CEFR, CELI 3 recognises the ability to deal confidently with a range of written and spoken communications. CELI 3 is designed for learners whose command of Italian is adequate for many practical purposes including work and study. CELI 3 is accepted by the Italian Ministry of Education to enter the University in Italy.

Candidature
CELI 3 is taken by around 5000 candidates per year in 31 countries and in 79 Examination Centres. Around 63% of CELI 3 candidates are in the 18-27 age group, only 14% are between 15-18; the remaining 23% are in the age group 27-55.

Structure of the Test
CELI 3 tests the skills of Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking. A specific paper, named 'Competenza Linguistica' is introduced at this level to assess grammatical and lexical competences. CELI 3 is administered in four separate papers: Paper 1, Reading and Writing; Paper 2, 'Competenza Linguistica'; Paper 3, Listening and Paper 4, Speaking. Of the five parts forming the test, each one has a different weight, in accordance to test's context and purpose. Productive abilities are weighted overall at 50% (Writing 20%, Speaking 30%) receptive abilities at 40% (Reading 20%, Listening 20%). The 'Competenza Linguistica' is weighted at 10%. There are five possible grades in CELI 3: three pass grades (A, B and C) and two fail grades (D and E). Results are based on candidates' aggregate scores across the five components of the test.

CELI 3 Reading and Writing Paper - (Paper 1)
The paper has a fixed format, with Part A (from A.1 to A.3) testing reading skills through a variety of quite long and articulated texts. Part B tests **Writing Skills** and is divided in two parts: **B.1** and **B.2**.

B.1 consists of two tasks, of which candidates are required to answer one. Candidates are expected to write a composition (120-180 words) of descriptive, narrative or argumentative type, on topics which candidates can relate to their personal experience or a short story both on real or imaginary events.

B.2 consists of three tasks, of which candidates are required to answer one. The assignment takes the form of a situationally-based writing task: candidates are required to write a letter or message or announcement (80-100 words) in reaction to a well described situation, being able to show the degree of formality appropriate to the context and following established conventions of the genre concerned. The range of functions, candidates should be able to perform, may include giving or requesting information and suggestions, making complaints, requiring feedback, etc.

Specific Information about the example Part 1 task
In this task (B.1) and for this sample, candidates are required to write an argumentative composition on how the new 'grandmother generation' has changed through the last thirty years, expressing opinions and feelings about the change and the effects produced in the families and in the society. Candidates can relate the

content of the composition to their personal experience. The task requires an answer between 120 and 180 words in length.

Mark distribution
There are a maximum of 40 marks for the Writing component. Both Part B.1 and B.2 carry a maximum of 20 marks. A mark scheme is used, which focuses on four criteria (Lexical Competence, Grammatical Competence, Coherence and Socio-cultural Competence) and a set of band descriptors (5) for each of the above criteria. Candidates are penalised for inadequately dealing with the requirements of the mark scheme.

Task Rating
The exam is marked by trained examiners (teachers at the University with a postgraduate degree in Italian L2) under the supervision of a Principal Examiner and Team Leaders. The Principal Examiner guides and monitor constantly the marking process. Examiners are required to refer to the mark scheme when they are working.

Effective Level
All CELI 3 Writing tasks are constructed on the basis of expert judgements (experienced teachers of Italian L2 on staff at the University) and according to CELI 3 specifications relating both to the B2 Can-Do statements in the CEF and to the ALTE Can-Do statements. Several meetings are run by Team Leaders with the Item Writers to decide the writing tasks most suitable for the level, before the final exam version is produced.

Sample task:

The task, instructions and rubric are all in Italian the target language.

The time allocated to complete test paper (Paper 1) is 2 hours 15 minutes (Paper 1 consists of reading and writing tasks). No time allocation is specified for individual tasks/components.

B.1 Svolgere UNO dei seguenti compiti. Scrivere nello spazio riservato a B1 nel Foglio delle Risposte

(da un minimo di 90 ad un massimo di 100 parole)

```
1. Le nonne di trenta anni fa dividevano il loro tempo
fra casa e nipoti. Oggi, invece, vanno in palestra,
fanno teatro, continuano a lavorare e tornano a
innamorarsi. Che cosa ne pensa Lei di questo
cambiamento? Quali sono, secondo Lei, gli aspetti
positivi e quelli negativi di questo fenomeno? Che
ricordi ha Lei dei Suoi nonni? Scriva le Sue opinioni e
considerazioni su questo argomento in un compito per il
Suo insegnante di italiano.
```

i) Task input/prompt

9	Rubrics and instructions are in…	Italian
10	Language level of rubric	Same as level of test
11	Time for this task	Not specified
12	Control/guidance	Semi-controlled
13	Content	Content is not specified
14	Discourse mode	Composition
15	Audience	Teacher
16	Type of input	Textual (excerpts)
17	Topic	Personal experiences (about aspects dealing with contemporary society and civilization)
18	Integration of skills	Reading

ii) Response (description of written response elicited by the prompt(s)/input)

19	Number of words expected	120-180
20	Rhetorical function(s)	Exposition; explanation; giving opinions; suggestion; argumentation
21	Register	Formal
22	Domain	Personal
23	Grammar	Limited range of complex structures
24	Vocabulary	Mainly frequent vocabulary
25	Cohesion	Competent use of cohesive devices
26	Authenticity: situational	Low
27	Authenticity: interactional	Low
28	Cognitive processing	Knowledge transformation
29	Content knowledge	Common, general, non-specialised
30	Task purpose	Referential (telling); emotive (reacting)

iii) Rating of Task		
31	Known criteria	Not on paper -can be viewed in publications and website
32	Task rating method	Analytic
33	Assessment criteria	Grammatical accuracy; cohesion and coherence; lexical control; socio-cultural competence
34	Number of raters	1+ moderation

iv) Feedback to candidates		
35	Quantitative feedback	Raw score on the front page of the Paper
36	Qualitative feedback	None. Provided when required

Example answer

Per dire la verità le nonne trenta anni fa dividevano realmente la loro vita tra casa e nipoti e oggi davvero ci sono molte nonne che si occupano di cose diverse, cercano diverse distrazioni, non vanno in pensione ma pensano ancora al lavoro e ci sono anche veramente quelle che cercano un nuovo amore.

Tale cambiamento ha ovviamente i suoi aspetti positivi e quelli negativi. Uno dei positivi e forse il fatto che le nonne che vanno in palestra o piscina oppure giocano a badminton o fanno del jogging, hanno una buona forma fisica che gli permette di conservare una buona salute fisica e mentale. Sembre anche buono che le donne anziane che vanno a teatro o al cinema non smettono mai di svilupparsi culturalmente e conoscono sempre qualche cosa di nuovo, che forse, non hanno ancora mai visto o sentito nella loro vita. Mi qui viene subito alla mente un aspetto negativo giacché queste nonne dimenticano dei loro nipoti e delle loro famiglie, che magari nel frattempo, vengono trascurati e perdono le loro nonne di vista. In realtà le nonne che badano ai loro nipoti sono molto necessarie e utili e per la loro cura verso i bambini dimostrano anche il loro amore. Il fatto è che la migliore situazione è quella quando le nonne si interessano dei loro nipoti e al tempo stesso sanno essere "nonne moderne".

Commentary

- **Lexical Competence**

Good range of vocabulary for expressing opinions and considerations according to the input. No spelling errors.

- **Grammatical Competence**

The text shows a good control of simple grammatical structures. Three errors: *'sembre'* instead of *'sembra'*, the verb 'essere' without accent at the third person and a wrong use of the preposition *'di': ('dimenticano dei loro nipoti'* instead of *'dimenticano i loro nipoti')* do not impede the correct communication.

- **Sociocultural Competence**

Good control of well-formulated expressions generally appropriate to the context.

- **Cohrence**

The text shows a high degree of internal coherence.

Score allocated

19 out a maximum possible score of 20

CVCL Sample Test Tasks

Report on analysis of	Certificato di Lingua Italiana - Livello 4 (CELI 4) (Writing)
Target language of this test	Italian
Target level (CEFR) of this test	C1
Task number/name	B.2

General Information about the writing component *

3	Number of tasks in the writing paper	2
4	Integration of skills	Writing (with written inputs)
5	Total test time	165 minutes inc. Reading section
6	Target performance level	C1
7	Channel	Handwritten
8	Purpose	General proficiency

* The numbers in the left hand column of the tables refer to the categories in the ALTE CEFR Writing Grid

Background to the Examination

CELI 4 is a general Italian qualification which is part of the Perugia CVCL Main-suite Examinations. Set at level C1 of the CEF, CELI 4 recognises the ability to communicate with confidence in Italian and deal with most aspects of daily life. CELI 4 is designed for learners who are reaching a standard of Italian that is adequate for most purposes, including study in higher education in the Italian academic context.

Candidature
CELI 4 is taken by around 1000 candidates per year in 27 countries and 65 Examination Centres. Around 60% of CELI 4 candidates are in the 21-30 age group, only 11 are aged 18 or under; the remaining 20% are aged between 30-55.

Structure of the Test
CELI 4 tests the skills of Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking and also has a specific paper to assess grammatical and lexical knowledge named: 'Competenza Linguistica'. CELI 4 is administered in five separate papers: Paper 1, Reading and Writing; Paper 2, 'Competenza Linguistica'; Paper 3, Listening and Paper 4, Speaking. Of the five parts forming the test each one has a different weight, in accordance to the test's content and purpose. Productive abilities are weighted overall 55%, receptive abilities at 35%. The 'Competenza Linguistica' is weighted at 10%. There are five possible grades in CELI 4: three pass grades (A, B and C) and two fail grades (D and E). Results are based on candidates' aggregate scores across the five components of the test.

CELI 4 Reading and Writing Paper – (Paper 1)
The paper has a fixed format, with Part A (from A.1 to A.3) testing reading skills through a variety of long and complex texts. Part B tests **Writing Skills** and is divided in two parts: B.1 and B.2. Candidates must be able to organise their writing and fully develop a theme.

B.1 is compulsory and requires candidates to process a text dealing with different topics also of complex and abstract nature (around 400 words in length) in order to write an effective summary (150-200 words), showing their ability to highlight the most salient points.

B.2 consists of two tasks, of which the candidates are required to answer one (220-250 words). This part covers a range of task types such as: formal letters to newspapers, reports and essays on complex and semi-technical subjects, imaginative stories. Candidates should be able to show their ability to write clear, well-structured texts, expressing and/or reporting effectively points of view, expanding and supporting opinions in a assured, natural style appropriate to the reader.

Specific Information about the example task
In this task B.2, and for this sample, candidates are required to write a composition based on a quite technical statement made by a researcher on one of the most serious problems our society has to face with: the use and distribution of water in the planet. Candidates are required to comment and express their points of view and suggestions according to different perspectives. The task requires an answer between 220 and 250 words in length.

Mark distribution

There are a maximum of 50 marks for the Writing component. Part B.1 carries a maximum of 20 marks, while part B.2 carries a maximum of 30 marks. A mark scheme is used, which focuses on four criteria (Lexical Competence, Grammatical Competence, Coherence and Socio-cultural Competence) and a set of band descriptors (5) for each of the above criteria. Candidates are penalised for inadequately dealing with the requirements of the mark scheme.

Task Rating

The exam is marked by trained examiners (teachers at the University with a postgraduate degree in Italian L2) under the supervision of a Principal Examiner and Team Leaders. The Principal Examiner guides and monitor constantly the marking process. Examiners are required to refer to the mark scheme when they are working.

Effective Level

All CELI 4 Writing tasks are constructed on the basis of expert judgements (experienced teachers of Italian L2 on staff at the University) and according to CELI 3 specifications relating both to the B2 Can-Do statements in the CEF and to the ALTE Can-Do statements. Several meetings are run by Team Leaders with the Item Writers to decide the writing tasks most suitable for the level, before the final exam version is produced.

Sample task:

B.2 Svolgere UNO dei seguenti compiti. Scrivere nello spazio riservato a B.2 nel Foglio delle Risposte.

                            (da un minimo do 220 ad un massimo di 250 parole)

1. "Si pensa che la mancanza d'acqua sua dovuta a scarsità naturale (...) ma l'acqua esiste dappertutto, anche sotto il Sahara. Basterebbe estrarla." (...) Il problema coinvolge non solo i paesi poveri, ma anche quelli ricchi "perché ci sono grandi nazioni che stanno letteralmente spompando le loro falde." (...) Bisogna "riconoscere il diritto all'acqua come diritto fondamentale dell'uomo."

(R. Petrella, "Corriere della Sera", 8 dicembre 2003)

Commenti, in un compito per il Suo insegnante di italiano, le affermazioni del professor Petrella (uno dei maggiori studiosi mondiali delle risorse idriche) facendo osservazioni sugli aspetti economici, sociali, ambientali, ecc legati alle risorse idriche.

i) Task input/prompt

9	Rubrics and instructions are in...	Italian
10	Language level of rubric	Same as level of test
11	Time for this task	Not specified
12	Control/guidance	Open
13	Content	Content is not specified
14	Discourse mode	Composition
15	Audience	Teacher
16	Type of input	Textual (excerpts)
17	Topic	Science and environment
18	Integration of skills	Reading

ii) Response (description of written response elicited by the prompt(s)/input)

19	Number of words expected	220-250
20	Rhetorical function(s)	Exposition; explanation; argumentation; giving opinions; suggestions; comparison and contrast
21	Register	Formal
22	Domain	Public
23	Grammar	Wide range of complex grammatical structures
24	Vocabulary	Wide range of advanced vocabulary
25	Cohesion	Advanced use of cohesive devices
26	Authenticity: situational	Low
27	Authenticity: interactional	Low
28	Cognitive processing	Knowledge transformation
29	Content knowledge	Very wide range of knowledge areas
30	Task purpose	Referential (telling); emotive (reacting)

iii) Rating of Task

31	Known criteria	Not on paper - can be viewed in publications and website
32	Task rating method	Analytic
33	Assessment criteria	Grammatical accuracy; cohesion and coherence; lexical control; Socio-cultural competence
34	Number of raters	1+ moderation

iv) Feedback to candidates

35	Quantitative feedback	Raw sore on the front page of the Paper
36	Qualitative feedback	None. Provided when required

Example answer

Secondo me dovrebbe essere il diritto di tutti gli uomini di poter soddisfare le necessità fondamentali come l'acqua. Forse non sarebbe neanche necessario estrarla sotto il Sahara ma basterebbe distribuirla in modo più giusto. I paesi ricchi spesso la stanno sprecando mentre nei paesi poveri non basta nemmeno per dare da bere a tutti. I ricchi vogliono avere l'erba bella verde e la piscina nel giardino per puro divertimento mentre la gente del terzo mondo deve fare delle camminate lunghissime per dare da bere ai bambini ed agli animali. A causa della mancanza d'acqua ovviamente anche il cibo è scarso. Senza l'acqua non cresce niente e la terra è secca. Migliaia e migliaia di persone muoiono ogni giorno per colpa di questa ingiustizia e spesso sono i più deboli cioè i bambini. Mi sembra incredibile che nell'anno 2004 non siamo ancora in grado di soddisfare le necessità fondamentali di tutti come il bere e il mangiare. Se i paesi ricchi rinunciassero un po' ai loro guadagni comunque mostrosi si potrebbe già fare molto. Ci sarebbe anche da investire nell'estrazione dell'acqua nelle regioni secche e tutti i paesi ricchi dovrebbero pensarci insieme. Nei libri che parlano della globalizzazione vengono descritte delle situazioni orribili e delle

guerre che potrebbero scoppiare a causa dell'acqua.
Potrebbe diventare un bene più prezioso dell'olio e
aumentare gli atti di terrorismo. E quindi è ora di
riconoscere il diritto all'acqua come diritto
fondamentale dell'uomo per garantire una vita migliore a
tutti.

Commentary

- **Lexical Competence**
  Good range of vocabulary for expressing points of view according to the input even if the vocabulary is neither particularly relevant to the topic, nor constantly adeguate: *'regioni secche'* instead of 'regioni aride'. One error: *'olio'* instead of *'petrolio'*. One spelling error *'mostrosi'* instead of *'mostruosi'*.

- **Grammatical Competence**
  The text shows a consistent and good control of grammatical structures.

- **Socio-cultural Competence**
  Consistent control of quite a good range of well formulated expressions even with some degree of uncertainty.

- **Coherence**
  The text is well structured, showing control of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive deivices, for instance: *' I paesi ricchi spesso la stanno sprecando mentre nei paesi poveri non basta nemmeno per...'* or *'Se i paesi ricchi rinunciassero un po' ai loro guadagni comunque mostrosi si potrebbe già fare molto'*

Score allocated
21 out a maximum possible score of 30

**CENTRO VALUTAZIONE
CERTIFICAZIONE LINGUISTICA**
Università per Stranieri Perugia

CVCL Sample Test Tasks

Report on analysis of	Certificato di Lingua Italiana - Livello 5 (CELI5) (Writing)
Target language of this test	Italian
Target level (CEFR) of this test	C2
Task number/name	B.2

General Information about the writing component *

3	Number of tasks in the writing paper	2
4	Integration of skills	Writing (with written inputs)
5	Total test time	165 minutes inc. Reading section
6	Target performance level	C2
7	Channel	Handwritten
8	Purpose	General proficiency

* The numbers in the left hand column of the tables refer to the categories in the ALTE CEFR Writing Grid

Background to the Examination

CELI 5 is a general Italian qualification which is part of Perugia CVCL Main-suite Examinations. Set at level C2 of the CEF, CELI 5 recognises the ability to function effectively in any Italian-speaking context. CELI 5 is designed for learners who have achieved a high level of language skills and are approaching a standard of Italian similar to an educated native speaker. The exam also requires an appropriate level of educational and personal maturity.

Candidature
CELI 5 is taken by around 800 candidates per year in 24 countries and 58 Examination Centres. Around 63% of CELI 5 candidates are in the 21-33 age group. Only 5% are in the 18-21 age group; the remaining 32% are aged between 33 and 55.

Structure of the Test
CELI 5 tests the skills of Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking and also has a specific paper to assess grammatical and lexical knowledge named: 'Competenza Linguistica'. CELI 5 is administered in four separate papers: Paper 1, Reading and Writing; Paper 2, 'Competenza Linguistica'; Paper 3, Listening and Paper 4, Speaking. Of the five parts forming the test each one has a different weight, in accordance to the test's context and purpose. Productive abilites are weighted overall at 55%, receptive abilities at 35%. The 'Competenza Linguistica' is weighted at 10%. There are five possible grades in CELI 5: three pass grades (A, B and C) and two fail grades (D and E). Results are based on candidates' aggregate scores across the five components of the test.

CELI 5 Reading and Writing Paper – (Paper 1)
The paper has a fixed format, with Part A (from A1 to A2) testing reading skills through a variety of long, complex and abstract texts. Part B tests **Writing Skills** and is divided in two parts: B.1 and B.2.

B.1 consists of three tasks, of which candidates are required to answer one (330-360 words). Candidates are required to write an essay on a topic of great and general interest, or a report on personal experiences/ points of view in relation to particular aspects of Italian civilisation, or a imaginative story. The input, for each task, consists on a short text that may come from a variety of sources, for example, newspaper or magazine articles, or quotations from researchers, experts, writers, famous journalists.

All the three tasks have a discursive focus. Candidates should be able to show their ability in sustaining an argument, comparing or contrasting different aspects of a problem, explaining a problem, suggesting possible solutions or making recommendations as well as in writing clear, flowing and engrossing stories.

B.2 is compulsory. Candidates are required to write two formal letters (overall around 170 words) performing different roles and different functions in relation to same given input. Candidates are required to defend or attack a particular argument or opinion, compare or contrast aspects of an argument or a situation and show their ability to convince and persuade people having different/opposite positions.

Specific Information about the example task

In this task (B.2) and for this sample candidates are required to write two letters in reaction to a quotation from a magazine defending and attacking the writer point of view.

Mark distribution

There are a maximum of 60 marks for the Writing component. Part B.1 carries a maximum of 35 marks, while Part B.2 carries a maximum of 25 marks. A mark scheme is used, which focuses on four criteria (Lexical Competence, Grammatical Competence, Coherence and Socio-cultural Competence) and a set of band descriptors (5) for each of the above criteria. Candidates are penalised for inadequately dealing with the requirements of the mark scheme.

Task Rating

The exam is marked by trained examiners (teachers at the University with a postgraduate degree in Italian L2) under the supervision of a Principal Examiner and Team Leaders. The Principal Examiner guides and monitor constantly the marking process. Examiners are required to refer to the mark scheme when they are working.

Effective Level

All CELI 5 tasks are constructed on the basis of expert judgements (experienced teachers of Italian L2 on staff at the University) and according to CELI 5 specifications relating both to the C2 Can-Do statements in the CEF and to the ALTE Can-Do statements. Several meetings are run by Team Leaders with the Item Writers to decide the writing tasks most suitable for the level, before the final exam version is produced.

Sample task:

B. 2 Svolgere nello spazio riservato a B.2 nel Foglio delle Risposte i seguenti due compiti

A proposito del Concorde, l'aereo supersonico più veloce del mondo caduto nell'estate 2000 sui cieli di Parigi causando la morte di tutti i passeggeri e di tutti i membri dell'equipaggio, si legge in un settimanale italiano:

"Forse il Concorde non volerà più. Lasciate le vie del cielo, finirà in un museo. C'è da sperare che almeno lì nessuno lo contesti, giacché il supersonico franco-britannico è probabilmente, in assoluto, l'oggetto più bello che il ventesimo secolo abbia creato. A terra, col becco abbassato, poteva sembrare un enorme animale, persino un po' goffo, come l'albatro di Baudelaire; ma quando sollevava il becco, al momento del decollo, un'improvvisa metamorfosi lo trasformava in un dominatore dell'aria, capace di esprimere, con la forza e il movimento, tutto l'orgoglio e la bilanciata bellezza del volo. Commemorato da molti con una sorta di

gioia maligna, quest'Icaro caduto merita di restare nel mito".

Come lettore/lettrice del settimanale, scriva DUE brevi lettere di commento al Direttore.

1. Si schieri tra gli estimatori del 'mito' Concorde e provi a difenderne la memoria.

(Da un minimo di 70 ad un massimo di 85 parole)

2. Si schieri tra i detrattori del Concorde, accusandolo di rappresentare il fallimento delle tecnologia più avanzata.

(Da un minimo di 70 ad un massimo di 85 parole)

i) Task input/prompt		
9	Rubrics and instructions are in...	Italian
10	Language level of rubric	Same as level of test
11	Time for this task	Not specified
12	Control/guidance	Controlled
13	Content	Content is specified
14	Discourse mode	Letter
15	Audience	Director of a magazine
16	Type of prompt	Textual
17	Topic	Cultural affairs
18	Integration of skills	Reading

ii) Response (description of written response elicited by the prompt(s)/input)

19	Number of words expected	140-170
20	Rhetorical function(s)	Commentary, argumentation; comparison and contrast
21	Register	Formal
22	Domain	Public
23	Grammar	Wide range of complex grammatical structures
24	Vocabulary	Wide range of advanced & specialised vocabulary
25	Cohesion	Advanced use of cohesive devices
26	Authenticity: situational	High
27	Authenticity: interactional	High
28	Cognitive processing	Knowledge transformation
29	Content knowledge	Very wide range of knowledge areas
30	Task purpose	Emotive (reacting), conative

iii) Rating of Task

31	Known criteria	Not on paper - can be viewed in publications and website
32	Task rating method	Analytic
33	Assessment criteria	Grammatical accuracy; Cohesion and Coherence; lexical control; Socio-cultural competence
34	Number of raters	1+moderation

iv) Feedback to candidates

35	Quantitative feedback	Raw score on the front page of the Paper
36	Qualitative feedback	None. Provided when required

Example answer

1.

Caro Direttore,

E' stato con molto piacere che ho letto il Vostro commento sul Concorde. Vorrei esprimere il mio pieno accordo sul fatto che questo aeroplano, indipendentemente dalle critiche mosse, possa essere considerato un esempio del grande lavoro svolto da tutti coloro che hanno avuto una parte nella sua realizzazione. La sua eleganza, la sua linea, la sua bellezza e la sua capacità tecnica saranno per sempre d'esempio per tutti i giovani progettisti del futuro. Rimarrà nella storia come un termine di paragone, espressione e simbolo di un'epoca; senza alcun dubbio.

2.

Caro Direttore,

Sono una vostra lettrice da diversi anni e sono piuttosto indignata dopo aver letto il Vostro commento sul Concorde. Paragonare questo veicolo ad un mito, ammirato da tutti, è a dir poco scandaloso. Pensiamo alle vittime e ai loro familiari, al dolore provocato e ci accorgeremo che ancora un'altra volta siamo rimasti soggiogati dal fascino superficiale della bellezza, della velocità, senza pensare invece alla sicurezza dei passeggeri e dell'equipaggio del Concorde. Solo dopo la catastrofe sono stati infatti portati alla luce i problemi tecnici che prima di allora non erano stati considerati come un pericolo.
Credo che delle scuse siano necessarie.

Commentary

- **Lexical Competence**
  Correct and appropriate use of vocabulary. No spelling errors.

- **Grammatical Competence**
  Consistent grammatical control of complex language

- **Socio-cultural Competence**
  Good range and variety of expressions. The register is appropriate. The candidate did not sign the letter as the genre would require.

- **Coherence**
  Constant and effective logical structure

Score allocated

25 out a maximum of 25