

This content is also available in French. The *Charter of the French language*, its regulations and the ministerial directive govern the consultation of English-language content.

Information Document

MINISTERIAL EXAMINATION

English Language Arts
Elementary 6

514-600

June 2026

Coordination and content

Direction de l'évaluation des apprentissages
Direction générale de la formation générale des jeunes et des adultes
Secteur de la réussite éducative et de la main-d'œuvre

This document is also available in French.

Title of French document:

Document d'information – Épreuve ministérielle
Anglais, langue d'enseignement – 6^e année du primaire
514-600
Juin 2026

General information

Ministère de l'Éducation
1035, rue De La Chevrotière, 27^e étage
Québec (Québec) G1R 5A5
Telephone: 418-643-7095
Toll-free: 1-866-747-6626

© Gouvernement du Québec
Ministère de l'Éducation

ISSN 1927-8381 (Online)
ISSN 1927-8411 (French, online)

Legal Deposit – Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec, 2025

25-157-07

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Structure of the examination	1
2. Materials needed for the examination	2
3. Conditions and procedures for administering the examination	2
3.1 Conditions for administering the examination	2
3.2 Dates and time allocation	3
3.3 Description of the tasks	3
3.4 Adaptation measures	4
4. Marking procedures	4
4.1 Marking centre	4
4.2 Criterion-referenced rubrics	4
4.3 Determining the level of performance	4
4.4 Exemplars	5
Appendices	
I Response to Literature	6
II Narrative Writing: Peer Feedback for Revision	7
III Rubrics and Evaluation Guidelines	8
IV Rubric for Scoring Written Response to Literature	10
V Rubric for Scoring Narrative Writing	11
VI Descriptors for Scoring Written Language Conventions	12
VII Talk to Communicate and Learn Profiles	13

INTRODUCTION

This document provides information on the ministerial English Language Arts examination for Elementary 6. It is designed to ensure that these examinations are administered in a uniform manner. It should be distributed without delay to all Elementary 6 English Language Arts teachers and consultants, and to all personnel concerned with examination scheduling and the distribution of the examination documents.

The Ministère de l'Éducation is responsible for developing an examination to be administered at the end of Elementary 6 in the June exam session. The examination is based on the [Framework for the Evaluation of Learning](#), the [Progression of Learning](#) and the [Québec Education Program](#). Information gathered on examinations administered in previous years is also taken into account in the development of examinations. In addition, the Ministère enlists teachers and education consultants representing different schools to contribute to this process.

This examination is intended to provide students with an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and competency, and to give teachers the opportunity to judge the extent of literacy development.

Educational institutions must administer the ministerial examination in accordance with the [official schedule](#).

For the 2025-2026 school year, the weighting assigned to the elementary ministerial examinations will be 20% for the competency or competencies evaluated.

1. STRUCTURE OF THE EXAMINATION

The English Language Arts examination has certain distinctive features:

- It was developed following an inquiry approach to provide purpose and context for the tasks.
- It is a context-based examination that incorporates the processes and strategies commonly associated with reading, viewing, discussing, responding and writing.
- It is made up of distinctive tasks that stem from both context and guiding questions or statements used to establish a situation and a focus for the tasks, which are linked through related activities and discussions. Students are required to read and respond to a text, and to compose a narrative.
- Two tasks will be formally assessed: Response to Literature and Narrative Writing.

2. MATERIALS NEEDED FOR THE EXAMINATION

Materials for the Teacher	Materials for the Student
• <i>Teacher's Guide</i> • Equipment for viewing media components • Media components	• <i>Literature Booklet</i> • <i>Student Booklet</i> • Reference materials: Dictionaries (unilingual and/or bilingual), thesauruses • Loose-leaf paper (provided by the school)

Certain digital tools (electronic dictionaries, word-processing software, etc.) may be used under the conditions set by the Direction de la sanction des études.

Students may bring their own reference materials or use those provided by the educational institution. It is forbidden for students to lend or to borrow any materials.

The person responsible for administering ministerial examinations must provide teachers with a copy of all of the documents in the examination package no earlier than seven working days before the first day of the examination.

It is forbidden to disclose any information about the content of a ministerial examination to anyone who is not directly involved in its administration. It is also forbidden to distribute, adapt or translate any examination document, in whole or in part, at any time or by any means whatsoever, including social media.

3. CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR ADMINISTERING THE EXAMINATION

3.1 Conditions for administering the examination

Schools are responsible for administering the examination according to the guidelines provided in the *Teacher's Guide*. All tasks are to be completed on the school premises, preferably in the regular classroom setting, unless otherwise indicated. In the case of multi-level classes (e.g. classes composed of Elementary 5 and 6 students), only the students for whom the examination is intended are required to complete the examination tasks. During the examination, teachers may ask the other students to work on tasks that are unrelated to the examination.

In the interests of equity and justice, the examination must be administered under the same conditions to all students across Québec. It is thus forbidden for anyone to help students in any way, for example by clarifying a question or rewording instructions. Examinations in which a teacher or any other school staff member is deemed to have overstepped the boundaries of their role may be declared invalid by the Ministère.

During the examination, students are strictly forbidden to have in their possession any personal mobile device (smartphone, wireless headphones or earbuds, smartwatch, etc.).

3.2 Dates and time allocation

Schools must administer the Elementary 6 English Language Arts ministerial examination in accordance with the official schedule.

Generally, the tasks to be performed in this examination should take **approximately seven hours** to complete. The suggested time allocations are approximations only and do not include teacher preparation time.

The *Teacher's Guide* provided by the Ministère will provide detailed instructions and procedures for each part of the examination. The tasks and procedures are organized sequentially to maintain uniformity across the province. **The prescribed sequence in the *Teacher's Guide* must be respected** to maintain the intended scaffolding for students.

It should be noted that **sustained blocks of time** for the performance of tasks are required to allow students to engage in activities that call for critical thinking, which is a key characteristic of competency-based learning. As students require sustained blocks of time to contextualize and to become familiar with the tasks, as well as to undertake both group and independent activities, certain individual tasks may take some students longer to complete than others. The time required to complete tasks will vary within classrooms across the province. Adjustments may be made for students with special needs.

NB Planning, collaboration and flexibility among school administrators and cycle teams are necessary to provide optimal examination conditions.

3.3 Description of the tasks

Response to Literature

Reading performance will be assessed through a written response to illustrated literature. The task will require students to read the text and to construct meaning from the text through a response process. Students are called upon to think critically and to synthesize the ideas in the text. **Approximately 3.5 hours** should be allocated for this part of the examination, as well as preparation time prior to the task. See Appendix I for more information on *Response to Literature*.

Narrative Writing

Writing performance will be assessed through a narrative writing task that requires students to craft a story for a peer audience. This task requires students to draw upon their knowledge of the structures and features of narrative writing (story) and language conventions; students should consider how these two important elements interact to entertain their peer audience. **Approximately 3.5 hours** should be allocated for this part of the examination. It includes activities to set the context, such as quick writes, and opportunities to share their writing. See Appendix II for more information on *Narrative Writing*.

Using Language to Communicate and to Learn

Talk for communication and learning will be used throughout the examination. Students will participate in activities that require them to discuss issues derived from the contents of the examination and the related activities. The competency *To use language to communicate and learn* is not formally assessed in this examination; however, opportunities are embedded in the activities to facilitate further collection of data. See Appendix VII for the *Talk to Communicate and Learn Profiles*.

3.4 Adaptation measures

Measures that adapt the conditions for administering ministerial examinations may be taken to enable students with specific needs to demonstrate their learning. For further information on the implementation of these measures, please refer to the documents made available to schools by the Direction de la sanction des études.

4. MARKING PROCEDURES

4.1 Marking centre

School boards and private schools are responsible for marking the Written Response to Literature and the Narrative Writing. It is recommended that Elementary 6 English Language Arts teachers come together, when possible, in a marking centre, to collaborate on the scoring of the students' performances. This opportunity to analyze and discuss students' work ensures uniform interpretation of the criteria and indicators, as well as equity and reliability. It also offers an excellent opportunity for professional development in evaluation as teachers work collaboratively to analyze and discuss anchor papers drawn directly from the students' work. The anchor papers, representative samples of each level of competency, serve as benchmarks for the subsequent marking of students' work.

4.2 Criterion-referenced rubrics

Rubrics for scoring the two evaluated tasks are provided in Appendices IV and V. As in past examinations, each rubric will describe five performance levels. Teachers are required to determine the overall performance level for each task evaluated.

Whereas the performance criteria are developed using pedagogical terminology, teachers will find that examining exemplars with their students provides an ideal opportunity to help students understand the expectations and see samples of quality work, as well as to explain the criteria using plain language. For more information, see *Rubrics and Evaluation Guidelines* in Appendix III.

4.3 Determining the level of performance

To determine the level of performance, teachers must read the anchor sentence describing the profile located above each column. Then, using exemplars or benchmark papers as a reference point and the rubrics in Appendices IV to VI, they assess the student's work by considering both strengths and shortcomings in order to determine the student's overall competency level.

Working horizontally across the levels, they read the descriptive indicators carefully. This is to verify whether the initial placement coincides with the level indicators and with the calibrated descriptors for the proposed level.

They then adjust the placement, if necessary, by moving to a higher or lower level profile to determine the "best fit." The level that best describes the student's work is one in which the majority of the indicators are met.

Interim levels may be indicated when the criteria are distributed over two or more levels by indicating + or - for the level that best describes the work.

4.4 Exemplars

Annotated student exemplars are available on a secure website of the Ministère and on the [DEELA](#) (Designs in Evaluation for English Language Arts) website. To access the content available on this secure website, teachers are asked to contact the education consultant or the person responsible for educational services at their educational institution. The exemplars also include excerpts from students' responses and narratives providing teachers with samples of student work for each performance level.

APPENDIX I**Response to Literature**

Response to Literature requires students to read or listen to a text and view the images carefully to interpret and derive meaning from the text. Students should pay attention to what is implied or inferred (suggested, but not actually stated) in the text. As they read/view/listen to the text, they may draw further meaning by making connections to other texts they have read, viewed or listened to, and to other experiences. Students should consider how the author and illustrator have crafted the text and images to enhance meaning.

When students write their response, they are exercising critical thinking. They consider new ideas and information in light of prior knowledge. This kind of thinking helps students to become better readers, to better understand texts and to extend their own ideas.

When responding to the text, students draw meaning by considering:

- *what they already know about the issues, problems and situations*
- *what they understand about the text, the author's purpose and message(s)*
- *their connections to the text from their own life experiences and/or other texts read, viewed or listened to, and how the connections helped them to draw meaning from the text*
- *how the author crafts and structures the text, and the specific features used to draw the reader's attention*
- *what they understand and what they think about the text, combining what they already know with new information learned (explain own opinion)*
- *which ideas or information will stay with them after reading/viewing/listening to the text*

Recommended Procedure

Students first read the entire story silently and independently. Following a second reading, students should make notes in preparation for a small group discussion. After the group discussion, they should add to their notes any new ideas drawn from the talk. A final reading helps consolidate their thoughts and ideas about the story before they write their response.

APPENDIX II**Narrative Writing: Peer Feedback for Revision**

Revision is fundamental to all good writing. It requires careful thought and attention to improve meaning by focusing on clarity, organization and wording. Revision involves making changes such as rephrasing, rearranging sentences and paragraphs, and making deletions and additions to the text. It is through revision that writing is shaped and refined, thereby enhancing the writer's message.

Sharing writing with a partner helps to clarify meaning and to recognize where changes are needed to better communicate and develop ideas. Careful questioning helps the writer examine the parts of the writing that need improvement and clarification. Writers might consider the procedures below when working on revision in a group.

To prepare for a feedback meeting, writers should:

- reread their writing
- select areas about which they would like to receive feedback

Students should become familiar with the roles of writer and listener.

Role of the Writer:

- summarizes their narrative out loud to contextualize the story for partner(s)
- reads selected parts of the draft to the partner(s) for feedback
- asks partner(s) to provide suggestions for improvement
- answers questions about the writing
- discusses possible changes with partner(s) and independently decides on revisions to be made

Role of the Listener:

- actively listens to the excerpts read by the writer
- responds with constructive criticism
- asks questions to clarify meaning and understanding, such as:
 - “I don't understand why . . . ”
 - “How did the . . . ”
 - “I find this part confusing. Can you explain it?”
 - “Tell me more about . . . ”

Rubrics and Evaluation Guidelines

A rubric is a tool used to evaluate complex tasks. It is a set of criteria and performance indicators based on the most significant attributes of specific tasks, arranged according to performance levels.

The rubrics are task specific and describe five performance levels. Teachers are to use the level descriptors at the top of the rubrics to anchor their evaluation, and then use the criteria to determine where in that level a student's work best fits. The pluses and minuses allow for the score to indicate where the performance falls within each level.

Working with exemplars gives students and teachers concrete examples of quality work. It also clarifies the vocabulary used in the rubrics. Teachers may wish to examine the evaluation criteria with their students and apply them to exemplars.

Converting Performance Levels to Percentage Values

The Ministère requires that the overall performance level for each task be converted to a percentage value. Therefore, the examination components Written Response to Literature and Narrative Writing should be assigned a percentage value, as indicated in the rubrics provided.

The numeric values indicate a possible range of up to three scores for each performance level; however, only the percentage values indicated can be assigned. For example, if the overall performance level for the task is scored as 5-, the percentage score is recorded as 90%; 92% is not a valid score.

Using the Rubrics to Evaluate Performance

Optimal conditions for scoring students' work ideally include teacher collaboration, marking in groups and shared decision making. The rubrics provided for this examination in Appendices IV, V and VI of this document were designed to assess the two specific tasks as indicated. When scoring students' work, teachers must be familiar with the required tasks and rubrics, noting the criteria for each performance level, as well as the level descriptors at the top of the rubrics.

Determining the Performance Level

- Examine the preselected anchor papers already scored, along with the rubrics provided for each task.
- After reading the student's work, refer first to the anchor sentence describing the profile at the top of the rubric to determine the student's performance level.
- Read down through the criteria to find evidence to determine the score within the level.

Evaluating Specific Task Performance

Reading: A written response to illustrated literature is evaluated to determine the students' ability to bring meaning to and draw meaning from the text—in particular, drawing on the information/ideas in the text and the context in which the tasks are set.

- Written Response to Literature draws on the students' ability to interpret the text, their acquired knowledge about structures and features of texts, and their appreciation of the author and illustrator's craft as it relates to purpose and audience.
- The task requires critical thinking.

Writing: A final piece of writing is evaluated to determine the students' ability to craft a narrative with a specific purpose and an audience of peers in mind. Students assume responsibility for shaping their writing through conferring with peers, revising and editing.

Students must demonstrate sufficient control of language conventions. The guidelines for scoring a student's performance for the writing task, with consideration for use of language conventions, are as follows:

- Consider the students' ability to apply language conventions, then determine where the performance best fits in one of the three *Descriptors for Scoring Written Language Conventions* (see Appendix VI). If the use of language conventions best fits in the **Partial** performance level, the score for the overall writing task may **not exceed Level 3- (60%)**.
- This weighting should be applied after the Narrative Writing task has been scored. Therefore, refer to language conventions **only after selecting a performance level** for the writing using the *Rubric for Scoring Narrative Writing*.

APPENDIX IV

Rubric for Scoring Written Response to Literature

LEVEL 5 – ADVANCED													
The reader draws comprehensive meaning from the text.													
LEVEL 4 – THOROUGH													
The reader draws clear meaning from the text.													
LEVEL 3 – ACCEPTABLE													
The reader draws general meaning from the text.													
LEVEL 2 – PARTIAL													
The reader draws limited meaning from the text.													
LEVEL 1 – MINIMAL													
The reader draws little or no meaning from the text.													
Determine the profile level that best describes the student’s overall performance and assign the corresponding score.													
NB Not all criteria need to be present in the response.													
CRITERIA	The reader examines the concepts and ideas in the text, making perceptive inferences and drawing on key ideas to support their own interpretation(s). Personal understanding is integrated in light of ideas in the text. Ideas are justified with insightful reasoning and references to the text. Through perceptive connections, the reader integrates personal experiences and/or other sources, enhancing their understanding of the text. The reader’s connections and ideas may suggest a world view. Meaning is drawn from subtle cues in the text. An explanation is provided of how structures and features enhance the reader’s understanding of the text. The effectiveness of the text is examined and personal insights are offered that go beyond the text and apply to life in general.			The reader explores the concepts and ideas in the text, attending to underlying ideas to support their own understanding, offering personal opinions. Ideas are justified with sound reasoning and thoughtful references to the text. The meaning of the text is extended by clearly connecting personal experiences and/or other sources to ideas in the text. The reader makes inferences from cues in the text and shares how structures and features contribute to understanding. The text is evaluated, a personal opinion is offered and thoughtful conclusions about the text are drawn.			The reader identifies and addresses relevant concepts and ideas in the text; understanding of the text is supported with a personal opinion, a logical explanation and/or reference(s) to the text. Meaning of the text is supported by connecting personal experience(s) and/or other sources to the text in a general way. The reader identifies structures and features, making general inferences that loosely support their understanding of the text. The reader reacts to the text, offering logical opinion(s) and drawing general conclusions about it.			The reader draws limited meaning from the text and shares some ideas that may suggest a literal understanding of it. References to the text are unclear and/or illogical. Connections are superficial in nature, providing minor support to the reader’s understanding of the text. The reader alludes to structures and features. The reader offers a mundane opinion about the text that reflects the obvious.		The reader lists minor details from the text. The ideas presented are uncertain and references to the text, if any, are confusing. Connections mentioned are irrelevant and may not link to the text. The reader comments on the text and may indicate preferences about it.	
	5+	5	5-	4+	4	4-	3+	3	3-	2+	2	1	
Score	100%	95%	90%	85%	80%	75%	70%	65%	60%	55%	50%	35%	

LEVEL 5 – ADVANCED The writer demonstrates comprehensive understanding of narrative writing.	LEVEL 4 – THOROUGH The writer demonstrates clear understanding of narrative writing.	LEVEL 3 – ACCEPTABLE The writer demonstrates general understanding of narrative writing.	LEVEL 2 – PARTIAL The writer demonstrates limited understanding of narrative writing.	LEVEL 1 – MINIMAL The writer demonstrates little understanding of narrative writing.
---	---	---	--	---

The writer sustains a solid focus on unfolding events to create the story. Carefully selected details enrich development and lend authenticity to the story. Crafted transitions guide the reader to a strong conclusion, appearing effortless.	The writer sustains a clear focus on unfolding events to create the story. Interesting details enhance development and lend originality to the story. Effective transitions lead to a sound conclusion.	The writer sustains a logical sequence of unfolding events for the most part to create the story. Relevant details support development and convey a story that occasionally sparks interest. Transitions connect parts of the story and lead to an adequate conclusion.	The writer's story requires further development; story elements are loosely connected. Details are strung together. Transitions lead to a simple conclusion.	The writer's ideas are disjointed and confusing. Details are disconnected and/or random.
The writer speaks to the audience in a memorable and compelling voice that contributes to the narrative, revealing a strong sense of purpose.	The writer speaks to the audience in an expressive voice that lends clarity to the narrative, revealing a clear sense of purpose.	The writer speaks to the audience in a discernible voice that holds attention at times, revealing an occasional sense of purpose.	The writer addresses the audience unevenly and fails to connect with the reader. An indistinct sense of purpose is evident through the writer's voice.	The writer disregards the audience for the most part; voice is flat or absent. A sense of purpose and direction is lacking.
The writer uses narrative structures and features in a deliberate manner. Effective use of plot, setting, characterization and other structures and features enriches the narrative. The writer displays a unique style.	The writer uses narrative structures and features in a sustained manner. Thoughtful attention to plot, setting, characterization and other structures and features elaborates the narrative. The writer experiments with style.	The writer uses narrative structures and features in a wavering manner. Inconsistent attention to plot, setting, characterization and other structures and features may lessen the effectiveness of the narrative at times.	The writer uses narrative structures and features through a simple sequence; attempts to use plot, setting and characterization are insufficient or confusing.	The writer suggests a series of loosely connected events or actions that allude to the story. Use of narrative structures and features is, for the most part, lacking.

When considering the writer's control of language conventions, refer to the *Descriptors for Scoring Written Language Conventions* on page 12.

APPENDIX VI

Descriptors for Scoring Written Language Conventions

The writer must demonstrate sufficient control of written language conventions, as detailed in the [Progression of Learning](#).

ADVANCED CONTROL

The writer demonstrates solid control of language conventions (i.e. spelling, punctuation, capitalization, syntax, paragraphs and sentence structure). They are applied consistently, guiding the reader smoothly through the text. Errors in language conventions rarely occur and do not interfere with meaning.

ACCEPTABLE CONTROL

The writer demonstrates acceptable control of language conventions (i.e. spelling, punctuation, capitalization, syntax, paragraphs and sentence structure). They are applied consistently. Errors in language conventions may occur and rarely interfere with meaning.

PARTIAL CONTROL

The writer demonstrates partial control of language conventions (i.e. spelling, punctuation, capitalization, syntax, paragraphs and sentence structure). They are neglected or applied inconsistently. Frequent errors in language conventions **impede meaning overall**.

NB If the use of language conventions is scored as **Partial**, the overall writing task **cannot be scored higher than Level 3- (60%)**.

APPENDIX VII

Talk to Communicate and Learn Profiles

The profiles below support teachers in evaluating a student's ability to use *Talk to Communicate and Learn* in a variety of contexts. Teachers should keep in mind that a student may perform at different levels throughout the school year (moving up and down the profile scale) depending on the discussion topic, student grouping for the task and the individual personality of the student.

It is therefore important for teachers to assess the Talk competency throughout the year, providing a variety of groupings, contexts and topics for students to demonstrate their skill at using *Talk to Communicate and Learn*.

ADVANCED

The student articulately shares perceptive, insightful ideas and provides helpful information that focuses the discussion. The student uses precise vocabulary to provide key details and asks relevant questions that move the discussion forward. The student paraphrases ideas to clarify thinking and synthesizes new information effectively. The student reacts intuitively and respectfully to the ideas of others, establishing a positive tone for the conversation through encouraging facial expressions and body language.

THOROUGH

The student clearly shares thoughtful ideas that guide the conversation. Effective use of key vocabulary and pertinent questions encourage discussion. The student paraphrases ideas and builds on the ideas of others. The student is respectful of others and contributes positively to the tone of the conversation through appropriate facial expressions and body language.

ACCEPTABLE

The student shares logical ideas that contribute to the conversation and attempts to use key vocabulary and to paraphrase ideas. The student may build on the ideas of others and, when prompted, asks questions and clarifies ideas. The student is respectful of others and participates positively in the discussion.

PARTIAL

The student may share logical ideas at times but struggles to participate meaningfully in the conversation and may offer ideas that are not relevant to the main topic. The student may misuse or disregard vocabulary and requires prompts and support to ask questions and clarify ideas. The student's body language and facial expressions may have a negative impact on the tone of the conversation.

