**Presentational Writing: Interview Essay (2-3 pages)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5**  **Strong**  **95-100%** | • Effective treatment of topic within the context of the task – all 3 parts of paper present with details.  • Demonstrates a high degree of comprehension of the interviewee’s viewpoints, with very few minor   inaccuracies.  • Essay is developed with coherence and detail.  • Organized essay; effective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices.  • Fully understandable, with ease and clarity of expression; occasional errors do not impede comprehensibility.  • Varied and appropriate vocabulary and idiomatic language.  • Accuracy and variety in grammar, syntax, and usage, with few errors.  • Develops paragraph-length discourse with a variety of simple and compound sentences, and some complex   sentences. |
| **4**  **Good**  **88-94%** | • Generally effective treatment of topic within the context of the task – all 3 parts of the paper present with   some details.  • Demonstrates comprehension of the interviewee’s viewpoints; may include a few inaccuracies.  • Essay is developed and coherent and some detail.  • Organized essay; some effective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices.  • Fully understandable, with some errors which do not impede comprehensibility.  • Varied and generally appropriate vocabulary and idiomatic language.  • General control of grammar, syntax, and usage.  • Develops mostly paragraph-length discourse with simple, compound, and a few complex sentences. |
| **3**  **Fair**  **77-87%** | • Suitable treatment of topic within the context of the task – all three parts are present, but may be filled with  fluff or lacking in some areas.  • Demonstrates a moderate degree of comprehension of the interviewee’s viewpoints; includes some   inaccuracies.  • Essay is somewhat coherent.  • Some organization; limited use of transitional elements or cohesive devices.  • Generally understandable, with errors that may impede comprehensibility.  • Appropriate but basic vocabulary and idiomatic language.  • Some control of grammar, syntax, and usage.  • Uses strings of mostly simple sentences, with a few compound sentences. |
| **2**  **Weak**  **72-76%** | • Unsuitable treatment of topic within the context of the task – parts missing, little relevant content, not   enough effort given.  • Demonstrates a low degree of comprehension of the interviewee’s viewpoints; information may be limited or   inaccurate.  • Essay is incoherent.  • Limited organization; ineffective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices.  • Partially understandable, with errors that force interpretation and cause confusion for the reader.  • Limited vocabulary and idiomatic language.  • Limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage.  • Uses strings of simple sentences and phrases. |
| **1**  **Poor**  **71% & below** | • Almost no treatment of topic within the context of the task – significant parts missing, barely any relevant   content.  • Demonstrates poor comprehension interviewee’s viewpoints; includes frequent and significant inaccuracies.  • Mostly repeats statements from the interview.  • Essay is undeveloped or incoherent.  • Little or no organization; absence of transitional elements and cohesive devices.  • Barely understandable, with frequent or significant errors that impede comprehensibility.  • Very few vocabulary resources.  • Little or no control of grammar, syntax, and usage.  • Very simple sentences or fragments. |
| **0**  **Unacceptable** | • Mere restatement of language from the prompt.  • Clearly does not respond to the 3 parts of the essay; completely irrelevant to the topic.  • “*I don’t know*,” “*I don’t understand*,” or equivalent in any language.  • Not written in Spanish.  • Blank. |

**Interpersonal Speaking: Interview Conversation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5**  **Strong**  **95-100%** | • Maintains the conversation with interjections, spontaneous questions, and/or personal opinion/anecdotes.   Goes beyond the script on the paper.  • Provides required information: all relevant teacher-created questions + 2-3 high-quality student-created   questions.  • Fully understandable, with ease and clarity of expression; occasional errors do not impede   comprehensibility.  • Length is 5-7 minutes of continuous, fluid, and natural-sounding speech.  • Accuracy and variety in grammar, syntax, and usage, with few errors  • Consistent use of register throughout (Tú vs. Ud. form) and is appropriate for the conversation  • Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response comprehensible; errors do not impede   comprehensibility  • Clarification or self-correction (if present) improves comprehensibility. |
| **4**  **Good**  **88-94%** | • Maintains the conversation with occasional interjections, spontaneous questions, and/or personal   anecdotes. Attempts to go beyond the teacher-generated questions on the paper.  • Provides required information: all relevant teacher-created questions + 2-3 good-quality student-created   questions.  • Fully understandable, with some errors which do not impede comprehensibility.  • Length is 5-7 minutes of mostly continuous, fluid, and natural-sounding speech. Occasional pauses or   halts may be present, but is not burdensome to the listener.  • General control of grammar, syntax, and usage.  • Generally consistent use of register (Tú vs. Ud. form) appropriate for the conversation, except for   occasional shifts.  • Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response mostly comprehensible; errors do not impede   comprehensibility.  • Clarification or self-correction (if present) usually improves comprehensibility. |
| **3**  **Fair**  **77-87%** | • Maintains the conversation, but does not show creativity. Sticks with the teacher-generated questions   and misses opportunities for further/deeper questioning.  • Provides required information: all relevant teacher-created questions + 2-3 student-created questions   (may be too basic or boring questions).  • Generally understandable, with errors that may impede comprehensibility.  • Length is 5 minutes, but may have frequent and long pauses causing the listener to become bored.  • Some control of grammar, syntax, and usage.  • Use of register (Tú vs. Ud. form) may be inappropriate for the conversation with several shifts.  • Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response generally comprehensible; errors occasionally   impede comprehensibility.  • Clarification or self-correction (if present) sometimes improves comprehensibility. |
| **2**  **Weak**  **72-76%** | • Partially maintains the conversation by only sticking with the teacher-generated questions. The   conversation is one-sided.  • Provides some required information. Some teacher-created or student-created questions may be missing.   Student-created questions are basic and lacking in substance.  • Partially understandable, with errors that force interpretation and cause confusion for the listener.  • Length requirement was not met (under 5 minutes), task is only partially completed and frequent and/or   long pauses may be present. Shows unpreparedness.  • Limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage.  • Use of register (Tú vs. Ud. form) is generally inappropriate for the conversation with uncontrolled shifts.  • Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response difficult to comprehend at times; errors impede   comprehensibility.  • Clarification or self-correction (if present) usually does not improve comprehensibility. |
| **1**  **Poor**  **71% & below** | • Unsuccessfully maintains the conversation by only sticking with the teacher-generated questions, and only   uses some of the questions.  • Provides little required information. Few (if any) student-created questions. Teacher-generated questions   missing.  • Barely understandable, with frequent or significant errors that impede comprehensibility.  • Length requirement not met (under 4 minutes), task is minimally completed with halting and choppy   speech. Frequent and/or long pauses present. Clearly shows unpreparedness.  • Little or no control of grammar, syntax, and usage.  • Minimal or no attention to register (Tú vs. Ud. form).  • Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response difficult to comprehend; errors impede   comprehensibility.  • Clarification or self-correction (if present) does not improve comprehensibility. |
| **0**  **Unacceptable** | • Mere restatement of language from the prompts  • Clearly does not respond to the prompts  • “*I don’t know*,” “*I don’t understand*,” or equivalent in any language  • Not in Spanish  • Blank (although recording equipment is functioning) |

**Presentational Speaking: Cultural Comparison**

**Required components:**

1. **Picture of interviewee**
2. **Short bio of interviewee**
3. **Cultural contrast/comparison between interviewee’s country & U.S.**
4. **~30 sec. audio snippet embedded in presentation**
5. **A reflection on your learning journey/process**
6. **An observation on the Spanish language use that surprised, confused, or interested you. Have a slide with examples/sentences from your interview.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5**  **Strong**  **95-100%** | • All required components are present (see above list).  • Relevant, detailed, and clear comparison/contrast between interviewee’s country and the U.S.  • Organized presentation; effective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices  • Fully understandable, with ease and clarity of expression; occasional errors do not impede comprehensibility  • Accuracy and variety in grammar, syntax, and usage, with few errors  • Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response comprehensible; errors do not impede comprehensibility  • Clarification or self-correction (if present) improves comprehensibility  • Meets length requirement (5+ minutes)  • Slides do not contain sentences, conjugated verbs, or excessive wording. Text is used to guide and direct the presentation (except for the Language Use slide). |
| **4**  **Good**  **88-94%** | • Missing 1 required component (see above list).  • Clear comparison/contrast between interviewee’s country and the U.S. with some detail  • Generally organized presentation; mostly effective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices  • Fully understandable, with some errors that do not impede comprehensibility  • General control of grammar, syntax, and usage  • Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response mostly comprehensible; errors do not impede comprehensibility  • Clarification or self-correction (if present) usually improves comprehensibility  • Meets length requirement (5+ minutes)  • Slides may be slightly too wordy or contain a few conjugated verbs. Text is used to guide and direct the presentation (except for the Language Use slide). |
| **3**  **Fair**  **77-87%** | • Missing 2 required components (see above list)  • Basic comparison/contrast between interviewee’s country and the U.S.  • Some organization; limited use of transitional elements or cohesive devices  • Generally understandable, with errors that may impede comprehensibility  • Some control of grammar, syntax, and usage  • Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response generally comprehensible; errors occasionally impede comprehensibility  • Clarification or self-correction (if present) sometimes improves comprehensibility  •Length is 4:00-4:59 mins.  •Slides may contain too many words, sentences, or conjugated verbs. Text is relied upon too heavily. |
| **2**  **Weak**  **72-76%** | • Missing 3 required components (see above list)  • Presents information about the student’s own community and the target culture, but may not compare them; consists mostly of statements with no development  • Limited organization; ineffective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices  • Partially understandable, with errors that force interpretation and cause confusion for the listener  • Limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage  • Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response difficult to comprehend at times; errors impede comprehensibility  • Clarification or self-correction (if present) usually does not improve comprehensibility  • Length is 3:00-3:59 mins.  • Slides are too wordy and may include sentences and conjugated verbs. Student reads from the slide. |
| **1**  **Poor**  **71% & below** | • Missing 4+ required components (see above list)  • Presents information only about the student’s own community or only about the target culture, and does not develop a comparison or contrast  • Little or no organization; absence of transitional elements and cohesive devices  • Barely understandable, with frequent or significant errors that impede comprehensibility  • Little or no control of grammar, syntax, and usage  • Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response difficult to comprehend; errors impede comprehensibility  • Clarification or self-correction (if present) does not improve comprehensibility  • Length is less than 3 minutes  • Student reads from the slide, makes no attempt to make eye contact with or engage audience |

**Transcription: Listening Accuracy**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5**  **Strong** | • Turned in on time and section is completed.  • Accuracy and precision shown in spelling, accentuation, and punctuation.  • Transcription is fully understandable; occasional errors do not impede comprehensibility.  • Transcription format is correct and easy to read. Margins line up, everything is evenly spaced, and font is   consistent throughout. |
| **4**  **Good** | • Turned in on time, but section is only ~90% complete / Submitted 1 day late, but is completed.  • Transcription contains some errors in spelling, accentuation, and punctuation which do not impede   comprehensibility.  • The majority of the transcription is fully understandable, with some errors which do not impede   comprehensibility.  • Transcription format is mostly correct and easy to read. May need minor adjustments to margins,   spacing, or font consistency. |
| **3**  **Fair** | • May be turned in on time, but section is ~80% complete / May be submitted 2 days late, but is   completed.  • Transcription contains errors in spelling, accentuation, and punctuation that may impede   comprehensibility.  • Generally understandable, with errors that may impede comprehensibility.  • Transcription format is ok. Needs changes to margins, spacing, or font. |
| **2**  **Weak** | • May be turned in on time, but is ~70% complete / May be submitted up to 3 days late, but is completed.  • Transcription contains frequent errors and limited accuracy in spelling, accentuation, and punctuation.   Errors impede comprehensibility.  • Partially understandable, with errors that force interpretation and cause confusion for the reader.  • Transcription format is sloppy, and difficult to follow. Needs significant changes to margins, spacing, or   font. |
| **1**  **Poor** | • May be turned in on time, but is ~60% or less complete / May be submitted up to 4 days late, but is   completed.  • Transcription contains little to no attention to spelling, accentuation, and punctuation. Comprehensibility   is significantly impeded.  • Barely understandable, with frequent or significant errors that impede comprehensibility.  • Transcription format impedes readability and is unattractive. Guidelines for margins, spacing, or font not   followed. |
| **0**  **Unacceptable** | • Not turned in after 4 days.  • No attention given to spelling, accentuation, and punctuation.  • Unintelligible; not written in Spanish.  • No attention to formatting given. |

There are 4 criteria that you will be graded on for your transcription:

1 – Turned in on time & completeness

2 – Spelling, accentuation, and punctuation accuracy

3 – Accuracy of the content in the transcription

4 – Formatting

Each • that is marked on the rubric will represent the points you will be awarded for your work. You may earn up to 20 points possible per submission. You will submit the transcription in 5 parts for a total of 100 points for the transcription. The submission dates are listed below.

9/13 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ / 20

9/20 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ / 20

10/4 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ / 20

10/11 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ / 20

10/18 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ / 20

**Total \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ / 100**