Rubrica de la escritura interpersonal
Interpersonal Writing: Email Reply

5 **Strong**	− Maintains the exchange with a response that is clearly appropriate within the context of the task − Provides required information (e.g., responses to questions, request for details) with frequent elaboration − 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 − Mostly consistent use of register appropriate for the situation; control of cultural conventions appropriate for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing), despite occasional errors − Variety of simple and compound sentences, and some complex sentences
4 **Good**	− Maintains the exchange with a response that is generally appropriate within the context of the task − Provides required information (e.g., responses to questions, request for details) with some elaboration − 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 − Generally consistent use of register appropriate for the situation, except for occasional shifts; basic control of cultural conventions appropriate for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing) − Simple, compound, and a few complex sentences
3 **Fair**	− Maintains the exchange with a response that is somewhat appropriate but basic within the context of the task − Provides required information (e.g., responses to questions, request for details) − Generally understandable, with errors that may impede comprehensibility − Appropriate but basic vocabulary and idiomatic language − Some control of grammar, syntax, and usage − Use of register may be inappropriate for the situation with several shifts; partial control of conventions for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing) although these may lack cultural appropriateness − Simple and a few compound sentences
2 **Weak**	− Partially maintains the exchange with a response that is minimally appropriate within the context of the task − Provides some required information (e.g., responses to questions, request for details) − 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 − Use of register is generally inappropriate for the situation; includes some conventions for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing) with inaccuracies − Simple sentences and phrases
1 **Poor**	− Unsuccessfully attempts to maintain the exchange by providing a response that is inappropriate within the context of the task − Provides little required information (e.g., responses to questions, request for details) − Barely understandable, with frequent or significant errors that impede comprehensibility − Very few vocabulary resources − Little or no control of grammar, syntax, and usage − Minimal or no attention to register; includes significantly inaccurate or no conventions for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing) − Very simple sentences or fragments
0 **Unacceptable**	− Mere restatement of language from the stimulus − Completely irrelevant to the stimulus − "I don't know," "I don't understand," or equivalent in any language − Not in the language of the exam − Blank (no response)

	Rubrica de la escritura de presentación
	Presentational Writing: Persuasive Essay
5 Strong	– Effective treatment of topic within the context of the task – Demonstrates a high degree of comprehension of the sources' viewpoints, with very few minor inaccuracies – Integrates content from all three sources in support of the essay – Presents and defends the student's own viewpoint on the topic with a high degree of clarity; develops a persuasive argument 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	– Generally effective treatment of topic within the context of the task – Demonstrates comprehension of the sources' viewpoints; may include a few inaccuracies – Summarizes, with limited integration, content from all three sources in support of the essay – Presents and defends the student's own viewpoint on the topic with clarity; develops a persuasive argument with coherence – 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	– Suitable treatment of topic within the context of the task – Demonstrates a moderate degree of comprehension of the sources' viewpoints; includes some inaccuracies – Summarizes content from at least two sources in support of the essay – Presents and defends the student's own viewpoint on the topic; develops a somewhat persuasive argument with some coherence – 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	– Unsuitable treatment of topic within the context of the task – Demonstrates a low degree of comprehension of the sources' viewpoints; information may be limited or inaccurate – Summarizes content from one or two sources; may not support the essay – Presents, or at least suggests, the student's own viewpoint on the topic; develops an unpersuasive argument somewhat incoherently – 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	– Almost no treatment of topic within the context of the task – Demonstrates poor comprehension of the sources' viewpoints; includes frequent and significant inaccuracies – Mostly repeats statements from sources or may not refer to any sources – Minimally suggests the student's own viewpoint on the topic; argument 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 prompt; completely irrelevant to the topic – "I don't know," "I don't understand," or equivalent in any language – Not in the language of the exam – Blank (no response)

Rubrica del Discurso Interpersonal
Interpersonal Speaking: Conversation

5 **Strong**	− Maintains the exchange with a series of responses that is clearly appropriate within the context of the task − Provides required information (e.g., responses to questions, statement, and support of opinion) with frequent elaboration − 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 − Mostly consistent use of register 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**	− Maintains the exchange with a series of responses that is clearly appropriate within the context of the task − Provides required information (e.g., responses to questions, statement, and support of opinion) with frequent elaboration − 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 − Mostly consistent use of register 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
3 **Fair**	− Maintains the exchange with a series of responses that is somewhat appropriate within the context of the task − Provides required information (e.g., responses to questions, statement, and support of opinion) − Generally understandable, with errors that may impede comprehensibility − Appropriate but basic vocabulary and idiomatic language − Some control of grammar, syntax, and usage − Use of register 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**	− Partially maintains the exchange with a series of responses that is minimally appropriate within the context of the task − Provides some required information (e.g., responses to questions, statement, and support of opinion) − Partially understandable, with errors that force interpretation and cause confusion for the listener − Limited vocabulary and idiomatic language − Limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage − Use of register is generally inappropriate for the conversation − 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**	− Unsuccessfully attempts to maintain the exchange by providing a series of responses that is inappropriate within the context of the task − Provides little required information (e.g., responses to questions, statement, and support of opinion) − Barely understandable, with frequent or significant errors that impede comprehensibility − Very few vocabulary resources − Little or no control of grammar, syntax, and usage − Minimal or no attention to register − 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 the language of the exam − Blank (no response although recording equipment is functioning)

Rubrica de la escritura de presentación
Presentational Writing: Persuasive Essay

5 Strong	− Effective treatment of topic within the context of the task − Demonstrates a high degree of comprehension of the sources' viewpoints, with very few minor inaccuracies − Integrates content from all three sources in support of the essay − Presents and defends the student's own viewpoint on the topic with a high degree of clarity; develops a persuasive argument 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	− Generally effective treatment of topic within the context of the task − Demonstrates comprehension of the sources' viewpoints; may include a few inaccuracies − Summarizes, with limited integration, content from all three sources in support of the essay − Presents and defends the student's own viewpoint on the topic with clarity; develops a persuasive argument with coherence − 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	− Suitable treatment of topic within the context of the task − Demonstrates a moderate degree of comprehension of the sources' viewpoints; includes some inaccuracies − Summarizes content from at least two sources in support of the essay − Presents and defends the student's own viewpoint on the topic; develops a somewhat persuasive argument with some coherence − 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	− Unsuitable treatment of topic within the context of the task − Demonstrates a low degree of comprehension of the sources' viewpoints; information may be limited or inaccurate − Summarizes content from one or two sources; may not support the essay − Presents, or at least suggests, the student's own viewpoint on the topic; develops an unpersuasive argument somewhat incoherently − 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	− Almost no treatment of topic within the context of the task − Demonstrates poor comprehension of the sources' viewpoints; includes frequent and significant inaccuracies − Mostly repeats statements from sources or may not refer to any sources − Minimally suggests the student's own viewpoint on the topic; argument 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 prompt; completely irrelevant to the topic − "I don't know," "I don't understand," or equivalent in any language − Not in the language of the exam − Blank (no response)

	Rubrica del Discurso de la Presentación *Presentational Speaking: Cultural Comparison*
5 Strong	– Effective treatment of topic within the context of the task – Clearly compares the student's own community with the target culture, including supporting details and relevant examples – Demonstrates understanding of the target culture, despite a few minor inaccuracies – Organized presentation; 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 – Mostly consistent use of register appropriate for the presentation – Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response comprehensible; errors do not impede comprehensibility – Clarification or self-correction (if present) improves comprehensibility
4 Good	– Generally effective treatment of topic within the context of the task – Compares the student's own community with the target culture, including some supporting details and mostly relevant examples – Demonstrates some understanding of the target culture, despite minor inaccuracies – Organized presentation; 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 – Generally consistent use of register appropriate for the presentation, 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	– Suitable treatment of topic within the context of the task – Compares the student's own community with the target culture, including a few supporting details and examples – Demonstrates a basic understanding of the target culture, despite inaccuracies – 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 – Use of register may be inappropriate for the presentation 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	– Unsuitable treatment of topic within the context of the task – Presents information about the student's own community and the target culture, but may not compare them; consists mostly of statements with no development – Demonstrates a limited understanding of the target culture; may include several inaccuracies – Limited organization; ineffective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices – Partially understandable, with errors that force interpretation and cause confusion for the listener – Limited vocabulary and idiomatic language – Limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage – Use of register is generally inappropriate for the presentation – 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	– Almost no treatment of topic within the context of the task – Presents information only about the student's own community or only about the target culture, and may not include examples – Demonstrates minimal understanding of the target culture; generally inaccurate – 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 – Minimal or no attention to register – 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 prompt – Clearly does not respond to the prompt; completely irrelevant to the topic – "I don't know," "I don't understand," or equivalent in any language – Not in the language of the exam – Blank (no response although recording equipment is functioning)