Applicant Information

Applicant Name: Sheri Anderson-Gutierrez

College / School: Arts & Sciences

Department: Languages, Literatures & Cultures

Project Information

Project Title: Intermediate Spanish Midterm Video Assessment Tool

Course(s) enhanced with this mini-grant award
Fall 2015 SPAN 2010 – Intermediate Spanish (9 sections, approx. 180 students)

Results Report

PROJECT DOCUMENTS
The following documents were used in the implementation of this mini-grant project for Fall 2015
(see Appendix for documents):
- Project objectives
- Project overview and timeline
- Project student expectations rubric
- Student and instructor grading rubrics
- Project peer evaluation form
- Post-project evaluation form

The following campus units and institutions were involved in this project:
- Department of Languages, Literatures & Cultures
- LLC Language Resource Center
- The Center for Service and Community Engagement
- International Student Services
- The Saint Louis Spanish Immersion School (SLLIS)

PROJECT GOALS
The main goal of this project was to design and implement an experiential and proficiency based midterm assessment tool into the SPAN 2010 curriculum. Specifically through this project I designed a midterm video project that students completed in small groups of 2-3 students as an alternative assessment for the midterm in lieu of a written exam. For the video project students had the options to: 1) interview a native Spanish speaker, 2) report on one of the service learning opportunities through SLU related to Spanish or 3) make an account of how Spanish, the language or Spanish speaking peoples, relates to their personal lives in concrete and meaningful ways. We watched the videos in class during the midterm week and all the students were able to gain person and cultural insights through watching each other's project. In order to accommodate students who did not personally have recording devices, this grant funded through the Reinart Center and a matching grant through The Language Resource Center (LRC), purchased a classroom set (10) iPod Touch5 devices.

The benefits and objectives of this project were: 1) to provide students real world opportunities to produce Spanish and to practice their language skills with others outside the classroom, 2) to allow students who are timid or not as outgoing in the classroom context to produce more authentic language and shine in a new way that is beyond the scope of the traditional classroom, and 3) offer an opportunity for student reflection, learning and personal growth. Through this project students engaged more with the course content, specifically Spanish language production, and with the larger community and Spanish speaking peoples and cultures locally.

A secondary programmatic objective of this project was to provide the Spanish language instructors at this level an opportunity to experiment with an alternative assessment and to start a rejuvenation of the core Spanish language program. Overall, these objectives were met with great success and, as discussed further below, this project has been permanently incorporated into the Core Spanish language Program not only at the 2010 level but also in the beginning 1010 and 1020 levels as well.

PROJECT OUTCOMES
Following here are the results from the Fall2015 Post-project evaluation completed by the SPAN 2010 students. The total number of students who completed the evaluation was 130 students, although not all students answered every question so the numbers below represent the percentage of students who answered each question.

1.1 Project Option Choice (N=110)

Option	#	%
Interview	54	49
Service	12	11
Personal reflection	44	40

1.2 Project Statistics (N=130)

	Average
# Group members (1-3)	2.56
Video length (minutes)	10.47
Project time to complete (hours)	12.17

1.3 Project Technology Used

Technology/Program	#	%
iPod Touch5 (grant)	0	0
iPod/iPhone (own)	**66**	**73**
iPad (own)	7	8
Android phone (own)	5	5
Other tablet(own)	0	0
Camera/recorder (own)	13	14
SLU Computer (lab)	2	2
Mac Laptop (own)	**91**	**76**
PC Laptop (own)	27	22
iMovie	**80**	**63**
Final Cut Pro	3	2
Quicktime Editor	2	2
Videopad Editor	0	0
MovieMaker	28	22
Movavi	0	0
Other	14	11

1.4 Project Objectives Met (2 point scale)

How well do you feel this assignment satisfied each of the objectives for this project?	Average
Evaluated your oral Spanish proficiency skills in an authentic speaking/presentation setting	1.57
Required you to practice all four language skills (reading/writing/listening/speaking) in an authentic setting	1.80
Encouraged you to make connections to Hispanic cultures and Spanish speaking communities through outside contact	1.72
Stimulated you to engage in self-reflection related to your own connections to the Spanish language and to local and international Hispanic communities	1.71

Completely Satisfied = 2
Somewhat Satisfied = 1
Did not Satisfy = 0

1.5 Project Evaluation (4 point scale)

Evaluation Statement	Average
The project expectations were clearly stated and I understood what was expected of me for this project.	3.69
I like having options for the project topic and found a topic I wanted to present.	**3.92**
I feel this project was fair in evaluating my Spanish language skills.	3.52
Adequate technology support and resources were provided to successfully complete this project.	3.65
I like participating in this type of midterm evaluation project.	3.41
I got along and worked well with my group members to complete this project.	**3.84**
I did not have difficulty making the video or using technology to complete this project.	3.24
I believe I improved in my language skills by completing this midterm video project.	3.25
I believe I improved in my cultural knowledge and/or sensitivity by completing this midterm video project.	3.44
This project took a reasonable amount of time to complete during the first seven (7) weeks of the course.	3.62

Strongly Agree = 4
Somewhat Agree = 3
Somewhat Disagree = 2
Strongly Disagree = 1

As you can see demonstrated above in the charts, the project was perceived overall to be very successful by the students. The majority of students report that they felt the project fulfilled the stated objectives and also report satisfaction in the process of completing this assignment. Two high points to note are that on average students reported a 3.92/4 that they like having options such as an interview vs. a self-reflection for the topic of the video. Also students on average reported 3.84/4 on getting along well with their group members. This shows a high degree of success in promoting team cooperation, communication, and group learning when students are given flexibility in an assignment and are able to demonstrate their abilities in their own way.

Another comparison to look at is the reported gains in cultural knowledge over language skill through this project. While both averages are high (3.44 vs. 3.24) on a 4 point scale, the cultural reflection and learning seems to resonate more with students through this project than the linguistic practice or learning. From a language teaching perspective, both linguistic skill and cultural knowledge or experience are very important aspects of language learning; however, teaching and assessing cultural knowledge and experience is generally seen as harder. I feel that this project really tapped into an important piece that has been missing in the SLU Spanish curriculum, which is to provide access to meaningful cultural learning opportunities.

PROJECT LESSONS
Overall, this project worked as I anticipated and was a success from both the student and instructor perspectives. It was very powerful to see the impact this project had on student learning; they demonstrated a deeper understanding and reflection on language and culture through making and watching these videos. Here are a few comments in their own words from the post-project evaluation.

The best part about this project was…
    "That it took the place of an exam and allowed us to work with other classmates."
    "I liked that I got to reflect on how Spanish will actually affect me in my field."
    "Learning about the native speaker's culture."
    "I was able to use what I learned to actually communicate rather than just write about what I know on a test."
    "Comparing my level of Spanish to a native speaker and understanding his cultural background."

I feel that the rubrics developed through this project were really helpful in articulating the goals to both the instructors and students across the different sections. The implementation was realistic and the instructors enthusiastically guided the students as they planned for and then made the videos. While the students had flexibility in their options for the video content, they were able to tailor the experience to their comfort level, while still producing good speech samples, and practicing Spanish in a new context. There was also a wide range of technical ability in making the videos; however all the students were able to be successful in producing the video and practicing Spanish despite their previous experience in video making and editing.

I feel that one of the greatest lessons learned through this project was by the level instructors who have not had the opportunity to use alternative assessment techniques in their classrooms. This alternative assessment model helped the level instructors begin to question previous assessment practices and they informally discussed with me how they learned a great deal about 'why' we assess student progress in addition to the 'how' we assess achievement. Several of the SPAN 2010 instructors have a very grammar focused orientation towards language teaching and learning, and feel much more comfortable with discrete point exams that focus on demonstrating knowledge of grammar rules. At the outset of this project, one instructor in particular informed me that he was very skeptical about the benefit to a video project and that it might be a waste of time for both the students and instructors. He was very unsure how we could assess student learning and if this type of project could or should really replace a more formal grammar midterm exam. I am very pleased to report that this same instructor was blown-away by the positive response of his students and really took to the idea of grading with a rubric. He saw first-hand how global competencies can indeed be measured and was also very appreciative of the efficiency of grading during midterm week. After the first semester experience with this video project, this skeptical instructor was the first to ask if we would be able to repeat the experience during the second Spring semester.

While this project was overall a success, there were some pitfalls and areas for improvement. At the outset I imagined that technology would be one of the key challenges or obstacles for students in completing this project. However, students reported few problems with the technology itself or access to technology. The primary challenge for students was time. On the evaluation form students reported:

The worst part about this project was…
"The amount of time I had to spend."
"Watching your own video during class."
"Getting the group together and editing the video."
"Knowing how to make a film, iMovie helped but I am extremely bad at technology and had a steep learning curve."
"Deciding which questions to ask and the pronunciation of new words."
"Working outside of class time and finding time to interview the person for the video."

From these comments, it seems that I did not allot enough classroom time to this project and had too high an expectation for students to work outside of class to complete the video project. Students are all very busy, and they needed more scheduled time together in order to plan and execute this project. In addition, the instructors reported that they were rushing to complete this project by midterms and the schedule did not allow them enough time in class to guide students, nor the students enough time to meet. In the future, we will consider using this project as a final course evaluation instead of a midterm in order to facilitate more interaction and planning time.

There were some students who were overwhelmed by the technology needs to complete this project; specifically using iMovie or other editing programs as mentioned above. Several students in my own classes reported that one person in the group ended up doing all the editing because she or he had the technology and the knowledge to complete the editing. While knowing how to use iMovie is not a requirement for the course, it was necessary for many students to complete the project. A number of students reported spending excess amounts of time editing, or learning how to edit, the videos. In the future I hope to offer a workshop or other resources on editing either through the LRC or the IT department to give students more instruction in this area so that they can feel confident in completing this project.

Finally, there were two parts of this project that I hoped to achieve which were not accomplished. First, I had planned to create a website or resource page with information on how to use the iPod Touch5 and other recording devices. Unfortunately, due to time constraints I was not able to complete this resource for our students. I did begin this part of the project with a graduate student in the LRC, however, since the project took place in only the first half of the semester in Fall 2015, I was not able to get the information together in time and then make it available in a timely manner to be of use to the students. I tried again in the Spring 2016, but the graduate assistant was very overwhelmed with other responsibilities and this part of the project was not completed.

This leads to the second unfortunate part about this project, which is that no students from the SPAN 2010 classes used the iPods that we purchased for the project in either the fall or spring semesters. In getting this grant, I thought it would be important to provide the technology to complete this assignment. The reality is that almost all the students have one or more devices that they can use to complete a video recording and they prefer to use their own equipment. Hence, the resource page would not have been very useful or needed because the students used their own equipment. I believe

now that instead of a technology resource page, it would be more beneficial to offer some training on good video making and editing techniques, using the technology they already have. I can happily report however that after giving a presentation to our department about this grant and project, one of my French colleagues did use the iPod Touch5 devices for her French lab during the Spring semester. I will discuss this more below, but I do feel that having this technology available for our language teachers students is a great resource.

From the completion of this project I have learned the following lessons. First, I have a deep belief in the power of assessment and that when assessments are appropriately aligned with goals and objectives this can guide both teaching and learning practices. While I learned this theoretically in my graduate course work, through this project I experienced personally the real transformative power of well-designed assessment! By having the time over the summer, and by being intentional in creating this project through the grant, I was finally able to put into practice a sound assessment plan in my classroom and the 2010 Spanish program. In addition, I was able to share this experience with my colleagues and the students benefitted tremendously through this alternative assessment opportunity.

Secondly, this project has helped me to reflect on the specific student population we have here at SLU. This is my fifth university where I have taught and each school is unique in its goals, mission, resources and student population. I was very surprised to learn how much access our students have with technology and that by and far they are quite proficient in using this technology to produce videos. I hope to implement this project in future classes and will spend less time focused on access to the technology, but rather better use and presentation of materials using the technology.

Another challenge that presented itself during this project was the lack of access that students at SLU have to Spanish speakers and Hispanic cultures. In previous institutions I have not had difficulty in finding interview partners or native speakers to participate in class activities and cultural events. Saint Louis is rather unique across the United States that it does not have a very large Hispanic population. My third lesson through this project has been how important it is to reach out and find resources in the community to help our students have authentic cultural experiences, even here in the United States. Through this project I have made some important contact with community partners such as the Saint Louis Spanish Immersion School, where I hope to foster opportunities for SLU students to engage with Spanish speakers and Hispanic cultures. Reaching out into the city to explore opportunities for our students can be time consuming and challenging, however, this project has reaffirmed for me the very great need and importance of community contact and intercultural opportunities for college students. I hope to build upon my experience through this project and find more ways to incorporate community connections in the classroom as I teach here at SLU.

FUTURE IMPACT
I was very fortunate to be able to present this project and results to the Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures in Spring 2016 (see attached presentation). During the presentation I expected to present the results from the project and conduct a workshop on alternative assessment with my colleagues. However, as can happen during presentations, the session became more of a question-answer event rather than a presentation and I spent most of the talk discussing how to implement this project into other classes, at other levels and for all languages. At the very outset of my presentation my colleagues immediately saw the benefits of this type of assessment and project for their own classrooms and wanted to be able to implement something this same year. I was very pleased to be able to spark such an important conversation in the department, and to demonstrate that assessment does not have to be intimidating or daunting, but rather can be a source of inspiration and innovation in the classroom.

Following the talk, one of my French colleagues immediately changed her lesson plans for the French lab and created a video project for the final exercise in the Spring semester. She was able to use the iPod Touch5 devices that we purchased through this grant in the lab, and the students produced videos as an alternative to giving standard presentations. This colleague admitted to me that she is not very tech-savvy and was always intimidated to try and implement a project using technology; however, when she saw that students really are equipped and interested to participate in this type of assessment she decided to give it a try. She was amazed at the results and has spoken with me several times about potential ways to incorporate other video projects into her classes. By having access to the devices and the technology support through the LRC, this project has improved the learning experience for multiple language and levels and is helping to transform the idea of assessment in the LLC department at SLU.

Finally, the future of this project is very bright! After the success we had during the 2015-16 school year in implementing this video alternative assessment in the SPAN 2010 courses, the other beginning level Spanish coordinators want to implement this methodology permanent into the Spanish Core curriculum. For the next 2016-17 academic year, we will be requiring a video project of this type at the SPAN 1010, 1020 and 2010 levels as a final oral and cultural assessment in lieu of the final exam. I have learned a great deal about how to implement such a project, how to help students have time to work together and to have strong rubrics and guidelines for the project. I will use this experience as a starting place to create better and sustainable projects for our Spanish core curriculum that will be used year to year.

APPENDIX I

1. Evaluate your Spanish oral proficiency skills in an authentic speaking or presentation setting.
2. Practice all four language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) in an authentic setting outside the language classroom.
3. Make connections to Hispanic cultures and Spanish speaking communities through contact outside the language classroom.
4. Engage in self-reflection related to your own connections to the Spanish language and to local and international Hispanic communities.

TOPIC OPTIONS

Choose ONE of the following options:

A. **INTERVIEW:** Conduct an 8-12 minute interview with an advanced or fluent Spanish speaker of Spanish. This may be a person from the SLU community, the larger Saint Louis community, your family or a personal contact. For example, you might interview: 1) an international student from a Spanish speaking country, a SLU faculty or staff member, or one of the SLU service employees who speaks Spanish; 2) a person from your church, service learning project or local organization; or 3) a family member, friend or person you know who speaks Spanish in your hometown. You may not interview any student who is enrolled in a Spanish course lower than the 4000 level. Speak to your instructor if you need assistance thinking how to contact a fluent Spanish speaker for this option.

B. **SERVICE LEARNING REFLECTION:** If you are engaged in a service learning or community based project that involves Spanish speakers and/or Hispanic communities you may give an 8-12 minute reflection about the specific project, who is impacted by this service and what you have learned through this community engagement project. This may be the same service learning project that you complete for the required 5 hours in the SPAN 2010 course. Speak to your instructor if you need guidance for this option.

C. **PERSONAL CONNECTION REFLECTION:** Give an 8-12 minute presentation about how the Spanish language and/or Hispanic cultures personally relates to you and your life. For example, you might talk about how your major and future career aspirations may involve Spanish speaking peoples; discuss how your interests or passions engage with Spanish speakers; or conduct an investigation of how Spanish speakers are impacting your life at the local, national or international level. Example topics: 1) an education major presents on immersion language programs in the United States, 2) a business major presents on marketing strategies targeting Spanish speakers in Missouri, 3) a pre-med student presents on the lack of translation services in hospitals, 4) a Spanish major presents on the study abroad options through the Madrid campus and her goals for improving her Spanish language skills, or 5) a SLU soccer player presents on the recent crackdown on corruption in the international FIFA organization. Speak to your instructor if you need assistance thinking of a topic for this option.

PROJECT TIMELINE

STEP	OPTION 1: INTERVIEW	OPTION 2: SERVICE	OPTION 3: CONNECTIONS
#1 Sept 4	Choose a group of 1- 3 people	Choose a group of 1- 3 people	Choose a group of 1- 3 people
#2 Sept 5 – 15	Decide on who to interview – contact this person to set up interview	Decide on project to review – make contact if not already involved in the project	Decide on topic or connection of personal interest and relevance to group members
#3 Sept 5 – 15	Determine what technology is needed/best to make video	Determine what technology is needed/best to make video	Determine what technology is needed/best to make video
#4 Sept 16	Turn in ½ page proposal with topic, technology needs and interview questions	Turn in ½ page proposal with topic, technology needs and project overview	Turn in ½ page proposal with topic, technology needs and brief (3-5) sources/ bibliography in MLA or APA
#5 Sept 17 – 23	Make a Plan: write a script with 5-8 questions, and 3-4 backup questions for the interview; determine who will ask each question and how the interview will flow and practice	Make a Plan: create an outline or script for your video and what you want to cover in the video and who will speak about each topic and practice	Make a Plan: create an outline or script for your video and what you want to cover in the video and who will speak about each topic and practice
#6 Sept 24 – Oct 7	Conduct interview and make video	Conduct project and make video	Conduct project and make video
#7 Oct 8 – 11	If necessary, edit the video to 8-12 minutes total	If necessary, edit the video to 8-12 minutes total	If necessary, edit the video to 8-12 minutes total
#8 Oct 12 – 16	Upload video on YouTube for presentation in class	Upload video on YouTube for presentation in class	Upload video on YouTube for presentation in class

PROJECT EXPECTATIONS

	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does not meet Expectations
Is my video the right length?	Video is 10-12 minutes; each person speaks at least 4 minutes	Video is 8-10 minutes; each person speaks at least 3 minutes	Video is less than 8 minutes; and/or each person does not speak at least 3 minutes
How organized and fluent is my video?	I organize my presentation in a logical manner. I speak with fluency and coherence. I introduce, orient and guide the audience throughout the video. I present major ideas/points with clarity and interest. I conclude or summarize the content and give adequate reflection in the video.	I organize my presentation in a logical manner. I pause a few times, disrupting the flow. I give some introduction and orientation in the video. I present major ideas/points with clarity and interest. I give simple conclusions and summary.	I focus mostly on the completion of the task; I pay little attention to the organization and flow of my presentation.
How well do I communicate in the video?	I create with the language by using strings of sentences and am generally accurate.	I create with language by using simple sentences and some strings of sentences and am intermittently accurate.	I use simple sentences, isolated words, and memorized phrases with accuracy.

What kind of vocabulary do I use in the video?	I use a wide range of vocabulary appropriate to the topic most of the time. I Understand and use idiomatic expressions.	I use a range of vocabulary that accomplishes the task. However, occasionally I may use the wrong word or expression. I show some understanding and use of common idiomatic expressions.	I use basic vocabulary and resort to English when I am unable to communicate my message. I do not demonstrate any knowledge of idiomatic expressions.
How well am I understood in the video?	I am generally understood by those unaccustomed (fluent speakers) to the speaking with language learners.	I am generally understood by those accustomed (teachers) to the speaking of language learners.	I am understood with occasional difficulty by those accustomed to the speaking of language learners.
How well do I capture and maintain my audience's attention in the video?	I consistently make good choices of phrases, images, and content to maintain the attention of the audience.	I make some good choices of phrases, images, and content to maintain the attention of the audience.	I use mostly gestures or visuals to maintain audience's attention. I use some phrases, but my vocabulary conveys very basic information.
How creative is my video?	I show a high degree of creativity and demonstrate knowledge by producing an original and distinctive product.	I show some creativity and demonstrate knowledge by producing a well-crafted product.	I show little creativity by producing a product with limited scope or depth.
How well do I demonstrate cultural understanding?	I generally demonstrate awareness of cultural appropriateness and make comparisons between my own culture and others'.	I occasionally demonstrate awareness of cultural appropriateness and make basic or stereotypical comparisons to my own culture.	I do not demonstrate an awareness of cultural appropriateness.
How well do I use technology to create the video and present my ideas?	I use technology independently and skillfully; I chose technologies appropriate to the task, thereby enhancing the quality of the presentation.	I use technology skillfully with guidance; I chose technologies appropriate to the task.	I use technology with minimal skill; had difficulty choosing appropriate technologies.

PROJECT RESOURCES

Language Resource Center (MOR 3200)
http://www.slu.edu/department-of-languages-literatures-and-cultures/language-resource-center

Center for Service and Community Engagement (CGC 130)
http://www.slu.edu/service

International Services (DPH 102)
http://www.slu.edu/international-services-home

APPENDIX II
Midterm Video Project Rubric

CRITERIA	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS		DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS
		STRONG	MINIMAL	
150 points total	A	A-	B	C
Project Mechanics: **10 points**	10-12 minutes in length, each person speaks at least 4 minutes. Uses strong technology skills that enhance the presentation. Maintains audience attention throughout.	8-12 minutes in length, each person speaks at least 3 minutes. Uses strong technology skills that enhance the presentation. Mostly maintains audience attention throughout.	8-10 minutes in length each person speaks at least 3 minutes. Uses some technology skills that enhance the presentation. Does not always maintain audience attention throughout.	<8 minutes in length, and/or each person does not speak at least 3 minutes. Technology skills do not enhance the presentation. Does not maintain audience attention.
Text Type: 10 points Quantity and organization of language discourse	Uses connected sentences and paragraph-length discourse.	Uses mostly connected sentences and some paragraph-like discourse.	Uses strings of sentences, with some complex sentences (dependent clauses).	Uses simple sentences and some strings of sentences.
Comprehensibility: 10 points Who can understand this language level?	Is understood by fluent speakers, even those unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although this may require some additional effort.	Is generally understood by those unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may occur.	Is generally understood by those accustomed to the speaking of non-natives.	Is generally understood by those accustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although additional effort may be required.
Language Function: 20 points Language tasks the speaker is able to handle speech in a consistent, comfortable, sustained, and spontaneous manner. INTERVIEW: Maintains conversation with fluent speaker SERVICE: Entirely explains and reflects upon experience CONNECTIONS: Fully details life connections and reflects on Spanish language use	Consistently narrates and describes in all major time frames. Able to communicate on familiar topics, which may include current events, employment, and matters of public interest and cultural topics.	Handles successfully uncomplicated tasks and social situations requiring exchange of basic information. Narrates and describes in all major time frames (present/past/future), although not consistently.	Creates with language by combining and recombining known elements; ability to express own meaning expands in quantity and quality. Handles successfully a variety of uncomplicated communicative tasks and topics.	Creates with language by combining and recombining known elements; is able to express personal meaning in a basic way. Handles successfully a number of uncomplicated communicative tasks primarily in concrete exchanges and topics.

CRITERIA	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS		DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS
		STRONG	MINIMAL	
150 points total	A	A-	B	C
Language Control: 20 points Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary	Demonstrates significant quantity and quality of language. When attempting to perform Advanced-level tasks, there is breakdown in one or more of the following areas: the ability to narrate and describe, use of paragraph-length discourse, fluency, breadth of vocabulary.	Demonstrates significant quantity and quality of language. When attempting to perform Intermediate-level tasks, there is breakdown in one or more of the following areas: the ability to narrate and describe, use of paragraph-length discourse, fluency, breadth of vocabulary.	Demonstrates minimal fluency and some control of aspect in narrating in present, past and future time. Vocabulary may lack specificity. Language decreases in quality and quantity when attempting to perform functions or handle topics associated with the intermediate level.	Is most accurate when producing simple sentences in present time. Pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax are strongly influenced by the native language. Accuracy decreases as language becomes more complex.
Fluency: 20 points Degree of fluency and appropriate presentational strategies used	Does not read from visuals or notes. Presented with systematic and sustained fluency and does not halter during presentation. Clearly well prepared and practiced speech at the paragraph level.	Does not read from visuals or notes. Presented with significant fluency and halters little during presentation. Clearly well prepared and practiced speech at the paragraph level.	Does not read from visuals or notes. Presented with fluency but may halter some during presentation. Clearly well prepared and practiced speech at the sentence level speech.	Reads from visuals or notes. Presentation is not fluid and/or maintains significant haltering throughout presentation. Does not appear to be well prepared and/or speaks only at the sentence level throughout entire presentation.
Impact: 20 points Clarity, organization, and depth of presentation; degree to which presentation maintains attention and interest of audience	Presented in a clear and organized manner. Presentation illustrates originality, rich details, and an unexpected feature that captures interest and attention of audience.	Presented in a clear and organized manner. Presentation illustrates originality and features rich details, visuals, and/or organization of the text to maintain audience's attention and/ or interest.	Presented in a clear and organized manner. Some effort to maintain audience's attention through visuals, organization of the text, and/or details.	Presentation may be either unclear or unorganized. Minimal to no effort to maintain audience's attention.
Cultural Reflection: 20 points Cultural understanding of Hispanic peoples and comparison to one's own culture and norms	Clearly demonstrates awareness of Hispanic cultural products and practices. Makes meaningful and thoughtful comparisons between own culture and others'.	Demonstrates awareness of Hispanic cultural products and practices. Makes a few comparisons between own culture and others'.	Demonstrates simple or stereotypical awareness of Hispanic cultural products and practices. Makes some comparisons between cultures	Does not demonstrate awareness of Hispanic cultural products and practices and/or does not make comparisons to own culture.
Peer Evaluation: 20 points Gives an opportunity to evaluate and reflect upon one another's video projects	Given high ratings from all your peers (+95%)	Given good ratings from all your peers (90-94%)	Given average ratings from all your peers (80-89%)	Given low ratings from all your peers (<80%)

SPAN 2010 FALL 2015
Midterm Video Project Grading Rubric

CRITERIA	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS		DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS
		STRONG	MINIMAL	
150 points total	**150-144**	**140-135**	**131-120**	**111 - <104**
Project Mechanics: **10 points**	10 10-12 minutes in length, each person speaks at least 4 minutes. Uses strong technology skills that enhance the presentation. Maintains audience attention throughout.	9.5 – 9 8-12 minutes in length, each person speaks at least 3 minutes. Uses strong technology skills that enhance the presentation. Mostly maintains audience attention throughout.	8.5 – 8 8-10 minutes in length each person speaks at least 3 minutes. Uses some technology skills that enhance the presentation. Does not always maintain audience attention throughout.	7 – <7 <8 minutes in length, and/or each person does not speak at least 3 minutes. Technology skills do not enhance the presentation. Does not maintain audience attention.
Text Type: 10 points Quantity and organization of language discourse	10 Uses connected sentences and paragraph-length discourse.	9.5 – 9 Uses mostly connected sentences and some paragraph-like discourse.	8.5 – 8 Uses strings of sentences, with some complex sentences (dependent clauses).	7 – <7 Uses simple sentences and some strings of sentences.
Comprehensibility: 10 points Who can understand this language level?	10 Is understood by fluent speakers, even those unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although this may require some additional effort.	9.5 – 9 Is generally understood by those unaccustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although interference from another language may be evident and gaps in comprehension may occur.	8.5 – 8 Is generally understood by those accustomed to the speaking of non-natives.	7 – <7 Is generally understood by those accustomed to the speaking of non-natives, although additional effort may be required.
Language Function: 20 points Language tasks the speaker is able to handle speech in a consistent, comfortable, sustained, and spontaneous manner. INTERVIEW: Maintains conversation with fluent speaker SERVICE: Entirely explains and reflects upon experience CONNECTIONS: Fully details life connections and reflects on Spanish language use	20 – 19 Consistently narrates and describes in all major time frames. Able to communicate on familiar topics, which may include current events, employment, and matters of public interest and cultural topics.	18.5 – 18 Handles successfully uncomplicated tasks and social situations requiring exchange of basic information. Narrates and describes in all major time frames (present/past/future), although not consistently.	17.5 – 17 – 16 Creates with language by combining and recombining known elements; ability to express own meaning expands in quantity and quality. Handles successfully a variety of uncomplicated communicative tasks and topics.	15 – 14 – <14 Creates with language by combining and recombining known elements; is able to express personal meaning in a basic way. Handles successfully a number of uncomplicated communicative tasks primarily in concrete exchanges and topics.

	20 – 19	18.5 – 18	17.5 – 17 – 16	15 – 14 – <14
Language Control: 20 points Grammatical accuracy, appropriate vocabulary	Demonstrates significant quantity and quality of language. When attempting to perform <u>Advanced</u>-level tasks, there is breakdown in one or more of the following areas: the ability to narrate and describe, use of paragraph-length discourse, fluency, breadth of vocabulary.	<u>Demonstrates significant quantity and quality of language</u>. When attempting to perform <u>Intermediate</u>-level tasks, there is breakdown in one or more of the following areas: the ability to narrate and describe, use of paragraph-length discourse, fluency, breadth of vocabulary.	Demonstrates minimal fluency and some control of aspect in narrating in present, past and future time. Vocabulary may lack specificity. Language decreases in quality and quantity when attempting to perform functions or handle topics associated with the intermediate level.	Is most accurate when producing simple sentences in present time. Pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax are strongly influenced by the native language. Accuracy decreases as language becomes more complex.
Fluency: **20 points** Degree of fluency and appropriate presentational strategies used	Does not read from visuals or notes. Presented with systematic and sustained fluency and does not halter during presentation. Clearly well prepared and practiced speech at the paragraph level.	<u>Does not read from visuals or notes.</u> Presented with significant fluency and halters little during presentation. <u>Clearly well prepared and practiced</u> speech at the paragraph level.	Does not read from visuals or notes. Presented with fluency but may halter some during presentation. Clearly well prepared and practiced speech at the sentence level speech.	Reads from visuals or notes. Presentation is not fluid and/or maintains significant haltering throughout presentation. Does not appear to be well prepared and/or speaks only at the sentence level throughout entire presentation.
Impact: 20 points Clarity, organization, and depth of presentation; degree to which presentation maintains attention and interest of audience	Presented in a clear and organized manner. Presentation illustrates originality, rich details, and an unexpected feature that captures interest and attention of audience.	<u>Presented in a clear and organized manner</u>. Presentation illustrates <u>originality</u> and features rich details, <u>visuals</u>, and/or organization of the text to <u>maintain audience's attention and/ or interest</u>.	Presented in a clear and organized manner. Some effort to maintain audience's attention through visuals, organization of the text, and/or details.	Presentation may be either unclear or unorganized. Minimal to no effort to maintain audience's attention.
Cultural Reflection: **20 points** Cultural understanding of Hispanic peoples and comparison to one's own culture and norms	Clearly demonstrates awareness of Hispanic cultural products and practices. Makes meaningful and thoughtful comparisons between own culture and others'.	<u>Demonstrates awareness of Hispanic cultural products and practices</u>. Makes a few comparisons between own culture and others'.	Demonstrates simple or stereotypical awareness of Hispanic cultural products and practices. Makes some comparisons between cultures.	Does not demonstrate awareness of Hispanic cultural products and practices and/or does not make comparisons to own culture.
Peer Evaluation: **20 points** Gives an opportunity to evaluate and reflect upon one another's video projects	Given high ratings from all your peers (+95%)	Given <u>good ratings</u> from all your peers (90-94%)	Given average ratings from all your peers (80-89%)	Given low ratings from all your peers (<80%)

Midterm Peer Evaluations   **GROUP #:**_____   **TOTAL SCORE:**_____

CRITERIA	AMAZING! BEST PRESENTATION	VERY STRONG PRESENTATION		LESS THAN EXCITING PRESENTATION	NOT AN ACCEPTABLE PRESENTATION
		GREAT	GOOD		
Points	5	4	3	2	1
ORGANIZATION: How well was the presentation organized and presented?					
CONTENT: How well were the ideas and content expressed?					
LANGUAGE USE: How fluent and accurate was the Spanish used in the presentation?					
IMPACT: How much did this presentation impact you as an audience member?					

PRAISE/COMPLEMENT ABOUT THE VIDEO

SUGGESTION/RECOMMENDATION FOR IMPROVEMENT FOR THE GROUP

Fall 2015 Midterm Video Project Evaluation   SECTION: SPAN 2010-_____

PROJECT OPTION CHOICE: INTERVIEW   SERVICE   CONNECTIONS

GROUP MEMBERS: 1   2   3

LENGTH (in minutes):   <5   5   6   7   8   9   10   11   12   12+

TECHNOLOGY USED: Please indicate all the devices and programs you used to complete this project.
(Circle all that apply)

iPod touch (lab)   iPod/iPhone (own)   iPad (own)

SLU computer (lab)   Mac laptop (own)   PC laptop (own)

Android phone (own)   Other tablet (own)   Camera/recorder (own)

iMovie   Final Cut Pro   Quicktime Editor

VideoPad Editor   MovieMaker   Movavi

Other device or program used:_____

TIME COMMITMENT: Please estimate how much time you spent on each step of the midterm project.

	<1 hour	1-2 hours	3-4 hours	5+ hours
Project proposal				
Pre-taping preparations				
Video taping				
Video Editing				
Group meetings/conversations				
Other:				

OBJECTIVES: How well do you feel this assignment satisfied each of the objectives for this project?

OBJECTIVES	COMPLETELY SATISFIED	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	DID NOT SATISFY
Evaluated your oral Spanish proficiency skills in an authentic speaking/presentation setting			
Required you to practice all four language skills (reading/writing/listening/speaking) in an authentic setting			
Encouraged you to make connections to Hispanic cultures and Spanish speaking communities through outside contact			
Stimulated you to engage in self-reflection related to your own connections to the Spanish language and to local and international Hispanic communities			

EVALUATION: Please respond to each statement with your reaction and feelings about the project.

EVALUATION STATEMENTS	STRONGLY AGREE	SOMEWHAT AGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
The project expectations were clearly stated and I understood what was expected of me for this project.				
I like having options for the project topic and found a topic I wanted to present.				
I feel this project was fair in evaluating my Spanish language skills.				
Adequate technology support and resources were provided to successfully complete this project.				
I like participating in this type of midterm evaluation project.				
I got along and worked well with my group members to complete this project.				
I did not have difficulty making the video or using technology to complete this project.				
I believe I improved in my language skills by completing this midterm video project.				
I believe I improved in my cultural knowledge and/or sensitivity by completing this midterm video project.				
This project took a reasonable amount of time to complete during the first seven (7) weeks of the course.				

PERSONAL REFLECTION: Please share your thoughts and reactions to this project. Your answers will give us insight into your experience with this project and help make the experience better in the future.

The **best** part about his project was:

The **worst** part about this project was: