

Communication Studies 103: Presentational Speaking in the Organization

Interview Paper – Grading Rubric

100 – 90 points

Analysis: Student paints a clear picture of what she/he learned during the interview; student discusses preconceptions and whether they were confirmed, and any surprising information obtained; ideas are explored and developed with complexity, critical thinking, and wit.

Self-evaluation: Student is thoughtful about her/his strengths and weaknesses as an interviewer; student discusses a plan for her/his next informational interview.

Questions: List of questions asked included with the paper; questions are clear, smart, creative, and appropriate (no unethical, immoral, or illegal questions asked); questions demonstrate that student/interviewer did solid research on the company, the position, and the individual being interviewed.

Mechanics: The various parts of the paper are the correct length; the student attached a business card or note from the interviewee on letterhead; student demonstrates sophistication in sentence structure and vocabulary; student exhibits superiority in written English, though some small flaws may be present.

89 – 80 points

Analysis: Student paints a picture of what she/he learned during the interview; student discusses preconceptions and whether they were confirmed, and any surprising information obtained; ideas are explored and developed with adequate and reasonable support.

Self-evaluation: Student is somewhat thoughtful about her/his strengths and weaknesses as an interviewer; student discusses a plan for her/his next informational interview, but the plan seems elementary and underdeveloped.

Questions: List of questions asked included with the paper; questions are clear and appropriate (no unethical, immoral, or illegal questions asked), but lacking in creativity; questions demonstrate that student/interviewer did some research on the company, the position, and the individual being interviewed.

Mechanics: The various parts of the paper are the correct length; the student attached a business card or note from the interviewee on letterhead; student demonstrates sophistication in sentence structure and vocabulary; student exhibits satisfactory written English (any flaws are not overwhelming or part of a consistent pattern).

79 – 70 points

Analysis: Student paints a picture of what she/he learned during the interview; student discusses preconceptions and whether they were confirmed, and any surprising information obtained; ideas discussed show some focus, but there may be problems in organization, support, or direction.

Self-evaluation: Student is somewhat thoughtful about her/his strengths and weaknesses as an interviewer; student discusses a plan for her/his next informational interview, but the plan fails to address the issues in some significant way.

Questions: List of questions asked included with the paper; questions are appropriate (no unethical, immoral, or illegal questions asked), but seriously lacking in clarity and creativity; questions suggest that student/interviewer may not have done sufficient research on the company, the position, and the individual being interviewed.

Mechanics: The various parts of the paper are the correct length; the student attached a business card or note from the interviewee on letterhead; student demonstrates satisfactory sentence structure and vocabulary; student exhibits developing written English skills; some sentences are difficult to read or understand.

Communication Studies 103: Presentational Speaking in the Organization

Interview Paper – Grading Rubric

69 – 60 points

Analysis: Student fails to demonstrate what she/he learned during the interview; student slights or ignores important aspects of the assignment; ideas discussed show little focus; there may be problems in organization, support, or direction.

Self-evaluation: Student neglects the discussion of her/his strengths and weaknesses as an interviewer; student neglects the discussion of a plan for her/his next informational interview; student demonstrates confusion about the task and/or only random or marginal mention of the self-evaluation portion of the assignment.

Questions: List of questions asked is either not included with the paper, or is seriously lacking in quantity and/or quality; questions may be inappropriate (unethical, immoral, or illegal); questions may be seriously lacking in clarity and creativity; questions suggest that student/interviewer did not do sufficient research on the company, the position, and the individual being interviewed.

Mechanics: The various parts of the paper miss the correct length; the student fails to attach a business card or note from the interviewee on letterhead; student demonstrates problematic sentence structure and vocabulary; student exhibits pervasive errors in written English, and these errors regularly prevent understanding.

59 – 50 points

Analysis: Student fails to demonstrate what she/he learned during the interview; student ignores important aspects of the assignment; ideas discussed show little focus; there are problems in organization, support, and/or direction.

Self-evaluation: Student fails to discuss her/his strengths and weaknesses as an interviewer; student fails to discuss a plan for her/his next informational interview; student demonstrates confusion about the task and/or only random or marginal mention of the self-evaluation portion of the assignment.

Questions: List of questions asked is either not included with the paper, or is seriously lacking in quantity and/or quality; questions are inappropriate (unethical, immoral, or illegal); questions are seriously lacking in clarity and creativity; questions suggest that student/interviewer did not research the company, the position, or the individual being interviewed.

Mechanics: The various parts of the paper miss the correct length; the student fails to attach a business card or note from the interviewee on letterhead; student demonstrates problematic vocabulary, and contains very few coherent or clear sentences; student exhibits pervasive and persistent errors in written English, and these errors regularly prevent understanding.

0 points

Student fails to submit a paper.

Note: The areas of evaluation (Analysis, Self-evaluation, Questions, and Mechanics) found above are listed in order of importance. In other words, a student whose mechanics are flawless should not expect a strong grade if her/his analysis section is weak.