

Marking guide/Rubric for Interactive oral discussion of novel, film or visual artefact

Marking Criteria	Excellent 7-10 marks	Very good 6.0-6.9	Good 5.0-5.9	Satisfactory 4.0-4.9	Poor (Fail) Less than 4	Points
<p>Criterion 1: Analysis of the literary text, visual artefact, or film: themes, motifs, style, structure, aesthetic techniques, as well as narrative voice, images, and character (where appropriate)</p>	<p>The student demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the literary or aesthetic artefact, in terms of its content and of all its narrative and/or aesthetic aspects. No factual errors unless self-corrected. Originality of thought is clearly evident.</p>	<p>The student's understanding of the content and aesthetic mechanisms of the work is evident, but one or two important points are left unaddressed. A minor factual error may be evident.</p>	<p>The student shows a grasp of many of the key aspects of the work. S/he may not always express these clearly, may omit or inadequately address several key elements of the work. S/he may make several minor factual errors</p>	<p>The student only partially presents the main content and mechanisms of the work, and may make some serious factual errors. Relevance of points is sometimes questionable.</p>	<p>The student has misunderstood several major narrative, aesthetic or thematic points and/or fails to analyse any of the key aspects of the work.</p>	
<p>Criterion 2: Inclusion of quotations in French from the work under discussion and commentary on these</p> <p>(*If the only artefact being discussed is a work of art, then aesthetic concepts in French are what is looked for here, e.g. "ligne de fuite", "perspective", "plans de l'image" etc. Replace "concepts" for "quotations" in all cases in this instance).</p>	<p>The student is intimately familiar with a very wide range of key quotations from the work (novel, film or visual artefact), can produce these spontaneously, analyse quotations that come up in the conversation, and can give additional comments and make links. Sh/e provides extremely convincing commentary on these quotations.</p>	<p>A wide range of key quotations are included in the conversation, and clear commentary and analysis is provided, for the most part spontaneously. Links are made between several of the quotations.</p>	<p>Several key quotations are included in the conversation, clear commentary and analysis is provided, but the student needs to be prompted and drawn out, to expand or make links.</p>	<p>Only a few quotations are included, some may be irrelevant, and some may not be well analysed or fully understood.</p>	<p>Very few or no quotations are spontaneously included, or the student misunderstands all or large parts of quotations when given them to analyse, or cannot comment on them adequately</p>	
<p>Criterion 3: Discussion of authorial and socio-historical context</p>	<p>The student demonstrates a wide-ranging understanding of the historical, societal and authorial circumstances relevant to the</p>	<p>Most of the major contextual factors (authorial and socio-historical) are analysed in depth.</p>	<p>There is slightly more emphasis on description than on analysis, but the student shows an understanding of some major</p>	<p>There is much more emphasis on description than analysis, but the student still discusses some important contextual points.</p>	<p>Only minimal context is discussed. Analysis is weak or absent.</p>	

	work under discussion, and to the society or societies associated with it.		contextual points.			
Criterion 4: Discussion of commentary by critics in French and/or critical theory in French	The student incorporates a variety of important critical commentary and theoretical concepts in French into the discussion and is fully able to translate and analyse any quotations discussed.	The student shows clear familiarity with the analysis of two or more key critics writing in French. Points and quotations are generally highly relevant but sh/e may need to be prompted on these.	The student includes at least two critics writing in French in the discussion, and comments fully on these. S/he may need to be prompted and may have slight problems of relevance.	The student may include fewer than two critics or theoretical points in French in the discussion, and does not show a full understanding or analysis of these. Relevance may be questionable and prompting may often be necessary.	The student is aware of only one (or no) critic who has commented on the work, or does not bring in any relevant key theoretical point in French. S/he may misunderstand these. The discussion remains on the level of statement rather than analysis. Prompting may be clearly needed.	
Criterion 5: Overall delivery, responsiveness, and flow of points	The conversation flows. The student speaks well and can respond intelligently, fluently, and clearly. The grammar and pronunciation of the spoken French and English is exemplary (self-correction is allowed). Only a minimal level of hesitation is present and this is evidently for purposes of reflection rather than lack of knowledge	The conversation generally flows very well and the student is responsive, perceptive and analytical. Hesitations are minimal but there may be one or two slight problems of clarity, pace and/or grammar.	The conversation flows well and the student is usually able to respond and speak fluently and well. Responsiveness may break down occasionally and there may be several slight problems with language or clarity etc.	Responsiveness and spontaneity are patchy. Delivery is not always confident and may be too slow or too fast, with problems of language. Lack of clarity is evident at several key points.	The conversation may falter significantly. Delivery may be clearly too slow or too fast, or unintelligible at several points.	
						Total points divided by 5 (each of the 5 criteria is weighted evenly):

