ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR A SUMMARY

STRUCTURE AND CONTENT

1	INTRODUCTION — 25%	
1.1	reference to the source: incomplete or not given	2-3%
1.2	topic (subject matter): distorted or not given	7-10%
1.3	thesis statement: incomplete or not given	7-12%
2	MAIN BODY AND CONCLUSION — 45%	
2.1	ALL IMPORTANT IDEAS ARE PRESENTED—25%	
a	an idea distorted or left out	5-7% each case
b	excess details	5-7%
c	repetition of ideas	5-7% each case
d	personal opinion given	3% each case
e	unnecessary sum-up in conclusion	5%
2.2	PARAGRAPH STRUCTURE —25%	
a	no topic sentence	7% each case
b	topic sentence not developed or ≠ support the thesis	7% each case
3	COHERENCE AND COHESION – 25%	
3.1	no mention of the author (2-3 times in the text)	3%
3.2	faulty logic (hasty conclusions, logical gaps, circular arguments, etc.)	5% each case
3.3	no cohesion within/between paragraphs; inappropriate connectives	5% each case
3.4	quotation (with/without inverted commas i.e. no proper paraphrasing)	5% each case
4	LENGTH – 5%	
	over 1/3 of the original text	5%

LANGUAGE

1	Sp (spelling)	1%
2	P (punctuation)	1%
3	Art (article)	2%
4	Prep (preposition)	2%
5	Ww (wrong word)	3-5%
6	Gr (grammar)	3-5%
7	St (style)	3%
8	Sense (a mistake which makes the sentence meaningless)	5%
9	Primitive language	10% (in all)
10	**NB** Appropriate use of Active Vocabulary is rewarded (AV= 0.5)	

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR AN ESSAY

STRUCTURE AND CONTENT

1	INTRODUCTION — 20%	
1.1	no introduction to the topic (hooking techniques)	7%
1.2	thesis statement not covering the topic /poorly articulated or not given	7-12%
2	**MAIN BODY — 45%**	
2.1	IDEAS WELL-DEVELOPED AND SUPPORTED WITH SPECIFIC EVIDENCE —25%	
a	ideas do not develop the thesis statement	5-7% each case
b	ideas not clearly stated	5% each case
c	no evidence (facts) illustrating ideas	5% each case
d	repetition of ideas	5% each case
e	no paragraph presenting an opposing viewpoint	7%
2.2	PARAGRAPH STRUCTURE —20%	
a	no topic sentence	7% each case
b	topic sentence not developed by supporting ideas	7% each case
3	**CONCLUSION – 10%**	
3.1	no clear sum-up	5%
3.2	new idea(s) introduced	5%
4	**COHERENCE AND COHESION – 20%**	
4.1	faulty logic (hasty conclusions, logical gaps, circular arguments, etc.)	5% each case
4.2	no cohesion within/between paragraphs; inappropriate connectives	5% each case
5	**LENGTH – 5%**	
	too short / too long	5%

LANGUAGE

1	Sp (spelling)	1%
2	P (punctuation)	1%
3	Art (article)	2%
4	Prep (preposition)	2%
5	Ww (wrong word)	3-5%
6	Gr (grammar)	3-5%
7	St (style)	3%
8	Sense (a mistake which makes the sentence meaningless)	5%
9	Primitive language	10% (in all)
10	**NB** Appropriate use of Active Vocabulary is rewarded (AV= 0.5)	

SPEECH ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

1	STRUCTURE AND CONTENT — 45%		COMMENTS
1.1	**INTRODUCTION**	10%	
a	catches the audience's attention and invites to thinking		
1.2	**MAIN BODY**	25%	
a	the message is clearly formulated and supported		
b	ideas are clearly stated and coherently laid-out		
1.3	**CONCLUSION**	10%	
a	leaves the audience with some food for thought, powerful and compelling		
2	**LANGUAGE (the use of oratory techniques) – 30%**		

2.1	The language is precise and colourful, emotive and expressive with a minimum of 5 oratory techniques listed below (tick while listening):
	
	☐ alliteration
	☐ address to the audience
	☐ contrast
	☐ emotive language
	☐ list of three
	☐ metaphor
	☐ parallelisms
	☐ rhetorical questions
	☐ repetition
	☐ simile
	☐ quotations
	☐ jokes and anecdotes
	☐ emphatic structures :
	  - inversion
	  - cleft sentences
	  - emphatic "do"
	  - nominal clauses		

3	**DELIVERY – 25%**		
3.1	body language		
3.2	eye-contact		
3.3	voice-level, intonation		
3.4	tempo, pauses		
3.5	pronunciation, clarity of speech		

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR A ROUND-TABLE DISCUSSION

1	PREPARATION — 30%	COMMENTS	
1.1	arguments to support the speaker's perspective	the number of arguments is sufficient (with a minimum of 3), and the arguments are compelling and not repetitive	10%
1.2	references to facts, figures, examples	each argument is supported by recent data and/or vivid examples	10%
1.3	contribution to the topic vocabulary list	considerable input to the topic-related vocabulary (5 items at least), with each phrase defined and exemplified	10%
2	PRESENTATION —70%		
2.1	relevance	Speaker's words comply with the assumed role, reflect his/her position; they are supported by solid arguments and related facts. The message is laid out within the cultural norms of academic discussion	20%
2.2	logic	Speaker presents the arguments coherently, follows the 'claim-reason-evidence' structure of an utterance, makes use of relevant linking devices to pass from one point to another	20%
2.3	interaction	The round-table discussion is 'round', with all the participants equally engaged. Speaker maintains effective communication, shows interest in the others' opinion and respect for their freedom to dissent, asks relevant, articulate questions, and gives clear and concise answers, makes use of the necessary communicative speech patterns (asking for opinion, giving opinion, agreeing, disagreeing, interrupting and dealing with interruptions.)	20%
2.4	fluency and accuracy	The range and level of the vocabulary and grammar structures used is that of an advanced speaker of English. Speaker adheres to the register of academic discussion, without confusing written and spoken language though.	10%

Критерии оценки «словесного поединка»

(* = штрафные баллы за каждый случай)

1	**ВЫПОЛНЕНИЕ КОММУНИКАТИВНОЙ ЗАДАЧИ – 30%**	
1.1	*(контр)*аргумент отсутствует*/не соответствует теме*	10%
1.2	*(контр)*аргумент* не развернут *(не подкреплен примерами/ пояснениями)* / частично не соответствует теме*	8%
1.3	примеры / пояснения не соответствуют *(контр)*аргументу	5%
1.4	высказывания мало развернуты	7%
2	**СТРУКТУРА ВЫСКАЗЫВАНИЯ - 15%**	
2.1	ЛОГИЧНОСТЬ организации: информация организована непоследовательно (присутствуют логические ошибки*, повторы*, и пр.)	5%
2.2	СВЯЗНОСТЬ	
a	наблюдается недостаток средств связи/маркеров дискурса	4%
b	ошибка в использовании средств связи*/маркеров дискурса*	3%
3	**НАВЫКИ ВЗАИМОДЕЙСТВИЯ – 10%**	
3.1	УМЕНИЕ ПОДДЕРЖАТЬ ДИАЛОГ: недостаточное владение дискурсивными средствами установления контакта и поддержания диалога (уточняющие вопросы, реплики-реакции на услышанное/навыки обратной связи и т.п.)	5%
3.2	НЕСОБЛЮДЕНИЕ РЕЧЕВОГО ЭТИКЕТА (неправильное выражение согласия/ несогласия, перебивание собеседника, пр.)	3%
3.3	НЕВЕРБАЛЬНЫЙ КОНТАКТ с собеседником: недостаточен	2%
4	**ЛЕКСИКО-ГРАММАТИЧЕСКОЕ ОФОРМЛЕНИЕ – 35%**	
4.1	ПРАВИЛЬНОСТЬ УПОТРЕБЛЕНИЯ – **20%**	
	неточности/ошибки в употреблении грамматических и лексических средств выражения, включая стилевые неточности * **NB**: неточности в активном вокабуляре и грамматике* - 4%	lex/gr: 2-4 % prep/art: 1-2%
	ошибки, нарушающие смысл высказывания *	5%
4.2	ДИАПАЗОН АКТИВНОГО ВОКАБУЛЯРА – **15%**	
a	не включает активный вокабуляр	15%
b	активный вокабуляр используется недостаточно	8%
5	**ФОНЕТИЧЕСКОЕ ОФОРМЛЕНИЕ - 10%**	
5.1	ТЕМП РЕЧИ слишком быстрый/медленный и/или прерывистый	5%
5.2	УДАРЕНИЕ в словах* и/или фразовое ударение не всегда правильно	3%
5.3	АРТИКУЛЯЦИЯ отдельных звуков имеет заметные искажения	2%

PRESENTATION ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

1	STRUCTURE — 10%	
1.1	no introduction/outline/ conclusion/references	5%
1.2	no signposting (transition from point to point)	5%
1.3	too short/long	5%
2	**CONTENT — 40%**	
2.1	topic of marginal importance	10%
2.2	no thesis statement	10%
2.3	arguments do not support thesis/no evidence	10% each case
2.4	faulty logic	5% each case
3	**PRESENTATION SKILLS — 20%**	
3.1	no interaction with the audience/inability to answer questions	15%
3.2	reading from notes	20%
4	**SCREEN DESIGN — 10%**	
4.1	primitive or unnecessarily fancy design n	5%
4.2	excess text	5%
4.3	poor readability (small font, pale printing, etc.)	5%
5	**LANGUAGE — 20%**	
5.1	unintelligible pronunciation	7%
5.2	low fluency	5%
5.3	grammatical and lexical mistakes	5-15%