

**ULS 2018/19  
Stage 5  
Assessment**

**Task 2 (semester 2)**

**Portfolio (oral and written activities)**

**Instructions:**

Individual portfolio based on **a research question related to the student's subject area in the target language country/countries**, consisting of:

- a **contents sheet** outlining the tasks completed.
- your **essay/ report planning record**.
- the **2** completed **language research tasks in the target language** which have helped you to address your research question.
- the completed **self-evaluation of your learning in Semester 2** of 300 words in English.
- your **final essay/report (1200 words maximum in the target language)** which addresses your research question.
- Your presentation slides for your 10 minute **oral presentation** of your essay/report.

The portfolio tasks, report and presentation slides must be correctly referenced throughout.

For your language research tasks, you must provide the full original text, video or audio source which you have worked from, not simply a url link.

**Your individual portfolio presentation will take place in SHU week 37 (w/c 8th April 2019) during class time, so your presentation time will be your deadline for your presentation assessment.**

**All above parts of your portfolio must be submitted online in SHU week 37 (by 15.30 on Friday 12<sup>th</sup> April 2019).**

**Learning Outcomes:**

<b>LO Ref</b>	<b>Learning Outcome</b>
<b>1</b>	Obtain and relate the major points of complex authentic recorded, spoken or written material, e.g. news broadcasts, media articles, and identify and respond to opinions and values contained in texts of a complex nature.
<b>2</b>	Apply communication skills to participate in group/pair routine and non-routine business and social discussions and presentations, involving complex negotiations and/or arguments.
<b>3</b>	Produce accurate and stylistically equivalent written translations in English of general or business related texts and compose accurate extended texts on topics relating to the student's own specialism.
<b>4</b>	Select and exploit appropriate sources of information relating to the student's subject specialism, and plan and manage their own learning.

**UNIVERSITY LANGUAGE SCHEME  
STAGE 5 PORTFOLIO  
MARKING CRITERIA**

<b>CONTENT (40)</b>		<b>MARKS</b>
<b>35-40</b>	Outstanding. The content is of an exceptionally high quality. There is ample evidence of intelligent use of source material and much original thought. The portfolio contains a wealth of appropriately selected and thoroughly analysed source material from a variety of media.	
<b>30-34</b>	Very good. The content is well thought out and based on intelligent reading. Sequence of ideas is logically presented and supported by ample evidence from different media well-documented in the portfolio. Some signs of original thinking.	
<b>25-29</b>	Good. The content is interesting and relevant. The ideas are clearly ordered and convincingly presented despite some minor omissions. Evidence, on the whole, is well-chosen and properly used. The portfolio contains appropriate source material from different media with some interesting analysis.	
<b>20-24</b>	Satisfactory. The subject has been clearly understood. The content is satisfactory despite a few omissions. The ideas are generally coherent and supported by some use of evidence. The portfolio contains some relevant information with limited analysis.	
<b>15-19</b>	Barely adequate. The subject has been understood but some serious omissions in the content with little use of evidence. An attempt has been made to present contents coherently despite some lapses or divergences. The portfolio contains minimum information and little analysis of the material.	
<b>10-14</b>	Poor. There is much irrelevant material and/or serious omissions in content. Little coherence in sequence of ideas. Little or no use of evidence. The portfolio contains little relevant information and very superficial analysis of the material, if any.	
<b>0-9</b>	Very poor. The work is very thin with no coherence. Little or no use of evidence, e.g. statistics, original sources. Subject may have been misunderstood. The portfolio has hardly any relevant information and no analysis.	

<b>PLANNING, ORGANISATION AND ORAL PRESENTATION (20)</b>		<b>MARKS</b>
<b>16-20</b>	Outstanding. The work is well-planned with well-defined objectives. There is clear evidence of reflection. The portfolio is clearly and logically set out. The report is exceptionally well-ordered, each part being related to the other parts in an exemplary manner. Presentation of both portfolio and report is excellent. The oral presentation is very well-delivered with a very clear focus on the salient points in the report. Full and correct referencing throughout.	
<b>14-15</b>	Very good. The work is well-planned with clear objectives. There is evidence of reflection. The report is well-ordered, each part being clearly related to the other parts. Presentation is generally very good. The oral presentation is well-delivered with a clear focus on salient points in the report. Correct referencing throughout.	
<b>12-13</b>	Good. The work has been adequately planned with clear objectives. There is some evidence of reflection. The report has been logically structured and attention has been paid to most aspects. Presentation is generally of a good standard. The oral presentation is delivered well for the most part and focuses on the majority of the salient points in the report. A good standard of referencing with only very minor errors.	
<b>10-11</b>	Satisfactory. Some evidence of planning and reflection but objectives not always clearly defined. The report has been fairly logically structured, but certain aspects have been developed disproportionately to others. Minor deficiencies in presentation. The oral presentation is delivered with sufficient clarity and covers most of the salient points in the report. References need to be checked more carefully as there are a number of errors.	
<b>8-9</b>	Barely adequate. Some evidence of planning but the objectives lack clarity. Very limited reflection if any. An attempt to structure the report but the central argument is difficult to follow. Some deficiencies in presentation. The oral presentation generally reflects the report but lacks clarity. Inadequate academic referencing.	
<b>4-7</b>	Poor. Little evidence of planning. No reflection. The report lacks structure and coherence. Poor presentation. The oral presentation is unclear. Very inadequate referencing.	
<b>0-3</b>	Very poor. A slapdash collection of disorganised elements both in the portfolio and the report. No evidence of planning or reflection. Very poor presentation. The oral presentation lacks coherence and clarity. No or very little academic referencing.	

<b>ACCURACY OF LANGUAGE (20)</b>		<b>MARKS</b>
<b>16-20</b>	Outstanding. Virtually error free.	
<b>14-15</b>	Very good. Grammatical structures are understood and are used accurately. There is a minimum of errors and those are of a very minor nature.	
<b>12-13</b>	Good. Basic grammar is sound. Tenses and agreement are reliable and errors occur only in the most difficult areas.	
<b>10-11</b>	Satisfactory. The grammatical structures are known but success in applying them is inconsistent, especially in less common structures.	
<b>8-9</b>	Barely adequate. Many sentences contain errors but comprehension is not impeded.	
<b>4-7</b>	Poor. Most sentences contain a serious error due to gaps in basic grammar.	
<b>0-3</b>	Very poor. Errors are elementary and so numerous that they impede comprehension.	

<b>USE OF LANGUAGE (20)</b>		<b>MARKS</b>
<b>16-20</b>	Outstanding. Highly appropriate use of vocabulary, grammatical structures, idiomatic expression and register. The level of language competence approaches that of an educated native speaker. Excellent pronunciation and intonation.	
<b>14-15</b>	Very good. Confident command of language demonstrated in varied use of vocabulary and grammatical structures. An appropriate use of idiomatic expression and register. Very good pronunciation and intonation.	
<b>12-13</b>	Good. A good range of vocabulary and an ability to handle complex sentences, despite one or two minor lapses. Good pronunciation and intonation.	
<b>10-11</b>	Satisfactory. There is a satisfactory range of expression with only occasional ambiguities. The errors in pronunciation and/or intonation do not impede communication.	
<b>8-9</b>	Barely adequate. Text can be easily understood but there is a limited range of expressions and some ambiguities. Some difficulty in following the oral presentation due to pronunciation and intonation errors.	
<b>4-7</b>	Poor. Text difficult to understand due to poor use of vocabulary and grammatical structure. Oral communication is impeded through grammatical and pronunciation errors.	
<b>0-3</b>	Very poor. Text almost impossible to understand due to extremely poor command of both vocabulary and grammar. Virtually no oral communication of the content of the report due to grammatical and pronunciation errors.	