

L3-2020

L3-2020

	Student showed mastery of this competency 2	Student showed clear evidence of this competency 1.5	Student showed some evidence of this competency 1	Student showed little evidence of this competency 0.5	Student was absent/ Competency not assessed 0
Pronunciation Phonology and intonation 10%	Native/Near-native phonology and intonation.	Good phonology and intonation, free from mother language interference. Few errors.	Phonology and intonation influenced by mother language, but understandable.	Mother tongue phonology and intonation. Numerous errors.	Very difficult to understand.
Technical Vocabulary 10%	Excellent use of technical vocabulary.	Good use of technical vocabulary.	Correct use of some technical vocabulary.	Basic words or incorrect pronunciation/use of technical vocabulary.	No use of technical vocabulary.
Grammar/Syntax 10%	Excellent control of language features. Uses a wide range of well-chosen vocabulary, and accurate and varied grammatical structures.	Good language control. Good range of relatively well-chosen vocabulary. Minor problems in usage do not distort meaning or inhibit communication.	Adequate language control. Vocabulary range is a bit lacking or some grammatical errors that do not obscure meaning. Little variety in structures.	Weak language control. Vocabulary used does not always match the task.	Numerous errors and incorrect use of simple structures.
Voice Fluidity, tone, speed 10%	Smooth and fluid presentation, with a lively pace in a perfect tone.	Speech is relatively smooth, correct rhythm and tone.	Some hesitation made the presentation longer than needed. Pausing may cause confusion	Too many breaks and errr...errr, except for short memorized phrases.	Monotonous presentation in a low voice or with too many hesitations.
Pedagogy How was the message conveyed? 10%	Very entertaining and clear message. The audience enjoyed the talk and learnt something new.	The message was well explained and fairly clear.	The message was more or less clear, but the speech needs some improving.	The explanation was not very clear because the candidate did not seem to master the topic.	The message was not clear at all, and the explanation was difficult to follow.
Freedom from notes Independence from written support 10%	Fluid speech. Hand-free presentation with no use of notes.	Notes were used as a guide but not read.	Some text fragments were read from notes/text.	Mostly reading from notes/text, which affected body language and interaction with colleagues, audience and visual support	The candidate read everything from notes/text. This led to awkward body language and no eye contact.
Body language Extralinguistic abilities 10%	Active, engaging, good use of hands, eye contact, smile.	Comfortable, pleasant, very good to watch.	Correct, but lacking to engage with interviewer. Needs to improve on eye contact/ use of hands/ posture.	Displays minimal eye contact with audience, while reading mostly from notes. Speaks in uneven volume with little or no inflection.	Holds no eye contact with audience, as entire report is read from notes. Speaks in low volume and/or monotonous tone, which causes audience to disengage
Structure Organisation 10%	The speech followed a linear, organised plan, very easy to follow by the examiner. Excellent introduction, development of main points and conclusion	The speech followed a fairly organised plan, but sometimes the explanation went back and forth.	The speech did not follow a clear plan. The candidate went round in circles to explain the topic.	The speech was rather disorganised, which made it difficult for the examiner to follow.	The speech was a collection of disconnected sentences .
Science Scientific content 10%	Excellent technical presentation that consists of a scientific topic and solid scientific support.	Technical presentation that makes explicit use of some scientific support.	The presentation is a bit informal. Scientific literature is referenced but only superficially.	No clear connection with a scientific topic or the sources are not explicitly referenced.	The presentation lacks scientific content. It makes no reference to scientific literature.
Video Technical quality 10%	The team submitted a single video, which has been edited and shows clear transitions and interaction between members.	The team submitted a single video, with some editing but no interaction between members.	The team submitted a single video, which is a collection of individual recordings, with no editing or interaction between members.	Individual videos that make some reference to one another, but establishing a connection between them is not straightforward.	The team submitted one independent video per member, without clear connection between them.