LISTENING & SPEAKING TEST EVALUATION CRITERIA (JULY 2024)

	RUBRICS	ABYSMAL	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT
Group Evaluation	**Speaking Time**	**0 Points** If a group of 3: Less than 5 minutes If a group of 4: Less than 7 minutes If a group of 5: Less than 9 minutes	**3 Points** If a group of 3: Between 5-6 minutes If a group of 4: Between 7-8 minutes If a group of 5: Between 9-10 minutes	**6 points** If a group of 3: 6 minutes or a little more If a group of 4: 8 minutes or a little more If a group of 5: 10 minutes or a little more	**8 Points** If a group of 3: Around 7-8 minutes If a group of 4: Around 9-11 minutes If a group of 5: Around 11-14 minutes	**10 Points** If a group of 3: Almost 9 minutes If a group of 4: Almost 12 minutes If a group of 5: Almost 15 minutes
	Opener	**0 Points** No Opener whatsoever was attempted. The group started the conversation by going straightly into the topic.	**3 Points** An Opener was attempted, but it wasn't connected with the topic. It was basically a greeting that went directly into the topic, so the conversation felt like it had an unnatural start.	**6 points** Opener was used but in a clumsy manner. It was basically one single person greeting everyone and introducing the topic through a monologue. It didn't seem like the topic emerged a naturally from the interactions of all members.	**8 Points** Opener was used and it was connected to the topic. The topic did somewhat emerge from most of the member's interactions (not only from one person), but it could have used more linkers for it to lead naturally to the conversation topic.	**10 Points** The Opener was perfectly integrated into the conversation, it emerged naturally from the interactions of all members.
	Preparation & Knowledge *(knowledge about the topic, speaking time balance, preparation prior to the test)*	**0 points** The group doesn't seem to have properly prepared for the test at all. Signs of this include, (but are not limited to): they spoke a lot less than the minimum time, insufficient knowledge of the theme (barely talked about the randomly selected topic or talked about but gave no meaningful opinions about it at all), spoke about a completely different topic, attempted to follow a scripted conversation and it didn't go well, etc. <u>Individual evaluation:</u> This student barely spoke and/or his/her answers lacked any sort of depth and reflection about the topic.	**9 Points** The group seemed to be poorly prepared (perhaps used scripts) and had only superficial understanding and knowledge about the topic. They didn't speak deeply about the videos, readings, homework they did in class, and gave only superficial opinions about it. <u>Individual evaluation:</u> It was visibly imbalanced (this student spoke visible less than the others and his/her answers somewhat lacked depth and reflection about the topic.	**18 Points** The group seemed fairly well prepared and had fair understanding and knowledge about the topic. They spoke about some (but not all) of the videos, readings, homework done in this class, and gave opinions on some of them. <u>Individual evaluation:</u> There was some imbalances (this student spoke a little bit less than others)	**24 Points** The group seemed well prepared and had good understanding and knowledge about the topic. They spoke about and gave opinions of all the videos, readings and homework. It was a generally well-balanced conversation (this student spoke for about the same time as all others).	**30 Points** The group excelled in its preparation and knowledge of the topic. They showed a deep understanding of the topic (deep, well thought opinions about the topics), touched upon absolutely all videos, readings and homework of this class. Equally excellent preparation by speaking for the maximum allotted time. Very well-balanced conversation, where everyone spoke for about the same time.
	Closer	**0 Points** No Closer whatsoever was attempted. The group ended the conversation abruptly.	**3 Points** A Closer was attempted, but it wasn't connected with the topic. It was basically just some sudden parting words spoken at the end, so the conversation felt like it had an unnatural ending.	**6 points** Closer was used but in a clumsy manner. It was basically one single person doing the closer, by giving the reason of why the conversation should end without expecting a reaction from the members. Then the same person said the parting words.	**8 Points** Closer was used and it was connected to the topic. The closer did somewhat emerge from the entire group (not a single person) but it was still too sudden and/or it could have used more linkers for it to lead naturally to the ending of the conversation.	**10 Points** The Closer was perfectly integrated into the conversation, it emerged naturally from interactions from all members and it lead to a smooth ending of the conversation.
Individual Evaluation	**Conversation Management Skills** *(A++Q System, Hesitators, Logic flow of ideas & how deeply the student has reflected about the topic)*	**0 Points** The student barely spoke or spoke only with one-line answers, so he/she doesn't seem willing to use the A++Q system at all. Many long silences without the use of hesitators.	**9 Points** The student might have used some of A++Q system a few times but mostly spoke with one or two line answers. Several long silences in the conversation, sometimes used hesitators but still the silences cut the flow of the students' speech. Answers somewhat lacked depth and deep reflection about the topic.	**18 Points** The student mostly spoke using the A++Q System but was somewhat disarticulated, questions and answers did not always lead into each other. Answers showed some depth and reflection about the topic, but it could have used more. There were some silences but in this case hesitators were used effectively.	**24 Points** The student spoke mostly using a well-articulated A++Q System, on which there was a fair amount of logic flow between questions and answers (answers properly and naturally lead to the next). Answers showed an adequate amount of depth and reflection about the topic. Barely any need for using hesitators because there were very few silences.	**30 Points** The had a conversation using a perfectly articulated A++Q System. There was a very natural and smooth logic flow between questions and answers. Answers showed a great deal of depth and reflection about the topic. No need of using hesitations because the student always proactively knew what to say.
	Eye Contact	**0 Points** The student made almost no eye contact at all.	**3 Points** The student made very little eye contact.	**6 points** The student made eye contact intermittently.	**8 Points** The student mostly made eye contact, but not always	**10 Points** The student made constant eye contact.