

SMLC Marking criteria for speaking - B1/B2 CEFR

| Class | Scale | Mark | <u>Language:</u> - accuracy, range and sophistication | <u>Communication and interaction:</u> - scope, clarity and coherence of ideas presented - comprehension and response | <u>Delivery:</u> - pronunciation & intonation - flow, pace, spontaneity - may include some or all of the following: body language, audibility... |
|--------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| First | Excellent 1 st | 100 94 | An exceptional performance Exceptional command of the language An exceptional performance in terms of grammatical and lexical accuracy. An exceptional range of pertinent vocabulary and idiomatic expressions. | An exceptional performance Exceptional fulfilment of all aspects of the task(s). An exceptional ability to argue, present and develop ideas with clarity. Register entirely appropriate to the context and task. An exceptional ability to understand and respond to detailed questions, and/or to react to a different point of view. | Exceptionally confident delivery Exceptional ability to engage the interlocutor. The candidate expresses themselves effortlessly and effectively. Virtually no errors of pronunciation. Exceptionally accurate intonation. |
| | High 1 st High Mid 1 st | 88 82 | An outstanding performance Outstanding command of the language. An outstanding performance in terms of grammatical and lexical accuracy. An outstanding range of pertinent vocabulary. | An outstanding performance Outstanding fulfilment of all aspects of the task(s). An outstanding ability to argue, present and develop ideas with clarity. Register entirely appropriate to the context and task. An outstanding ability to understand and respond to detailed questions, and to react to a different point of view. | Outstanding delivery Outstanding ability to engage the interlocutor. The candidate expresses themselves spontaneously and effectively. Virtually no errors of pronunciation. Highly convincing intonation. |
| | Low Mid 1 st Low 1 st | 78 74 | An excellent performance Excellent command of the language. Excellent performance in terms of grammatical and lexical accuracy although there may be occasional minor | An excellent performance Excellent fulfilment of all aspects of the task(s). An excellent ability to argue, present and develop ideas with clarity. | Excellent delivery Excellent ability to engage the interlocutor. The candidate expresses themselves very confidently and |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|----|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>grammatical and/or lexical slips. Excellent range of pertinent vocabulary.</p> | <p>Register entirely appropriate to the context and task. An excellent ability to understand and respond to detailed questions, and to react to a different point of view.</p> | <p>effectively. Excellent pronunciation and intonation displayed overall though there may be occasional minor errors.</p> |
| Upper Second | High 2:1 | 68 | <p>A very good performance Very good command of the language. Very good performance in terms of grammatical and lexical accuracy. Very good range of pertinent vocabulary. There are occasional: - minor grammatical and/or lexical slips - interferences from other language(s) (syntax & vocabulary)</p> | <p>A very good performance Very good fulfilment of all aspects of the task(s). A very good ability to argue, present and develop ideas with clarity. Register fully appropriate to the context and task. A very good ability to understand and respond to detailed questions, and to react to a different point of view.</p> | <p>Very good delivery Very good ability to engage the interlocutor. The candidate expresses themselves confidently and effectively. Generally fluent, but may need time for rephrasing to adjust to sudden or complex changes of tone or topic. Very good pronunciation and intonation displayed overall, though there are occasional minor errors.</p> |
| | Mid 2:1 | 65 | <p>A good performance Good command of the language. Good performance in terms of grammatical and lexical accuracy. Good range of pertinent vocabulary. There are some: - minor grammatical and/or lexical slips - interferences from other language(s) (syntax & vocabulary) There may be isolated major grammatical and/or lexical errors.</p> | <p>A good performance Good fulfilment of the task(s). Good ability to argue, present and develop ideas with clarity. Register appropriate to the context and task. Good ability to understand and respond to questions, but may occasionally need to ask the interlocutor to clarify their point of view.</p> | <p>Good delivery Good ability to engage the interlocutor. The candidate generally expresses themselves confidently and effectively but may be hesitant in places. Good pronunciation and intonation displayed overall but there are some minor errors.</p> |
| | Low 2:1 | 62 | <p>A mostly good performance Mostly good command of the language. Mostly good performance in terms of grammatical and lexical accuracy. Mostly good range of pertinent vocabulary. Several minor grammatical and/or lexical</p> | <p>A mostly good performance Mostly good fulfilment of the task(s). Mostly good ability to present and develop ideas with clarity, but these may be lacking in scope and/or depth, or are insufficiently developed. Register mostly appropriate to the</p> | <p>Mostly good delivery Mostly good ability to engage the interlocutor. The candidate generally expresses themselves confidently and effectively but is hesitant in places.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|----|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>errors are present. Some major grammatical and/or lexical errors may be present, especially when dealing with more complex structures. Interferences from other language(s) (syntax & vocabulary) may be more frequent.</p> | <p>context and task. Mostly good ability to understand and respond to a range of questions but the candidate may need to ask for clarification.</p> | <p>Mostly good pronunciation and intonation displayed overall but errors may be more frequent.</p> |
| Lower Second | High 2:2 | 58 | <p>A reasonable performance Reasonable command of the language. May rely on basic structures. Reasonable performance in terms of grammatical and lexical accuracy. Reasonable, if somewhat limited, range of pertinent vocabulary and idiomatic expressions. Several minor and major grammatical and/or lexical errors. Interferences from other language(s) (syntax & vocabulary) are more frequent.</p> | <p>A reasonable performance Task(s) fulfilled but pedestrian approach. Reasonable ability to present and develop ideas. Ideas are lacking in scope and/or depth. Register not always appropriate to the context and task. The candidate does not sufficiently develop their response. The discussion may falter in places. Occasional difficulty in understanding and responding to questions. The candidate aptly answers simple questions but starts to struggle with more detailed/complex questions. The candidate may need to ask for clarification and/or repetition.</p> | <p>Reasonable delivery Reasonable ability to engage the interlocutor (some of the following may apply: over-reliance on notes; pre-prepared verbatim delivery) The candidate expresses themselves reasonably well, but is hesitant in places. Frequent errors in pronunciation and intonation but these do not place undue strain on the interlocutor.</p> |
| | Mid 2:2 | 55 | <p>An inconsistent performance Inconsistent command of the language. Tends to rely on basic structures. Uneven performance in terms of grammatical and lexical accuracy. Syntax may be deficient in places. Limited range of pertinent vocabulary and idiomatic expressions. Frequent minor and regular major grammatical and/or lexical errors. Interferences from other language(s)</p> | <p>An inconsistent performance Task(s) partially fulfilled but pedestrian and somewhat unconvincing approach. The candidate tends to struggle in presenting and developing ideas in a coherent way. Ideas are generally underdeveloped. Register not always appropriate to the context and task. In places, the candidate clearly has difficulty in understanding questions,</p> | <p>Inconsistent delivery Engagement with the interlocutor is inconsistent (some of the following are likely to apply: over-reliance on notes; pre-prepared verbatim delivery) The candidate struggles to maintain the flow of discussion and communication is halted with hesitations. Frequent errors in pronunciation</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--------------|----------|----|--|---|--|
| | | | (syntax & vocabulary) are more frequent. | even when they have been rephrased/simplified. As a result, they may be unable to respond. | and intonation which may occasionally result in the interlocutor struggling to understand the candidate's arguments/answers. |
| | Low 2:2 | 52 | <p>An insecure performance Insecure command of the language. Tends to rely on basic structures. Poor in terms of grammatical and lexical accuracy. Syntax may be deficient. Very limited range of pertinent vocabulary and idiomatic expressions. Persistent minor and regular major grammatical and/or lexical errors. Interferences from other language(s) (syntax & vocabulary) are frequent.</p> | <p>An insecure performance Fairly unconvincing approach to the task(s). The candidate tends to struggle in presenting and developing ideas in a coherent way. Ideas are generally underdeveloped and/or simplistic. Key information is missing. Understanding of the issues is often vague. Register not always appropriate to the context and task. In places, the candidate clearly has difficulty in understanding questions, even when they have been rephrased/simplified. As a result, they may be unable to respond.</p> | <p>Insecure delivery Engagement with the interlocutor is insecure (e.g. over-reliance on notes; pre-prepared verbatim delivery) The candidate struggles to maintain the flow of speech and frequently hesitates. Frequent errors in pronunciation and intonation which may result in the interlocutor struggling to understand the candidate's arguments/answers.</p> |
| Third | High 3rd | 48 | <p>A poor performance Poor command of the language. Syntax may be awkward. Poor in terms of grammatical and lexical accuracy. Limited range of vocabulary. Mother tongue interferes with performance. Frequent minor and major grammatical and/or lexical errors. Interferences from other language(s) (syntax & vocabulary) are so frequent that they may impede comprehension.</p> | <p>A poor performance Unconvincing approach to the task(s). The candidates struggles to present and develop ideas in a coherent way. Ideas are underdeveloped and rather simplistic and/or irrelevant. Poor understanding of the issues. Register often inappropriate to the context and task. The candidate has persistent difficulty in understanding questions, even when they have been rephrased/simplified. As a result, they may be unable to respond.</p> | <p>Very insecure delivery Engagement with the interlocutor is insecure (e.g. over-reliance on notes; pre-prepared verbatim delivery) The candidate struggles to maintain the flow of discussion and communication is laborious. Frequent errors in pronunciation and intonation which may impede comprehension in places.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------|----|--|---|---|
| Mid 3rd | 45 | <p>A very poor performance Very poor command of the language. Syntax is rather awkward and affects comprehension. Very poor in terms of grammatical and lexical accuracy. Very limited range of vocabulary. Mother tongue regularly interferes with performance. Persistent minor and major grammatical and/or lexical errors, which may result in incoherent syntax and may obscure meaning.</p> | <p>A very poor performance Very unconvincing approach to the task(s). The candidate is more often than not unable to present and develop ideas in a coherent way. Ideas are not developed and are simplistic and irrelevant. Poor understanding of the issues. Register often inappropriate to the context and task. The candidate has persistent difficulty in understanding questions, even when they have been rephrased/simplified. As a result, they may be unable to respond.</p> | <p>Very poor delivery Engagement with the interlocutor is very poor (e.g. over-reliance on notes; pre-prepared verbatim delivery) The candidate really struggles to maintain the flow of discussion and communication is particularly laborious. Persistent errors in pronunciation and intonation which occasionally impede comprehension.</p> |
| Low 3rd | 42 | <p>An extremely poor performance Extremely poor command of the language. Syntax is awkward and affects comprehension. Extremely poor in terms of grammatical and lexical accuracy. Severely limited range of vocabulary. Mother tongue interferes with performance. Persistent minor and major grammatical and/or lexical errors, which result in incoherent syntax and often obscure meaning.</p> | <p>An extremely poor performance Task(s) largely unfulfilled and unconvincing. The candidate displays a clear inability to present and develop ideas in a coherent way. Ideas are not developed, are simplistic and often irrelevant. Register often inappropriate to the context and task. The candidate generally fails to understand questions, even when they have been rephrased/simplified. As a result, they may be unable to respond.</p> | <p>Extremely poor delivery Engagement with the interlocutor is extremely poor (e.g. over-reliance on notes; pre-prepared verbatim delivery) The candidate is unable to maintain the flow of discussion and communication is pared down to simple laborious utterances. Persistent errors in pronunciation and intonation which impede comprehension.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-------------|----------------------------|----|--|--|---|
| Fail | High Fail (sub honours) | 38 | <p>An unsatisfactory performance Unsatisfactory command of the language. Unsatisfactory command of syntax. Unsatisfactory in terms of grammatical and lexical accuracy. Severely limited range of vocabulary, which obscures meaning and prevents communication. Mother tongue systematically interferes with performance. Preponderance of minor and major grammatical and/or lexical errors, which result in incoherent syntax and obscure meaning.</p> | <p>An unsatisfactory performance Task(s) unfulfilled and unconvincing. The candidate is barely able to present simple ideas. A lot of irrelevant material. The candidate tends to repeat the same ideas. Register inappropriate to the context and task. The candidate fails to understand questions, even when they have been rephrased/simplified. As a result, they are unable to respond.</p> | <p>Unsatisfactory delivery Engagement with the interlocutor is unsatisfactory (e.g. the candidate is unable to detach themselves from their notes, pre-prepared verbatim delivery) The candidate is unable to take part in the discussion and communication is pared down to simple laborious/irrelevant utterances. Endemic errors in pronunciation and intonation which impede comprehension.</p> |
| | Mid Fail | 32 | <p>A very unsatisfactory performance A very unsatisfactory command of the language. A very unsatisfactory command of syntax. Very unsatisfactory in terms of grammatical and lexical accuracy. Extremely limited range of vocabulary, which obscures meaning and prevents communication. Mother tongue systematically interferes with performance. Preponderance of minor and major grammatical and/or lexical errors, which result in incoherent syntax and obscure meaning.</p> | <p>A very unsatisfactory performance Task(s) unfulfilled. The candidate is barely able to present simple ideas and completely fails to analyse and develop them. Mostly irrelevant material. The candidate tends to repeat the same ideas. Register inappropriate to the context and task. The candidate fails to understand questions, even when they have been rephrased/simplified. As a result, they are unable to respond.</p> | <p>A very unsatisfactory delivery. Engagement with the interlocutor is very unsatisfactory. The candidate is unable to take part in the discussion and performance is pared down to simple laborious/irrelevant utterances or breaks down completely. Frequent errors in pronunciation and intonation which make comprehension almost impossible.</p> |
| | | 25 | <p>A wholly inadequate performance Little evidence of grammatical / lexical competence. Comprehension is near impossible. Or not enough language to assess.</p> | <p>A wholly inadequate performance Wholly inadequate grasp of the subject matter. Few signs of coherence and logic. Work that falls well below the</p> | <p>Wholly inadequate delivery The delivery is so halted or unintelligible that the examiner consistently fails to understand what the candidate tries to say.</p> |
| | Low fail | 12 | | | |

| | | | | | |
|------|------|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | standards required at this level, and a total inability to convey ideas. | |
| Zero | Zero | 0 | | Work of no merit OR Absent OR Work not submitted OR Penalty in some misconduct cases | |