IQM3001

LEVEL 3 · CONTROLLED ASSESSMENT

English for Academic Purposes

Assessment 2: Speaking Assessment SPA

Candidate brief

Duration
30 minutes per group of four

Total marks
50

Assessment window
Sample 2026

Assessment set
Set S of 2026

Audience
Candidate

Release timing
exam release

What you will do

- Prepare from the common academic source material supplied with this brief.
- Present your assigned aspect to the group for 2-3 minutes. Do not use presentation notes, a script or slides during the performance.
- Take part in the moderated seminar discussion, responding to other students and the examiner.
- The complete assessment lasts 30 minutes: a 2-minute introduction, four 2–3-minute presentations (12 minutes total), and a 16-minute moderated seminar.

Items to submit

- No separate written submission is required; the live presentation and seminar are the assessed evidence.

Assessment topic

Topic: Designing fair and useful feedback in a multilingual university learning community.

Common source material

Use the common source below, “The Learning Commons feedback pilot”. It is an original instructional scenario created for this sample. Treat its stated facts as the complete common evidence for the task.

Common academic source material · The Learning Commons feedback pilot

Scenario and evidence (original instructional material)

Northbridge University is planning a six-week pilot in its Learning Commons. The pilot will offer audio or written comments on draft assignments, a short learner self-check, and one scheduled opportunity to ask a follow-up question. The design team has four aims: make feedback understandable, help learners decide what to do next, support different communication preferences, and make staff workload manageable.

The design team has identified four aspects for discussion: access and inclusion; feedback timing and workload; learner agency and dialogue; and quality assurance and improvement. These aspects are deliberately connected: a change that helps one aim may create a pressure for another. Candidates should explain the implications of their assigned aspect and suggest a practical safeguard.

Evidence available to every candidate: the pilot lasts six weeks; each learner receives one feedback response on a draft; the response may be audio or written; the learner completes a self-check before the response; and one follow-up question may be asked at a scheduled opportunity. No other facts, survey results or research findings are supplied. Do not invent them.

Three design options are on the table: Option 1 offers written comments with a fixed response window; Option 2 lets the learner choose audio or written comments but requires staff to prepare

both formats; Option 3 uses a common written template, then reserves the scheduled follow-up for questions that remain unclear. These are proposals for this scenario, not tested findings. Compare their likely benefits, limits and safeguards using only the supplied evidence.

Perspective 1 · access and inclusion: A learner may understand a written comment better because it can be reread, while another learner may find a short audio explanation easier to follow. The pilot therefore treats format choice as a design question rather than assuming one format suits everyone. A fair proposal should explain how a learner is told what choices exist, how the self-check informs the response, and how the team would avoid making a learner justify a communication preference.

Perspective 2 · timing and workload: A fixed response window makes expectations visible, but it may create pressure when many drafts arrive together. Preparing two formats may increase choice but also increase staff time. A common template may make responses more consistent, but it could leave an individual question unanswered unless the follow-up opportunity is used well. A strong presentation should identify the trade-off and propose a manageable safeguard, such as a clear response window, a limit on the scope of the pilot, or a way to route unresolved questions.

Perspective 3 · learner agency and dialogue: The self-check asks the learner to identify what they want feedback to help with. The scheduled question gives the learner a defined chance to test their understanding. These features can support an active exchange when the response is specific enough to act on. They can also become procedural if the learner is given a form without a meaningful opportunity to explain, ask or choose. Candidates should distinguish receiving information from deciding what to do with it.

Perspective 4 · quality assurance and improvement: The team needs a way to learn from the six-week pilot without treating a single comment as proof that the design works. Candidates may propose recording whether a response was sent within the stated window, whether the learner could identify a next step, whether the chosen format was usable, and what questions remained after the scheduled opportunity. These are suggested checks for the scenario, not results. Do not claim that any option is effective unless you explain what evidence would support that judgement.

Task expectation: use the common material to summarise your assigned perspective, explain one benefit and one limitation, and recommend one safeguard. In the seminar, connect your proposal to at least one other perspective, ask a relevant follow-up question, and respond to a peer using the supplied evidence. You may make a reasoned proposal, but label it as a proposal rather than a finding.

Source and licence: Original scenario and evidence written for IQM3001 A3 Set S of 2026 with Codex assisted authoring, 12 September 2026. Licence: IQ internal controlled assessment material; reproduce only within this assessment pack. No external authors or research claims are used.

Candidate section allocations

Group of four (sample design for this set). Allocate one aspect to each candidate: A access and

inclusion; B feedback timing and workload; C learner agency and dialogue; D quality assurance and improvement. Each aspect must be presented for 2–3 minutes.

Seminar discussion prompts

After all presentations, discuss: Which proposal best balances fairness and usefulness? What evidence would you collect in a first pilot? How should the university respond if learners experience the pilot differently? Ask at least one follow-up question and respond to at least one peer point.

Permitted AI use · Level 2 planning

- AI may support brainstorming, outlining, planning and orientation to sources you have identified.
- Your spoken contribution, analysis and conclusions must be your own. Slides are not used in this sample performance.
- You remain responsible for checking sources and correctly acknowledging any AI use.