EAP Speaking teacher exercise

Read the selected extracts, identify evidence relevant to each approved criterion, and record a provisional judgement. Compare with the separate teacher reference after independent consideration.

Fictional AI-generated material for teacher standardisation. Proposed judgements require human review.

These extracts do not show complete performances or pronunciation. Do not award a whole-task mark from an extract alone. Use the complete internal pack and its simulated observation record when rehearsing a full marking decision.

SP-X1 presentation

Option 1 has a fixed response window, and I think that is useful as well. Students want to know when comments will arrive. But if many drafts arrive together, staff may have difficulty keeping that window. We should not promise a number of days without knowing the work. The source says six weeks for the pilot; that does not mean staff have six weeks to answer every draft. I would propose a response window separately, after checking what is manageable.

Relevant criterion and evidence: _____

Provisional band and evidence still needed: _____

SP-X2 presentation

My part is quality assurance and improvement. I think the team should check the pilot at the end of six weeks. We need to know if the comments are useful. There is four aims, including understanding and workload. My suggestion is a short review using the checks in the source.

Relevant criterion and evidence: _____

Provisional band and evidence still needed: _____

SP-X3 seminar turns 14 to 16

Chloe: It could provide some evidence, but absence of a question is ambiguous. Someone might understand, or might not feel able to ask. I would keep the follow-up available for clarification and use a brief next-step check as a proposed review measure. We should be honest that this measure would add some work.

Dawit: Can I check what you mean by absence being ambiguous? If the student says nothing, you mean we cannot mark that as understood? I think I was treating no question as a good result, but it could be that the opportunity was not clear.

Chloe: Yes. We should record that no question was asked without deciding why. If the team wants to understand the reason, it needs further evidence. That is why I would explain the opportunity clearly before it happens, so students know that asking is part of the process.

Relevant criterion and evidence: _____

Provisional band and evidence still needed: _____

SP-X4 seminar turns 25 to 27

Ben: We now have two prepared formats, a checklist, a realistic window and a next-step check. Each sounds useful, but together they may be a lot. Amina, if the team cannot manage those things, would you still choose Option 2? I think there must be a point where a smaller offer is more reliable.

Amina: I would not recommend promising something the team cannot deliver. My first proposal would be to reduce the pilot's scope while preserving the aims. If that cannot make Option 2 manageable, the team should compare the limits of the other options explicitly. We do not have enough capacity evidence to decide that trade-off conclusively today.

Chloe: I agree with keeping the conclusion conditional. We can recommend a preferred design and state what needs checking before it begins. That is stronger than calling it the best option without qualifications. The pilot is intended to help the team learn, so uncertainty is part of the decision.

Relevant criterion and evidence: _____

Provisional band and evidence still needed: _____