

## Commentary for Oracy exemplars Winter 2019

The following commentary is to be used in conjunction with the exemplar recordings available to view on the secure website. They cover a range of achievement across the Criteria Bands.

### Individual Researched Presentations

#### Joshua

Joshua chose the topic of the use of technology in sport for his presentation. This was quite a technical subject but he had a clear structure, covering the use of GPS tracking, prosthetic limb use and orthotics. In each case he gave accessible information and also clarified with his own opinions. His notes were very brief prompts which were acknowledged on the customised criteria sheet with a note that he did not look at them.

Joshua used a wide and ambitious range of vocabulary while ensuring he also engaged with his audience. After a presentation lasting a little over four minutes he answered several questions with confidence, in particular, explaining the advantage of the use of orthotics to relieve his own problems with plantar fasciitis.

Overall, he developed his ideas well, had a clear structure to his talk and was confident in his use of grammatical devices and range of sentence structure.

#### Assessment

##### *Content and organisation*

Joshua struck a clear balance between information and opinion and had a strong engagement with his audience. He was perhaps a little hesitant at times, but nevertheless achieved the criteria for Band 5 with a mark of **18**.

##### *Register, grammatical accuracy and range of sentence structures*

Joshua's use of varied and ambitious vocabulary was completely appropriate and was clearly understood by his audience. There was a good range of varied sentences and Joshua was aptly placed at the top of Band 5 with a mark of **20**.

Joshua's overall mark for this task was **38**.

#### Edan – De-extinction

Edan's presentation has been edited to show the beginning and the end. The original presentation was rather long at over nine minutes, but was clearly a result of Edan's particular interest and knowledge of the topic. He began by highlighting the growing concerns over animals which had become extinct or were at risk and endangered. It is of particular note that he clearly had no notes and had learned his presentation, but this did not have a negative impact on his engagement with the audience. In the middle section he highlighted the lost species – many as a result of man hunting them to extinction. He went on to explore the possibility of de-extinction, where DNA from an extinct creature could be used to produce a clone of the original.

He mentioned possible objections and introduced humour in the use of analogy with the 'Jurassic Park' films. In the final part of the recording, he gave a well-reasoned response to a question about the social aspects of such a project.

## **Assessment**

### *Content and organisation*

This was a very well-organised presentation, using PowerPoint effectively as a support. Edan covered a wide range of material and it was telling that the teacher's comment on the record sheet was 'I learnt a lot that day'. The engagement with the audience was excellent. The mark awarded was **20**.

### *Register, grammatical accuracy and range of sentence structures*

Edan had a very secure command of all aspects of language here and used a wide range of ambitious vocabulary while also engaging well with his audience. He was awarded **20** marks here, giving a total of **40** for the task.

## **Ryan – Reading as a hobby**

Ryan gave a sustained presentation lasting around seven minutes which was followed by questions. His presentation was prepared and although he had notes he did not refer to them slavishly. It was clear he had learned his presentation as there were occasional pauses while he recollected the next word or phrase. There was a clear sense of organisation in the talk and he was keen to persuade his listeners of the benefits of reading. There was a real sense of ambition in the use of vocabulary. He summed up the main points at the end and gave extended answers to the questions posed, though there was, perhaps, a sense that these were prepared.

## **Assessment**

### *Content and organisation*

Ryan was confident in his presentation and not only gave information but also evaluated the pros and cons of reading. The talk was well structured and clearly appealed to the audience. He was placed towards the top of Band 4 with a mark of **15**.

### *Register, grammatical accuracy and range of sentence structures*

Ryan was ambitious in his use of vocabulary and also varied sentences for effect. The register was in keeping with his audience and he was placed at the top of Band 4 with a mark of **16** making his total for this task **31**.

## **Naeve – Citizenship: equality for women**

Naeve began her presentation by giving information about the Suffragette movement, citing Emmeline Parkhurst and Emily Watson as important figures in the movement who influenced women both at that time and now. She made sensible and informative use of PowerPoint to illustrate her points without it being intrusive. She went on to look at modern-day campaigns such as the HeForShe movement inspired by Emma Watson and the more recent Time's Up campaign against injustice in the workplace. She spoke without notes, though she did rather fade away at the end of her presentation. Her teacher asked some questions which she answered well, if a little colloquially.

## **Assessment**

### *Content and organisation*

Naeve tackled a fairly demanding topic and gave an orderly presentation with some confidence. She went beyond straightforward information and was placed in Band 4 with a mark of **14**.

### *Register, grammatical accuracy and range of sentence structures*

In general Naeve used appropriate register here and there was some range and ambition in the vocabulary used. She was placed in Band 4 with a mark of **14** giving a total of **28** for this task.

## **Lucy – Reading as a hobby**

Lucy chose to express her opinions on reading, claiming the benefits of it being 'riveting and relaxing'. She organised her talk, which was a little brief at around three minutes, into areas about different genres, the benefits of reading and how she became interested in reading. She was rather dependent on her notes at times, but did attempt to engage with her audience, in particular by mentioning her enjoyment of the 'Hunger Games' novels. Her teacher asked some questions which she answered fairly briefly but appropriately.

## **Assessment**

### *Content and organisation*

Lucy's strength was in her attempt to use some quite ambitious vocabulary, such as mentioning that reading offered 'escapism from this chaotic world' and an element of 'catharsis'. There was an element of evaluation here which again was a positive aspect which in part countered the brevity of the presentation. Overall, she was placed in Band 3 with a mark of **11**.

### *Register, grammatical accuracy and range of sentence structures*

The range of vocabulary used was good and there was variety of sentence structure here. Lucy showed awareness of the appropriate register. She was again placed in Band 3 with a mark of **12**, giving a total for the task of **23**.

## **Brandon – Robots and AI**

Brandon gave a fairly brief presentation of around four minutes on the subject of how robots impact our lives and the emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI). Unfortunately, he read a script and had little rapport with the audience until he answered questions in the last few minutes. He did explore a number of issues and evaluated some of the ideas, and in the questioning showed thoughtful responses.

### **Assessment**

#### *Content and organisation*

The teacher made the following comment on the record sheet: 'Mark has been restricted due to reliance on notes'. The presentation did have some organisation and evaluation but showed no real regard for 'the needs of the audience'. There was virtually no eye contact until the questions were asked. As a result, the mark was restricted to the lower end of Band 3 at **9**.

#### *Register, grammatical accuracy and range of sentence structures*

There was some range of vocabulary, and there was more awareness of the needs of the audience when answering questions, though some colloquialism did creep in here – 'like advancing human resources and stuff'. Again, the mark was pegged into Band 3 at **9**, giving a total for the task of **18**.

## **Lewis – Football**

Lewis gave straightforward information about his hobby of football, both from the perspective of a player and a spectator. Much was listing of teams and facts about the history of the game. He also spoke about his ambition to play for Swansea City. He answered questions in a straightforward way and had no notes.

### **Assessment**

#### *Content and organisation*

There was a clear attempt to structure the material but Lewis seldom went beyond conveying straightforward information. There was an attempt to structure the talk. He was placed securely in Band 2 with a mark of **7** for this part of the assessment.

#### *Register, grammatical accuracy and range of sentence structures*

The register was appropriate for the task, but there were a few slips such as 'very fun '. There was some range of vocabulary and this enabled the assessment to be placed in Band 2 with a mark of **7**, giving a total of **14** for this task.

## Responding and Interacting (Group Discussion)

All three topics were used by the candidates.

### **Joshua – Work Experience for 15 and 16 year olds. What do you think?**

Joshua worked in a group of three with two other candidates, Sam and Harry. The record sheet noted that Joshua opened the discussion, but it would have been helpful if the candidates had introduced themselves, especially as this was an audio recording.

The three candidates pursued a range of ideas and gave thoughtful and well-expressed comments on the topic. This was overall a high-level discussion which was natural – there was no sense of there being prepared ideas or statements other than the brief use of some statistical information early on. It was helpful that the candidates used each other's names from time to time.

Joshua interacted well within the group and was not only clearly listening and also providing some of his own material for the argument in favour of work experience, but he also responded to the comments of Harry and Sam. He used a range of vocabulary and introduced new ideas such as the practical benefits for some students. The discussion was sustained.

### **Assessment**

#### *Content and organisation*

Joshua clearly fulfilled the Band 5 criteria here, with a number of appropriate contributions, careful listening and appropriate responses to the other members of the group. He was awarded a mark of **19** for this aspect.

#### *Register, grammatical accuracy and range of sentence structures*

Again, Joshua achieved Band 5 marks for this aspect of the task, with a wide range of vocabulary and sensitive responses to his peers. His use of register was secure and there were varied sentences in evidence. He was awarded a mark of **19**, making his total for the task overall **38**.

### **Edan – Should exotic animals be kept as pets?**

Edan worked in a group of three and opened the discussion, using an example of people purchasing a marmoset. He took a pivotal role in this discussion, which does continue for the recommended time of ten minutes. He responded to the comments of others and also introduced new ideas. The other two in the group also responded to his comments and the whole discussion was natural and there were no notes or prompts used. Comments were sustained and extended and a number of statistics and examples were used to support the arguments given. The discussion ranged over pets and also conservation projects as opposed to keeping animals in zoos.

### **Assessment**

### *Content and organisation*

Edan used a range of evidence to support his views, showed clear listening skills and considered the views of others carefully. He developed ideas both of his own and of others. He was placed securely in Band 5 with a mark of **19**.

### *Register, grammatical accuracy and range of sentence structures*

Edan was secure in his command of grammar and selected an appropriate register for the task. His ambitious, appropriate vocabulary was confidently used. He was awarded a mark of **19** here, giving a total for the task of **38**.

### **Naeve – Work Experience for 15 and 16 year olds. What do you think?**

Naeve was joined by two other candidates, Alyssa and Catherine, who were clearly identified. Catherine had a leading role in instigating the discussion, but Naeve was fully involved, responding to Catherine's comments and offering alternatives. She made extended comments and introduced new ideas. Her response was also personal when she commented on her own experience in both positive and negative terms. She also complemented Alyssa's comments on the confidence work experience contributed.

The discussion was perhaps a little brief at around six and a half minutes and at times Naeve slipped into colloquial expression. The discussion was fairly natural though there was an element of polite exchanges and lack of real interaction at times.

### **Assessment**

#### *Content and organisation*

Naeve developed and responded to comments and opinions of others in the group. She was confident in her approach and listened carefully to others. She was placed in Band 4 with a mark of **14**

#### *Register, grammatical accuracy and range of sentence structures*

The register used was appropriate and Naeve generally used a secure command of grammar. There was a variety of sentence structures used and she was awarded a Band 4 mark of **14** here, giving a total for the task of **28**.

### **Lucy – Litter – how big a problem is it?**

Lucy was part of a group of four – two boys and two girls – in this discussion. The two boys tended to dominate, but Lucy did make a significant number of contributions during this rather lengthy discussion lasting around thirteen minutes. She was the first to respond giving a few statistics about the prevalence of litter and developed the idea about how lower economic countries were not as educated about how to dispose of litter properly. She spoke about how adults might stereotype teenagers and also questioned about the littering of plastic bottles and the impact of

plastic on the oceans. She also made contributions about whether fining for dropping litter was the best option. She was clearly listening carefully.

## **Assessment**

### *Content and organisation*

Lucy made a number of significant contributions and helped to move the discussion forward on a number of occasions. She developed a number of the main ideas and listened closely and attentively. She was awarded a mark of **11** for this aspect of the assessment.

### *Register, grammatical accuracy and range of sentence structures*

Lucy varied her responses and used an appropriate register within the group. There was a range of vocabulary used appropriately. She achieved a Band 3 mark of **12** for this part of the assessment, giving an overall mark of **23** for this task.

## **Brandon - Work Experience for 15 and 16 year olds. What do you think?**

Brandon was part of a group of four students discussing the topic of work experience. They had no notes and the whole discussion developed in a natural way.

He opened the discussion and made a number of pertinent contributions throughout. He was thoughtful in his comments and responded to others well. He listened closely and introduced areas for discussion which developed from comments made by others, such as how businesses might take advantage of those on work experience. He summed up that he felt work experience was vital.

## **Assessment**

### *Content and organisation*

Brandon made a number of significant contributions and listened closely to the ideas other put forward. He developed main ideas in some detail. He was placed at the top of Band 3 with a mark of **12**.

### *Register, grammatical accuracy and range of sentence structures*

The overall tone of the group's discussion was fairly informal. Brandon did use some range of vocabulary and the register was appropriate for the group. There was some variety of sentencing. He was awarded a mark of **10** for this aspect, giving a total of **22** for this task.

## **Lewis - Litter – how big a problem is it?**

Lewis was part of a group of four boys in this discussion and tended to be involved least. He was clearly listening carefully and there were a number of occasions when he appeared ready to contribute but others did so before he could speak. He posed

questions to the group on two occasions and did make some response to the comments of others, concerning litter from dogs, encouraging recycling with some incentives and teenagers thinking it might be 'cool' or a 'trend' to drop litter. He might have been able to contribute more in a group of three perhaps.

## **Assessment**

### *Content and organisation*

Lewis did make some significant contributions but they were quite brief and straightforward on the whole. He did listen attentively. His relatively few contributions did impact on his mark, which was **6**.

### *Register, grammatical accuracy and range of sentence structures*

Lewis used some range of vocabulary but struggled to structure sentences at times and tended towards some colloquial expression. He was awarded a mark of **6** for this aspect, giving a total of **12** for this task.

## **Overall assessments for candidates**

The six candidates who completed both tasks have the following total marks out of 80 for this Unit.

**Joshua – 38 + 38 = 76**

**Edan – 40 + 38 = 78**

**Naeve – 28 + 28 = 56**

**Lucy – 23 + 23 = 46**

**Brandon – 18 + 22 = 40**

**Lewis – 14 + 12 = 26**