Internal assessment criteria—HL

Overview

Individual oral commentary and discussion

There are six assessment criteria at HL.

Criterion A	Knowledge and understanding of the poem	5 marks
Criterion B	Appreciation of the writer's choices	5 marks
Criterion C	Organization and presentation of the commentary	5 marks
Criterion D	Knowledge and understanding of the work used in the discussion	5 marks
Criterion E	Response to the discussion questions	5 marks
Criterion F	Language	5 marks
	Total	**30 marks**

Individual oral presentation

There are three assessment criteria at HL.

Criterion A	Knowledge and understanding of the work(s)	10 marks
Criterion B	Presentation	10 marks
Criterion C	Language	10 marks
	Total	**30 marks**

The following descriptors are for examiner use and for teacher and student information.

Individual oral commentary and discussion (HL)

Criterion A: Knowledge and understanding of the poem

- How well is the student's knowledge and understanding of the poem demonstrated by their interpretation?

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1	There is limited knowledge and little or no understanding, with poor interpretation and virtually no relevant references to the poem.
2	There is superficial knowledge and some understanding, with limited interpretation occasionally supported by references to the poem.
3	There is adequate knowledge and understanding, demonstrated by interpretation supported by appropriate references to the poem.

Marks	Level descriptor
4	There is very good knowledge and understanding, demonstrated by careful interpretation supported by well-chosen references to the poem.
5	There is excellent knowledge and understanding, demonstrated by individual interpretation effectively supported by precise and well-chosen references to the poem.

Criterion B: Appreciation of the writer's choices

- To what extent does the student appreciate how the writer's choices of language, structure, technique and style shape meaning?

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1	There are few references to, and no appreciation, of the ways in which language, structure, technique and style shape meaning in the poem.
2	There is some mention, but little appreciation, of the ways in which language, structure, technique and style shape meaning in the poem.
3	There is adequate appreciation of the ways in which language, structure, technique and style shape meaning in the poem.
4	There is very good appreciation of the ways in which language, structure, technique and style shape meaning in the poem.
5	There is excellent appreciation of the ways in which language, structure, technique and style shape meaning in the poem.

Criterion C: Organization and presentation of the commentary

- To what extent does the student deliver a structured, well-focused commentary?

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1	The commentary shows little evidence of planning, with very limited structure and/or focus.
2	The commentary shows some structure and focus.
3	The commentary shows evidence of a planned structure and is generally focused.
4	The commentary is clearly structured and the focus is sustained.
5	The commentary is effectively structured, with a clear, purposeful and sustained focus.

Criterion D: Knowledge and understanding of the work used in the discussion

- How much knowledge and understanding has the student shown of the work used in the discussion?

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1	There is little knowledge or understanding of the content of the work discussed.
2	There is some knowledge and superficial understanding of the content of the work discussed.
3	There is adequate knowledge and understanding of the content and some of the implications of the work discussed.
4	There is very good knowledge and understanding of the content and most of the implications of the work discussed.
5	There is excellent knowledge and understanding of the content and the implications of the work discussed.

Criterion E: Response to the discussion questions

- How effectively does the student respond to the discussion questions?

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1	There is limited ability to respond meaningfully to the discussion questions.
2	Responses to the discussion questions are sometimes relevant.
3	Responses to the discussion questions are relevant and show some evidence of independent thought.
4	Well-informed responses to the discussion questions show a good degree of independent thought.
5	There are persuasive and independent responses to the discussion questions.

Criterion F: Language

- How clear, varied and accurate is the language?
- How appropriate is the choice of register and style? ("Register" refers, in this context, to the student's use of elements such as vocabulary, tone, sentence structure and terminology appropriate to the commentary.)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1	The language is rarely clear and appropriate, with many errors in grammar and sentence construction and little sense of register and style.
2	The language is sometimes clear and appropriate; grammar and sentence construction are generally accurate, although errors and inconsistencies are apparent; register and style are to some extent appropriate.

3	The language is mostly clear and appropriate, with an adequate degree of accuracy in grammar and sentence construction; the register and style are mostly appropriate.
4	The language is clear and appropriate, with a good degree of accuracy in grammar and sentence construction; register and style are effective and appropriate.
5	The language is very clear and entirely appropriate, with a high degree of accuracy in grammar and sentence construction; the register and style are consistently effective and appropriate.

Individual oral presentation (HL)

Criterion A: Knowledge and understanding of the work(s)

- How much knowledge and understanding does the student show of the work(s) used in the presentation?

0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	There is little knowledge or understanding of the content of the work(s) presented.
3–4	There is some knowledge and superficial understanding of the content of the work(s) presented.
5–6	There is adequate knowledge and understanding of the content and some of the implications of the work(s) presented.
7–8	There is very good knowledge and understanding of the content and most of the implications of the work(s) presented.
9–10	There is excellent knowledge and understanding of the content and the implications of the work(s) presented.

Criterion B: Presentation

- How much attention has been given to making the delivery effective and appropriate to the presentation?
- To what extent are strategies used to interest the audience (for example, audibility, eye contact, gesture, effective use of supporting material)?

0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	Delivery of the presentation is seldom appropriate, with little attempt to interest the audience.
3–4	Delivery of the presentation is sometimes appropriate, with some attempt to interest the audience.
5–6	Delivery of the presentation is appropriate, with a clear intention to interest the audience.