

Summary of changes to Delta Module One examination for 2015

All changes are in italics

<p>Current paper format Paper 1 – 5 tasks Paper 2 – 4 tasks</p>	<p>2015 format Paper 1 – 5 tasks Paper 2 – 3 <i>tasks</i></p>
<p>Current marks allocation</p> <p>Paper 1 Task 1 – 6 marks Task 2 – 12 marks Task 3 – 15 marks Task 4 – 40 marks Task 5 – 27 marks</p> <p>Paper 2 Task 1 – 20 marks Task 2 – 30 marks Task 3 – 10 marks Task 4 – 40 marks</p>	<p>2015 marks allocation</p> <p>Paper 1 Task 1 – 6 marks Task 2 – 12 marks Task 3 – <i>12 marks</i> *Task 5 – <i>50 marks</i> (current Task 4) *Task 4 – <i>20 marks</i> (current Task 5)</p> <p>Paper 2 Task 1 – <i>18 marks</i> *Task 2 (current Tasks 2 & 3 combined) – <i>42 marks</i> Task 3 – 40 marks</p>
<p>Changes by task</p> <p>Paper 1 Task One</p> <p>6 marks</p>	<p>Paper 1 Task One No change to the task. 6 marks</p>
<p>Paper 1 Task Two Candidates are given <i>6 terms</i> from which they <i>define 4</i>.</p> <p>12 marks 1 mark for definition 1 mark for further point made 1 mark for each correct example</p>	<p>Paper 1 Task Two Candidates are given <i>4 terms</i> to define.</p> <p>12 marks <i>2 marks</i> for definition <i>No marks for further points</i> 1 mark for each correct example</p>
<p>Paper 1 Task Three Candidates identify <i>5 language features</i>.</p> <p>15 marks 1 mark for each language feature 2 marks for each correct example</p>	<p>Paper 1 Task Three Candidates identify <i>3 language features</i>.</p> <p>12 marks <i>2 marks</i> for each language feature 2 marks for each correct example</p>
<p>Paper 1 Task Four</p> <p>40 marks 1 mark for each correct point made</p>	<p>Paper 1 Task Five No change to the task. Task moved to the end of the paper.</p> <p>50 marks 1 mark for each correct point made</p>

Paper 1 Task Five

Candidates identify *3 strengths and 3 weaknesses*, and give *3 reasons for prioritising one of the weaknesses*.

27 marks

1 mark for each strength/weakness
 1 mark for each example
 12 marks weighted to 17
 4 additional marks for insightful comment
 1 mark for each justification
 1 additional mark for fully developed justification

Paper 1 Task Four

Candidates identify a total of *4 key strengths and weaknesses*. *No prioritisation of weaknesses required*.

20 marks

3 marks for each strength/weakness
2 marks for each example
No weighting
No additional marks
No justification marks

Paper 2 Task One**20 marks**

1 mark for each positive/negative
 1 mark for each application to the learner
 2 additional marks for testing terminology
 14 marks weighted to 20 marks

Paper 2 Task One

No change to the task.

18 marks

2 marks for each positive/negative
 1 mark for each application to the learner
No additional marks for terminology
No weighting

Paper 2 Tasks Two and Three**Task Two**

Candidates identify the purpose of activities and stages in coursebook material and comment on key assumptions about language learning.

Task Three

Candidates identify and comment on how activities support activities and stages discussed in Task Two.

Task Two 30 marks

2 marks for each purpose (up to max. 16)
 1 mark for each assumption

Up to 2 additional marks for each explanation of an assumption

Only the 6 highest scoring assumptions are marked.

Task Three 10 marks

1 mark for each way the exercise combines.

Paper 2 Task Two

Tasks Two and Three have been combined, with current Task Three forming Part b of new Task Two.

42 marks

2 marks for each purpose (max. 12 marks)
 2 marks for each way the exercise combines (max. 12 marks)

No additional marks

1 mark for each assumption

1 mark for each explanation of an assumption

1 mark for each relevant exercise referenced

Only the first 6 assumptions are marked.

Paper 2 Task Four**40 marks**

2 marks for each correct point made.

Paper 2 Task Three

No change to the task.

40 marks

2 marks for each correct point made (max. 30 marks)
A mark out of 5 is given for the depth of the overall response. This is doubled to a mark out of 10.

Depth Criteria for Paper 2 Task Three

Give a rating between 0 and 5 for the overall response. NB Ratings for depth are doubled to a maximum of 10 marks

Depth criteria: development, rationale, reference

Rating	
5	<p>A fully developed, well-balanced response to the task.</p> <p>Points are consistently supported by rationale based on relevant reference to experience; and/or examples; and/or range of contexts; and/or sources; and/or theories.</p> <p>Rationale is convincing and insightful in justifying points made.</p>
4	<p>A well-developed, well-balanced response to the task.</p> <p>Points are mostly supported by rationale based on relevant reference to experience; and/or examples; and/or range of contexts; and/or sources; and/or theories.</p> <p>Rationale is mostly convincing and insightful in justifying points made.</p>
3	<p>A generally well-developed response to the task.</p> <p>Points are generally supported by rationale based on relevant reference to experience; and/or examples; and/or range of contexts; and/or sources; and/or theories. Some points may be less well supported; a few irrelevancies may be present.</p> <p>Rationale is satisfactory in justifying points made.</p>
2	<p>A limited response to the task.</p> <p>Points are sometimes supported by rationale based on relevant reference to experience; and/or examples; and/or range of contexts; and/or sources; and/or theories. Some points may be unsupported; a number of irrelevancies may be present; the response may contain more description than analysis.</p> <p>Rationale is evident, but inconsistent in justifying points made.</p>
1	<p>A minimal response to the task.</p> <p>Points are minimally supported by rationale based on relevant reference to experience; and/or examples; and/or range of contexts; and/or sources; and/or theories. Most points are unsupported; a number of irrelevancies may be present; the response contains a lot of description and very little analysis.</p> <p>Rationale is minimal.</p>
0	<p>No development of the response.</p>