

Teachers' Guidelines for Doctoral Students' Workshops: A1, A2, B1, B2:

Dear Colleagues,

The workshops consist of 15-minute oral presentations where students are tasked with presenting a topic as outlined in their assignments. These assignments have been distributed 13 days prior to the face-to-face workshops.

Your role in these workshops is to actively engage by listening to their presentations and providing constructive feedback on various aspects, such as pronunciation, grammar, coherence, and body language. It's essential to emphasize that there are no grades associated with these presentations. Instead, the primary goal is to create a platform for students to practice English in front of an audience, fostering their self-confidence.

Your valuable input and encouragement will undoubtedly contribute to their growth and development in the language and presentation skills. Thank you for your commitment to supporting our doctoral students in their English language journey.

Additionally, please note that a students' presence paper should be maintained and submitted to the administration (vice rector/CFD) at the conclusion of this journey.

Best regards,

Prof. Leila Kara Mostefa-Boussena (Chlef university)

President of CPNM Commission

A sample of formative assessment rubric

Presentation Rubric

Presenter: [Student's Name]

Date: [Presentation Date]

Topic: [Title of the Presentation]

Presentation Content

| Criteria | Feedback |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Topic Relevance | - The topic is related to your field of study. - It aligns with the academic discipline. |
| 2. Research and Information Gathering | - Thorough research with credible sources. - Diverse sources used, including academic journals, books, and reputable websites. |
| 3. Content Clarity | - Content is generally clear. - Some complex |

CPNM of English September 2023

| | |
|--|--|
| | concepts could be explained more effectively. - The organization is somewhat logical. |
|--|--|

Presentation Delivery

| Criteria | Feedback |
|--------------------|--|
| 4. Engagement | - Good audience engagement. - Effective start but could have been more attention-grabbing. - Limited audience interaction. |
| 5. Speaking Skills | - Clear and audible voice. - Confidence is noticeable, but eye contact can improve. - Minimal use of filler words. |
| 6. Timing | - Presentation adhered to the 15-minute time limit. - Some sections felt rushed; pacing could be improved. |

Visual Aids (optional for students)

| Criteria | Feedback |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| 7. Use of Visuals | - Visual aids enhance understanding. - Good choice of visuals, but some slides were cluttered. - Clear text and visuals. |
| 8. Clarity and Relevance of Visuals | - Visuals contribute to overall clarity. - Mostly relevant to the topic but a few unrelated visuals. |

Overall Presentation

| Criteria | Feedback |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 9. Organization and Structure | - Overall, well-organized with a clear introduction, main points, and conclusion. - A more logical flow would improve coherence. |
| 10. Overall Impact | - Left a decent impression on the audience. - Could have emphasized the significance of the topic more effectively. |

This sample rubric provides qualitative feedback on various aspects of the presentation without assigning grades. The feedback allows the student to identify strengths and areas for improvement in each criterion.