Английский язык для специальных целей. Урбанистика – 3

Course Syllabus for «English for Specific Purposes. Urban Planning– 3»

Developer	A.A. Rivlina, N.V. Katasonova, E.O. Muraviova
No. of credits	3
Contact hours	52
Independent study (hours)	62
Year of study, degree programme	The second year of study,1–3 modules
Study format	Full-time

Abstract

The discipline refers to the variable educational tracks offered to students of the curricula for bachelor's while mastering the optional course of English in accordance with the Concept of Development of English-language Communicative Competence of HSE Students. The course is designed for further development of the two-part course for the first-year students: "English for Specific Purposes. Urban Planning – 1, 2" and at the same time it may be viewed as an independent course which introduces students to professional and business communication and develops students' language skills for interacting in general business and professional settings, specifically in the field of urban planning. The material used in the course contains a certain number of authentic texts/videos/tracks on technology, sustainable development and historical background, modern trends and issues which urban planning focuses on. Thus, the course motivates students to further develop their range of socially and professionally applicable language. In particular, a special emphasis is placed on building advanced professional vocabulary through reading authentic texts on the theory and practices of urban planning and listening to expert talks. The course allows for the personalization of the learning experience with a structured approach that gives the flexibility to focus on specific needs and learning outcomes using more advanced criteria of assessment.

Learning Objectives

1. To acquire vocabulary skills (general academic and professional vocabulary in the field of urban planning)

2. To master writing skills (text summary writing, review writing, diagram description, essay writing)

3. To master listening skills (listening to professional talks and discussions, Ted talks, note-taking)

4. To master public speaking agility skills through presentations and discussions on urban planning topics

5. To develop reading skills (reading different types of texts from various sources in the field of urban planning)

6. To apply the set of skills to the professional subject area, from simple ones to complex, such as informative and persuasive presentation skills (individual/group work)

Learning Outcomes

– To develop systematically an argument giving the reasons for or against a point of view.

- To be able to check and correct spelling, punctuation and grammar mistakes in long written texts.

- To be able to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of different options and/or suggested solutions during a discussion. .

- To conduct a monologue of different types (descriptive/informative/reasoning) on a familiar/unfamiliar topic.

- To develop an argument giving reasons in support of or against a particular point of view or a suggested solution to a problem in a dialogue/discussion/debate concerning urban issues.

- To develop the basic skills of diagram description (in particular, graphs with numerical information changing in time or fixed in time).

- To develop the basic skills of essay writing (in particular, problem and solution essay, cause and effect essay, argumentative essay).

- To explain information in detail in graphs and charts accompanying presentations.

- To extract key details from official documents and reports in the field of urban planning.

- To follow extended speech and complex lines of arguments

- To identify the main reasons for and against an argument or idea in a discussion delivered in clear standard speech.

- To make presentations on professional topics, giving reasons in support or against a particular point of view, giving the advantages and disadvantages of various opinions and respond to clearly expressed questions on a presentation they have given.

- To manage debates on on abstract, complex topics both familiar and unfamiliar topics confirming comprehension, inviting others in, agreeing with or refuting an opinion/a suggestion.

- To plan, manage and deliver informative and/or persuasive presentations.

- To summarise, comment on and discuss a wide range of texts of different registers: magazine and newspaper articles, articles in professional journals and urban studies manuals.

- To understand academic/ professional lectures/presentations which are linguistically complex, to write a list of key points (Note-taking skills development) (e.g.: TED talks, popular videos, interviews and conversations with urban planning specialists, documentaries, professional conference presentations and lectures).

- To understand dialogues and polylogues on both familiar and unfamiliar topics

- To understand main points and check comprehension by using contextual clues.

- To understand specialised complex longer texts*/articles and reports concerned with contemporary problems (CEFR)

- To use appropriate outlines to organise ideas.

- To use basic reading techniques, skimming & scanning to make inferences or predictions about the content of texts/ newspaper and magazine articles

- To write a review of news articles, reports and surveys, or projects in urban planning, providing clear, well-structured texts, synthesising and evaluating information.

- To write a review of news articles, reports and surveys, or projects in urban planning.

- To write a structured text/ report clearly signalling main points and supporting details.

Course Contents

1. **Module 1. Urban planning as an interdisciplinary professional field Unit 1.**
   Key terms and concepts in urban planning. Major areas in urban studies. Urbanization, its trends and tendencies. Case studies/ city profiles. Dealing with various sources of information for reading on urban issues.

2. **Module 1. Urban planning as an interdisciplinary professional field Unit 2.**
   The dynamics of urbanization: challenges and opportunities. Urban revival/renewal and urban blight; neighborhood gentrification and decline. Reviews of articles on urban planning news.

3. **Module 2. Livable cities and urban competitiveness Unit 3.**
   What makes a city livable: factors and indicators. Listening to urban planning professionals discussing city development processes; participating in a discussion on different aspects of city livability.

4. **Module 2. Livable cities and urban competitiveness Unit 4.**
   City surveys and rankings. Dealing with data in urban planning. Interpreting graphs and diagrams in urban development reports.

5. **Module 3. Urban planning projects and policies Unit 5.**
   Urban problems and solutions. Developing urban projects and policies as a response to present or future challenges and demands in urban life.

7. **Module 3. Urban planning projects and policies Unit 6.**
   Approaches and methods in urban planning project development. Reviews of urban projects and policies; project briefs / policy briefs. Presentations on urban projects.

Assessments

The final grade is composed of the following parts: 25% Written Assessment (WA) +20% Oral Assessment (OA) + 25% student Independent Work Assessment /online (IWA) + 30% Final Assessment (FA).

Only overall grade is rounded.

Written assessment elements can be taken during the course of 10 days after they took place if a student has a medical certificate. The 10-day period starts from the last day of the medical leave. This, however, does not apply to oral assessment and individual work assessment (elements cannot be retaken).

The Final Assessment may be taken again during the retake period. The first retake follows the structure of the Final Assessment. The second retake is conducted using unique Testing and Assessment Materials which cover the materials of the whole course. The grade for the second retake corresponds with the grade for the entire course.

Listening, reading, and grammar and vocabulary tests are assessed as follows:

Grade	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% fully completed tasks at home/in the classroom/on line work	100 - 96%	95 - 91%	90 - 86%	85 - 78%	77 - 71%	70 - 61%	60 - 51%	50 - 36%	35 - 21%	20 - 1 %	0%

- Final Assessement

Period of Final Assessment: the final exam is held in class within 10 days before the exam period online on MS Teams platform.

The release of examination papers: during the session.

The exam consists of 3 parts: *Listening (30%), Reading (30%)* and *Writing* (40%) respectively in the total mark for the exam. 0 points in case of cheating.

Retaking exams: till the 15th of October 2022.

Time limit: 80 minutes online/offline.

Tasks complexity: B2.

Exam structure:

1.	*Listening (L)*	Listen to the text and complete the tasks 1-10.	max. 10 points
2.	*Reading (R)*	Read the text and complete the tasks 1-10.	max. 10 points
3.	*Writing (W)*	Write a review	review assessment criteria

Grading formula: $L*0,3+R*0,3+W*0,4 = 10$

Note

Depending on the epidemiological situation the final test is held in class during the session week or online on Zoom or MS Teams platforms. Students must log in using their first name and surname. If a student connects to the videoconferencing session late, the time allocated for the element of assessment may be extended at the examiner's discretion (p. 34 of Regulations for Interim and Ongoing Assessments of Students at National Research University Higher School of Economics).

The exam is conducted in written form online with proctoring.

Taking a break during the Exam is not allowed.

To take the exam, a student should:

- check the operation of the webcam, microphone, headphones or speakers, the speed of the Internet (for the best results, it is recommended to connect the computer to the network via a cable);
- prepare the necessary items for the exam tasks (pens, A4 paper for a draft);
- disable other applications in the task manager of the computer, except for the platform (Zoom or MS Teams).

The student provides the necessary conditions for the exam:

• sufficient level of illumination;

• low noise level;

•absence of interference with video and audio signal transmission;

• a fully operational webcam (including built-in laptop cameras);

• a fully operational microphone (including built-in laptop cameras);

• a permanent and stable Internet connection with a data transfer rate of at least 5 Mbps.

During the writing part of the exam, it is prohibited to:

• turn off the webcam and microphone; reduce its level of sensitivity to sound;

• use auto-correct functions, notes, textbooks, other educational materials;

• leave the desk area during the Exam (leave the visibility zone of the webcam);

• use headphones, headsets for any other reason than to complete the Listening section of the exam;

• use "smart" gadgets (smartphone, tablet, etc.);

• involve another person to help with the Exam, talk with another person during the Exam;

• read tasks out loud.

In the event of a long-term communication failure with the Zoom or MS Teams platform during the exam, the student must record the fact of the loss of communication with the platform (take a screenshot/photograph of the entire screen so that the time and the application/web browser window are visible, get a response from the Internet provider) and report the problem to the office of the student's Program and to the teacher (in one email).

Note:

According to part 33 of Regulations for Interim and Ongoing Assessments of Students at National Research University Higher School of Economics «…. The use of materials not permitted by this list, attempts to communicate with other students or other individuals (e.g., through electronic means of communication), unauthorized movement in the examination room, having electronic means of communication that are not allowed by the teacher, intended disconnection from the video conference or switching browser tab, when it is clear that the teacher forbids the action, and other violations of examination procedure constitute ground for the end of exam for the particular student (student's removal from the examination room, disconnection from the videoconference, etc.) with a subsequent "0" grade in the examination grade column.

REVIEW ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (max 10 points)

Recommended word count – 250-300

Task Response (max 3 points)

3 points – the student fully addresses all parts of the task (writes a title and a catchy introduction which identifies the reviewed item, gives a complete and fair description of the item, makes valid recommendations in conclusion); presents a fully developed position in answer to the question with relevant, fully extended and well supported ideas (presents a thorough discussion);

2 points – the student addresses all parts of the task although some parts may be more fully covered than others (writes a title and a relevant introduction, gives a narrow description, makes valid recommendations in conclusion); presents a relevant position although the conclusions may be unclear or repetitive; presents relevant main ideas but some may be inadequately developed/unclear;

1 point – the student responds to the task only in a minimal way or the answer is tangential; the format may be inappropriate: the student does not write a title but writes an introduction, gives a short description of the item, makes invalid recommendations in conclusion; the student presents a position but it is unclear; presents some main ideas but they are difficult to identify and may be repetitive, irrelevant or not well supported;

0 points – the student does not adequately address any part of the task: the student does not write an introduction, presents undetailed arguments, neither presents the personal impression nor the verdict; does not express a clear position; presents few ideas which are largely undeveloped or irrelevant.

Coherence and Cohesion (max 2 points)

2 points – the student writes a clearly structured objective review on the item, uses a variety of linking devices which connect the ideas appropriately, organises information in a logical order, uses paragraphing sufficiently;

1 point – the student writes a poorly structured review, uses a limited number of linking devices, does not use paragraphing sufficiently;

0 points – the student does not organise information and ideas logically, fails to use linking devices appropriately or repeats them.

Lexical Resource and Register (max 2 points)

2 points – the student uses a wide range of vocabulary specific to this topic without repetitions, makes 1 lexical or spelling mistake, the review is written in the appropriate register;

1 point – the student uses a limited range of vocabulary, fails to use active vocabulary items, makes 2 lexical or spelling mistakes, the student uses the appropriate register;

0 points – the student uses basic vocabulary, makes 3 or more lexical / spelling mistakes, the student uses an inappropriate register.

Grammatical Range and Accuracy (max 2 points)

2 points – the student uses a variety of complex grammar structures and makes 1 grammar mistake;

1 point – the student uses basic grammar structures and makes 2 grammar mistakes;

0 points – the student makes numerous grammar mistakes which impede understanding.

Punctuation (max 1 point)

1 point – the students may make 1-2 punctuation errors;
0 points – the students makes more than 2 punctuation errors.

- Independent Work Assessement

PRESENTATION ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (max 10 points)

If the content of the presentation does not relate to the topic, a student receives "0" for the whole presentation.

Task Response (max 3 points):
3 points – **the student fully addresses all parts of the task:** the presentation corresponds to the chosen topic; it is clearly divided into introduction, main body and conclusion, all content points are covered; introduction contains the purpose and the plan of the presentation, each part of the main body has an explicit pattern of organisation (illustration, cause and effect, comparison, definition, etc.); conclusion

includes both summary and the final statement and rounds the presentation of appropriately; presentation contains appropriate references in APA style in speech and slides; various coherence devices are used;

2 points – **the student addresses all parts of the task although some parts may be more fully covered than others**: the presentation partially corresponds to the topic, it is clearly divided into introduction, main body and conclusion and the parts of the presentation are connected with linking devices; presentation contains appropriate references in APA style in speech and slides;

1 point – **the student responds to the task only in a minimal way or the answer is tangential, the format may be inappropriate**: the presentation partially corresponds to the chosen topic, not all the content points are covered it is not clearly divided into introduction, main body and conclusion; presentation is free from logical fallacies; presentation does not contain appropriate references in APA style in speech and slides;

0 points – **the student does not adequately address any part of the task:** the presentation is not divided into introduction, main body and conclusion and the parts of the presentation are not connected with linking devices; presentation does not contain appropriate references in APA style in speech and slides.

Language Use (max 3 points):
3 points – the speaker uses an appropriate amount of academic vocabulary, terminology is relevant to the subject, synonyms are used to avoid repetitions, the hedging strategies are applied when applicable, the speaker uses collocations and advanced grammar when needed, pronunciation and speech flow are natural, occasional vocabulary and grammar mistakes in speech causing no difficulties for the audience; texts on slides have no vocabulary and grammar mistakes; the speaker naturally fills in the pauses caused by breakdowns of different nature;
2 points – the speaker complies with academic register, the speech is characterized by fluency and adequate pace; the speaker does not use collocations, omits vocabulary and grammar mistakes that sometimes cause difficulties for the audience, and/or there are 1-2 vocabulary and/or grammar mistakes on slides; the speaker naturally fills in the pauses caused by breakdowns of different nature;
1 point – the speaker demonstrates limited language resource; the vocabulary and grammar are generally appropriate with a few non-impeding inaccuracies; the speaker fills in the pauses caused by breakdowns of different nature with effort;
0 points – the speaker demonstrates poor language resources, omits vocabulary and grammar mistakes that cause serious difficulties for the audience, and the speaker does not fill in the pauses.

Manner of Delivery (max 2 points):
2 points – the presenter speaks with confidence maintaining a certain level of dynamics and keeping an appropriate posture and body language, maintains the adequate level of eye contact, uses stress, intonation and pausing appropriately; the presentation is given without reading off the slides or paper within the given time limit; the presenter makes 1-2 pronunciation mistakes in words of common use causing no difficulties for the audience, when answering questions; the speaker interacts with ease and responds appropriately;
1 point – the presenter makes 3-4 pronunciation mistakes causing difficulties for the audience and/or the presenter uses stress, intonation and pausing with limited control causing some difficulties for the audience; the presentation is given without reading off the slides or paper, when answering questions; the speaker interacts with effort or responds inappropriately; the speaker delivers the content within the given time limit;
0 points – the presenter makes 5 and more pronunciation mistakes in words of common use causing difficulties for the audience; the speaker does not interact with the audience; the presentation is given with reading off the slides or paper; the presentation does not fit the time limit.

Visual Aids (max 2 points):

2 points – the visuals are prepared in a certain style consistent throughout the presentation and well readable (font, color); each visual has a heading relevant to the overall theme of the presentation, conforming to the academic register; each visual contains only key words and phrases without complete sentences; presentation as a whole has an adequate balance of graphic and verbal information;

1 point – the visuals are well readable (font, color), contain both complete sentences and key words and phrases, presentation has a disbalance of graphic and verbal information;

0 points – the visuals are not well readable, and do not conform to the academic register.

NEWS ARTICLE REVIEW ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (max 10 points)

Task response:

3-2-1-0
- presents the content of the article clearly by summarizing the main points, with key terms from the article and major review vocabulary used properly;
- paraphrases the main ideas from the article (no citations);
- includes no irrelevant information;
- clearly formulates personal opinion about the content of the article reviewed;
- captures the audience's attention and makes the content of the article understandable;
- does not exceed the time limit (7 min.);
- asks questions that check factual information in the article and provoke a thoughtful discussion;

Coherence and cohesion:

2-1-0
- logically organizes information and ideas, with clear overall progression;
- uses a range of cohesive devices and signpost language appropriately;
- organizes the discussion after the review presentation by using discussion-eliciting speech formulae;

Lexical resource and register:

2-1-0
- presents 5-10 professional and/or advanced vocabulary items from the article, with their proper translation into Russian;
- uses a wide range of advanced vocabulary, including collocations and idioms, of appropriate (formal, academic) register;
- makes no major lexical mistakes; there are no more than two lexical inaccuracies or 'slips', which do not hinder the comprehension of the article review;

Grammatical range and accuracy:

2-1-0
- uses a range of grammatical constructions, including complex structures;
- makes no major grammatical mistakes; there are no more than two grammatical inaccuracies or 'slips', which do not hinder the comprehension of the article review;

Level/track specific criteria – delivery:

1-0
- employs the delivery style (intonation, stressing the key words, gestures, eye contact) that adds to the audience's understanding of the facts and ideas in the article reviewed;

- does not read the review;
- pronounces the key terms correctly; makes no more than 2 minor pronunciation mistakes

- Oral assessment

DIALOGUE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (max 10 points)

Task Response (max 3 points)

3 points – the student fully addresses all parts of the task: initiates the conversation, shares opinions, demonstrates active listening and questioning skills, responds to questions; presents a fully developed position in answer to the question with relevant, fully extended and well supported ideas; the student finds common ground, presents logical arguments, supporting evidence and examples, makes comments and draws conclusions, shows the interest in what another participant says; content corresponds with the topic of the dialogue;

2 points – the student addresses all parts of the task although some parts may be more fully covered than others: the student takes an active part in the dialogue, shares some ideas, does not always hear the thoughts and ideas of the partner; presents a relevant position although the conclusions may be unclear or repetitive, gives arguments, some of which are not fully developed, extended or supported;

1 point – the student responds to the task only in a minimal way: the student is not an active participant of the dialogue, rarely shares ideas, does not propel the conversation; presents a position but it is unclear and/or the arguments are not fully developed, extended or supported; presents some main ideas but these are difficult to identify and may be repetitive, irrelevant or not well supported;

0 points – the student does not adequately address any part of the task: the student is rather passive, does not share any ideas or answer questions; does not express a clear position.

Coherence and Cohesion (max 2 points)
2 points – the student applies logic when organising ideas, effectively uses a wide range of cohesive devices, introductory constructions, etc., makes the points clearly but briefly, allows the partner to finish without interrupting, encourages the partner to speak by inviting him/her to give his/her opinion, shows agreement or disagrees politely;
1 point – the student applies logic when organising ideas but there might be an occasional breach in logic, cohesive devices are inadequate, repetitive, under- or overused, the student sometimes talks over the other speaker, disagrees harshly, dominates the conversation;
0 points – the student does not apply logic when organising ideas, there are no linking devices, introductory constructions and/or they are used inappropriately.

Lexical Resource and Register (max 2 points)
2 points – the student uses a wide range of appropriate vocabulary including some advanced lexical items; the student uses appropriate phrases for better dialogue development;
1 point – the student uses appropriate but limited vocabulary; phrasal verbs and/or collocations are used inappropriately;
0 points – the student's vocabulary is too limited to comment on the topic; numerous mistakes impede communication; active vocabulary is not used or is used inappropriately.

Grammatical Range and Accuracy (max 2 points)
2 points – the student uses a wide range of question forms and other grammar structures accurately, may make 1 minor mistake which does not impede communication, can correct the mistake;
1 point – the student uses a variety of grammar structures and may make 2 mistakes which could impede communication;
0 points – the student makes numerous grammar and stylistic mistakes which impede communication.

Fluency, pronunciation (max 1 point)

1 point – the student's speech is smooth and fluent, there might be some minor pronunciation mistakes but they don't impede communication; intonation is appropriate; all sounds are articulated clearly;

0 points – the speech is slow, it takes the student time to find words; he/she fumbles the words and ideas and/or makes numerous pronunciation mistakes, which impede communication; intonation is not appropriate; some sounds are articulated indistinctly.

DISCUSSION ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (max 10 points)

Task Response (max 3 points)

3 points – the student fully addresses all parts of the task: the student presents a fully developed position in answer to the question with relevant, fully extended and well supported ideas; content corresponds to the topic of the discussion; the student takes an active part in the discussion; the student's contribution makes the discussion more effective;

2 points – the student addresses all parts of the task although some parts may be more fully covered than others: the student presents a relevant position although the conclusions may be unclear or repetitive; content corresponds to the topic of the discussion; the student takes an active part in the discussion, not always hears the thoughts and ideas of other students, sometimes dominates the discussion;

1 point – the student responds to the task only in a minimal way or the answer is tangential: presents some ideas but they may be repetitive, irrelevant or not well supported (attitude is not expressed, and/or the arguments are not fully developed or extended); content is partially relevant to the topic; the student does not take an active part in the discussion, rarely shares ideas;

0 points – the student does not adequately address any part of the task; the student is rather passive, does not share any ideas, does not express a clear position; the student presents few ideas, which are largely undeveloped or irrelevant.

Coherence and Cohesion (max 2 points)
2 points – the student applies logic when organising ideas, effectively uses a wide range of cohesive devices, introductory constructions, makes the points clearly but briefly, encourages others to speak by inviting them to give their opinions;

1 point – the student applies logic when organising ideas, but there might be an occasional breach in logic, cohesive devices are inadequate, repetitive, under- or overused;

0 points – the student does not apply logic when organising ideas, there are no linking devices, introductory constructions and/or they are used inappropriately.

Lexical Resource and Register (max 2 points)
2 points – the student uses a wide range of appropriate vocabulary attempting to use some advanced lexical items, phrases useful for the discussion development;
1 point – the student uses appropriate but limited vocabulary; phrasal verbs and/or collocations are used inappropriately;
0 points – the student's vocabulary is too limited to comment on the topic, numerous mistakes impede understanding; active vocabulary is not used or used inappropriately.

Grammatical Range and Accuracy (max 2 points)

2 points – the student uses a wide range of grammar structures;

1 point – the student uses basic grammar structures and may make occasional mistakes which do not impede communication;

0 points – the student makes numerous grammar mistakes which impede communication.

Fluency, pronunciation (max 1 point)

1 point – the student's speech is smooth and fluent; there might be some minor pronunciation mistakes but they don't impede communication; intonation is appropriate; all sounds are articulated clearly;

0 points – the speech is slow; it takes the student time to find words; he/she fumbles the words and ideas and/or makes numerous pronunciation mistakes which impede communication; intonation is not appropriate; some sounds are articulated indistinctly.

- Written assessment

ESSAY ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (max 10 points)

Recommended word count – 250

Task Response (max 3 points)

3 points – the student fully addresses all parts of the task: the task in the introduction is fully paraphrased, the student presents a fully developed position in answer to the question with relevant, fully extended and well supported ideas: each paragraph contains a valid topic sentence which clearly focuses on the main idea/problem and 1-2 arguments which are completely developed; the conclusion contains relevant ideas which are discussed in the main body; content corresponds to the topic;

2 points – the student addresses all parts of the task although some parts may be more fully covered than others: the task in the introduction has been only partly paraphrased; the student presents relevant main ideas but some may be inadequately developed/unclear; the main points are summarised in the conclusion but some points may be unclear or repetitive; content corresponds to the topic;

1 point – the student responds to the task only in a minimal way or the answer is tangential: the task has been only partly paraphrased and/or the thesis statement lacks focus and/or the conclusion contains some irrelevant ideas which are not discussed in the main body; the student presents a position but it is is unclear; presents some main ideas but they are difficult to identify and may be repetitive, irrelevant or not well supported; content only partially corresponds to the topic;

0 points – the student does not adequately address any part of the task: he task hasn't been paraphrased or there is no introduction and/or there is no thesis statement in the introduction; all the topic sentences are irrelevant / there are no topic sentences; there is no conclusion at all; the student presents few ideas, which are largely undeveloped or irrelevant.

Coherence and Cohesion (max 2 points)

2 points – the student writes a clearly structured essay, uses a variety of linking devices which connect the ideas appropriately, uses paragraphing sufficiently, the ideas are logically organised;

1 point – the student writes a poorly structured essay, uses a limited number of linking devices, does not use paragraphing sufficiently; the ideas are not always logically organised;

0 points – the student does not organise information and ideas logically, fails to use linking devices appropriately or repeats them, does not write in paragraphs.

Lexical Resource and Register (max 2 points)

2 points – the student uses a wide range of vocabulary, including some advanced lexical items; there may be 1-2 inaccuracies;

1 point – the student uses a sufficient range of vocabulary, but may make 1-2 mistakes in spelling, word formation or word choice;

0 points – the student only uses basic vocabulary with very limited control of spelling, word formation or word choice; errors are numerous and impede understanding.

Grammatical Range and Accuracy (max 2 points)

2 points – the student uses a wide range of grammar structures and may make 1 minor mistake;

1 point – the student uses a variety of grammar structures, but may make 2 mistakes;

0 points – the student uses basic grammar structures or a limited range of structures and/or makes more than 2 grammatical mistakes, some of which impede understanding.

Level/track specific criteria (max 1 point)

1 point – the student presents an example for each argument;

0 points – the student does not present any example for an argument.

REVIEW ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (max 10 points)

Recommended word count – 250-300

Task Response (max 3 points)

3 points – the student fully addresses all parts of the task (writes a title and a catchy introduction which identifies the reviewed item, gives a complete and fair description of the item, makes valid recommendations in conclusion); presents a fully developed position in answer to the question with relevant, fully extended and well supported ideas (presents a thorough discussion);

2 points – the student addresses all parts of the task although some parts may be more fully covered than others (writes a title and a relevant introduction, gives a narrow description, makes valid recommendations in conclusion); presents a relevant position although the conclusions may be unclear or repetitive; presents relevant main ideas but some may be inadequately developed/unclear;

1 point – the student responds to the task only in a minimal way or the answer is tangential; the format may be inappropriate: the student does not write a title but writes an introduction, gives a short description of the item, makes invalid recommendations in conclusion; the student presents a position but it is unclear; presents some main ideas but they are difficult to identify and may be repetitive, irrelevant or not well supported;

0 points – the student does not adequately address any part of the task: the student does not write an introduction, presents undetailed arguments, neither presents the personal impression nor the verdict; does not express a clear position; presents few ideas which are largely undeveloped or irrelevant.

Coherence and Cohesion (max 2 points)

2 points – the student writes a clearly structured objective review on the item, uses a variety of linking devices which connect the ideas appropriately, organises information in a logical order, uses paragraphing sufficiently;

1 point – the student writes a poorly structured review, uses a limited number of linking devices, does not use paragraphing sufficiently;

0 points – the student does not organise information and ideas logically, fails to use linking devices appropriately or repeats them.

Lexical Resource and Register (max 2 points)

2 points – the student uses a wide range of vocabulary specific to this topic without repetitions, makes 1 lexical or spelling mistake, the review is written in the appropriate register;

1 point – the student uses a limited range of vocabulary, fails to use active vocabulary items, makes 2 lexical or spelling mistakes, the student uses the appropriate register;

0 points – the student uses basic vocabulary, makes 3 or more lexical / spelling mistakes, the student uses an inappropriate register.

Grammatical Range and Accuracy (max 2 points)

2 points – the student uses a variety of complex grammar structures and makes 1 grammar mistake;

1 point – the student uses basic grammar structures and makes 2 grammar mistakes;

0 points – the student makes numerous grammar mistakes which impede understanding.

Punctuation (max 1 point)

1 point – the students may make 1-2 punctuation errors;

0 points – the students makes more than 2 punctuation errors.

▨ Interim assessment (3 module)

0.300 Final Assessement

0.250 Independent Work Assessement

0.250 Written assessment

0.200 Oral assessment

Types of classrooms:

Lecture / seminar classroom (52)

<center>**Sources**</center>

Recommended Core Bibliography

New headway Academic skills: reading, writing, and study skills: level 3 : student's book, Philpot, S., ISBN: 978-0-19-471576-8, 2007

Open forum 2 : academic listening and speaking, Blackwell, A., ISBN: 978-0-19-436111-8, 2006

Successful writing : proficiency, Evans, V., ISBN: 1-84216-880-0, 2000

Презентация научных проектов на английском языке : учеб. пособие для студентов вузов и аспирантов, Кузьменкова, Ю. Б., ISBN: 978-5-211-05991-7, 2011

Recommended Additional Bibliography:

Dynamic presentations, Powell, M., ISBN: 978-0-521-15004-0, 2010

Key concepts in urban studies, Gottdiener, M., ISBN: 978-1-84920-199-5, 2016

New headway Academic skills: reading, writing, and study skills: level 3 : teacher's guide, Philpot, S., ISBN: 978-0-19-471663-5, 2007

Successful writing for qualitative researchers, Woods, P., ISBN: 0-415-18847-4, 2003

Презентация научных проектов на английском языке. Книга для преподавателя : учеб. пособие для студентов вузов и аспирантов, Кузьменкова, Ю. Б., ISBN: 978-5-211-05993-1, 2012

Booth, T. (2018). English for Everyone : English Vocabulary Builder (Vol. First American edition). New York, New York: DK. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&site=eds-live&db=edsebk&AN=1636939

Wayne C. Booth et al. The Craft of Research (4th ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2016.

The Oxford Handbook of Urban Planning / Ed. by Randall Crane and Rachel Weber. – Oxford, et al.: Oxford University Press, 2012. – ISBN 978-0-19-537499-5. – Режим доступа: http://proxylibrary.hse.ru:2089/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195374995.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780195374995