

5.6 Conduct a prepared class seminar with an accurate synthesis

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 24 marks**

KEY WORDS seminar 研讨课 • synthesis 综合 • consensus 共识

Objective

Conduct a prepared class seminar with an accurate synthesis. This is original GAC014-aligned practice, not an official assessment. All people, texts, records and instructions are fictional. This sheet’s word ranges and analytic points are local teaching conventions, not official assessment specifications. Written scripts and plans support listening/speaking preparation; they do not replace reviewed audio or assess pronunciation, actual delivery or one-pass listening comprehension.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

■ **Key knowledge: interaction, source limits and unresolved decisions belong in the seminar record**

A **seminar** 研讨课 connects prepared evidence, relevant questions and interaction around a focused academic task. A **synthesis** 综合 draws together contributions without erasing their differences. If **consensus** 共识 is required, check it explicitly instead of counting silence as agreement.

An agenda should protect time for discussion, not just speeches. Record suggestions, agreed actions and unresolved questions separately. A classroom plan can guide rehearsal; actual seminar conduct needs participants, delivery and an honest record.

■ **Source A: text or task brief**

Original fictional seminar brief: During two weeks, a campus equipment log recorded 40 requests and 6 double bookings. It did not record waiting time, abandoned attempts or whether the 40 requests came from 40 different people. An availability interface is proposed; no trial has occurred.

Local twelve-minute rehearsal agenda: two minutes to frame the question, four for two prepared contributions, four for discussion and two for synthesis. The question is, “What should a limited trial measure before wider adoption?” Roles are chair, access speaker, operations speaker and recorder. These roles and timings are local practice, not official assessment rules.

■ **Source B: response or review record**

Discussion record: Operations speaker proposes recording double bookings. Access speaker proposes recording abandoned attempts and waiting time. The chair asks what a usable improvement would mean. The group explicitly agrees to recommend measuring conflicts and access difficulties, but no trial duration or numerical success threshold is agreed. The recorder has not spoken about the summary.

Draft closing: “The interface has solved all conflicts. Everyone approved rollout for forty users. Our success threshold is whatever the result turns out to be.”

■ **Worked example: synthesise the contributions without manufacturing a decision**



Known: conflicts and missing access measures concern different parts of the proposed trial. Why connect them? A system could record fewer conflicts while discouraging attempts, so one count alone would not capture both concerns.

The group agreed to recommend measures, not to approve rollout. A useful closing invites correction, records the unresolved duration and threshold, and proposes setting evaluation criteria before seeing trial results. Six double bookings among forty requests is not necessarily six different people.

2 Practice

2.1 Give the logged request count and double-booking count. [2]

2.2 State TWO missing access or identity details in the log. [2]

2.3 Correct THREE claims in the draft closing. [3]

2.4 State what the group agreed and TWO matters still unresolved. [3]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 Plan a closing synthesis that links two views, records decision status and checks the record. Explain TWO useful facilitation moves. [6]

3.2 Write an 80–110 word chair’s closing that records agreement accurately, invites correction and names the next planning work without approving rollout. [8]

Solutions

2.1

Forty requests; six double bookings.

2.2

Any two, B1 each: waiting time; abandoned attempts; whether requests came from different people.

2.3

No trial has occurred/solution unmeasured; no rollout approval or forty-user identity count established; choosing a threshold after seeing results undermines a pre-stated evaluation.

2.4

Recommend measuring conflicts and access difficulties; trial duration; numerical success threshold.

3.1

Links operations conflicts with access difficulties; distinguishes agreed measurement recommendation from rollout; notes unresolved duration and threshold; invites correction/recorder confirmation; explains an invitation that obtains a relevant missing view; explains setting criteria before results or preserving discussion time.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: links operational and access concerns; accurately records agreed measurement recommendation; no trial results invented; duration and threshold unresolved; requests distinct from unique users; relevant correction/recorder invitation; pre-stated evaluation planning without rollout approval; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: “The seminar connected operational conflicts with access difficulties: fewer recorded double bookings would not by itself show that the proposed interface works well for users. We agreed to recommend measuring conflicts and access difficulties, with waiting times and abandoned attempts proposed as indicators. However, no trial has occurred, and its duration and numerical success threshold remain undecided. The log records forty requests, not necessarily forty different people. Recorder, does this summary represent the agreed recommendation accurately, and has any unresolved concern been missed? Our next planning step is to define the trial and evaluation criteria before observing results. We have not approved a wider rollout.”