

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]
