

General Proficiency Level Assessment Guidelines for screening applicants for Bachelor's Degree Programme in Immersive Software Engineering and AI

University of Jyväskylä Centre for Multilingual Academic Communication. Based on the Common European Framework of Reference for languages and departmental core skills analyses. Original guidelines by Károly et al.; updated 2024 by Hämäläinen & Lahtela; adapted for ISEAI 2026 by Hämäläinen P., Kelly R., Rajapolvi P. & Reini A.)

	Oral interaction (Interview) The applicant...	Spoken production (Interview) The applicant...	Reading skills (Written pre-task) The applicant...	Writing skills (Written pre-task) The applicant...
YES (~B2)	<p>participates with sufficient fluency and appropriacy in an interactive interview situation.</p> <p>mostly follows clearly structured lines of discussion.</p> <p>uses sufficient strategies for expressing themselves and formulating their responses (e.g. turn-taking, asking for clarification if needed).</p> <p>mostly monitors their own speech, identifies most mistakes and addresses them when needed.</p>	<p>uses a range of vocabulary and grammatical structures with overall intelligibility; errors rarely impede comprehension.</p> <p>uses pronunciation that is generally accurate, and meaning is usually clear to the listener.</p> <p>produces a sufficient range of vocabulary, generally appropriate in style and register.</p> <p>contributes responses with sufficient depth, demonstrating adequate critical thinking and argumentation skills.</p>	<p>understands main ideas and details of the source text relevant to the task.</p> <p>selects and prioritises information that is appropriate for the writing task.</p> <p>demonstrates consistent understanding of essential terminology and concepts.</p>	<p>produces an answer that mostly fulfils all task components</p> <p>produces a mostly structured and coherent text with evidence of logical progression.</p> <p>demonstrates adequate paraphrasing when relevant; wording is often original but may occasionally echo source phrasing</p> <p>writes cohesively with some clear connections between ideas</p> <p>produces occasional language errors that rarely interfere with overall comprehension.</p> <p>provides convincing evidence of evaluation and adaptation of the source material in their own writing.</p> <p>reflects on reading and writing strategies using some specific points but may lack depth or consistency.</p>
MAYBE (~B1)	<p>participates almost fluently and appropriately in an interactive interview situation; can follow simple lines of discussion.</p> <p>uses limited strategies for expressing themselves and formulating responses</p>	<p>uses vocabulary and grammatical structures with adequate intelligibility; errors can affect comprehension.</p> <p>uses pronunciation that is generally intelligible, though inaccuracies may</p>	<p>understands the overall topic of the source text and key ideas relevant to the task but misses some details.</p> <p>selects information with minor relevance to the writing task; prioritisation is inconsistent.</p>	<p>produces an answer that fulfils some task components (for example length)</p> <p>produces a basic text structure with some evidence of logical progression.</p>

	<p>(e.g. turn-taking, asking for clarification if needed...) .</p> <p>attempts to monitor their own speech; identifies some common mistakes and address them when needed...</p>	<p>require listener effort to understand meaning.</p> <p>produces limited vocabulary, sometimes inappropriate style and register.</p> <p>contributes limited responses, demonstrating some critical thinking and argumentation skills.</p>	<p>shows understanding of key terminology and concepts with some inconsistencies in usage.</p> <p>provides a descriptive interpretation of the source text with minimal connection to task requirements.</p>	<p>demonstrates some ability to paraphrase when relevant; the text heavily relies on wording from the source text.</p> <p>generally writes cohesively, but connections between ideas may be unclear.</p> <p>produces frequent language errors that sometimes affect comprehension.</p> <p>provides some evidence of evaluation and adaptation of the source material in their own writing.</p> <p>reflects on reading and writing strategies in a very general manner that lacks concrete examples.</p>
NO (<B1)	<p>has difficulty participating appropriately in an interactive interview situation; struggles to follow simple lines of discussion.</p> <p>is rarely able to use interactional strategies for expressing themselves and formulating responses (e.g. turn-taking, asking for clarification), leading to breakdowns in interaction.</p> <p>has clear difficulties monitoring their own speech; rarely identifies or addresses mistakes, even when communication problems arise.</p>	<p>uses very limited vocabulary and grammatical structures; frequent errors significantly affect intelligibility and often impede comprehension.</p> <p>uses pronunciation that is frequently unclear, requiring considerable listener effort to understand meaning.</p> <p>produces very limited vocabulary, with frequent inappropriate use of style and register.</p> <p>has difficulty contributing coherent responses; demonstrates limited ability to express ideas, with little evidence of critical thinking or argumentation.</p>	<p>recognises some familiar words or basic information in the source text, but understanding of the overall topic and key ideas relevant to the task is very limited.</p> <p>selects information from source text irrelevant to the writing task.</p> <p>recognises some key terminology and basic concepts but understanding and use are limited and often inconsistent.</p> <p>provides inaccurate interpretation of the source text with no visible connection to task requirements.</p>	<p>does not respond meaningfully to the task or addresses it only minimally.</p> <p>shows strong dependence on the source text through copying or excessive quoting</p> <p>provides no meaningful reflection of the writing process.</p> <p>produces a text that is largely irrelevant to the pre-task instructions; lacks any kind of visible structure and logical progression; contains frequent or serious language errors that make comprehension difficult.</p>