

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO PARANA
PLANO DE ENSINO
FICHA N° 1 (Permanente)

Departamento: Letras Estrangeiras Modernas

Setor: Ciências Humanas, Letras e Artes

Disciplina: Língua Inglesa Escrita IV Código: HE285

Natureza: () anual (x) semestral

Carga Horária: aulas teóricas: 30 aulas práticas: 30
estágio: -- total: 60 créditos: 03

Pré-requisito : Língua Inglesa Escrita III

Co-requisito:

Ementa (Unidades Didáticas)

- Análise de textos quanto aos aspectos funcionais e retóricos.

- Produção de textos para diferentes audiências, meios de divulgação e objetivos (artigos de revistas técnicas ou de divulgação geral, editoriais, crônicas, etc.).

Validade: a partir do ano letivo de 1992
José Erasmo Gruginski

Professor: Vera Lucia Posnik Roloff Assinatura: 
PROF. CELIA MARIA ARNS DE MIRANDA

Chefe do Departamento: Estrangeiras Modernas Assinatura: 

Aprovado pelo C.E.P. - Resolução nº ____ de ____/____/____

Pró-Reitor de Graduação: Assinatura: _____

PLANO DE ENSINO
Ficha No. 2 (parte variável)

Disciplina: LÍNGUA INGLESA ESCRITA IV

Validade: 1996

Código: HE 285

Turma

Local: Ed. Dom Pedro I

Curso:

Professor responsável: Michael Watkins

Programa (os itens de cada unidade didática):

01 - Cartas formais, neutras e informais

02 - Instruções

03 - Resumos: de textos (orais e escritos) em inglês; de textos em português; de mais de um texto.

04 - Tradução de português para inglês (textos jornalísticos).

05 - Ditados (vários tipos).

06 - Relatórios.

07 - Técnicas de ensino da língua escrita; correção e avaliação.

Procedimentos didáticos:

Apresentação de textos autênticos para análise.

Trabalhos escritos na sala de aula, com acompanhamento individualizado pelo professor.

Atividades específicas para treinar pontuação, coesão e sensibilidade à variação estilística.

Objetivos (competências do aluno):

O aluno deve ser capaz de:

01 - escrever uma carta no estilo apropriado ao contexto comunicativo;

02 - escrever instruções claras e objetivas;

03 - escrever o resumo de um texto (oral ou escrito, em inglês ou português), ou de mais de um texto;

04 - traduzir um texto jornalístico de português para inglês conservando o sentido, estilo, e efeito comunicativo do original;

05 - escrever, qualquer que seja a tarefa, usando vocabulário e sintaxe apropriados à situação comunicativa, com pouquíssimos erros. Em termos gerais, escrever ao nível exigido para aprovação no Certificate of Advanced English (CAE), da Universidade de Cambridge, embora com ajuda do dicionário.

inaccuracies
no hindrance whatsoever to fluent reading because of mechanical
inaccuracies

Referências bibliográficas:

- White, R. & Arndt, V. (1991) Process Writing London: Longman
Kroll, B. (ed.) (1990) Second Language Writing Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
Weir, C. (1993) Understanding and Developing Language Tests London: Prentice-Hall
Halim, B. & Mason I. (1990) Discourse and the Translator London: Longman

Avaliação:

Através de trabalhos escritos durante o curso na sala de aula (50%), e duas provas formais (50%), avaliadas de acordo com os critérios na folha anexa.

Professor responsável: Raphael

Coordenadora da área: Eva Cruz Pelegrin

Chefe do departamento:

Prof. María Ascension Jiménez Martín
Chefe do Departamento de Letras
Estrangeiras Modernas
Mata 69523

inaccuracies
No hindrance whatsoever to fluent reading because of mechanical
inaccuracies

1 RELEVANCE AND ADEQUACY OF CONTENT

- 1 Answer of limited relevance to the task set. Major gaps in treatment of topic and/or pointless repetition
- 2 For the most part answers the task set, though there may be some important omissions and/or redundant information, or size may be inadequate.
- 3 Relevant answer to the task set, though some gaps and/or redundancies Size may not be wholly adequate.
- 4 Relevant and adequate answer, on the whole, though not totally satisfactory in some way
- 5 Entirely relevant and adequate treatment of task

2 COHESION (= lexical and grammatical linking devices between and within sentences)

- 1 Cohesion almost totally inadequate for the task.
- 2 Some attempt at appropriate cohesion in places, but mostly inadequate for the task.
- 3 For the most part satisfactory cohesion, but effectiveness reduced in a number of places by inappropriate or non-existent cohesion.
- 4 Effectiveness of communication only slightly reduced in a few places by inappropriate cohesion.
- 5 Totally effective use of cohesion.

3 VOCABULARY

- 1 Frequent inadequacies in vocabulary for the task, making communication largely ineffective.
- 2 Vocabulary inadequate or inappropriate for the task in a number of places, seriously affecting communication at times.
- 3 Occasional inadequacies or inappropriateness of vocabulary, resulting in reduced effectiveness in several places.
- 4 Very few inadequacies in vocabulary for the task. Only occasional inappropriacy, not seriously affecting communication anywhere.
- 5 Choice of vocabulary totally appropriate for the task.

4 GRAMMAR

- 1 Frequent grammatical errors, even in basic structures
- 2 Occasional inaccuracies in basic structures; complex structures not attempted, or mainly inappropriate and/or inaccurate
- 3 Basic structures generally accurate; complex structures not always attempted where appropriate, and with considerable inaccuracy when attempted.
- 4 Basic structures almost entirely accurate, with just occasional slips; complex structures generally used appropriately, but with some inaccuracy at times.
- 5 Entirely appropriate use of grammatical structures, with only very rare inaccuracies.

5 MECHANICAL ACCURACY (spelling, punctuation, layout, handwriting)

- 1 Frequently difficult to read because of mechanical inaccuracies
- 2 Occasionally difficult to read because of mechanical inaccuracies
- 3 Generally easy to read, though effectiveness occasionally reduced because of mechanical inaccuracies.
- 4 Very little hindrance to fluent reading because of mechanical inaccuracies
- 5 No hindrance whatsoever to fluent reading because of mechanical inaccuracies

**PLANO DE ENSINO
(Ficha no. 2 - parte variável)**
LINGUA INGLESA ESCRITA IV **CÓDIGO HE285**

Primeiro e segundo semestres de 1997

Edifício D. Pedro I

Curso de Letras-Inglês

(diurno e noturno)

Professor responsável: EVA CRISTINA R. A. DALMOLIN

PROGRAMA

- 1. Análise de textos quanto aos aspectos funcionais e retóricos.**
- 2. Produção de textos para diferentes audiências, meio de divulgação e objetivos
(artigos de revistas técnicas ou de divulgação geral, editoriais, crônicas,etc)
(ementa)**
- 2.1. Descrições;**
- 2.2. ensaios;**
- 2.3. contos;**
- 2.4. cartas .**

OBJETIVOS

- 1.No final do curso o aluno deverá ser capaz de escrever uma descrição, ensaio ou conto sobre um tema tirado da prova de redação do "Certificate of Proficiency in English" da Universidade de Cambridge, com 350 palavras aproximadamente, sem dicionário, com nota 70 na escala do IELTS anexa para ser aprovado por média ou 50 para ser aprovado em exame final.**
- 2.O aluno também deverá ser capaz de escrever cartas para diferentes audiências, com diferentes níveis de formalidade.**

AVALIAÇÃO:

2(duas) provas bimestrais feitas sob as condições acima mencionadas, corrigidas por uma banca de professores de língua inglesa do DELEM, valendo 50% da nota. Exercícios em sala e em casa, feitos para fins de avaliação valerão 50% da nota.

Referências:

White, R. Arndt. PROCESS WRITING. London, Longman, 1991.

Kingsbury, Roy et alii. CAE Advantage. London, Longman, 1992.

Professora Eva Cristina R.A. Dalmolin

Coordenação da sub-área de LINGUA INGLESA

Chesfia do DELEM

Prof. Maria Ascension Jimenez Martin
Chefe do Departamento de Letras
Estrangeiras Modernas
Matr. 69523

Eva C.R.A. Dalmolin

ACADEMIC AND GENERAL TRAINING WRITING MODULES

COMMUNICATIVE QUALITY

WRITING MODULES TASK 2

Communicative Quality	Arguments, Ideas & Evidence	Vocabulary & Sentence Structure
9. The reader finds the writing completely satisfactory.	A clear point of view is presented and developed. The argument proceeds logically through the text, with a very clear progression of ideas. There is plentiful material.	A wide range of vocabulary and sentence structures is used accurately and appropriately.
8. The reader finds the writing communicates fluently.	A clear point of view is presented and developed. The argument proceeds logically through the text with a clear progression of ideas.	The range of vocabulary and sentence structures used is good, and well controlled for accuracy and appropriacy. There are no significant errors in word formation or spelling.
7. The reader finds the writing satisfactory and that it generally communicates fluently with only occasional lapses.	A generally clear point of view is presented. The argument has a clear progression overall, and ideas and evidence are relevant and sufficient, although there may be minor isolated problems in these areas.	A satisfactory range of vocabulary and sentence structures occurs, usually used appropriately. There are only occasional minor flaws in word formation and in control of sentence structure. Spelling errors may occur, but they are not intrusive.
6. The reader finds the writing mainly satisfactory and that it communicates with some degree of fluency. Although there is occasional strain for the reader, control of organisational patterns and devices is evident.	A point of view is presented, although it may become unclear in places. The progression of the argument is generally clear. The relevance of some ideas or evidence may be dubious and more specific support may seem desirable.	Vocabulary and sentence structures are generally adequate and appropriate, but the reader may feel that control is achieved through the use of a restricted range. In contrast, examples of the use of a wider range of structures are not marked by the same level of accuracy. Some errors in word choice, word formation and spelling may occur, but they are only slightly intrusive.
5. The writing sometimes causes strain for the reader. While the reader is aware of an overall lack of fluency, there is a sense of an answer which has an underlying coherence.	The writing introduces ideas, although they may be limited in number or insufficiently developed. A point of view may be evident, but arguments may lack clarity, relevance, consistency or support.	The range of vocabulary and the appropriacy of its use are limited. There is a limited range of sentence structures and the greatest accuracy is achieved on short, simple sentences. Inappropriate choice of words and errors in areas such as agreement of tenses or subject/verb agreement are noticeable. Word formation and spelling errors may be quite intrusive.
4. The writing attempts communication but the meaning may come through only after considerable effort by the reader.	There are signs of a point of view, but main ideas are difficult to distinguish from supporting material and the amount of support is inadequate. Such evidence and ideas as are presented may not be relevant. There is no clear progression to the argument.	The range of vocabulary is often inadequate and/or inappropriate and limited control of sentence structures, even short, simple ones, is evident. Choice of words can cause significant problems for the reader. Errors in such areas as agreement of tenses or subject/verb agreement, word formation and spelling can cause severe strain for the reader.
3. The seriousness of the problems in the writing prevents meaning from coming through more than spasmodically.	The writing has few ideas and no apparent development. Such evidence and ideas as are presented are largely irrelevant. There is little comprehensible point of view.	Control of vocabulary and sentence structures is evident only occasionally and errors predominate.
2. The writing displays almost no ability to communicate.	There may be glimpses of one or two ideas without development.	There is little or no evidence of control of sentence structure, vocabulary, word form or spelling.
1. The writing appears to be by a virtual non-writer, containing no assessable strings of English writing.		
0. Answers of less than two lines are automatically scored as Band 1.		
0. Should only be used where a candidate did not attend or attempt the question in any way.		

HE285 PLANO DE ENSINO
(ficha 2 - parte variável)
Língua Inglesa Escrita IV

Segundo semestre de 1997

Edifício D. Pedro I

**Curso de Letras-Inglês
(diurno e noturno)**

Professora responsável: EVA CRISTINA R. AVELAR DALMOLIN

Programa

1. Análise de textos quanto aos aspectos funcionais e retóricos.
2. Produção de textos para diferentes audiências, meio de divulgação e objetivos(artigos de revistas técnicas ou de divulgação geral, editoriais, crônicas, etc.)
 - descrições
 - ensaios
 - contos
 - editoriais
 - cartas

Objetivos

1. O aluno deverá ser capaz de produzir diferentes tipos de textos para diferentes audiências no final do curso, a nível da prova de redação do exame de proficiência em inglês da Universidade de Cambridge.
2. O aluno deverá ser capaz de escrever cartas para diferentes audiências com diferentes níveis de formalidade.

Avaliação

02 (duas) provas bimestrais constando de um prova de redação do "Certificate of Proficiency in English" da Universidade de Cambridge, com 350 palavras, **sem uso do dicionário**, com nota baseada na escala do IELTS(anexa). Estas provas bimestrais serão corrigidas por uma banca de dois professores de língua inglesa, sendo um deles o professor responsável pela disciplina.
As provas valerão **50% da nota bimestral**, enquanto que exercícios em sala de aula ou em casa para fins de avaliação valerão os outros **50% da nota bimestral**.

Referências bibliográficas:

- Jolly, David. Writing Tasks. Cambridge, 1984.
Kingsbury, Roy et alii. CAE Advantage. London, Longman. 1992.
White, R. Process Writing. Longman, 1992.
Testes de proficiência em inglês da Universidade de Cambridge.

Eva Cristina R. Avelar Dalmolin

Professora EVA CRISTINA R. AVELAR DALMOLIN

Nair Nodoca Taneuchi
Chefe do DELEM, em exercício

**PROFILE BAND DESCRIPTORS
ACADEMIC AND GENERAL TRAINING WRITING MODULES**

Communicative Quality

WRITING MODULES TASK 2

Communicative Quality	Arguments, Ideas & Evidence	Vocabulary & Sentence Structure
9. The reader finds the writing completely satisfactory.	A clear point of view is presented and developed. The argument proceeds logically through the text, with a very clear progression of ideas. There is plentiful material.	A wide range of vocabulary and sentence structures is used accurately and appropriately.
8. The reader finds the writing communicates fluently.	A clear point of view is presented and developed. The argument proceeds logically through the text with a clear progression of ideas.	The range of vocabulary and sentence structures used is good, and well controlled for accuracy and appropriacy. There are no significant errors in word formation or spelling.
7. The reader finds the writing satisfactory and that it generally communicates fluently with only occasional lapses.	A generally clear point of view is presented. The argument has a clear progression overall, and ideas and evidence are relevant and sufficient, although there may be minor isolated problems in these areas.	A satisfactory range of vocabulary and sentence structures occurs, usually used appropriately. There are only occasional minor flaws in word formation and in control of sentence structure. Spelling errors may occur, but they are not intrusive.
6. The reader finds the writing mainly satisfactory and that it communicates with some degree of fluency. Although there is occasional strain for the reader, control of organisational patterns and devices is evident.	A point of view is presented, although it may become unclear in places. The progression of the argument is generally clear. The relevance of some ideas or evidence may be dubious and more specific support may seem desirable.	Vocabulary and sentence structures are generally adequate and appropriate, but the reader may feel that control is achieved through the use of a restricted range. In contrast, examples of the use of a wider range of structures are not marked by the same level of accuracy. Some errors in word choice, word formation and spelling may occur, but they are only slightly intrusive.
5. The writing sometimes causes strain for the reader. While the reader is aware of an overall lack of fluency, there is a sense of an answer which has an underlying coherence.	The writing introduces ideas, although they may be limited in number or insufficiently developed. A point of view may be evident, but arguments may lack clarity, relevance, consistency or support.	The range of vocabulary and the appropriacy of its use are limited. There is a limited range of sentence structures and the greatest accuracy is achieved on short, simple sentences. Inappropriate choice of words and errors in areas such as agreement of tenses or subject/verb agreement are noticeable. Word formation and spelling errors may be quite intrusive.
4. The writing attempts communication but the meaning may come through only after considerable effort by the reader.	There are signs of a point of view, but main ideas are difficult to distinguish from supporting material and the amount of support is inadequate. Such evidence and ideas as are presented may not be relevant. There is no clear progression to the argument.	The range of vocabulary is often inadequate and/or inappropriate and limited control of sentence structures, even short, simple ones, is evident. Choice of words can cause significant problems for the reader. Errors in such areas as agreement of tenses or subject/verb agreement, word formation and spelling can cause severe strain for the reader.
3. The seriousness of the problems in the writing prevents meaning from coming through more than spasmodically.	The writing has few ideas and no apparent development. Such evidence and ideas as are presented are largely irrelevant. There is little comprehensible point of view.	Control of vocabulary and sentence structures is evident only occasionally and errors predominate.
2. The writing displays almost no ability to communicate.	There may be glimpses of one or two ideas without development.	There is little or no evidence of control of sentence structure, vocabulary, word form or spelling.
1. The writing appears to be by a virtual non-writer, containing no assessable strings of English writing. Answers of less than two lines are automatically scored as Band 1. Should only be used where a candidate did not attend or attempt the question in any way.		



UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO PARANÁ
SETOR DE CIÊNCIAS HUMANAS, LETRAS E ARTES
DEPARTAMENTO DE LETRAS ESTRANGEIRAS MODERNAS

PLANO DE ENSINO

FICHA N° 2 (variável)

Disciplina: Língua Inglesa Escrita IV

Código: HE285

Validade: 2º semestre de 1998

Curso: Letras Inglês

Turma:

Professor Responsável: Mariza Riva de Almeida

Programa (os itens de cada unidade didática):

- 01- Análise de textos quanto aos aspectos funcionais e retóricos.
- 02- Leitura e produção de textos para diferentes audiências, meios de divulgação e objetivos (artigos de revistas técnicas ou de divulgação geral, editoriais, crônicas, poesias, revisões literárias, textos jornalísticos, cartas, propagandas, descrições).
- 03- Comparação de características entre textos falados e escritos.

Procedimentos didáticos:

- 01- Produção de textos escritos sobre temas estabelecidos em sala de aula.
- 02- Compreensão de textos a partir da leitura dos mesmos.

Objetivos (competências do aluno):

- 01- O aluno deverá ser capaz de produzir diferentes tipos de textos para diferentes audiências.
- 02- O aluno deverá ser capaz de trabalhar com compreensão e análise de textos a nível adiantado, explorando vocabulário relativo a temas diversos.

Referências Bibliográficas:

- JONES, L. Progress to Proficiency. Cambridge : CUP, 1988.
McCARTHY, M. & O'DELL, F. English Vocabulary in Use. Cambridge: CUP, 1994.
SWAN, MICHAEL. Practical English Usage. Oxford: OUP, 1992.
WELLMAN, G. Wordbuilder. Avon: Heinemann, 1992.

Avaliação:

Textos produzidos em sala de aula e em casa pelos alunos (50% da avaliação).
Duas provas bimestrais, constando da produção escrita de textos.

Observação: Para efeitos de avaliação será usado o critério do exame IELTS (em anexo). A nota para aprovação sem exame final será 7 na escala IELTS ou 5 para aprovação com exame final.

Professor responsável:

Waldemar

Coordenador(a) do curso:

Waldemar

Chefe do departamento:

Celia Maria Arns de Miranda

Prof. Celia Maria Arns de Miranda
Chefe do Departamento de Letras Estrangeiras Modernas
Matr. 066036

WRITING IV - Criteria for Evaluation
(IELTS - The International English
Language Testing System)

PROFILE BAND DESCRIPTORS

ACADEMIC AND GENERAL TRAINING WRITING MODULES

TASK 2

Communicative Quality	Arguments, Ideas & Evidence	Vocabulary & Sentence Structure
9. The reader finds the writing completely satisfactory.	A clear point of view is presented and developed. The argument proceeds logically through the text, with a very clear progression of ideas. There is plentiful material.	A wide range of vocabulary and sentence structures is used accurately and appropriately.
8. The reader finds the writing communicates fluently.	A clear point of view is presented and developed. The argument proceeds logically through the text with a clear progression of ideas.	The range of vocabulary and sentence structures used is good, and well controlled for accuracy and appropriacy. There are no significant errors in word formation or spelling.
7. The reader finds the writing satisfactory and that it generally communicates fluently with only occasional lapses.	A generally clear point of view is presented. The argument has a clear progression overall, and ideas and evidence are relevant and sufficient, although there may be minor isolated problems in these areas.	A satisfactory range of vocabulary and sentence structures occurs, usually used appropriately. There are only occasional minor flaws in word formation and in control of sentence structure. Spelling errors may occur, but they are not intrusive.
6. The reader finds the writing mainly satisfactory and that it communicates with some degree of fluency. Although there is occasional strain for the reader, control of organisational patterns and devices is evident.	A point of view is presented, although it may become unclear in places. The progression of the argument is generally clear. The relevance of some ideas or evidence may be dubious and more specific support may seem desirable.	Vocabulary and sentence structures are generally adequate and appropriate, but the reader may feel that control is achieved through the use of a restricted range. In contrast, examples of the use of a wider range of structures are not marked by the same level of accuracy. Some errors in word choice, word formation and spelling may occur, but they are only slightly intrusive.
5. The writing sometimes causes strain for the reader. While the reader is aware of an overall lack of fluency, there is a sense of an answer which has an underlying coherence.	The writing introduces ideas, although they may be limited in number or insufficiently developed. A point of view may be evident, but arguments may lack clarity, relevance, consistency or support.	The range of vocabulary and the appropriacy of its use are limited. There is a limited range of sentence structures and the greatest accuracy is achieved on short, simple sentences. Inappropriate choice of words and errors in areas such as agreement of tenses or subject/verb agreement are noticeable. Word formation and spelling errors may be quite intrusive.
4. The writing attempts communication but the meaning may come through only after considerable effort by the reader.	There are signs of a point of view, but main ideas are difficult to distinguish from supporting material and the amount of support is inadequate. Such evidence and ideas as are presented may not be relevant. There is no clear progression to the argument.	The range of vocabulary is often inadequate and/or inappropriate and limited control of sentence structures, even short, simple ones, is evident. Choice of words can cause significant problems for the reader. Errors in such areas as agreement of tenses or subject/verb agreement, word formation and spelling can cause severe strain for the reader.
3. The seriousness of the problems in the writing prevents meaning from coming through more than spasmodically.	The writing has few ideas and no apparent development. Such evidence and ideas as are presented are largely irrelevant. There is little comprehensible point of view.	Control of vocabulary and sentence structures is evident only occasionally and errors predominate.
2. The writing displays almost no ability to communicate.	There may be glimpses of one or two ideas without development.	There is little or no evidence of control of sentence structure, vocabulary, word form or spelling.
1. The writing appears to be by a virtual non-writer, containing no assessable strings of English writing. Answers of less than two lines are automatically scored as Band 1. 0. Should only be used where a candidate did not attend or attempt the question in any way.		

PLANO DE ENSINO
Ficha número 2

LÍNGUA INGLESA ESCRITA IV HE285

Primeiro semestre letivo de 1999

Curso de Letras-Inglês

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO PARANÁ

Professora responsável: EVA CRISTINA RODRIGUES AVELAR DAL MOLIN

Programa:

1. Análise de textos quanto aos aspectos funcionais retóricos.
2. Leitura e produção de textos para diferentes audiências, meios de divulgação e objetivos (artigos de revistas técnicas ou de divulgação geral, editoriais, crônicas, poesias, revisões literárias, textos jornalísticos, cartas, propagandas, descrições)
3. Comparação de características entre textos falados e escritos.

Procedimentos didáticos:

1. Produção de textos escritos sobre temas estabelecidos em sala de aula
2. Compreensão de textos a partir da leitura dos mesmos.

OBJETIVOS:

1. O aluno deverá ser capaz de produzir diferentes tipos de textos para diferentes audiências.
2. O aluno deverá ser capaz de trabalhar com compreensão e análise de textos a nível adiantado, explorando vocabulário relativo a diversos textos.

Avaliação: textos produzidos em sala de aula e em casa pelos alunos valendo 50% da nota, duas provas bimestrais constando da produção escrita de textos, valendo 50% da nota.
Para efeito de avaliação será usado o critério do exame IELTS.

Referências bibliográficas:

JONES, L. Progress to Proficiency. Cambridge.
SWAN, Michael. Practical English Usage. Oxford.
ACTIVATOR. Longman.

Assinaturas:

Professora responsável:

Eva Cristina Avelar Dal Molin

Coordenação da Área de Inglês:

Ricardo Vaz D'Ávila

Chefia do DELEM:

Celia Maria Arns de Miranda

Profª Celia Maria Arns de Miranda
Chefe do Departamento de Letras Estrangeiras Modernas
Matr. 066036

**PLANO DE ENSINO
FICHA N° 2 (variável)**

Disciplina: Língua Inglesa Escrita IV

Código: HE 285

Validade: 2º semestre de 1999

Turma:

Curso: Letras - Inglês

Professor Responsável: Mariza Riva de Almeida

Programa (os itens de cada unidade didática):

- 01 - Análise de textos quanto aos aspectos funcionais retóricos.
- 02 - Leitura e produção de textos para diferentes audiências, meios de divulgação e objetivos (artigos de revistas técnicas ou de divulgação geral, editoriais, crônicas, poesias, revisões literárias, textos jornalísticos, cartas, propagandas, descrições).
- 03 - Comparação de características entre textos falados e escritos.

Procedimentos didáticos:

- 01 - Produção de textos escritos sobre temas estabelecidos em sala de aula.
- 02 - Compreensão de textos a partir da leitura destes.

Objetivos (competência do aluno):

- 01 - O aluno deverá ser capaz de produzir diferentes tipos de textos para diferentes audiências.
- 02 - O aluno deverá ser capaz de trabalhar com compreensão e análise de textos a nível adiantado, explorando vocabulários relativos a textos diversos.

Referências Bibliográficas:

- JONES, L. Progress to Proficiency. Cambridge: CUP, 1998.
McCARTHY, M. & O'DELL, F. English Vocabulary in Use. Cambridge: CUP, 1994.
SWAM, Michael. Practical English Usage. Oxford: OUP, 1992.
WELLMAN, G. Wordbuilder. Avon: Heinemann, 1992.

Avaliação:

- Textos produzidos em sala de aula e em casa pelos alunos (50%) da avaliação.
- Duas provas bimestrais, constando da produção escrita de textos.

Observação: Para efeitos de avaliação será usado o critério do exame IELTS (em anexo). A nota para aprovação sem exame final de 7 (sete) na escala IELTS ou 5 (cinco) para aprovação com exame final.

Professor responsável: Mariza Riva de Almeida

Coordenador (a) do curso: Eduardo Costa

Chefe do departamento: E. G. J.