Oral Presentations Assessment Rubric

Speakers’ (first) Names.
Speaker 1: _________________________.
Speaker 2: _________________________.
Speaker 3: _________________________.
Speaker 4: _________________________.
Speaker 5: _________________________.
Speaker 6: _________________________.
Speaker 7: _________________________.

Questions

1. PRESENTATION LENGTH. Presenters kept within the specified time-limit.
   a) Right on target.
   b) Too long.
   c) Too short.

   Fill in one of the above for each box by speaker number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   The following all ask if you:
   a) Strongly agree.
   b) Agree.
   c) Disagree.
   d) Strongly disagree.

   Fill in one of the above for each box by speaker number. At the end, please comment on each.

2. ORATORICAL PRESENCE/PERFORMANCE (hupokrisis, autoēthopoia). Presenter projected a convincing (neither over-
or nor underdone) rhetorical persona.
   - Stated name and presentation title in a non-perfunctory way. (Presentations start as soon as soon as presenters open their mouths)
   - Conveyed a sense of investment in the speech
   - Made eye contact with audience (not simply instructor), employed suitable gestures, spoke clearly and with suitable voice modulation, suitable pacing
   - In short, presenter “sold” it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. STRUCTURE (taxis). Presenter’s speech offered clear and appropriate structure, as required by genre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. CLARITY. I could readily follow the speech, its sequence of ideas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. REASONING (logismos, epicheireme). Whether or not I agree with the views conveyed, the presenter was able to make the arguments work at the level of logic; they made sense. (This matters, whatever the genre.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
6. LANGUAGE (lexis). The speech employed suitable vocabulary: words well chosen both as to topic and as to level of discourse. Sentences were grammatical.

7. RHETORICAL ELABORATION/AMPLIFICATION (auxēsis, exergasia, peribolē, epicheireme, etc.). Presenter employed figures of speech and thought (Burton Silva Rhetoricae) suitable to the type of speech and to subject matter — did not over- or underdo it, made the expression all the more effective.

YOUR COMMENTS (indicate speaker, req’d for each).