

Your name, date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Second Oral Presentation 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.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

*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. Presenter projected a convincing (neither over- 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

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. STRUCTURE. Presenter's speech offered clear and appropriate structure, as required by genre.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

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

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. REASONING. 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.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. LANGUAGE. The speech employed suitable vocabulary: words well chosen both as to topic and as to level of discourse. Sentences were grammatical.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. RHETORICAL ELABORATION/AMPLIFICATION. Presenter employed figures of speech and thought suitable to the presenter's argument — did not over- or underdo it.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

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

