|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CRITERIA | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Below Expectations |
| **Form** |  |  |  |
| introduction | captivating attention-getter; thesis was clear and thought-provoking; intro precisely forecasted main points  | gained audience interested; thesis was clear; upcoming main points were generally clear | struggled to get audience attention; thesis was unclear; upcoming main points were absent or confusing |
| organization of main points  | main points were clear and distinct through entire speech  | main points were generally distinct and sensible  | main points were indistinct; organization was haphazard |
| connectives (transitions, previews, reviews) | incredibly easy to follow; used frequent connectives to aid audience comprehension | relatively easy to follow; generally used connectives when needed  | difficult to follow; did not use many connective devices  |
| conclusion | contained a clear and accurate summary of the speech, and left the audience with a positive impression | conclusion functioned well enough to review the main points of the speech and indicated sense of finality | lacked a conclusion; summary was absent or confusing; uncertain if speech had actually ended |
| time constraints | was within time limits | was within time limits | was outside time limits |
| **Content** |  |  |  |
| choice of topic | Topic was challenging and handled expertly  | Topic was moderately challenging | Unchallenging topic or trivial treatment of topic |
| reasoning and argumentation | reasoning was flawless; arguments were compelling; no fallacies were committed | generally well-reasoned; arguments were valid and free of fallacies | contained flawed reasoning and/or used poor arguments (committed fallacies, etc.)  |
| use of evidence | evidence was abundant and high-quality; fully established sources’ credentials orally; evidence perfectly fit the topic and the claims | evidence was sufficient and most was high-quality; sources were orally cited; evidence backed up claims well | some or all evidence was poor, biased, low-quality; did not cite some sources orally; evidence wasn’t always fitting to the argument |
| clarity of ideas andadapted to occasion and audience  | entire speech was understandable and meaningful for a general audience  | most of the speech was meaningful to nearly every audience member  | was either overly simplistic or too highly technical for a general audience |
| visual aid construction | visual aid was necessary, quickly understandable, and aesthetically pleasing | visual aid was necessary and generally useful as illustration of claim or evidence | visual aid was redundant with verbal message, unclear, irrelevant, or not interpretable |
| **Delivery** |  |  |  |
| use of speaking notes and eye contact | notes were minimal, appeared almost to not need notes at all, eye contact 85% or more of time | used minimal notes only; relied somewhat on notes, more half of time sustained eye contact | relied extensively on notes, or read directly from notes, less than 50% time eye contact |
| level of confidence and enthusiasm  | was clearly prepared and confident, excellent poise and passion for the topic | was generally confident and poised; enthused about speech | was overly nervous or appeared unprepared; lacked enthusiasm |
| rate and volume | volume was appropriate, rate of speech was perfectly paced | could be heard by all in the room, rate was understandable | either too quiet or too loud, spoke too quickly to be understood |
| fluency(no “ums”, “ahs”, “likes”) | contained almost no influencies  | contained only a few influencies | contained frequent and distracting influencies |
| use of visual aid | only shown when necessary, faced audience at all times | generally displayed and hid at correct times, faced audience nearly always | displayed when not referring to VA, turned back to audience |