**TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_/40 \* 15 (weight) = \_\_\_\_\_%**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation: individual** | **Excellent** **4** | **Acceptable** **3** | **Needs Work** **2** | **Unacceptable****1** |
| **Point of View** | Presenter establishes a point of view and maintains clear purpose via suitable voice and tone  | Evidence of a point of view can be found and presenter generally maintains purpose | Presenter attempts to create a point of view and communicate a purpose | Presenter fails to create a point of view there is not a clear purpose |
| **Focus** | Conveys an insightful point All parts of the presentation have clear and/or explicit connection to that central point. | Conveys a point but that point lacks insight. There may be some parts of the presentation that don't clearly connect to the central point. | Produced a draft around a common topic, but did not convey a central point. Parts of the presentation are linked by a common subject matter, but the relationship among ideas is not often clear and/or explicit. | Comprised of various subject matter with no apparent relationship among ideas. |
| **Format/Grammar** | The presenter demonstrated mastery of conventions appropriate to the intended audience. | The presenter sometimes deviated from appropriate conventions, but the meaning of the writer was not impaired. | Deviations from conventions distracted the listener from the presenter’s meaning. | Deviations from conventions made the meaning of the presenter unclear. |
| **Oral Presentation- Content** | The presentation fulfilled all the requirements of the assignment. Thorough preparation/research was evident. The speaker demonstrated a command of facts and information. | The presentation met most requirements of the assignment. Preparation and research were evident. The speaker demonstrated some command of facts and information. | The presentation failed to meet significant requirements of the assignment. Little evidence of preparation and research. Command of facts and information was insufficient. | The presentation failed to meet most significant requirements of the assignment. Little evidence of preparation or research was provided. Speaker had a limited understanding of the facts. |
| **Overall Verbal Effectiveness**  | The speaker enunciated clearly and spoke fluently. Used volume and rate effectively. Excellent vocal variety and engaged the class in the topic. | The speaker enunciated clearly most of the time and spoke with some fluency. Used some changes in volume and rate effectively. Reasonable vocal variety. Mostly engaged the class in the topic. | The speaker did not enunciate clearly. Fluency was sporadic. The speaker used few changes in volume or rate. At times the class could not hear clearly. Did not keep the class engaged in the topic. | The speaker enunciated poorly and the delivery was choppy. The class had difficulty hearing throughout. The speaker employed little variation. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation: Goup as a whole** | **Excellent** **4** | **Acceptable** **3** | **Needs Work** **2** | **Unacceptable****1** |
| **Time Management** | Made good use of time and adhered to the time allotment. Structured the presentation and lesson in a logical, thoughtful manner. | Usually made good use of time and almost adhered to the time allotment. Mostly structured the presentation and lesson in a logical manner. | Occasionally made good use of time and did not adhere to time allotment. Some of the presentation and lesson was structured in a logical manner.  | Did not make good use of time or adhere to the time allotment. Did not structure the presentation and lesson in a logical, thoughtful manner. |
| **Group Structure** | The overall presentation made sense in a cohesive way and flowed seamlessly between the presenters  | The overall presentation usually made sense and there was decent flow between presenters. | The overall presentation occasionally made sense and some of the flow between presenters worked  | The overall presentation structure did not make sense or flow from one presenter to another |
| **Introduction** | The introduction laid the groundwork for the presentation in a clear and understandable manner.  | The introduction mostly laid the groundwork for the presentation in a clear and understandable manner. | The introduction laid some groundwork for the presentation. | The introduction did not lay the groundwork for the presentation. |
| **Conclusion**  | The conclusion tied together the entire presentation in way that clearly outlined the differences and similarities between different dances. | The conclusion mostly tied together the entire presentation in way that clearly outlined the differences and similarities between different dances. | Parts of the conclusion tied the presentation together however some elements were not addressed. | There was not a clear conclusion to the presentation. |
| **Powerpoint/visuals** | The visuals supported the overall presentation and made sense in a cohesive way. | The visuals mostly supported the overall presentation and usually made sense. | The visuals supported some of the overall presentation. | The visuals were lacking and did not support the overall presentation. |