

4. Oral Presentation (An example for an assignment that contributes to all or most of the credits of a course, using grade points for conversion purpose)

Criteria	Excellent GP = 4	Good GP = 3	Satisfactory GP = 2	Marginal Pass GP = 1	Fail GP = 0
<i>Organization of the presentation</i>					
Introduction	Topic and focus of the presentation introduced clearly and in an interesting way. Outline was given.	Topic and focus of the presentation were made clear. Outline was given.	Topic and focus of the presentation were introduced.	Topic and/or focus of the presentation were introduced but limited.	PLAGIARISM or NON SUBMISSION
Main point	The central claim of the presentation was clearly identified and was easy to follow. Connection of main points was in order with succinct transitions.	The central claim of the presentation was identified and there were connections between main points.	The central claim of the presentation was included but difficult to follow.	Central claim of the presentation was difficult to identify.	
Grouping of ideas	The presentation was organized into clearly-identifiable sections with logical and interesting sequence which audience can follow.	The presentation was organized into identifiable sections with most information presented in logical sequence. A few minor points maybe confusing.	Students jumped around sections and several points were confusing.	The presentation had limited identifiable sections and ideas were disjointed.	
Conclusion	Ended with a conclusion which reinforced the main points of the presentation. Showing thoughtful, strong evaluation of the evidence presented.	The presentation ended with a summary of the main points showing some evaluation of evidence presented.	The presentation ended with a summary with a few evidence of evaluating content based on evidence.	The presentation ended without limited evidence of summary or conclusion.	

Criteria	Excellent GP = 4	Good GP = 3	Satisfactory GP = 2	Marginal Pass GP = 1	Fail GP = 0
Content					
Depth	An accurate and complete explanation of key concepts was presented. Level of presentation was appropriate for the audience.	For the most part, explanations of concepts were accurate and complete. Level of presentation was generally appropriate for the audience.	Explanations of concepts were accurate but incomplete. Portions of presentation were too elementary or sophisticated for the audience.	Explanations of concepts were mostly inaccurate and incomplete. Presentation was mostly too elementary or too sophisticated for the audience.	PLAGIARISM or NON SUBMISSION
Accuracy	Information (names, facts, etc.) was precise, explicit and consistently accurate.	No significant errors were made. A few inconsistencies or errors in information were identified.	Enough errors were made to distract knowledgeable listener, but some information is accurate.	Information included was mostly inaccurate that the audience can hardly depend on the presentation as a source of accurate information.	
Evidence	There were enough amount and varieties of supporting materials (e.g. examples, quotes from interviewees, photo captures, etc.) that made the central claims persuasive.	Most of the supporting materials were significant to make the central claims persuasive.	Supporting materials were lack in development or not enough varieties of supporting materials were used to make the central claims persuasive.	There were limited supporting materials to make the central claims persuasive.	

Criteria	Excellent GP = 4	Good GP = 3	Satisfactory GP = 2	Marginal Pass GP = 1	Fail GP = 0
<i>Connection to the audience</i>					
Verbal: Enthusiasm	A strong positive feeling about the topic was demonstrated during the entire presentation.	Positive feelings about the topic were occasionally shown.	Some negative feelings toward the topic were shown.	There was limited interest in the topic presented.	PLAGIARISM or NON SUBMISSION
Verbal: Responsiveness to audience	Highly responsive to audience comments and needs. Consistently clarifies, restates, and response to questions. Summarizes when needed.	Generally responsive to audience comments and needs. Most of the time, clarifies, restates, and response to questions and summarizes when needed.	Reluctantly interacts with audience. Responds to questions inadequately.	Active audience participation were avoided and discouraged. Was hardly responsive to audiences.	
Nonverbal: Eye contact	Eye contact was maintained throughout or the speakers constantly looked at the audience. Rarely read to notes.	Eye contact was maintained most of the time or the speakers occasionally looked at the audience. Sometimes read to notes.	Some eye contact, but not maintained. Speakers only focused to particular part of the class, did not scan the audience. At least half of the time read to notes.	Limited attempt to look at audience. Read notes most of the entire time.	
Nonverbal: Body language and facial expressions	Body languages reflected confidence and ease when interacting with audience.	Body language reflected comfort when interacting with audience.	Body language reflected some discomfort when interacting with audience.	Body language revealed some reluctance to interact with audience.	
<i>Team Work Skills</i>					
Team Balance	Every member of the team had equal chances of presenting the materials. The first speaker introduced the team-mates and captured the attention of the audience to the topic. The final speaker concluded the presentation with captures of main points.	Every member of the team had chances of presenting the materials but not equally shared the load.	Not every member of the team contributed to the presentation. Only one or two members dominated the presentation.	Team work was hardly observed. The distribution of presentation work load was hardly compromised.	PLAGIARISM or NON SUBMISSION
Transitions	Transitions from one speaker to another were smoothed. Team members "added value" to the work of others in the team.	Transitions from one speaker to another were smoothed and team members generally "added value" to the work of other members.	Transitions from one speaker to another were observed but not very smooth.	Transitions were hardly observed from one speaker to another. Each speaker considered their part almost in isolation.	

Criteria	Excellent GP = 4	Good GP = 3	Satisfactory GP = 2	Marginal Pass GP = 1	Fail GP = 0
<i>Use of Visual Aids</i>					
Visual Aid	Visual aids (photos, videos, etc.) were logically used to reinforce the spoken messages and the central claims of the presentation. The audience was engaged and kept interested.	Most of the visual aids used were appropriated and related to the spoken message. The presentation was supported effectively.	Visual aids were occasionally used appropriately to support some of the spoken messages.	Limited visual aids (including PowerPoint) were used.	PLAGIARISM or NON SUBMISSION
<i>Time Management</i>					
Length	The presentation was finished in time. Within 30 seconds above or below the allotted time (10 min).	The presentation was a little bit overrun or under run. Within 1 minute above or below the allotted time.	The presentation was either overrun or under run for more than 1 minute.	The presentation was overrun for 1 minute and not all contents were able to be presented. Or, the presentation was few minutes below the allotted time.	PLAGIARISM or NON SUBMISSION

This rubric is modified based on [HTTP://WWW.AACU.ORG/VALUE/RUBRICS/PDF/ORALCOMMUNICATION.PDF](http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/pdf/oralcommunication.pdf)