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|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1, 0 |
| Audience  Awareness / Use of Technology | Demonstrates a clear understanding of Moeller audience and the situation; uses appropriate vocabulary/voice and arguments. Power Point / Supporting element (whatever speaker uses) acts as a powerful support / guide for the audience to follow the speech, utilizing brief videos, captivating images, limited text. | Demonstrates a general understanding of the Moeller audience and the situation; uses vocabulary and arguments appropriate for that audience; author uses some technological platform as a guide for the audience that works well | Demonstrates some understanding of the Moeller audience and situation; uses arguments appropriate for that audience; technological platform distracts the audience or doesn’t work well in conveying the message | Demonstrates little to no attention to the audience and / or the situation.  Author’s technological platform is disconnected from presentation. Power Point / technology demonstrates little attention / effort / focus; author doesn’t use a technological platform. |
| Goal / Thesis | The goal or thesis provides a clear, strong, convincing claim (fact, value, policy) or set of claims for the audience | The goal or thesis provides a clear claim (fact, value, policy) or set of claims for the audience | An explicit goal or claim is present, but does not make the action clear for the audience | There is clear, definitive claim for the audience |
| Evidence Depicting Topic / Claim for Audience | Includes three or more pieces of CRAAP-worthy evidence (facts, examples, statistics, real-life experiences) that demonstrate the topic / reason for action. The speaker anticipates the listener’s concerns, biases, or arguments by addressing them. All sources are attributed | Includes three or more pieces of relatively CRAAP-worthy evidence (facts, statistics, examples, real-life experiences) that demonstrate the topic / reason for action | Includes two pieces of somewhat CRAAP-worthy evidence (facts, statistics, examples, real-life experiences) that demonstrate the topic / reason for action | Includes one or fewer pieces of evidence (facts, statistics, examples, real-life experiences) that demonstrate the topic / reason for action.  Evidence is unrelated, insufficient, not at all CRAAP-worthy |
| Unity, Logic, Coherence | Speech’s organization is logical, clear, and easy to follow, making use of transitional words and phrases that make the text flow well. The writing is concise, avoids redundancy, and remains relevant to the main point being expressed. | Speech’s organization is generally logical, clear, and easy to follow, but contains some repetitions and redundancies or drifts from the main point being expressed. | Speech’s organization is basically okay, but contains some faulty logic, redundancies or digressions that take away from the main point being expressed. | Speech is difficult to follow due to lack of unity, coherence, or use of fuzzy logic. |
| Verbal / Nonverbal Elements of speaking | Speaker expresses himself clearly, coherently, modifying volume / tone / inflection according to the content of the speech. | Speaker’s volume, tone, inflection moderated at some points, but may be problematic at times. | Verbal elements in the speech prove problematic in the speaker’s conveying his message to his audience. | Speaker’s volume, tone, inflection are awkward; little to no attention shown in utilizing verbal communication to convey speech |
| Nonverbal elements of speaking | Speaker utilizes effective , even masterful nonverbal communication, utilizing gesticulation to emphasize ideas and maintaining steady eye contact and posture throughout the speech | Speaker’s nonverbal communication is mostly effective, but gesticulation, eye contact, posture are problematic at times. | Nonverbal elements are problematic in the speaker conveying his message to the audience | Speaker shows little to no attention to nonverbal cues in conveying his message to the audience |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 24=100 | 23=96 | 22=92 | 21=88 | 20=84 |
| 19=80 | 18=77 | 17=74 | 16=71 | 15 or below=69 |

**Comments:**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_ X 2 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**
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