

**Public Justice Oral Presentation PBJ 401 Rubric**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Quality/ Criteria</b>	<b>No/Limited Proficiency 1</b>	<b>Some Proficiency 2</b>	<b>Proficiency 3</b>	<b>High Proficiency 4</b>	<b>(Rating)</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	The purpose of the presentation is not clear to audience. No attempt made to capture the attention of audience.	Purpose is somewhat vague or loosely related to topic. Minimal effort is made to capture the attention of the audience.	Purpose of presentation is fairly clear. Effort was made to capture the attention of the audience.	Purpose of presentation is very clear. Audience attention has been promoted and engaged.	
<b>Securing and maintaining the interest/involvement of the class.</b>	No effort made to involve the class.	Minimal effort made to involve the class. Often only asking for questions after conclusion.	Effort made to involve the class, although not always successful.	Student stimulates and maintains audience involvement and interest.	
<b>Effective use of visual aids/speakers.</b>	No use or ineffective use of visual aids/speakers. No clear purpose for inclusion of visual aids.	Student attempts to use aids, but with minimal effectiveness.	Student uses aids in an effective manner.	Use of aids greatly enhances presentation effectiveness.	
<b>Quality of Information</b>	Student uses questionable resources and insufficient material.	Some quality resources are evident but presentation still lacks quality material.	Many quality sources are used and presentation offers quality information.	Information presented demonstrates the synthesis of multiple quality sources.	
<b>Organization</b>	Audience cannot understand presentation because there is no sequence of information. Presentation time dramatically less than required.	Presentation lacks a logical sequence. Presentation time is inappropriately short or long.	Information is presented in a logical sequence. Presentation time meets the requirement.	Presentation sequence flows well. Timing is very appropriate for the topic.	
<b>Speaker Style</b>	Speaker lacks professionalism. Reads all of report with no eye contact.	Speaker's manner is somewhat professional. Attempts eye contact occasionally.	Speaker's manner is professional. Maintains good eye contact, but reads some material.	Student presents in a highly professional manner. Maintains eye contact and interacts with the audience.	
<b>Evidence of Preparation</b>	Student has minimal knowledge of topic/issues. Preparation is drawn from personal experience rather than from research.	Student is uncomfortable with information and is able to answer only rudimentary questions.	Student is at ease with material. Able to answer most questions.	Student demonstrates full knowledge by answering most class questions with elaboration. Student is confident in knowledge.	
<b>Conclusion</b>	Presentation has no conclusion.	Minimal attempt is made to summarize material.	Summary of importance of topic and issues related to the topic.	Interesting conclusion leading audience to future thought about the issue.	
<b>Effectiveness of Presentation</b>	Audience not at all engaged due to style of presenter and/or organization of material.	Material and presenter somewhat engaging and communicative.	Material conveyed in an interesting, and stimulating fashion to improve knowledge of audience.	Audience actively engaged in learning.	
					<b>OVER</b>

Public Justice Oral Presentation PBJ 401 Rubric [Critical Thinking]

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Quality/ Criteria	No/Limited Proficiency 1	Some Proficiency 2	Proficiency 3	High Proficiency 4	(Rating)
<p>Area 1</p> <p>Students will identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments as they occur in their own and other's work.</p>	<p>1. Does not isolate the argument(s) from extraneous elements in the text.</p> <p>2. Does not identify the argument's conclusion or distinguish it sufficiently from the premises and little or no effort is made to identify relevant definitions or hidden assumptions.</p> <p>3. Does not address whether the argument's premises provide sufficient logical support for the conclusion, independently of the truth of the conclusion.</p> <p>4. Does not consider whether the premises are reasonable to believe, independently of whether they support the conclusion or else no effort is made to evaluate the credibility of the premises' sources.</p>	<p>1. Identifies the target argument(s) but includes extraneous elements such as expressions of opinion and descriptions of events.</p> <p>2. Distinguishes the argument's conclusion from its premises, but little effort is made to identify relevant definitions and/or hidden assumptions.</p> <p>3. Attempts to assess whether the argument's premises provide sufficient logical support for the conclusion, independently of whether the premises are true.</p> <p>4. Attempts to assess the reasonableness of the argument's premises, but little effort is made to consider the credibility of the premises' sources.</p>	<p>1. Identifies the target argument(s).</p> <p>2. Distinguishes the argument's conclusion from its premises and some effort is made to identify relevant definitions and/or hidden assumptions.</p> <p>3. Correctly assesses whether the argument's premises provide sufficient logical support for the conclusion, independently of whether the premises are true.</p> <p>4. Correctly assesses the reasonableness of the premises, including the credibility of their sources, independently of whether they support the conclusion.</p>	<p>1. Identifies the target argument(s) and clearly distinguishes it from any extraneous elements such as expression of opinion and descriptions of events.</p> <p>2. Carefully articulates the argument's conclusion, clearly distinguishes it from its premises and identifies most relevant definitions and/or hidden assumptions.</p> <p>3. Clearly and correctly assesses whether the argument's premises provide sufficient logical support for the conclusion, independently of whether the premises are true.</p> <p>4. Clearly and correctly assesses the reasonableness of the premises, including the credibility of their sources (e.g. observation, testimony, measurement, experiment, etc.), independently of whether the premises support the conclusion.</p>	
<p>Area 2</p> <p>Students will develop well-reasoned arguments.</p>	<p>1. Does not clearly state a conclusion or point of view or else little or no supporting reasoning or evidence is presented.</p> <p>2. Makes no attempt to recognize or respond to objections or alternative points of view.</p> <p>3. Makes not attempt to describe the broader relevance or significance or to apply the reasoning to a novel problem.</p>	<p>1. States a conclusion or point of view but does not organize the evidence or reasons in a logically adequate way.</p> <p>2. Does not clearly identify or respond to relevant objections or alternative points of view.</p> <p>3. Does not adequately describe the broader relevance or significance or apply the reasoning to a novel problem.</p>	<p>1. Presents an argument using evidence and/or logical reasoning in support of a point of view.</p> <p>2. Identifies some qualifications or objections or alternative points of view.</p> <p>3. Describes the broader relevance, significance of context and/or applies the reasoning to a novel problem.</p>	<p>1. Develops a clearly articulated argument, using evidence and/or systematic logical reasoning in support of a conclusion or point of view.</p> <p>2. Identifies relevant qualification or objections or alternative points of view and prioritizes evidence and/or reasons in support of the conclusion.</p> <p>3. Describes the broader relevance, significance or context of the issue and/or applies the reasoning to a novel problem.</p> <p><b>Total Points:</b></p>	

