|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **HD** | **DN** | **CR** | **PS** | **FL** |
| **Individual Delivery:**   * **body language** (stance, movement, gestures, facial expressions) * **paralinguistics** * **Eye contact and prompt cards.** * **Language Use**   **10 marks** | Appropriate and varied body language was extensively and consistently used to effectively reinforce the message and engage the audience | Appropriate body language (stance, movement, gestures and facial expressions) was consistently used to effectively engage the audience. | Appropriate body language was sometimes used to generally engage the audience. | Appropriate body language was minimally used to somewhat engage the audience. | The use of body language was either inappropriate or insufficient to engage the audience. |
| Outstanding use of paralinguistics effectively accentuated important points and captivated and sustained audience attention. | Consistent use of paralinguistics accentuated important points and sustained audience attention. | The moderate use of paralinguistics sustained some audience attention. | The use of paralinguistics was minimal allowing audience attention to drift. | Paralinguistic variations were insufficient or not evident in the presentation. |
| Appropriate eye contact was extensively and consistently used to effectively engage the audience. Prompt cards, if used, were palm size and rarely used to prompt the speaker. | Appropriate eye contact was consistently used to effectively engage the audience. Prompt cards were palm size and used occasionally to prompt the speaker. | Appropriate eye contact was sometimes used to generally engage the audience. Prompt cards were palm size and used regularly to prompt the speaker. | Appropriate eye contact was minimally used to generally engage the audience. Prompt cards were palm size and used extensively to prompt the speaker. | The use of eye contact was either inappropriate or insufficient to engage the audience. Prompt cards were too large and/or relied upon for the majority of the speech. |
| The language used was deliberat-ely chosen and cleverly incorpor-ated to promote understanding (logos), persuasiveness (ethos), and engagement (pathos), and included strategic use of devices such as signposting, revisiting premises/central ideas, catch-phrase, summarising statements. | The language used was deliberately chosen to promote understanding (logos), persuasiveness (ethos), and engagement (pathos), and included use of devices such as signposting, revisiting premises/ central ideas, a catchphrase and summarising statements. | The language used generally promoted some understanding (logos), persuasiveness (ethos), and/or engagement (pathos), and included some use of devices such as signposting, revisiting premises/ central ideas, a catchphrase and summarising statements. | The language used was acceptable but only minimally promoted some understanding (logos), persuasiveness (ethos), and/or engagement (pathos), and include-ed an inconsistent use of devices such as signposting, revisiting premises/ central ideas, catch-phrase, summarising statements. | The language used did not/ minimally, promoted under-standing (logos), persuasiveness (ethos), and/or engagement (pathos), and devices such as signposting, revisiting premises/ central ideas, catchphrase or summarising statements were either poorly, or not used. |
| **Individual Use of Rhetorical Mix:**   * **LOGOS (logic): Logical premise & main ideas support group stance** * **ETHOS (credibility): Use of credible evidence and credible delivery to persuade the audience** * **PATHOS (emotion): Use of devices to emotionally connect to, and engage the audience**   **10 marks** | A highly persuasive premise, supporting the group’s stance and complementing other premises, along with relevant, insightful and logically interlinked main ideas were consistently and compellingly delivered. | A very persuasive premise which supported the group’s stance and complemented other premise along with relevant, and logically interlinked main ideas, were consistently delivered to convince the audience. | A persuasive premise which supported the group’s stance and complemented other premises, along with relevant, main ideas, were delivered to convince the audience. | An appropriate premise which supported the group’s stance and generally complemented other premises, along with generally relevant main ideas, were sometimes used to convince the audience. | A clear or appropriate premise was not introduced to support the group’s stance and/or failed to complement other premises presented and/or the main ideas were either miscommunicated or irrelevant. |
| The main ideas were supported by extensive credible evidence, (meeting task requirements) and the information was presented in a highly convincing manner, demonstrating a superior understanding of the topic. | The main ideas were supported by quality credible evidence (meeting task requirements) and the information was presented in a convincing manner, demonstrating a sound understanding of the topic. | The main ideas were mostly supported by credible evidence (meeting task requirements) and the information was presented in a generally convincing manner, demonstrating a general understanding of the topic. | The main ideas were minimally supported by credible evidence and the information was presented in a reasonable manner, demonstrating some understanding of the topic. | The main ideas were not supported by sufficient credible evidence and/or delivered in an unconvincing manner, demonstrating limited understanding of the topic. |
| The presentation was delibera-tely and thoughtfully designed to incorporate pathos; used evocatively, sensitively and appropriately connect emotionally with the audience. | The presentation was deliber-ately designed to incorporate pathos which was used appropriately to emotionally connect with the audience. | Some pathos was included in the design of the presentation and was used to generally connect emotionally the audience. | Minimal pathos was incorporated into the presentation and used to generally connect with the audience. | The use of pathos was either inappropriate or absent resulting in no palpable audience connection. |
| **Group Argument & Use of Rhetorical Mix:**   * **LOGOS (logic) Present a logical stance/thesis and premises** * **ETHOS (credibility)  credible evidence communicated** * **PATHOS (emotion): Creative design, team presentation style, and use of costumes, props & aids**      * **Demonstration of team cohesion and unity**    1. **Marks(group )** | A strong, logically developed argument was delivered with presentation of a strong stance and relevant premises throughout the presentation, and concluded with a compelling closing statement reinforcing the stance. | A suitable stance was presented and appropriately supported by relevant premises throughout the presentation, concluding with a sound closing statement reinforcing the stance. | A fair stance was presented and supported by reasonable premises for during the presentation, concluding with a closing statement reinforcing the stance. | A basic stance was presented and supported by premises, some which lacked relevance, during the presentation, and/or the closing statement did not sufficiently reinforce the stance. | A discernible stance was not evident and/or supporting information lacked any relevance to the stance and/or omitted an appropriate closing statement. |
| The presentation comprehen- sively and skilfully applied high quality credible evidence in the form of topic related and communication theory (meeting task requirements), demonstrating a superior understanding of the topic. | The presentation skilfully applied very appropriate topic related and communication theory (meeting task requirements), demonstrating a good understanding of the topic. | The presentation applied appropriate topic related and communication theory (meeting task requirements), demonstrating a sound understanding of the topic. | The presentation applied some topic related or communication theory, demonstrating a basic understanding of the topic. | The presentation did not apply sufficient and/or appropriate theory, demonstrating a limited understanding of the topic. |
| Original ideas were used to develop a creatively designed presentation which was performed convincingly to emotionally engage the audience. A wide variety of audio and visual aids/props/ costumes creatively enhanced the key ideas presented. | A creatively designed presentation was developed and performed competently to intellectually and emotionally engage the audience. A variety of audio and visual aids/props/ costumes creatively enhanced the key ideas presented. | The design of the presentation incorporated some creativity and its performance generally engaged the audience. Audio and visual aids/props/ costumes creatively enhanced the key ideas presented. | The design of the presentation incorporated minimal creativity and its performance minimally engaged the audience. Visual/ audio aids were used to communicate the key ideas presented but only occasionally engaged the audience. | This presentation failed to incorporate sufficient originality or creativity and, therefore, failed to engage the audience. Visual/ audio aids failed to communicate the key ideas presented or engage the audience. |
| A flowing and cohesive team presentation was demonstrated with creative and smooth transitions between speakers were, and appropriate dress demonstrated unified team values, and/or provided visual reinforcement of the message. | A cohesive team presentation was demonstrated with creative and smooth transitions between speakers were, and appropriate dress demonstrated unified team values, and/or provided some visual reinforcement of the message. | A cohesive team presentation was demonstrated with competent transitions between speakers, and dress was appropriate, demonstrating some team unity but limited visual reinforcement of the team message. | Minimal team cohesion was demonstrated with some awkward transitions between speakers and/or dress was appropriate but did not demonstrate any team unity or professionalism. | Only minimal or no team cohesion was demonstrated as transitions appeared unrehearsed and/or dress was inappropriate for a formal presentation, resulting in a below average presentation. |
| **Internal Group Processes:**  **Team communication as demonstrated in the performance, tutorial activities, and guided by self and peer assessment.**  **7.5 marks (Individual)** | The student’s performance in the presentation and tutorial activities and their behaviour (as recorded on the peer and self-assessment evaluation tool) demonstrated both: the individual’s total commitment to the team and the processes required for synergetic group development; and a clear awareness of the alignment between individual responsibilities and team goals. | The student’s performance in the presentation and tutorial activities and their behaviour (as recorded on the peer and self-assessment evaluation tool) demonstrated both: the individual’s high commitment to the team and the processes required for synergetic group development; and a moderate awareness of the alignment between individual respon-sibilities and team goals. | The student’s performance in the presentation and tutorial activities and their behaviour (as recorded on the peer and self-assessment evaluation tool) demonstrated both: the individual’s moderate commitment to the team and the processes required for synergetic group development; and an awareness of the alignment between individual responsibilities and team goals. | The student’s performance in the presentation and tutorial activities and their behaviour (as recorded on the peer and self-assessment evaluation tool) demonstrated both: the individual’s limited commitment to the team and the processes required for synergetic group development; and minimal awareness of the alignment between individual responsibilities and team goals. | The student’s performance in the presentation and tutorial activities and their behaviour (as recorded on the peer and self-assessment evaluation tool) demonstrated: no commitment to the team and the processes required for synergetic group development: and no awareness of the alignment between individual respon-sibilities and team goals. |
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