Rubric for evaluating the informative speeches of your peers

***Speaker \_Jack Adamson \_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***

***Topic \_Titration \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***

***Evaluator \_Santiago Bermudez\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***

Canvas will assign to you 4 of your colleagues. This form will provide for you a framework for performing the analysis/evaluation. Print off 4 copies of this form and use question/response format to provide your feedback. I recommend completing your evaluations first by hand, then cutting and pasting this document on to a Microsoft Word document to type in your submissions to me. All of your submissions to me must be typed per the writing requirements of the course. The amount of points you get for each of these forms will directly correspond to my perception of the thoughtfulness and helpfulness you demonstrate, you can earn up to 10 points per evaluation for a total of 40 points. ***Use specific feedback, don’t generalize, and give examples. Without such specificity you will not earn the available points.***

**Attention getting device**

Did the speaker consciously use an effective attention getting device in the introduction?

Jack does not seem to use an attention-getting device at all in his introduction. He simply starts his presentation. The result of this is that he comes off as unenthusiastic and starts off his presentation in a weak manner.

**Purpose statement**

Did the speaker clearly state the purpose of the speech ("the purpose of my speech is to demonstrate . . . ") in the introduction?

Yes. Jack tells his audience that the purpose of his speech is to inform them of a chemistry lab technique known as “titration”.

**Credibility statement**

Did the speaker clearly state why she/he is an authority to speak on the topic?

Yes. Jack explains to the audience that he is Chemistry major who has done titration calculations hundreds of times in labs over the past couple of years.

**Salience**

Did the speaker clearly state why this topic is important/valuable to the audience?

Jack explains that titration is used in most branches of physical science, is commonly used in medicine, and has immeasurably benefited the human race. He isn’t direct about why it is important but appears to be on a borderline between having properly done his salience statement and having not done his salience statement properly.

**Preview of main points**

Within the introduction, did the speaker distinctly preview all of the main points?

*This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome*

Yes. Jack explains that he will start off with a “bird’s eye-view” of what titration is, then give a “mechanical” analysis of titration, and finally end with some applications of titration.

**Organization**

Was the presentation organized in a logical, easy to follow manner?

Yes. Jack starts off by explaining what titration is to the best of his ability (he explains that it is the process by which you try and determine the concentration of one substance by using another substance). He then goes on to talk about what is used in titration and what can be observed. Finally, he ends his discussion of main points with pharmaceutical applications, as he said he would.

**Content**

Was the content relevant to the topic and was there enough or too much?

*This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome*

The content that Jack presented seemed to be relevant regarding his topic of titration. Nothing he presented went off track and he managed to present everything within the time constraints, so he came prepared with just enough content.

**References**

Did the speaker cite credible (peer reviewed scholarly articles) within the speech as well as citing them in the outline? (3 required)

Jacob does not ever verbally cite any of his sources or articles in his speech. Again, I don’t have access to anyone’s outlines, so I can’t answer the second part of the question.

**Transitions**

Did the speaker "connect the dots" for the audience?

Jacob does “connect the dots” for his audience with the help of his visual aids. He shows the audience a graph to help illustrate one of his points. He also uses a glass of water as reference for one of his explanations (he explains that reactions can produce salt and water).

**Persuasive elements**

Did the speaker use any persuasive mechanisms such as evaluative language, do any significant arguments exist against claims made by the speaker, were there any call(s) to action? (The use of any of these mechanisms is a significant problem).

For the most part, Jack does well to avoid evaluative language. He used no calls to action, and there are no arguments against any of his claims. In his introduction, he makes the mistake of describing titration as something that “immeasurably benefited the human race”. This phrase may come off as persuasive because it could convince his audience that titration is a good thing. Apart from that, his speech is informative.

**Verbals and non-verbals**

Did the speaker exhibit an inordinate number of non- verbal behaviors? Did the speaker show enthusiasm for the subject through her/his vocalics, did the speaker use eye-contact with the audience?

He keeps one of his hands in his pockets, which may be seen as unprofessional. Verbally, he handles the presentation just fine. In terms of body language, he is rather still and does not make use of any hand gestures. This helps in that it avoids creating distractions for the audience.

**Conclusion**

Did the speaker clearly summarize the main points and use some type of an effective clincher?

Jacob does remember to summarize the main points in his conclusion, going over them in the same order that he previewed them. He does not use any clincher, instead simply thanking the audience.