Rubric for evaluating the informative speeches of your peers

***Speaker \_Neida Lopez \_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***

***Topic \_Platypuses \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***

***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?

Neida starts off by showing the audience a drawing of “Perry the Platypus” and contrasting it to what an actual platypus looks like (she pulls out a stuffed animal that accurately represents a platypus). This is an interesting take on an attention-getter.

**Purpose statement**

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

Yes. In the introduction of her speech, Neida states, “The purpose of my speech is to inform you about platypuses.”

**Credibility statement**

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

No. Neida does not ever mention why she is qualified to speak about platypuses. She simply goes over her motive for talking about them instead.

**Salience**

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

Neida does not really explain why knowing about platypuses is important to the audience or what the value of knowing about them is. She instead talks about how she hopes that her audience knows that is it okay to be weird in nature.

**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. Neida mentions that she will cover platypus attributes, their habitats (where they live), and common threats that these creatures face in the wild.

**Organization**

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

Yes. Neida does talk about her main points in the order that she said she was going to present them but appears to rush a bit. In her speech she seems to give each of her main points “short trips”. Apart from that, her speech is easy enough to follow.

**Content**

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

*This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome*

As far as things go, the content that Neida presents is completely relevant to her topic. She brings up many points about platypuses, such as the importance of where they live or why males have venom glands on their hind legs.

**References**

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

Neida does verbally cite at least three external sources in her speech. From this, we can deduce that she did do the research for her presentation, and that she met the research requirement in its entirety in her outline.

**Transitions**

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

Neida does connect the dots by explaining some of her main points in further detail. For instance, she explains that platypuses need to reside in bodies of water that are five to ten meters deep as that level of water depth is optimal for their food sources.

**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).

As far as things go, Neida avoids all forms of persuasive and evaluative language. There are no valid arguments against claims that she has made and no calls to action. Neida purely informs her audience in this presentation.

**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?

Verbally, Neida gives the presentation in a calm and relaxed tone, making it seem as if she had practiced quite a bit. In terms of body language, Neida appears to let her hand gestures flow naturally during the presentation. She makes good “eye-contact” with her audience in that she looks at the camera most of the time.

**Conclusion**

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

Neida does summarize her main points in her conclusion, quickly stating that she has covered platypus attributes, their habitats, and dangers they face in the wild. She does use a clincher in leaving a final statement. She states that she hopes her audience knows that it is okay for there to be outliers in nature and that there are outliers in even the most generalized rules (whatever that means).