**Rubric for evaluating the persuasive speeches of your peers**

***Speaker \_Victoria Torres Mendoza\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***

***Topic \_Gentrification\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***

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

Canvas will assign to you 2 of your colleagues. This form will provide for you a framework for performing the analysis/evaluation. Please note that there are 2 distinct dimensions/parts to your peer evaluations of the persuasive speeches of your colleagues: one like you did for the other 2 speeches, and the other part is for the speaker's use of Monroe's motivated sequence. For these evaluations, each of the 2 parts are worth up to 10 points. The math breaks down this way 10 points for the first part, 10 points for the second part, and you will be evaluating 2 speeches totaling 40 points. I recommend completing your evaluations first by hand using these questions as a framework. Then type your responses onto this form and then cutting and pasting the completed 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?

Not quite. Victoria starts off with a basic introduction of herself but doesn’t really try to grab her audience’s attention by any means or try to start things off in an interesting 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. Victoria states, “The purpose of my persuasive speech would be to talk about gentrification.”

**Credibility statement**

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

Victoria states that she considers herself to be a credible authority to talk about gentrification as she has lived in the bay area for some time and has seen its impacts firsthand.

**Salience statement**

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

Victoria appears to make a weak attempt at her salience statement. She simply states that, “knowing about gentrification will allow you know about the negatives and positives that it has brought on lives.”

**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*

No. Victoria fails to quickly preview all of her main points in the introduction. She just goes straight into the body of her speech.

**Organization**

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

Regardless of how her introduction went, Victoria did seem to have some structure in her speech. Based on how she presented her main points, I was able to deduce that her main points were rent, construction, restaurants, and technology barriers.

**Content**

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

*This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome*

Victoria did speak about a few things and she managed to relate them to gentrification. Overall, I would say she had just enough content for her topic.

**References**

Did the speaker cite credible (peer reviewed scholarly articles) within the speech as well as citing them in the outline? (4 required)

As far as things go, she verbally cited one external source. From this, it can be determined that she did do some research for her speech, but not if she met the research requirement in its entirety.

**Transitions**

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

Victoria does bring up lot of points, but what she is trying to get at is confusing. It is unclear what she is trying to persuade about or what her goals are.

**Visual aids/presentation aids**

Did the speaker provide visual aids that were appropriate and effective to the situation? (3 required, at least 2 different mediums).

Victoria does provide visual aids for her audience, but she only uses two visual aids. Also, she did not have visual aids of different mediums.

**Persuasion/rhetorical effectiveness**

Did the speaker deliver a clear persuasive message using all of the dimensions of Monroe’s Motivated Sequence?

Victoria, sadly, does not really deliver a clear persuasive message using Monroe’s Motivated Sequence effectively. It was unclear what she wanted her audience to do.

**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?

In terms of body language, Victoria does seem to do fine. It is hard to determine if she made eye contact with her audience, however, as she never has her camera pan to them. Verbally, it really seems like she did not rehearse her speech.

**Conclusion**

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

Victoria does not quickly review her main points again in the conclusion of her speech. She also does not use an effective clincher as her video gets cut off at the end.