Rubric: Video

Criteria	Professional	Experienced	Developing	Novice
Organization How the information was put together; the flow of the presentation 30 points	☐ Presentation was structured with a definite beginning, middle, and end. (6 points)	☐ Beginning, middle, and end were present but not clearly identified. (5 points)	☐ Beginning, middle, or end was difficult to discern. (4 points)	☐ Beginning, middle, or end was missing. (3 points)
	☐ The main points were logical with points building on each other. (6 points)	☐ The main points were generally easy to follow and logical. (5 points)	☐ The main points were logical but difficult to follow. (4 points)	☐ The main points were so difficult to follow that their logic could not be determined, or they were illogical. (3 points)
	☐ Introduction engaged audience and identified video's purpose. (6 points)	☐ Introduction was interesting and provided partial explanation of what video was about. (5 points)	☐ Standard introduction was presented and hinted at purpose of the video. (4 points)	☐ Introduction was uninteresting and did not identify the video's purpose. (3 points)
	☐ Material was suited to the length of the video. (6 points)	Material was fairly well suited to the video's length.(5 points)	☐ Content appeared to be stretched or omitted to fit the video's length. (4 points)	☐ Too much or too little information was presented in the video. (3 points)
	☐ Video came to a suitable conclusion with main points summarized. (6 points)	☐ Conclusion was satisfying, but not all main points summarized. (5 points)	☐ Conclusion seemed unsatisfying, or main points were vague. (4 points)	☐ Video ended abruptly without a conclusion or summary of key points. (3 points)
Content The information that was shared with the audience 40 points	☐ Video presented relevant, accurate, up-to-date information. (10 points)	☐ Information presented was relevant to the video's purpose but was outdated. (8 points)	☐ Irrelevant information was occasionally presented. (6 points)	☐ Information presented was unrelated to the video's purpose and wandered aimlessly. (4 points)
	☐ Meaningful supporting information was provided for each key point. (10 points)	☐ Unsupported information did not limit understand-ability of video. (8 points)	☐ Some information was vague or unsupported by evidence. (6 points)	☐ Video information was vague and lacked supporting evidence. (4 points)
	☐ Examples were relevant to the audience and the occasion. (10 points)	☐ Examples were presented but they were not relevant to the audience. (8 points)	☐ Examples strayed from the purpose of the video or required thought to grasp. (6 points)	☐ Video presented dated examples that failed to support its purpose. (4 points)
	☐ Video demonstrated originality and creative choice of examples that hooked the audience. (10 points)	☐ Video demonstrated originality and creativity, but examples were too bizarre to be believable. (8 points)	☐ Video utilized fairly traditional treatment of topic and examples. (6 points)	☐ Video relied on fully traditional treatment of topic and examples, failing to keep audience's attention. (4 points)

Rubric: Video						
Criteria	Professional	Experienced	Developing	Novice		
Delivery How the speaker presented the information 30 points	☐ Video was delivered smoothly in a conversational style. (5 points)	☐ Delivery contained a few unnecessary pauses. (4 points)	Delivery was filled with dead words such as "uh," "and," or "like." (3 points)	☐ Video was filled with dead words and sounded artificial. (2 points)		
	☐ Words were pronounced correctly and clearly, making it easy to understand what was being said. (5 points)	☐ Words were clearly enunciated but occasionally mispronounced. (4 points)	☐ Words were occasionally mumbled and mispronounced, making it difficult to understand what was said. (3 points)	☐ Words were mumbled and mispronounced throughout the video, making it almost impossible to understand what was said. (2 points)		
	☐ Terminology used in the video was familiar or clearly explained. (5 points)	☐ A few unfamiliar words were used and were not explained; however, their meaning could be understood from context. (4 points)	☐ Some technical terms were used and were not explained. (3 points)	☐ Unexplained technical terms were used throughout the video, making the information unclear. (2 points)		
	☐ Vocal expression, volume, and pace kept the audience hooked. (5 points)	☐ Vocal expression and pace maintained audience's interest in the video; volume was too soft/loud. (4 points)	☐ Vocal expression sounded artificial; volume was too loud/soft; and the pace of delivery was too fast or too slow. (3 points)	Speaker spoke in a too soft/loud monotone voice, using a pace that was too fast or too slow to maintain interest. (2 points)		
	☐ Speaker used correct grammar and standard English throughout the video. (5 points)	☐ Speaker used correct grammar, occasionally incorporating slang into the video. (4 points)	☐ Speaker made a few grammatical mistakes and used slang throughout the video. (3 points)	☐ Video was hampered by grammatical mistakes and reliance on slang. (2 points)		
	☐ Video was supported with clear and easy-to-see visual aids that used correct grammar and spelling. (5 points)	☐ Video had easy-to-see visual aids, but they contained a few spelling or grammar errors. (4 points)	☐ Video's visual aids contained many grammatical and spelling errors and required concentration to see and understand. (3 points)	☐ Video's visual aids were too small/faint/ dark to be seen easily and contained so many spelling and grammatical errors that they detracted from the presentation. (2 points)		