

**Presentation rubric**

<b>Rubric</b>			
<b>Assessment area / mark</b>	<b>75 % - 100 %</b>	<b>60 % - 74 %</b>	<b>0 % - 59 %</b>
<b>Ethos</b> <b>Appeal to Ethics/Credibility/Trust</b>	Appears knowledgeable Confident in delivery Referred to credible sources Employed a variety of credible visual sources Approachable, friendly, and inviting presentation	Appears somewhat knowledgeable Delivery is acceptable, but lacks confidence Claims are substantiated Employed visual sources that seem somewhat credible Somewhat neutral presentation	Does not seem knowledgeable Little confidence in delivery Little to substantiate claims Visual sources are lacking, or they do not seem credible Somewhat distant, or offputting
<b>Pathos</b> <b>Appeal to Emotion/Passion</b>	Language was vivid Anecdotes/stories support the message Analogies/metaphors support the message Made the message relevant to the audience Tone and pacing supports the message Integrated an emotional dimension into the argument The presentation content was incredibly clear and made audience feel involved	Language is practical, but lacks vibrance Some use of anecdotes/stories that support messages Some use of analogies/metaphors that support messages Message was not made that relevant to audience There was somewhat control over the tone and pacing Emotional dimensions in the argument are somewhat lacking The presentation content was clear enough for audience to somewhat follow	Language use is neither practical nor vibrant Little/no use of anecdotes/stories that support messages Little/no use of analogies/metaphors that support messages The message was not relevant to audience There was little control over tone and pacing Emotional dimensions are not integrated or are distracting The presentation content was not clear and could confuse audience
<b>Logos</b> <b>Appeal to Facts/Research/Evidence</b>	Has a clear message, reinforced throughout the presentation The presentation follows a clear structure and organisation of content The message is well placed within the presentation structure References to facts/research/evidence drive the message across Made comparisons/metaphors/analogies that supported argument Employed a variety of clear graphs, photographs, models, posters etc.	Has a somewhat clear message, at points in the presentation There is some structure and organisation in the presentation The message is somewhat supported by the structure and organisation References to facts/research/evidence is somewhat related to message Comparisons/metaphors/analogies are somewhat present Graphs, photographs, models, posters etc. are somewhat clear	Has an unclear message Little/no structure and organisation in the presentation The message has little/no support from structure and organisation Little/no references to facts/research/evidence or unrelated to message Comparisons/metaphors/analogies are not used or don't support claims Little/no or distracting/irrelevant use of graphs, photographs, models, posters etc.
<b>Kairos</b> <b>Appeal to Right/Critical/Opportune Moment</b>	Considered presentation within the context that supports message Presentation occurred within allowed time, and used timing as a tool Presentation content and delivery was timed well, so as to reinforce messages	Some consideration of the context of the presentation and its messages Presentation occurred within allowed time, and some use of timing as a tool Presentation content and delivery was somewhat timed, and somewhat reinforced messages	Little/no consideration of the context of presentation or messages Presentation went far under or over the allowed time Presentation content and delivery did not consider timing, how timing reinforces messages