: Grade for presentation	1 (Pass)	2 (Fair)	3 (Good)	4 (Very good)	5 (Excellent)
O R G A N I S A T I O N INTRODUCTION 1. attention-grabber 2. establishes credibility 3. statement of purpose 4. overview	No clear introduction	Lacks one or more of the required parts (Nos.1-4)	Attempts to gain audience attention at the beginning + Nos. 2-4	Attention-grabber very effective, but might still lack some relevance for the audience or a strong connection to the purpose of the talk + Nos. 2-4.	Highly successful attention-grabber that shows relevance to the audience of the talk's aim and purpose + Nos. 2-4
BODY & CONTENT Main points clearly linked to purpose Amount of detail/depth Logical organization Use of analogy, examples Uses "you" to stress relevance to audience	Content lacks a connection to the purpose or lacks depth and detail	Some parts of the content seem irrelevant to the purpose / topic Content is not organized logically.	An attempt is made to organize the content of the body; organization is sometimes not logical. Too much / too little detail. Not very much reference to academic sources	Same as in 5 (excellent) but there might be a bit too much / too little detail in the body, or insufficient reference to academic sources.	Content is relevant and directly supports the purpose. Academic approach successfully displayed through research-referenced evidence.
CONCLUSION Transition into conclusion Clear summary; Returning to the problem used in introduction Inviting questions	No real conclusion; Forgot to ask for questions/ comments	Weak attempt to signal the end, or includes new information in the conclusion; Very weakly asked for questions/comments	Clear transition to the conclusion; the main points listed; opened the Q&A with just a little prompting	Clear transition to the conclusion; the main points summarized; invited questions naturally	Conclusion refers back to the theme; includes an emotional and intellectual appeal closely linked to the theme; invited questions in a very smooth and natural matter right after concluding.
M E T A METALANGUAGE Transitions between slides Superordinates/ enumeration to discuss sub-points	No transitions	Some transitions between slides, but too few, short or inaccurate	Clear transitions between slides, but may be occasionally lacking or inaccurate Some use of superordinates to move between sub-points in the same slide	Consistent use of transitions between slides, though sometimes inaccurate or too few. Use of superordinates to move between sub-points within the same slide, but occasionally inconsistent or inaccurate	Consistent use of transitions to introduce new slides Consistent and accurate use of superordinates
V I S U A L S VISUALS Relevance of images (visual evidence) Amount of text Suitability of headings (assertion/purpose) Physical interaction with visuals Font family & size (min. 24pt) Use of colour, bold font to emphasise Graphs and diagrams replace text	Irrelevant images and excessive text; Bullets used Some slides lack headings or are only topical (not statements of assertion or purpose) Many language errors on slides	Excessive text (Mainly text-based slides); Few images and/or images not always relevant or used as evidence or explanation; Only some slides have assertion headings, the rest are topical and unhelpful; Font type or size disturbs communication; Notable errors on slides	Images are good, but may occasionally seem irrelevant or distract from the main message, and only occasionally provide evidence If text on slides, attempts to use 6 x 6 approach Headings are mostly statements of assertion or purpose; Some spelling/ grammar mistakes & inaccuracies	Images support communication and the assertion/purpose being made Graphs, diagrams and flow charts replace the written word Consistent use of assertion-evidence Headings are clearly helpful statements of assertion (or purpose) Only a few inaccuracies in language on slides	Colours and other techniques (e.g. pointer) used to highlight and mark for listeners parts of visuals (graphs, diagrams, etc.); Includes key words; Headings are very successful statements of assertion or purpose; Excellent visual evidence in body part of slides Only one-two to none inaccuracies
D E L I V E R Y DELIVERY Speed Pronunciation Fluency Accuracy, style and word choice Length devoted to each section Handling the Q&A Total length	Very difficult to understand; Speech is too slow and hesitant; No interaction with the audience during the talk; Q&A handled poorly or avoided; Too short (8 minutes or under)	Problems with pronunciation; word stress, fluency, accuracy, and L1 intonation seriously hinder understanding; Little interaction with the audience; Q&A handled with minimum response or with incomplete responses; Too short (8 min or under) or too long (over 11 min)	Some problems with pronunciation, word stress, and accuracy though these do not seriously hinder understanding; Sufficient interaction with the audience during the presentation; Q&A goes reasonably well with only some inappropriate/ awkward responses; Less than a minute too short or too long (acceptable)	Fairly fluent in word stress and intonation, but some occasional mistakes in language accuracy; Consistent eye contact with the audience and other forms of interaction; Q&A goes very well with natural responses, and possibility ability to deflect questions (if running out of time) or ask for clarification; Within the target time limit (10 min max.w/out Q&A)	Fluent & natural (pause, stress, varying speed & intonation) Constant eye contact; Very good use of body language to supplement the message and to interact with audience; Q&A responses go exceedingly well, even if speaker unable to answer with requested detail/information or if questions deflected (due to lack of time) or clarification is sought; Within the target time limit (10 min w/out Q&A)