

## ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR REACTING SPEECHES

### Logic:

1	2	3	4	5
Plan and purpose of speech not apparent, undeveloped, or fatally disorganized; <b>transitions</b> between paragraphs unclear or wholly lacking. Paragraphs do not develop logically around an organizing idea and are without beginning, middle, and end; assertions seem unconnected and supporting evidence unrelated. "Logic words" misused or completely absent.	Central thesis is apparent but argument is underdeveloped or disorganized; <b>transitions</b> between paragraphs are abrupt, monotonous, or even confusing. Relationship of supporting evidence to argument may need clarification; some assertions not clearly related to the organizing idea of the paragraph. Use of "logic words" is rather clumsy or unclear.	Central thesis is apparent but argument is not consistently developed; <b>transitions</b> between paragraphs abrupt, mechanical, or monotonous. Relationship of supporting evidence to argument may need clarification; not all assertions may be clearly related to the organizing idea of the paragraph. Use of "logic words" (e.g. "because," "therefore") may be occasionally clumsy.	Argument is logically sound and without fallacies. Thesis advances by clearly ordered and logically connected stages. The relevance of supporting evidence is clearly explained. Paragraphs follow a logical order, each building on the preceding one. Logical <b>transitions</b> between sentences and paragraphs are clear and explicit.	Argument is logically sound and without fallacies – or brilliantly exploits fallacies. Thesis advances by clearly ordered and logically connected stages; the relevance of supporting evidence is clearly explained; paragraphs (and within them, sentences) are beautifully organized; logical <b>transitions</b> are clear and explicit. No holes can be poked in the argument.

### Content:

1	2	3	4	5
Central idea lacking, or confused, or completely unsupported by historical evidence (i.e., concrete and relevant detail). Historical details in speech appear made up and are easily discredited using basic search tools.	Central idea is more or less clear but supporting evidence is sketchy. Historical detail is either completely lacking, restricted to the information in the role sheet and pp. 1-47 of the GB, or vague and general. Some claims may be inaccurate.	Central idea is clear but somewhat banal or too general. Argument is supported with concrete detail, mostly drawn from Game Book. Supporting information may be occasionally irrelevant, repetitious, sketchy, or mildly historically inaccurate.	The central idea of the speech is clearly defined and developed, supported with concrete, substantial, and consistently relevant detail. The historical information in the speech goes beyond the outline in the Game Book and is accurate.	The central idea is clearly defined and developed, supported with concrete, substantial, and powerfully relevant detail. The historical information in the speech is richly detailed and shows evidence of deep research.

### Style:

1	2	3	4	5
Sentence structure is unclear to the point where the reader/ listener must struggle to understand what the speaker wants to say. Diction is inappropriate or unidiomatic. Communication is obscured by frequent deviations from standard grammar, usage, punctuation, and/or spelling.	Sentences are frequently incorrect (e.g., fragments, mixed constructions, dangling modifiers); meaning is sometimes somewhat unclear as a result of non-standard grammar, usage, punctuation, and/or spelling. Diction may be inappropriate or uneven (formal one moment, vulgar the next).	Sentences are correctly constructed but unvaried, monotonous, excessively plain; diction is appropriate and clear but flat, basic. Clarity and effectiveness of expression are weakened by deviations from standard grammar, punctuation, and spelling. Dangling modifiers may be a particular problem.	Sentences are skillfully constructed (unified, forceful, effectively varied); diction is precise, economical, fresh, and idiomatic. Clarity and effectiveness of expression are promoted by consistent use of standard grammar, punctuation, and spelling. Figurative language is skillfully deployed and cliché mostly avoided.	Sentences are skillfully constructed (unified, forceful, effectively varied); diction is precise, economical, fresh, and idiomatic. Grammar and usage are impeccable, and skillful use is made of metaphor and/or other figurative language. No clichés anywhere. Brilliant word choices and rhythm make the speech especially eloquent.

### Delivery:

1	2	3	4	5
Speaker is very hesitant OR obviously reading verbatim from script; appears not to be able to remember what (s)he is talking about; does not look at or connect with audience; appears under-rehearsed and/or mechanical rather than sincere. Listeners struggle to understand what is being said/asked of them.	Speaker appears minimally prepared and relies heavily on notes. Sentences are often delivered with unnatural intonation (e.g. flat tone or sing-song recital). Frequent hesitations ("ums," awkward pauses) interrupt the flow and make the talk hard to follow. Contact with audience is minimal.	Speaker appears well-prepared, though a bit too reliant on notes. Occasionally sentences are hard to follow, though grammatical, because of unnatural intonation or vocal emphasis. Occasional hesitations ("ums," awkward pauses) between points do not obscure the message but detract from the performance.	Speaker appears spontaneous and sincere, yet fluent; speech is obviously well-rehearsed, yet animated and expressive. Speaker effectively uses intonation and vocal emphasis to convey meaning. Speaker is fully in control of message, knows what (s)he is saying now and what she will say next.	Speech has all the qualities listed under 4, and also has dramatic flair; contact and connection with the audience are maintained at all times, evident from the active audience response (laughing, gasping, clapping, heckling, etc).