

CRITERIA	Criteria Description	Percentage	SCALES				
			10 out of 10	8 out of 10	6 out of 10	4 out of 10	2 out of 10
PRESENTATION			Exceptional	Very Good	Good	Improving	Needs Work
Thesis Statement	Does the presentation include a clear, relevant, and precise thesis statement that directly answers the assignment's question?	20	The presentation's thesis statement is clearly presented at the start of the presentation. The thesis statement is clear, soundly-based and convincing. It directly answers the assignment's question.	The presentation's thesis statement is presented at the start of the presentation. The thesis statement is relatively clear and soundly-based but not necessarily convincing. It directly answers the assignment's question.	The presentation's thesis statement is presented at the start of the presentation. The thesis statement is relatively clear but only indirectly answers the assignment's question.	The presentation's thesis statement is presented at the start of the presentation. However, the thesis statement is hard to understand and does not answer the assignment's question.	No presentation's thesis statement is presented. There is no agenda. The audience is not sure what to expect with the presentation.
Support of Thesis Statement (Logical Validity)	How well do the premises support the presentation's thesis statement? Is the argument presented logically valid?	20	The premises provide strong support for the presenter's thesis statement. It is very clear that the argument is logically valid.	The premises provide ample support for the presenter's thesis statement. It is clear that the argument is logically valid.	The premises support the presenter's thesis statement but it is unclear if the argument is logically valid.	The premises provide some support for the presenter's thesis statement but the argument is logically invalid.	The premises provide little to no support for the presenter's thesis statement.
Explicit Use of at Least Two Peer-Reviewed Academic Articles (Truth of the Premises)	Is each of the premises supported by (at least) one peer-reviewed academic article?	20	Each of the premises is supported by (at least) one relevant peer-reviewed academic article. It is very clear that the premises are factually true.	Each of the premises is supported by (at least) one peer-reviewed academic article. It is relatively clear that the premises are factually true.	One of the premises is not supported by (at least) one peer-reviewed academic article. It is nevertheless probable that the premises are factually true.	It is unclear if the premises are factually true or not.	It is not reasonable to assume that the premises are factually true.
Legitimate Objection and Valid Reply to It	Does the presentation end with a legitimate objection to the argument presented? Is a valid reply to this objection offered?	20	The presentation ends with a legitimate objection to the argument presented. A valid reply to this objection is also offered.	The presentation ends with an objection to the argument presented. This objection is a "straw man", however. A valid reply to this objection is also offered.	The presentation ends with a "straw man" objection to the argument presented. The reply offered is not valid.	The presentation ends with a "straw man" objection to the argument presented and no reply to it is offered.	The presentation does not include any objection to the argument presented.
Content Organization	How well is the content of your presentation organized? Does the presenter rely on a clear and concise PowerPoint presentation (or other visual materials)?	20	The presentation materials are very well-organized—the information presented is very easy to follow and matches the presenter's speech.	The presentation materials are organized, the information can be followed, and there is a connection to the presenter's speech.	Presentation materials are present and somewhat organized. Some of the information can be followed. And, there is some connection to the presenter's speech.	Some presentation materials are present, but it is not organized. There is a slight connection to the presenter's speech.	No presentation materials are present. There's not a clear connection between visual materials that are used and the presenter's speech.