TCO 341
Oral Proposal Presentation Grading Rubric

Please use the criteria in the following tables to rate the quality of *I* − content of presentation, *II* − individual presentations, and *III* − overall presentation.

I. *Content of Presentation*

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
• Excellent statement of problem or need • Excellent discussion of solution alternatives • Clear rationale for proposed solution • Proposed solution clearly implementable • Staffing requirements clearly identified • All required facilities and equipment clearly identified • Excellent quality control plan • Budget complete, realistic, and justified • Criteria for measuring success of proposed solution clearly identified	• Good statement of problem or need • Adequate discussion of design alternatives • Rationale for proposed solution somewhat obvious • Proposed solution implementable with some modifications • Most staffing requirements evident • Most of the facilities and equipment identified • Adequate quality control plan • Budget estimated and presented • Some criteria for measuring success identified	• Statement of problem or need is confusing or incomplete • At least one alternative seems contrived • Rationale proposed solution not clear • Proposed solution implementable with major modifications • Staffing requirements lacking • Facilities and equipment not clearly identified • Inadequate quality control plan • Incomplete budget estimated and presented • Very few criteria for measuring success identified	• Inaccurate statement of problem or need • All alternatives are seriously flawed • No rationale for proposed solution • Proposed solution cannot be implemented • No staffing requirements • No facilities and equipment identified • No quality control plan • No budget developed • No criteria for measuring success of proposed solution identified

The content of this oral presentation was (circle one):

Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor

Comments:

II. Individual Presentations

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
• Excellent use of language without grammatical errors • Volume and rate vary to add emphasis • Clear articulation • Excellent eye contact and presence • No verbal static (um, ah) • Excellent, substantive responses to questions	• Good use of language with few grammatical errors • Volume not too soft or loud; rate not too fast or slow • Majority of articulation adequate • Good eye contact and presence • Minimal verbal static • Good responses to most questions	• Simplistic use of language; many grammatical errors • Volume too low or loud; rate too fast or slow • Poor articulation • Poor eye contact and presence • Lots of verbal static • Poor responses to questions	• Significant grammatical errors • Volume too low or loud; rate too fast or slow; monotone • Significant articulation problems • No eye contact or presence • Excessive verbal static • Answered no questions

The quality of each individual presentation was (circle one):

Name of Speaker: _____   Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor

Name of Speaker: _____   Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor

Name of Speaker: _____   Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor

Name of Speaker: _____   Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor

III. Overall Presentation

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
• Clear organization pattern • Excellent transition between topics • Excellent transition between speakers • Visuals well designed to support topics • Visuals contain no errors • Appropriate length	• Some elements of organization present • Appropriate transition between topics • Adequate transition between speakers • Visuals adequately designed • Visual contain minimal errors • Over/under time limit	• Organization lacking • Inadequate transition between topics • Inadequate transition between speakers • Visuals poorly designed • Visuals contain many errors • Well over/ under time limit	• No apparent organization • No transition between topics • No transition between speakers • Visuals inadequate • Visuals contain significant errors • Significantly over/ under time

The overall quality of this oral presentation was (circle one):

Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor