

Criteria	Ratings				Pts	
Hook	Excellent: Creative and engaged most of the audience at the beginning of speech. 2.0 pts	Needs Improvement: Engaged only some of the audience at the beginning of speech or farther down in the speech. 1.5 pts		Unacceptable: Did not engage the audience. 1.0 pts	2.0 pts	
Thesis/Specific Goal	Excellent: Articulated the goal of the speech in the introduction. 2.0 pts	Needs Improvement: Articulated part of the goal of the speech in the introduction. 1.5 pts		Unacceptable: Thesis or goal are confusing and/or missing. 1.0 pts	2.0 pts	
Headings view longer description	Excellent: All headings used with all the information required. (Specific Goal, Application, Ethos-primary-secondary, Pathos, Logos, Audience Assessment, Adaptation to Audience, Pattern of Organization, Introduction, Hook, Thesis, Preview, Transitions, Body, Conclusion, References) 5.0 pts	Satisfactory: All headings are used. Somewhat included all information required. 4.5 pts	Needs Improvement: Most headings were used and/or information included is minimal. 4.0 pts	Incomplete: Many headings are missing and/or information included is minimal. 3.0 pts	Unacceptable: Most headings are missing. Information provided is not complete. 2.0 pts	5.0 pts
Formatting of points and transitions	Excellent: Harvard number system used accurately, subpoints indented, spaced and consistently, only one complete sentence per point, if there was a 1 there was a 2, if an A a B. Transition statements used between all most main points. 5.0 pts	Satisfactory: Harvard number system used accurately, subpoints indented most of the time, spaced and consistently, only one complete sentence per point, if there was a 1 there was a 2, if an A a B. Transition statements used between all most main points, but may be missing elements. 4.5 pts	Needs Improvement: Harvard number system used accurately some of the time, subpoints indented, spaced and consistent some of the time. Only one complete sentence per point most of the time. If there was a 1 there was a 2, if an A a B most of the time. Transition statements used between some main points. 4.0 pts	Incomplete: Harvard number system was attempted, but most is incorrect. Only key words or phrases used, subpoints not indented. Transition statements rarely used between main points. 3.0 pts	Unacceptable: Harvard number system was not used. Overall format was confusing and not well constructed. Transition statements rarely used or were confusing. 2.0 pts	5.0 pts
Preview/Introduction	Excellent: Clearly identified main points in the introduction. 2.0 pts	Needs Improvement: Identified main points in the introduction. Each point is not short or concise. 1.5 pts		Unacceptable: Missing many parts or very unclear. 1.0 pts	2.0 pts	

Criteria	Ratings					Pts
Body	<p>Excellent: Followed preview section. Gave in depth information new to the audience about points. Supported points with research, included logos, pathos and ethos. 5.0 pts</p>	<p>Satisfactory: For the most part, followed preview section. Gave some depth of information new to the audience about points. Supported points with research, included logos, pathos and ethos. 4.5 pts</p>	<p>Needs Improvement: Did not follow preview completely. Gave information about points. Supported some points with research, included only two of logos, pathos and ethos. 4.0 pts</p>	<p>Incomplete: Mostly did not follow preview. Information about points is underdeveloped. Few points with research, included only one of logos, pathos and ethos. 3.0 pts</p>	<p>Unacceptable: Did not follow preview. Gave some superficial information about points that was not new to the audience. Did not support points with research, included only one or none of logos, pathos and ethos. 2.0 pts</p>	5.0 pts
Conclusion	<p>Excellent: Included a restatement of the thesis and main points. Ended with a thought provoking last line. 2.0 pts</p>		<p>Needs Improvement: Included a restatement with most of the thesis and main points. Ended with mediocre average last line. 1.5 pts</p>		<p>Unacceptable: Missing more than one component of the conclusion. Ended with poor last line. 1.0 pts</p>	2.0 pts
Grammar and Spelling	<p>Excellent: Grammar and spelling were mistake free. Full sentences were used throughout. 2.0 pts</p>		<p>Needs Improvement: Grammar and spelling were somewhat accurate. Full sentences were used most of the time. 1.5 pts</p>		<p>Unacceptable Work: Many Grammar and spelling errors. Full sentences were rarely used. 1.0 pts</p>	2.0 pts
Citations	<p>Excellent: Citations were placed next to the right claims, citations were accurately formatted in text and in the reference section 3 scholarly sources were used. 5.0 pts</p>	<p>Satisfactory: Citations were placed next to the right claims, citations were mostly accurately formatted in text and in the reference section 3 scholarly sources were used. 4.5 pts</p>	<p>Needs Improvement: Citations were frequently placed next to the right claims, citations had a few mistakes accurately formatting in text and in the reference section 3 scholarly sources were used. 4.0 pts</p>	<p>Incomplete: Citations were mostly missing in text and/or formatted incorrectly. Reference section included but not in correct format. Less than 3 scholarly sources were used. 3.0 pts</p>	<p>Unacceptable Work: Citations were missing by claims, citations formatting was missing or inaccurate in text and in the reference section less than 2 scholarly sources were used. 2.0 pts</p>	5.0 pts
Edited from Draft Outline	<p>Excellent: Clearly updated based on instructor feedback on draft outline. 10.0 pts</p>	<p>Needs Improvement: Some parts of outline were edited based on feedback from instructor. 7.0 pts</p>		<p>Unacceptable: Little editing of outline was done based on instructor feedback. 5.0 pts</p>	<p>Submitted exact same outline as draft. 0.0 pts</p>	10.0 pts
Total Points: 40.0						