Existential Literature PHIL 489

Grading Rubric for: **Class Presentation**, Worth 35%

Evaluator’s Student #\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Presenter’s Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Research and theory** | | **/24** |
| Needs Work (1 point) | Competent (2 points) | Exemplary (3 points) |
| The topic is not introduced, the presenter does not discuss why it was chosen, little or no context is provided | The topic is briefly introduced but the presenter could still explain on why they chose it and provide more in-depth context | The presenter introduces the topic: why they chose it and the context surrounding it |
| The research question is included, but it fails to make a clear connection to the subsequent research done | The research question offers a jumping off point for the research done, but the research only loosely follows from the question | The research question lays a clear foundation and intention for the presentation of the research to come |
| The plot of the literary work is incorrectly summarized or referenced | The plot is accurately summarized but too little or too much detail is given (the whole book doesn’t need to be summarized) | The presentation includes the precise amount of plot summary that is required for what it is they want to say |
| Almost no historical research and context is given | The presentation includes research on the historical context of the given work or author, but it falls short of offering further insight into the intentions of the work or author in question | Research into the historical context of the given work or author allows for a stronger understanding of the situation in which the work was written, illuminating the authors intentions and situating the work within the literary and philosophical discussion of the time |
| No philosophical exposition of possible relevant theories or ideas surrounding the literary work is done | Philosophical exposition lacks clarity, yet it is able to bring to light themes surrounding the literary work or historical context | Philosophical expositions of relevant ideas relating to the literary work are well formulated and concise, clearly establishing key themes as being integrally related to the text |
| Literary rhetorical argument is unconvincing and textual evidence rarely given | Textual evidence helps to explain what it is that the author is trying to say, but the rhetorical argument made by the presenter could be improved | Critical analysis of the literary work is rhetorically robust, creatively reimagining the meaning of the work while referring to applicable textual evidence |
| The answer(s) to the research question is vague and difficult to determine | The answer(s) to the research question is easy to determine but is unsatisfying; it engages some discussion in class but has trouble against scrutiny | The answer(s) to the research question is easy to determine, forceful, and helps to synthesize research into a fitting conclusion; it also has the power to spark class discussion, taking a stand that can be defended |
| Content was not respectful or was not sensitively presented | Content was largely/generally respectful and was sensitive and relativistic | Content was entirely respectful and was sensitive |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation skills (organization and presentation)** | | **/18** |
| The presentation rambled with little evidence of a guiding structure | The presenter was mostly well organized, but there were problems with consistently maintaining a central topic or theme | The presentation was well organized with an obvious structure |
| The presentation did not flow logically; ideas and content were disconnected and connection between ideas was not articulated | The presentation flowed logically, but ideas could have been better connected or the connection between ideas could have been better explained | The presentation flowed logically; ideas and content were connected and moved fluidly from one to the next |
| The presenter mumbled, spoke too fast or too slow, whispered or shouted, droned to the point of unintelligibility | The presenter was understood but mumbled, spoke too fast or too slow, whispered, shouted, or done; still intelligible though | The presenter spoke clearly, slowly and loudly enough to be heard without shouting, and modulated voice tone and quality |
| The presentation was dull | The presentation used examples to draw the audience in, but they were over or under used | The presenter used thought-provoking examples, appropriately, to liven up and illustrate the presentation |
| The presenter remained rigid, never looked at the audience, or engaged in other body language that distracted seriously from the content | The presenter’s body language did not distract significantly, but the presenter remained rigid, never looked at the audience | The presenter used expressive, appropriate language and maintained eye contact with the audience |
| The presentation barely used the time allowed or used far too much time | The presenter's timing was a little too long or too brief, but not excessively so. | The presenter used all the time allowed but did not speak too long. |
| **Assigned Reading** |  | **/9** |
| Reading was 3+ days late | Reading was 1-2 days late | Reading was assigned on time/ahead |
| Content from readings was not integrated into the presentation | Content from readings was mentioned in the presentation, but could have been better incorporated | Content from readings was very well integrated into the presentation |
| Readings did not provide context to the presentation and did not deepen the readers understanding (poor choice) | Readings provided context to the presentation, but did not deepen the reader’s | Readings provided context to the presentation and deepened the reader’s understanding of the topic |
| **Discussion and Discussion Questions** |  | **/12** |
| Discussion questions were off topic and difficult to answer; not relevant | Discussion questions were relevant but difficult to answer/contribute to | Discussion questions were relevant to readings and presentation, allowing the class to meaningfully participate in/contribute |
| Questions were obvious, not well thought-out and did not inspire engagement | Questions were thoughtful but perhaps obvious and not very thought provoking | Questions were thoughtful and thought provoking |
| The discussion was tangential and not relevant to the presentation; it did not deepen  knowledge of the topic | The discussion was largely relevant to the presentation, but was repetitive or tended to regurgitate information. No deeper knowledge | The discussion was very relevant to the presentation and helped to deepen knowledge of the topic |
| Presenter not able to answer class questions and demonstrates a fragile grasp on the text | Presenter can answer the majority of questions and demonstrates a good grasp of the text | Presenter becomes an authority on the text, answering questions with ease and a breadth of knowledge |
| **Comments** | | |
|  | | |

Total: /63