

## Summary of Scoring Approaches for the Individual Multimedia Presentation and Oral Defense

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context	
What to look for	Where?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the relevance of the research question made clear? <i>(Why does the question matter? Why is it worth pursuing?)</i></li> <li>2. Is the connection to the stimulus materials clearly made?</li> </ol>	Usually in the introduction (but stimulus material ref could be elsewhere).
<p><b>Low:</b> Very limited context, perfunctory, tenuous or non-existent connection to stimulus materials. <i>Response offers almost nothing in the way of rationale for the question.</i></p> <p><b>Medium:</b> General statements about context and relationship to stimulus materials. <i>At the medium level there is some kind of context based rationale for the research question which may not be entirely convincing AND some link to the stimulus materials (which may not be clearly explained or convincing either).</i></p> <p><b>High:</b> Relevance of the question is clear <i>(you understand why it matters)</i> as is the connection to the stimulus material <i>(direct engagement with stimulus material required)</i>. Both need to be present to score 6.</p>	
Row 2: Establish Argument	
What to look for	Where?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the argument logically organized? Does it lead you through connected claims supported by evidence?</li> <li>2. Does it fully explain <i>how</i> evidence supports the claims?</li> </ol>	Throughout.
<p><b>Low:</b> Predominantly summarize information instead of offering an argument (evidence is not connected to claims), or the argument is very weak (mostly unsubstantiated claims), or it is hard to see what the argument is because it's not really a debatable issue.</p> <p><b>Medium:</b> Discernable argument but may be disorganized or contain faulty reasoning.</p> <p><b>High:</b> Convincing argument that is logically organized and fully explains how the evidence supports the claims.</p>	
Row 3: Select and Use Evidence	
What to look for	Where?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the evidence clearly relevant? Does the presentation differentiate and evaluate the strength of evidence from sources?</li> <li>2. Is evidence brought together and integrated? <i>(Are the pieces of evidence in conversation with one another?)</i></li> <li>3. Are different perspectives represented?</li> </ol>	Throughout
<p><b>IF NO EVIDENCE IS INCLUDED AT ALL, SCORES ZERO</b></p> <p><b>Low:</b> Minimal range of perspectives, evidence is not used to support the argument (it is not relevant or credible, or is just summarized), or multiple examples/pieces of evidence from one single perspective.</p> <p><b>Medium:</b> Evidence is presented, but connections between pieces of evidence are not clearly articulated, various perspectives incorporated. Quotes are dropped in without much explanation.</p> <p><b>High:</b> Draw relevant evidence together from different perspectives (puts them in conversation with each other) to develop and support the argument.</p>	

<b>Row 4: Establish Argument (Resolutions, Conclusions, Solutions)</b>	
<b>What to look for</b>	<b>Where?</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the presentation have a resolution, conclusion, or a solution? (If so, is it completely oversimplified?)</li> <li>2. Is the resolution, conclusion or solution realistic?</li> <li>3. Does the presentation consider the limitation(s) and or implication(s) of the resolution, conclusion, or solution?</li> </ol>	Towards the end (but check for alignment with the stated question at the beginning).
<p><b>Low:</b> No resolution, conclusion or solution, or what they offer is oversimplified or unsubstantiated (or contrived because it's a not really a debatable issue).</p> <p><b>Medium:</b> Specific resolutions, conclusions or solutions offered but lack detail to demonstrate plausibility or are not entirely realistic; partially address research question.</p> <p><b>High:</b> Resolutions, conclusions or solutions are realistic and consider limitations and implications.</p>	
<b>Row 5: Engage Audience (Design)</b>	
<b>What to look for</b>	<b>Where?</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the audience understand the argument better because the presentation contains carefully selected key information to display?</li> <li>2. Does the design provide imagery or information that simply reinforces the oral presentation (without enhancing it)?</li> <li>3. Does the design distract with constant moving parts or lengthy, unreadable segments of text?</li> <li>4. Does it just provide a summary list of what is being said?</li> </ol>	Throughout.
<p><b>Low:</b> Unreadable, full of errors, many slides serve no purpose or contain distracting pointless elements, confusing formatting, or just a list of keywords (no selection or use of design elements).</p> <p><b>Medium:</b> Generally clear and follows the presentation, some relevant charts, graphs or pictures are included (and usually used) but some are decorative (wallpaper), sometimes too much text creating a listening/reading conflict.</p> <p><b>High:</b> Effectively contextualize information, consistently make effective <i>use</i> of design elements like charts and pictures (they add value), selection and emphasis of information help the audience understand the argument.</p>	

Row 6: Engage Audience (Performance)				
What to look for			Where?	
1. Vocal variety and clear delivery 2. Eye contact with the audience 3. Movements and posture			Throughout.	
Feature	Low	Medium	High	
Vocal variety/ delivery	Monotone, read without expression; frequent stumbles; losing place; frequent “um” “ah” or “like”; inappropriate ad-libbing.	Voice has some variety, basic delivery of information, not much to add interest; could be memorized so feels like recitation; few stumbles.	Voice is varied to provide emphasis and interest; conveys own interest in the topic, lively, engaging.	
Eye- contact	Most of the time looking down, at notecards, or at slides.	Makes eye contact some of the time; sometimes lapses into reading slides or looking at notecards.	Makes eye contact throughout – like talking to an actual person.	
Movement	No gestures for emphasis; fidgeting; defensive posture.	Generally open posture, a bit stiff at times; gestures used but not always effectively.	Open, relaxed posture; uses gestures for emphasis, refers to visuals.	

It is recommended you pause the video and score rows 1-6 before moving on to the Oral Defense.

Remember Oral Defense responses do not affect other rows.

Row 1 Oral Defense: Reflect	
What to look for	Where?
<b>Low:</b> Response describes something that doesn't answer the question or is simplistic. <b>Medium:</b> Provides relevant answer with some evidence but is general (it could be talking about any presentation – so “I used peer-reviewed sources” isn't specific enough to reach a High). <b>High:</b> Response provides relevant and specific details (often explains the <i>why</i> or <i>how</i> , or gives specific instances).	Answer to question 1 on research process
Row 2 Oral Defense: Establish Argument (Extension)	
What to look for	Where?
<b>Low:</b> Doesn't really answer the question, or the response is simplistic. <b>Medium:</b> Answers the question, provides some evidence but it might be general. <b>High:</b> Explains significance of inquiry (in context of question) and provides relevant and specific details.	Answer to question 2 on conclusions