

AP Seminar Performance Task 1: Team Multimedia Presentation (TMP) Rubric with Scoring Notes

EFFECTIVE 2017-18 ACADEMIC YEAR

Scoring Protocols:

1. Do not repeatedly rewind or re-listen.
2. There is a time limit. **Only the first 10 minutes** of any presentation are scored (excluding the oral defense).
3. The defense is scored only after the presentation proper is scored. The defense does not impact the scores in Rows 1-4.

Row/Proficiency	Score 0 if...	Points earned for...			MAX Points
1 ESTABLISH ARGUMENT	The presentation offers a series of unsubstantiated opinions. It is not academic in nature. 0 pts	The presentation describes the existence of a problem or reports on a problem, but does not argue for a team solution or resolution. 2 Pts	The presentation conveys the argument for the team's solution or resolution using evidence that is not well selected for the situation. 4 Pts	The presentation conveys the convincing argument for the team's solution or resolution through strategic selection of supporting evidence. 6 Pts	6
Decision Rules & Scoring Notes					
		<p>Is there a team solution?</p> <p><i>NO team solution but it may have individual solutions.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>May have series of unconnected individual arguments</i> • <i>Might be only individual reports yoked by a very broad theme OR might offer evidence related to a topic</i> <p><i>OR</i></p> <p><i>YES, a team solution may be identified but it is not explained, not justified, or not supported.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>May be an argument for the existence of a problem (with solution tagged on at the very end)</i> • <i>Demonstrates almost no principles of selection and emphasis</i> • <i>Needs a lot of work to infer</i> • <i>The solution has little to no connection to the problem</i> <p><i>Award 2 points</i></p>	<p>Is the argument for the solution clear and coherent?</p> <p><i>YES, but</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Only some claims are supported by effective evidence</i> • <i>Selection and emphasis are not always controlling: at times may have instances of extraneous information or too much for time limit; at times may lack focus demonstrated in digressions or repetition</i> • <i>There is some logical connection between the solution and the problem but it is weak (for example, overgeneralized, oversimplified)</i> • <i>Demonstrates only some logical connection among speakers.</i> <p><i>Award 4 points</i></p>	<p>Is the argument for the solution clear, coherent, AND complex?</p> <p><i>YES</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The logic of the argument is made clear through strategic selection of key claims and relevant supporting evidence</i> • <i>Contains only relevant material sufficient to successfully make the argument within the given time limit (any repetition is effective)</i> • <i>Viable and convincing solution is tightly connected to the argument and illustrates the complexity of the issue</i> • <i>Demonstrates mostly consistent, logical connection among speakers.</i> <p><i>Award 6 points</i></p>	

2 UNDERSTAND AND ANALYZE CONTEXT (EVALUATE SOLUTIONS)	The presentation does not identify or only minimally identifies solutions, either the team's or others' (e.g., a list of solutions with brief annotations). 0 Pts	The presentation describes pros and/or cons of potential options related to the topic. OR The presentation describes limitations or implications of the solution proposed by the team, but in an inconsistent, illogical, overly broad, or otherwise unconvincing manner. 2 Pts	The presentation explains the pros and/or cons of potential options and situates the team's proposed solution in conversation with them. AND The presentation evaluates the solution proposed by the team by thoroughly explaining its limitations or implications. 4 Pts	4	
	Decision Rules & Scoring Notes				
	Has the presentation considered more than one option? Has the presentation explained the implications or limitations of the proposed team solution?				
<i>If neither criterion is met, award zero points.</i>	<i>If one criterion met, or both partially met, award 2 points.</i>	<i>If both criteria are fully met award 4 points.</i>			

3 ENGAGE AUDIENCE (PERFORMANCE)	The presenting is entirely inappropriate for the audience, purpose or context. 0 Pts	All or all but one of the presenters make little or no use of techniques to engage the audience. 2 Pts	At times, some presenters (i.e. more than one) effectively engage the audience. As a team the presenters demonstrate uneven delivery or performance techniques. 4 Pts	All presenters effectively engage the audience through strategic intentional use of performance techniques most of the time. 6 Pts	6
Decision Rules & Scoring Notes					
Does the team recognize they are giving a presentation to human beings? Does the team use strategies to connect with those human beings?					
NO, but <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One presenter might Award 2 points		YES, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> at least two presenters do at least some of the time (but others don't) Award 4 points	YES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The entire team does (most of the time) Note: There may be minor lapses but they do not detract from the overall impression of an engaging presentation. Award 6 points		
Performance techniques that do not engage audience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of eye contact with audience (e.g. staring at slides, at note cards, into space, or at the floor) Lack of vocal variety, monotone or mumbling. Rate of speech is too fast to be comprehensible or too slow to maintain interest. Being distracted by presenter support materials (e.g. note cards, slides, or teleprompters). Reciting from memory or teleprompter in a way that compromises connection with the audience (as if not talking to actual people). Lack of energy (seem bored by the project) Movement that is distracting (e.g. fidgeting, swaying, slumping, excessive hand movements for no strategic purpose) or complete lack of movement. 		Effective performance techniques to engage the audience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eye contact with audience Vocal variety is used to emphasize important information (e.g., volume, pause, rhetorical question) Effective rate of speech (controlled, well-paced, not rushed or overly dense with information) Use of presenter support materials (e.g. note cards, slides, or teleprompters) does not compromise connection to the audience Effectively incorporates into the presentation supporting materials (e.g. visuals, slides, handouts, posters) Energy (seem interested in the project) Movement (gestures serve to emphasize key points) 			

4 ENGAGE AUDIENCE (DESIGN)	No design or minimal design with significant errors. 0 Pts	The presentation’s design demonstrates an understanding of media and design elements but does not enhance the team’s message, or does so inconsistently. 2 Pts	Overall, the design clearly guides viewers through the presentation and demonstrates strategic selection of media and design elements that help clarify the argument for the team’s solution. 4 Pts	4	
	Decision Rules & Scoring Notes				
	Does the presentation incorporate media and design elements?				
	NO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visuals may be little more than blocks of pasted information or informal notes Little or no signposting to guide audience No clear principle of visual design across speakers Award 0 points	YES, but <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visuals guide the audience through the argument but are at times illogical, confusing or otherwise ineffective (signposting, emphasis) Several visuals may display information overload or a poor selection of supporting words and images (decorative but not argumentatively purposeful, or unreadable in the time frame they are shown) Visuals may contain some noticeable, significant errors Visual and design cohesion may be inconsistent across the team (e.g., hierarchy of information, cohesion of imagery, metaphor, parallel structure) Award 2 points	YES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall visuals serve a clear purpose in organizing or advancing the team argument (such as signposting, emphasis) Throughout, well-chosen words and images highlight key points or information; The visuals contain little clutter or visual “noise”; they enhance rather than compete with the speaker’s message, there are no extraneous images or “data dumps” Cohesion is created through consistency of design across the team throughout. Award 4 points		

5 COLLABORATE REFLECT	No points awarded: All or all but one member of the team offer generic responses that could apply to any collaborative project. Or the answers by all or all but one of the team may be unacceptably brief. 0 Pts	Two or more of the responses in the oral defense support their answers with some relevant evidence specific to the team’s project. 2 Pts	All responses in the oral defense articulate detailed answers to the question asked and support those answers with relevant evidence specific to collaboration on this project. AND The answers in the oral defense taken together with the presentation demonstrate roughly equal participation from all team members. 4 Pts	4	
	Decision Rules & Scoring Notes				
	Do the team members provide relevant evidence specific to their project in their responses?				
	NO, but <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One presenter might Award 0 points	YES, at least two responses provide specific and relevant evidence about the team’s project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other responses lack detail Award 2 points	YES, both conditions are met. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions must be relevant to the team’s collaborative work. Responses are specific and answer the question posed. Award 4 points		