## This rubric is a sample provided by the Department of Chinese and Bilingual Studies (PolyU)

Task/ Assessment: Students in group work on lobbying and negotiating to launch a pilot scheme in a major external corporate branding programme.

## Assessment Rubric: A Oral Presentation Assessment - 40%

## A. On the side of panel speakers (25%)

		Outstanding	Very satisfactory	Satisfactory	Barely satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Score-grade equivalence (Criteria/ Weighting)		A, A+ 35.1 – 40.0	B , B+ 28.1 – 35.0	C, C+ 24.1 – 28.0	D, D+ 20.1 – 24.0	F 0.0 – 20.0
Content, Effectiveness & Organization	8%	<ul> <li>Outstanding topical relevance to the internal corporate stakeholders reviewing the proposed external corporate branding programme;</li> <li>Ideas and arguments are superbly coherent;</li> <li>Highly effective use of persuasive, lobbying and negotiation skills.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Strong topical relevance to the internal corporate stakeholders reviewing the proposed external corporate branding programme;</li> <li>Ideas and arguments are effectively coherent;</li> <li>Effectively use of persuasive, lobbying and negotiation skills.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Satisfactory topical relevance to the internal corporate stakeholders reviewing the proposed external corporate branding programme;</li> <li>Ideas and arguments are adequately coherent;</li> <li>Satisfactory use of persuasive, lobbying and negotiation skills.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Marginal topical relevance to the internal corporate stakeholders reviewing the proposed external corporate branding programme;</li> <li>Ideas and arguments are marginally coherent;</li> <li>Marginally use of persuasive, lobbying and negotiation skills.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Weak topical relevance to the internal corporate stakeholders reviewing the proposed external corporate branding programme;</li> <li>Ideas and arguments are poorly coherent;</li> <li>Weakly use of persuasive, lobbying and negotiation skills.</li> </ul>
Verbal Delivery	6%	<ul> <li>Superb command of accuracy and fluency;</li> <li>Superb choices of register and style.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Effective command of accuracy and fluency;</li> <li>Effective choices of register and style.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Adequate command of accuracy and fluency;</li> <li>Adequate choices of register and style.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Barely adequate</li> <li>command of accuracy and</li> <li>fluency;</li> <li>Barely adequate choices</li> <li>of register and style.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Inadequate command of accuracy and fluency;</li> <li>Inadequate choices of register and style.</li> </ul>

Nonverbal Delivery	6%	<ul> <li>Superb command of body Language (Eye contact, Facial expressions, Gesture, Posture, etc);</li> <li>Superbly use of paralanguage (Volume, Pitch, Rate, Emphasis, etc.);</li> <li>Superb use of Multimedia Aids</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Effective command of body Language (Eye contact, Facial expressions, Gesture, Posture, etc);</li> <li>Effectively use of paralanguage (Volume, Pitch, Rate, Emphasis, etc.);</li> <li>Effective use of Multimedia Aids</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Adequate command of body Language (Eye contact, Facial expressions, Gesture, Posture, etc);</li> <li>Adequately use of paralanguage (Volume, Pitch, Rate, Emphasis, etc.);</li> <li>Adequate use of Multimedia Aids</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Barely adequate command of body Language (Eye contact, Facial expressions, Gesture, Posture, etc);</li> <li>Barely adequate use of paralanguage (Volume, Pitch, Rate, Emphasis, etc.);</li> <li>Barely adequate use of Multimedia Aids</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Inadequate command of body Language (Eye contact, Facial expressions, Gesture, Posture, etc);</li> <li>Inadequate use of paralanguage (Volume, Pitch, Rate, Emphasis, etc.);</li> <li>Inadequate use of Multimedia Aids</li> </ul>
Replies to strategic questions/ criticisms from external stakeholders	5%	<ul> <li>Superbly confident, informative and tactful responses to critical comments from external stakeholders;</li> <li>Strong evidence of persuasive appeals of Ethos, Logos and Pathos.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Effective confident, informative and tactful responses to critical comments from external stakeholders;</li> <li>Quite strong evidence of persuasive appeals of Ethos, Logos and Pathos.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Adequate confident, informative and tactful responses to critical comments from external stakeholders;</li> <li>Adequate evidence of persuasive appeals of Ethos, Logos and Pathos.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Barely adequate confident, informative and tactful responses to critical comments from external stakeholders;</li> <li>Weak evidence of persuasive appeals of Ethos, Logos and Pathos.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Inadequate confident, informative and tactful responses to critical comments from external stakeholders;</li> <li>Very weak evidence of persuasive appeals of Ethos, Logos and Pathos.</li> </ul>

## B. On the side of floor reporters (15%)

		Outstanding	Very satisfactory	Satisfactory	Barely satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Score-grade		A, A+	В, В+	C, C+	D, D+	F
equivalence		35.1 - 40.0	28.1 - 35.0	24.1 - 28.0	20.1 - 24.0	0.0 - 20.0
(Criteria/ Weight	ting)					
	7%	- Outstanding topical	<ul> <li>Strong topical</li> </ul>	- Satisfactory topical	- Marginal topical relevance	- Weak topical relevance to
		relevance to the internal	relevance to the internal	relevance to the internal	to the internal corporate	the internal corporate
		corporate stakeholders	corporate stakeholders	corporate stakeholders	stakeholders reviewing the	stakeholders reviewing the
		reviewing the proposed	reviewing the proposed	reviewing the proposed	proposed external	proposed external
		external corporate	external corporate	external corporate branding	corporate branding	corporate branding
Content, Effectiveness & Organization		branding programme;	branding programme;	programme;	programme;	programme;
		<ul> <li>Ideas and arguments are superbly coherent;</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Ideas and arguments are effectively coherent;</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Ideas and arguments are adequately coherent;</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Ideas and arguments are marginally coherent;</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Ideas and arguments are poorly coherent;</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Highly effective use of strategic questioning and negotiation skills.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Effectively use of strategic questioning and negotiation skills.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Satisfactory use of strategic questioning and negotiation skills.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Marginally use of strategic questioning and negotiation skills.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Weakly use of strategic questioning and negotiation skills.</li> </ul>
	4%	- Superb command of	- Effective command of	- Adequate command of	- Barely adequate	- Inadequate command of
		accuracy and fluency;	accuracy and fluency;	accuracy and fluency;	command of accuracy and	accuracy and fluency;
Verbal Delivery		- Superb choices of register and style.	- Effective choices of register and style.	<ul> <li>Adequate choices of register and style.</li> </ul>	fluency; - Barely adequate choices	- Inadequate choices of register and style.
					of register and style.	
Nonverbal Delivery	4%	- Superb command of body Language (Eye contact, Facial expressions, Gesture, Posture, etc);	- Effective command of body Language (Eye contact, Facial expressions, Gesture, Posture, etc);	- Adequate command of body Language (Eye contact, Facial expressions, Gesture, Posture, etc);	<ul> <li>Barely adequate</li> <li>command of body</li> <li>Language (Eye contact,</li> <li>Facial expressions, Gesture,</li> <li>Posture, etc);</li> </ul>	- Inadequate command of body Language (Eye contact, Facial expressions, Gesture, Posture, etc);
		- Superbly use of paralanguage (Volume, Pitch, Rate, Emphasis, etc.)	- Effectively use of paralanguage (Volume, Pitch, Rate, Emphasis, etc.)	- Adequately use of paralanguage (Volume, Pitch, Rate, Emphasis, etc.)	- Barely adequate use of paralanguage (Volume, Pitch, Rate, Emphasis, etc.)	- Inadequate use of paralanguage (Volume, Pitch, Rate, Emphasis, etc.)