

Screencasting Assessment Rubric

Department of Mathematics

Group: _____

Faculty Reviewer: _____

Your screencasting projects will be graded based on the following criteria. For each criterion, I will assign the number which best describes the work. Please note that even numbers can be used to show that the presentation shows qualities of both neighboring categories (feel free to circle relevant characteristics). Any additional comments for the student(s) will be given on the back of the form.

_____ **1. Organization & Delivery** (33 $\frac{1}{3}$ %)

| 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 |
|---|----|--|----|--|
| <p>Inadequately organized work. No clear outline or flow to the presentation. Quality of work falls far short of expectations. Evidence of lack of effort or enthusiasm. No evidence of the use of outside programs or attempts at organizing the material presented.</p> | | <p>Work is moderately well organized. Outline not completely clear. Quality of work meets expectations. Work seems reasonably polished with supporting points. Student use of outside programs was insufficient to effectively guide the presentation.</p> | | <p>Superior and carefully organized work. Clear outline. Quality of work exceeds expectations. Work is extremely polished and poignant. Audience is engrossed in the subject matter. Student use of outside programs such as power point or beamer aided in the flow of the presentation. The presentation is very attractive and technically sound.</p> |

_____ **2. Maple Usage** (33 $\frac{1}{3}$ %)

| 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 |
|---|----|--|----|--|
| <p>There was little to no evidence of Maple usage, and what little was done in Maple was incorrect or not compelling. No context for the calculations was given and results were not explained clearly.</p> | | <p>Several examples were presented in Maple, but little justification for the significance of these examples was offered. There were several errors in the explanation of the results.</p> | | <p>The use of Maple was clearly evident in the presentation. Examples were clearly justified and presenters used Maple to effectively support their findings. The examples presented were graphically rich and expressive. Context and meaning of calculations were discussed correctly and added to the overall presentation.</p> |

_____ **3. Screencast Quality** (33 $\frac{1}{3}$ %)

| 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 |
|---|----|---|----|--|
| <p>Video is choppy and hard to read. Audio is very quiet. Pace of narration was much too fast and failed in drawing the listener in. Little to no evidence of edited video or audio. Presentation took too little time or exceeded the allotted time.</p> | | <p>Video and audio quality is acceptable. Pace of narration was appropriate. Some evidence of video or audio editing which added depth to the work. Presentation was completed within an acceptable time frame.</p> | | <p>Video and audio quality exceeds expectations. Narration was professional and effective. Video and audio editing highlighted key points of the talk, and provided a rich viewing experience to the work. Presentation was crisp with little filler time and was completed within an acceptable time frame.</p> |

Overall Presentation Grade (circle one): A+ A A- B+ B B- C+ C C- D+ D D- F