# Rubric for the Acme Role-Playing Scenario

| | 0.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Originality | Needed to be told an idea to do, and this was copied directly from sources or from instructor's guidance | Needed to be told an idea to do, and very little originality was used in adapting it | Needed much guidance to come up with an idea. Idea was copied from sources without much adaptation to Acme | Came up with own idea. Some original thought went into the design | Highly creative/innovative proposal with some original ideas |
| Viability of idea (Is it useful? Would it cost a lot, or even save money?) | Proposal was unsuitable for Acme, or totally unrealistic | Proposal had little value for Acme, or largely unrealistic | Proposal could be used at Acme but wouldn't help much | Proposal could make a significant difference | Proposal could make a big improvement in environmental impact for the cost |
| Presentation design & structure | Slides/paper was very incomplete & very muddled | Slides/paper was very incomplete or very muddled | Slides/paper was too short or way too long, or hard to follow | Slides/paper was generally good, but it was a bit hard to follow in parts | Slides/paper was clear to follow, flowed well, and had the right level of detail |
| Presentation content | Mostly irrelevant to the topic in hand, or was copied without change | Some was irrelevant, or contained much content without attribution of source. Very vague. | Irrelevant in parts, or missing a lot of detail, or some content without attribution. Vague, few specifics | All main points were there with some specifics, but some details missing or irrelevant. Possibly am image or two without attribution | All points were there, with plenty of detail and specific facts. |
| Quality of oral presentation | Didn't appear to know what they were talking about | Much hesitation, very hard to follow. Failed to answer questions. | Some hesitation, perhaps skipped over some details too quickly, or dragged things out too long | Fairly clear, but perhaps missed a few details, or couldn't answer a question | Very clear, brought the slides/paper to life, engaged the listener, appeared to understand topic very thoroughly |
| Quality of argument | Couldn't tell what argument was being made | Hard to tell what they were arguing for | Disjointed or unclear argument, with some elements of valid argument present | Made a good case, but perhaps overlooked some factors | Very convincing, left the audience excited and/or totally convinced |