



PREMIER CHAPTER PRESENTATION AND INTERVIEW RUBRIC

Indicator	Very strong evidence of skill: 5–4 points	Moderate evidence of skill: 3–2 points	Weak evidence of skill: 1–0 points	Weight	Points Earned
A1. Explained how the activity in the specific category was tied to the quality standard.	Example activity was directly tied to the quality standard and was clearly explained.	Example activity was somewhat tied to the quality standard and was explained well.	Example activity was rarely tied to the quality standard and was not explained.	X 1	
A2. Explained how the activity was educational and innovative.	The educational value and level of innovation of the activity were thoroughly explained.	The educational value and innovation of the activity were identified but were not expanded upon.	The educational value and innovative nature of the activity were not presented.	X 2	
B1. Provided background beyond the application but relevant to the activity.	Provided ample background and knowledge relevant to the activity.	Provided some background and knowledge relevant to the activity.	Provided little background to the activity that wasn't present in the application.	X 3	
B2. Spoke knowledgeably about the activity.	Possessed a strong knowledge-base and effectively articulated information regarding related facts and current issues.	Possessed a good knowledge-base and, for the most part, articulated information regarding related facts and current issues.	Possessed some knowledge-base but was unable to articulate information regarding related facts and current issues.	X 1	
B3. It was clear that the chapter activity was completed by chapter members.	Throughout the presentation, it was clear the activity was completed by chapter members.	Presenters gave the impression that most of the activity was completed by members.	The activity was not member driven.	X 2	
B4. The presentation brought the specific activity in the application alive.	The presentation was lively and helped actualize the specific activity in the application.	The presentation helped bring the activity to life.	The presentation was not dynamic and did not give more information than what was presented in the application.	X 1	
B5. Presenters explained whether activity implementation processes were followed as originally planned and, if not, why and what was learned.	Presenters thoroughly explained the activity implementation process as originally planned and also described what was learned if it did not go as planned.	Presenters could have done a better job explaining the activity implementation process as originally planned and also describing what was learned if it did not go as planned.	Presenters did not explain the activity implementation process and if it was not followed as originally planned, struggled to explain why and what was learned.	X 1	

Indicator	Very strong evidence of skill: 5–4 points	Moderate evidence of skill: 3–2 points	Weak evidence of skill: 1–0 points	Weight	Points Earned
C1. Explained how and why the activity was selected.	Presenters thoroughly explained how and why the activity was selected.	Presenters attempted to explain how and why the activity was selected.	Presenters did not describe how and why the activity was selected.	X 1	
C2. Conveyed how engaged and innovative students were in the activity from planning to delivery.	Presenters explained the members' level of engagement and innovation from planning to delivery.	Presenters referred to the members' level of engagement and innovation from planning to delivery but could have been more descriptive.	Presenters did not convey a positive level of engagement and innovation from members in planning to delivery.	X 3	
D1. Interview responses went beyond the presentation's content.	Interview responses expanded on the topic beyond the presentation content.	Some interview responses expanded on the topic beyond the presentation content.	Interview responses did not expand on the topic beyond the presentation content.	X 3	
D2. Interview responses were free-flowing.	Spoke unrehearsed with comfort and ease Spoke quickly with organized thoughts and concise answers	Spoke unrehearsed mostly with comfort and ease but sometimes seemed nervous or unsure Spoke effectively but had to stop and think and sometimes was off focus	Showed nervousness or seemed unprepared when speaking unrehearsed Seemed to ramble or spoke before thinking	X 1	
D3. Complete answers were given.	Complete thoughts and thorough answers were given to all questions. Always provided details which supported the point; well organized	Complete thoughts and thorough answers were given to most questions. Usually provided details which were supportive of the point; displayed good organizational skills	Complete thoughts and thorough answers were rarely given. Sometimes overlooked details that could have been very beneficial to the point; lacked organization	X 3	
D4. Presenters were knowledgeable – more than just well-prepared.	Presenters were genuinely knowledgeable about the activity.	Presenters seemed somewhat knowledgeable about the activity.	Presenters were not genuinely knowledgeable, but rather prepared for the basic presentation.	X 2	
E1. Preparation and organization was evident.	Presenters were well prepared and organized.	Presenters could have been more prepared and organized.	Presenters were not prepared or organized.	X 1	
E2. Did well with professionalism, disposition and appropriate delivery (grammar, pitch, quality, articulation, language).	- Appropriate tone was consistent. - Spoke at the right pace to be clear - Confident - Poised and in control at all times	- Appropriate tone was usually consistent. - Spoke at the right pace most of the time but showed some nervousness - Somewhat	- Had difficulty using an appropriate tone - Pace was too fast; nervous - Rarely displayed confidence - Sometimes seemed to lose composure	X 2	

Indicator	Very strong evidence of skill: 5–4 points	Moderate evidence of skill: 3–2 points	Weak evidence of skill: 1–0 points	Weight	Points Earned
		confident Poised and in control most of the time, rarely lost composure			
Additional co-presenter was used during presentation (Deduction)				-25	
TOTAL SCORE (135 points possible)					

Scores from the written report submitted for prequalifying will count as 25 percent of the overall score. Interview judges will not see the scores from the written report and the convention score will account for 75 percent of the overall score.