FIFA Presentation Grading Rubric
PowerPoint Writing Style (50%)

	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Headlines *10%*	Headlines are incomplete, wordy, or grammatically incorrect	Complete headlines on each slide with the "so what"	Complete headlines on each slide with the "so what" Powerful language that conveys precise meaning Concise Flawless grammar
Synthesis *10%*	Content is not synthesized, e.g., just lists of bullet points Insufficient evidence to support synthesis and headline	Content on each slide is appropriately synthesized, based on sufficient evidence	Content on each slide is synthesized with a hierarchy that demonstrates relationships among elements or in a flow that helps process information Evidence to support synthesis is clearly communicated
Concise, active voice *10%*	Much of the text is written in the passive voice Text is wordy Bullet points are at different levels of abstraction	Majority of text is written in active voice Text is concise	All text is written using the active voice Text is concise Bullet points are at the same level of abstraction
Unifying visual *10%*	Minimal visuals or excessively simple visuals (e.g., logos, images) Visuals do not enhance ability to understand the message Slide has too little information for a standalone document Slide is too dense	Unifying visuals on each slide The right amount of information on a slide for a standalone document	Unifying visuals on each slide, with thoughtful use of space, color, and shading that enhances ability to understand the message Visuals effectively communicate, punctuate, and emphasize the meaning of the evidence provided on each slide
Varied visuals *10%*	Many slides are primarily text Format is repeated	Some visual variation among slides	Visuals are varied and keep audience interest

FIFA Presentation Grading Rubric (continued)

Inductive Reasoning (20%); Verbal Presentation (30%)

	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Inductive structure *10%*	Too few/too many categories Categories overlap; not fully independent Categories at different levels of abstraction (e.g., mix of reasons and actions)	3 – 5 independent, non-overlapping categories at the same level of abstraction: all actions, or all reasons, or all findings	3 – 5 independent, non-overlapping ideas at the same level of abstraction: all actions, or all reasons, or all findings Each category significantly advances the argument
Evidence *10%*	Evidence does not support the headline Evidence is weak Missing citations	Have meaningful supporting evidence Sources cited appropriately on each slide	Ample, high impact, supporting evidence Sources are cited appropriately on each slide
Audience engagement (10%)	No eye contact Looks at notes or back at screen excessively No enthusiasm or interest Memorized script	Generally maintains eye contact Shows interest Natural, conversational style	Excellent eye contact with all sections of the audience Smiles Shows energy and enthusiasm Engaging dialogue
Tone and clarity (10%)	Not audible to everyone Frequently not understandable No variance to tone and pitch Excessive fillers "ums" "uhs" Excessive inappropriate/casual language ("you guys")	Strong opening Audible to all Clear and understandable Minimal fillers "ums" "uhs" "like" Appropriate language	Audience can hear at all times Clear and understandable Varies tone and pitch No filler words Professional, inspirational language Strong opening and closing
Posture (10%)	Excessive swaying, rocking, or crossing legs Excessive slouched or closed posture Leaning on podium or table	Minimal swaying, rocking or crossing legs Mostly open posture	No swaying, rocking, or crossing legs Open and upright posture