**Rating System and Presentation for Multimedia App Selection**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exemplary | Proficient | Below Standard | Did Not Demonstrate | Total Points |
| Rating Descriptors | The group has selected ratings descriptors that are clear and easy to understand. It is clear that students will interpret the descriptors the same way. There is an element of creativity to the rating descriptors; the group uses language that goes beyond “Excellent,” “Fair,” and “Poor.” | The group has selected ratings descriptors that are clear and easy to understand. It is clear that students will interpret the descriptors the same way.  | The group has selected ratings descriptors, but some of them may be either unclear, rudimentary (relying on descriptors such “Excellent,” “Fair” and “Poor), or hard to interpret. | The group has selected ratings descriptors that are unclear, difficult to understand, and/or show little care or thought for the process. |  |
| Factors for Ranking | At least five factors are well chosen; the group used their Application Analysis to select factors that contribute to the app’s usefulness to the broadcast program. The language used is clear and applicable to all multimedia apps, not just apps that share a singular purpose (ex. just to teleprompter apps). | Five factors are well chosen; the group used their Application Analysis to select factors that contribute to the app’s usefulness to the program. The language used is clear. | The group has selected valid five factors, but did not take into consideration the usefulness of the application to the broadcast program. | Factors selected are superficial, not helpful, and/or irrelevant to the broadcast program |  |
| Presentation: Pros and Cons | Pros and cons for using the app are thoughtful, realistic, and take into account the app’s purpose in a broadcast classroom. The group makes creative suggestions for app usage. | Pros and cons for using the app are realistic and take into account the app’s purpose. | Pros and cons are superficial, but still relevant to the program. | Pros and cons are irrelevant to the use of the app in the broadcast program. |  |
| Presentation Demonstration | Application demonstration is planned and well-rehearsed. It is clear that the group knows exactly what it would like to show the audience about the functionality of the app and its usefulness in the classroom, or lack thereof. | There is a clear sense of rehearsal among group members and the audience gets a clear sense of what the app has the ability to do for the program. | Group shows that they are familiar with the app, but are not able to clearly communicate the app’s functions to the audience. | Group shows a superficial understanding of what the app can do and is unable to clearly demonstrate its function to the class. |  |
| Presentation: Recommendation | The group takes a stance as to whether or not the broadcast program should use the app. The recommendation is thoughtful and supported by evidence from the Application Analysis assignment. The group does an excellent job persuading the audience that we should/should not use the app. | The group takes a stance as to whether or not the broadcast program should use the app. The recommendation is supported by evidence from the Application Analysis assignment. The group makes an attempt to persuade the audience to use/not to use the app. | The group takes a stance as to whether or not the broadcast program should use the app, but the stance is weakly supported by evidence. The group makes an unsuccessful attempt to persuade. | The group either does not make a recommendation or makes an unsupported recommendation. If a recommendation is made, it does not persuade the audience. |  |
| Group Dynamics | The group worked well together and supported each other as a team. | The group had only minor issues in group dynamics. | The group did not work well as a team. | Complaints as to conduct were made about this group. |  |
| Total Points |  |  |  |  | \_\_\_/\_\_\_ points |