Name of Peer Reviewer:

Name of Podcast Producer(s):

HIST 4212/5212 (Fall 2020)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Score** | **Notes** |
| **Speaking**  **(20 pts.)** |  |  |
| **Analysis**  **(20 pts.)** |  |  |
| **Evidence**  **(20 pts.)** |  |  |
| **Structure**  **(25 pts.)** |  |  |
| **Technical Production**  **(15 pts.)** |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |

**Podcast Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Communication**  **(20 pts.)** | **<14 pts.**  Difficult to follow or distracting due to major problems with enunciation, clarity, tone variation, pacing, energy, or phrasing. Delivery sounds unrehearsed, choppy, or wooden. Read from a script. | **14-16 pts.**  Consistent problems with enunciation, clarity, tone variation, pacing, energy, or phrasing. Delivery sounds either poorly rehearsed or read from a script. | **17-18 pts.**  Minor issues with enunciation, clarity, tone variation, pacing, energy, or phrasing. Rehearsed delivery without directly reading from a script. | **19-20 pts.**  No issues with enunciation, clarity, tone variation, pacing, energy, or phrasing. Smooth and conversational delivery actively engages the listener. |
| **Analysis**  **(20 pts.)** | **<14 pts.**  Presents only basic information with little to no historical analysis or narrative coherence. Fails to follow assignment instructions. | **14-16 pts.**  Relies on weak, superficial, or difficult-to-follow analytical points. More descriptive than analytical, lacking necessary context. | **17-18 pts.**  Engages in substantive, specific, and coherent historical analysis of the topic. Minor issues with depth, clarity, or context. | **19-20 pts.**  Makes exceptionally compelling, powerful, and creative analytical points while providing rich context for the listener. |
| **Evidence**  **(20 pts.)** | **<14 pts.**  Does not use specific evidence or examples to support its points. Fails to consult any sources or uses obviously problematic sources. | **14-16 pts.**  Uses evidence sporadically, inappropriately, or in confusing ways. Relies on a weak or limited historical source base. | **17-18 pts.**  Provides specific evidence to support analysis while consulting appropriate historical sources. | **19-20 pts.**  Uses a variety of carefully selected and compelling evidence to support analytical points. Consults a deep and substantive source base. |
| **Structure**  **(25 pts.)** | **<18 pts.**  Difficult or impossible to follow due to incoherent structure. Missing written outline, intro, outro, or other requirements. Major recording length issues (way too short/long). | **18-20 pts.**  Confusing structure with missing or poor transitions, lack of narrative coherence. Limited or inadequate written outline. Minor issues with recording length. | **21-23 pts.**  Ties together main points with only minor issues in coherence, clarity, or transitions. Appropriate recording length. | **24-25 pts.**  Elegant organizational structure weaves together elements into a powerful and coherent whole. Appropriate recording length. |
| **Technical Production**  **(15 pts.)** | **<10 pts.**  High levels of background noise, distracting volume changes or low audio quality; entirely unprocessed or unmixed; no use of sound effects; fails to follow technical requirements of assignment (file size, submission format, etc.) | **10-11 pts.**  Occasional background noise; inconsistent volume and audio quality; poor mixing or processing; minimal or distracting use of sound effects; some issues with technical requirements (file size, submission format, etc.) | **12-13 pts.**  Minimal background noise; consistent volume and audio quality; adequately mixed and processed; good use of sound effects without being distracting; meets technical requirements of assignment. | **14-15 pts.**  No background noise, exceptional volume and audio quality; clearly mixed and processed; smartly uses sound effects to actively enhance listener experience; meets technical requirements of assignment. |