**Social Media Platforms Assignment**

For this assignment, group members will work together to create an informative presentation that conveys knowledge about and enhances understanding about a social media platform used to reach a public audience. Each group should consider the knowledge of the audience and the types of research that will be most effective in discussing the platforms.

In this 5-7 minute presentation, each group member will present his or her primary research and show examples that explain the features, uses, benefits, and drawbacks of the platform. In addition to the presentation, each group will prepare and submit a presentation outline and bibliography in APA style. Because this is an informative presentation, groups should not advocate for a particular platform, but simply inform the audience about the chosen platform.

**Outline and References**

The group will provide a typed outline on the day of the presentation. The outline should have an **Introduction** (attention-getter, relevance statement, credibility statement, and preview of main points), **Body** (typically, the perspective of each panelist comprises one of the main points with relevant support/evidence), and **Conclusion** (summary of key issues and a memorable close). A **reference list** of at least 10 sources must be included with the outline and must follow **APA** 6th edition guidelines. All references must be cited at some point during the presentation.

**Attire**

This formal presentation will be recorded. Dress appropriately for the situation and your topic.

**Evaluation**

The presentation should be a group effort. For that reason, 60 points of the 100 points possible will be based on overall group performance, meaning every member of the group receives the same number of group points. The other 40 points will be individual points. Twenty (20) points will be based on the individual’s performance during the presentation and 20 points will be based on the confidential group evaluation points given to each student by his or her fellow group members.

**Assessment tools**: JMU Rubric for Academic Presentations, JMU Rubric for Academic Presentations (formative comments), in-class peer evaluations, and group peer evaluations, and self-evaluation.

**Summative Evaluation Form**

**Group**:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Traits** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Competent** | **Exemplary** |
| **Purpose**  Focused on conveying the presenter’s thesis or claim and its relevance to the audience, setting and context.  Examined features may include topic selection, appropriateness, content, language, clarity, or focus. | Weak or unclear thesis or claim.  Presenter demonstrates poor audience analysis.  Purpose is inappropriate, lacks relevance, and intention.  Audience gains little from the presentation. | Clear, discernible thesis or claim.  Presenter demonstrates use of audience analysis.  Language and word choice appropriate for audience, occasion, and setting.  Presentation communicates intended or assigned content to audience. | Presentation develops sophisticated thesis or claim.  Presenter demonstrates sophisticated analysis of the audience, occasion, and setting.  Presenter provides audience with substantial knowledge and/or awareness beyond assigned goal of the presentation. |
| **Structure**  Focused on organization and coherence of presentation elements.  Features include flow or sequencing of ideas (introduction, body, conclusion, & transitions) and other conventional elements appropriate to the content; aids audience understands and supports purpose. | Presentation lacks cohesive organization and flow.  Many structural features are missing or not used logically.  Organization detracts from audience’s ability to identify thesis and fails to support claims. | Presentation follows logical and cohesive pattern.  All necessary and appropriate structural features present.  Organization assists audience’s identification of thesis and supports claims. | Sequencing of ideas exceptionally clear; progresses logically within and between conventional elements.  Structural features used skillfully to frame and unify presentation.  Organization enhances audience’s understanding of thesis and strongly supports claims. |
| **Complexity**  Focused on the depth or sophistication of ideas presented to the audience(s).  Features may include evidence or research that supports thesis, use of analysis, integration or synthesis of the content, an ethical purpose, creativity, and perspective(s). | Little to no appropriate evidence or data to develop claims.  If used, sources lack variety, validity, accuracy, are misused or uncited.  Ideas presented are simplistic, illogical, superficial, or unoriginal.  Content merely summarizes information and/or lacks critical analysis. | Accurate, appropriate, and relevant evidence and data develop thesis or claim.  Sources are credible and appropriately cited.  Presentation demonstrates some critical analysis and interpretation.  Information presented goes beyond summary by making connections that develop thesis or claim.  Some evidence of synthesis. | Evidence and data strongly develop thesis and are well integrated into presentation.  Sources are critically selected to reflect multiple authoritative perspectives.  Critical analysis and interpretations demonstrate originality, depth, and/or creativity.  Synthesis and connections evident. |
| **Delivery**  Focused on presenter’s control of the **vocal** (rate, pitch, tone, volume, rhythm, and articulation), **physical** (eye contact, posture, movement, gestures, position, and appearance), and **audio-visual** dimensions (use of presentation tools PowerPoint or Prezi, images, sounds, and objects) of the presentation or performance event.  Other features may include evidence of rehearsal/preparation, adherence to time guidelines, and creativity. | Presenter’s delivery lacks sufficient control of all three dimensions.  Delivery detracts from purpose, structure, and complexity of presentation.  Delivery features are simplistic, unpolished, inappropriate, uncomfortable, or unnatural.  Delivery does not meet assignment requirements. | Presenter’s delivery demonstrates satisfactory control of all three dimensions.  Delivery supports purpose, structure, and complexity of presentation.  Delivery features are appropriate, varied, and engaging.  Delivery dimensions are used purposefully.  Delivery meets assignment requirements. | Presenter’s delivery demonstrates masterful control.  Delivery creates cohesive whole by strongly reinforcing purpose, structure, and complexity of presentation.  Delivery creates dynamic and engaging relationship with audience.  Delivery features are used to enhance meaning creatively with polish and intention. |

**Grade**:

**Formative Evaluation Form**

**Group Name:** **Time**:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Level**  **Trait** | **Unsatisfactory (U)**  Presentation fails to meet minimal academic competencies at the college level. | **Competent (C)**  Presentation meets minimal academic competencies at the college level. | **Exemplary (E)**  Presentation goes beyond competency and consistently surpasses expectations. |
| **Purpose:** Conveying the presenter’s thesis or claim and its relevance to the audience, setting and context.  Examined features may include topic selection, appropriateness, content, language, clarity, or focus. | Mark one: **U C E**  Comments**:** | | | |
| **Structure:** Organization and coherence of presentation elements.  Features include flow or sequencing of ideas (introduction, body, conclusion, & transitions) and other conventional elements appropriate to the content; aids audience understands and supports purpose. | Mark one: **U C E**  Comments**:** | | | |
| **Complexity:** The depth or sophistication of ideas presented to the audience(s). Features may include evidence or research that supports thesis, use of analysis, integration or synthesis of the content, an ethical purpose, creativity, and perspective(s). | Mark one: **U C E**  Comments**:** | | | |
| **Delivery**: Presenter’s control of the **vocal** (rate, pitch, tone, volume, rhythm, and articulation), **physical** (eye contact, posture, movement, gestures, position, and appearance), and **audio-visual** dimensions (use of presentation tools PowerPoint or Prezi, images, sounds, and objects) of the presentation or performance event.  Other features may include evidence of rehearsal/preparation, adherence to time guidelines, and creativity. | Mark one: **U C E**  Comments**:** | | | |

**In-Class Peer Evaluation Form**

**Group**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Topic**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Evaluator**:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Your job is to provide a written critique of the presenting group’s presentation (use the back of the sheet, if necessary). Please be as honest as possible, providing both positive comments and tactful, constructive suggestions for improvement. Since specific comments are more useful to the presenting group, please avoid generalities.

1. How was the presentation made relevant to this audience? Was it adequately focused on the audience? Explain your answer.
2. Comment on the presenting group’s organization. Was a preview included? What about transitions? Were you able to follow the presentation? Were there gaps in any of the arguments presented? Did any member of the presenting group commit any logical fallacies? Explain your answer.
3. How was the topic developed, clarified, and illustrated? Was this development sufficient? Did the presenting group’s evidence pass the test for bias, timeliness, and credibility? Did the presenting group follow the guide for citing sources orally? Explain your answer.
4. Comment on the presenting group’s delivery (eye contact, gestures, tone, rate, fluency, facial expressions, stance, confidence, and enthusiasm).
5. Write three strengths of this group presentation.
6. Make three suggestions for improvement.

a.

b.

c.

Group Presentation Peer Evaluation Form

**Name: Group:**

Please evaluate your group members on their performance on the group presentation assignment. You **must assign grades to each member within each component using a merit system**. The merit system applies to **EACH** of the individual components. If you determine that all members of your group “deserve” the same grade, you have just defined for yourself an 'average' group member - average = 2.   **Be sure to include yourself** **in your evaluation*.***

Provide an evaluation for each of the components using the following scale:

3 = this member excelled within this area, performing above group standards

2 = this member performed to the standards of the rest of the group

1 = this member's performance needs improvement within this area

0 = this member didn't participate enough to receive a score within this area

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Your Name** | **Name** | **Name** | **Name** | **Name** | **Name** |
| Using the spaces to the right, list the names each of member of your group, including yourself, **ONE NAME PER COLUMN. WRITE** a score for **EACH** member for EACH component in the rows below**.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| This person made a strong effort to **attend** all group meetings and was an active participant in these meetings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **research** done by this person contributed greatly to the group effort. He/she chose appropriate sources, supporting materials and cited them effectively. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| This person contributed to the **equal participation** of all members of the group. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| This person's **verbal behavior** was appropriate. He/she clarified, paraphrased, was concrete and descriptive, well organized, and informative. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| This person's **nonverbal behavior** was appropriate. He/she was attentive, made eye contact, affirmative responses, and showed respect for others. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| This person was **pleasing** to work with and was a positive addition to our group. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| This person **encouraged audience participation**, asked questions, shared the floor. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| This person was one of **the top workers** in our group. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

On my honor, I have not discussed or divulged this evaluation with anyone. I understand complete confidentiality resides in the instructor and me. My peers WILL be given aggregate data.

Group Presentation Self-Evaluation

# Name

As you watch your recorded presentation, look at it objectively as you can. Focus on the final product, not on the amount of effort you put into it or your intentions. Evaluate what you actually produced in the following areas:

## Central Message

1. Please explain what parts of your group presentation you believe were compelling (the message was precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported) your answer.
2. What could you have done differently to produce a more successful central message?

## Language

1. Please explain how effectively you used language in your group presentation. Were your language choices imaginative, memorable, or compelling? Did the language that you used enhance the effectiveness of the presentation? In what ways was the language appropriate for the audience?
2. What could you have done differently in terms of the language that you used?

## Organization

1. Please explain what organizational pattern (e.g., topical, chronological, problem-solution, problem-cause-solution, or Monroe’s motivated sequence) you used in your group presentation. Why did you chose this organizational pattern and not another pattern?
2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the organizational pattern that you chose? What organizational pattern would have been more effective?

## Supporting Materials

1. Please explain what kinds of supporting materials you used. In what ways did these materials establish your credibility/authority on the topic?
2. What could you have done differently with your supporting materials that would have been more effective?

**Delivery**

1. Did your delivery techniques make the group presentation compelling to the audience? Why or why not?
2. What could you have done differently in terms of delivery techniques that would have made your group presentation more compelling and allow you to appear more polished and confident?