Peer Review - Storytelling Evaluation

Intelligibility—pronunciation (sounds, stress, intonation)
1 = very difficult to understand
2 = difficult to understand; a lot of effort needed
3 = sometimes easy, sometimes difficult to understand
4 = easy to understand; minimal effort needed
5 = very easy to understand

Fluency—smooth, even flow; natural speed; natural pausing
1 = poor: not smooth; major problems with speed and/or pausing
2 = fair: many problems with speed and/or pausing
3 = moderate: some problems with speed and/or pausing
4 = good: generally smooth; good speed and pausing
5 = very good: smooth, even flow; natural speed; natural pausing

Interesting—connection with the audience
1 = poor: weak connection; not interesting
2 = fair: somewhat interesting; not much connection with audience
3 = moderate: fairly interesting; able to connect with audience
4 = good: interesting; connected well with audience
5 = very good: very interesting; connected with and held audience’s attention

Technique—storytelling techniques used
1 = poor: weak/unclear use of storytelling techniques
2 = fair: few clear/effective uses of storytelling techniques
3 = moderate: some clear/effective uses of storytelling techniques
4 = good: fairly clear/effective use of storytelling techniques
5 = very good: extremely clear/effective use of storytelling techniques

Content—quality of story (organization; details; time)
1 = poor: no apparent cohesive storyline; confusing
2 = fair: week storyline/organization; few details; very short
3 = moderate: average cohesive storyline/organization; some detail; short
4 = good: clear, organized narrative arc/storyline; fairly good detail; appropriate time
5 = very good: extremely cohesive/ well organized storyline; detailed; lengthy

_____ /25 = total

Comments: