CIS 4250 Ethics and Computer Science
Oral Competency Assessment

Instructor: Daniel Chang
106A MCH (Carothers Hall)
dchang@cs.fsu.edu

Assistant: TBA
-
TBA@cs.fsu.edu

Oral Argument Format

The course Oral Communication Competency assessment is comprised of two oral arguments. For the first oral argument the student will be assigned an ethical issue along with a position for that issue, neither of which is of the student's choosing. For the second oral argument the student will address the same issue, but from the opposing viewpoint. During each argument the student will present alongside another student with the same issue, but an opposing position. Students are limited to using three (3) 5-inch by 8-inch, or smaller, index cards for notes.

Each oral argument will consist of an eight (8) minute presentation session, a three (3) minute rebuttal session, and a three (3) minute challenge session. Each argument will be performed in tandem, with two presenters from opposing positions on the same issue. The first presenter will be randomly determined, and then the presenters will alternate through each of the three sessions.

- **Presentation:** During this time the presenter will deliver their primary argument. The presentation must contain at least one supporting point that applies an ethical analysis methodology to the issue. The presentation must contain at least one more point, that can contain additional ethical analysis or supporting argument of the presenter's choosing.
- **Rebuttal:** During this time the presenter will present any arguments countering the content of their opponent's initial presentation. The presenter may also introduce any mitigating arguments to any deficiencies in their position, as well as highlight deficiencies in the opposing position.
- **Challenge:** During this time the presenter must answer questions from the audience and the instructor. The presenter must also convincingly respond to any challenges to the presented argument or fundamental position from the instructor.

Grading Rubric

Each argument will be scored according to the following rubric:

	Excellent (3 points)	*Acceptable (2 points)*	*Poor (1 point)*	*Unacceptable (0)*
Physical Presentation ➤ Expertise	Rarely visible reference to notes. No perception of reading from a script	Noticeable reference to notes. Occasional interruption of flow due to note review. Rare perception of reading from script	Frequent reference to notes. Perception of reading from script but presentation flow is still comfortably presented	Obvious recitation of scripted material. Mechanical presentation
➤ Speech	Clear articulation at adequate volume.	Clear articulation but occasional interruption from pauses, verbalized pauses, inexactness and repetition	Unclear speech with occasional unintelligible portions. Occasional low volume or mumbling, but speech is still varied	Unclear and confusing speech. Constant low volume with frequently imperceptible speech. Monotone
➤ Poise	Poised posture with eye contact, enthusiasm and confidence. Clear perception of relaxed and comfortable speaker. No nervous or distracting mannerisms	Infrequent physical mannerisms. Noticeable periods failing to directly address audience. No significant distraction from message	Frequent distracting physical mannerisms or fidgeting. Frequent distracting pauses and phrases. Speaker appears anxious and uncomfortable. Blank or unaffected expression	Constant clear avoidance of eye contact. Speaker appears unprepared or completely out of place. Uninterested expression.
Rhetoric ➤ Audience Engagement	Audience involved in presentation. Posed questions and responses that give audience the feeling of being led through an analyzed discussion. Held audience attention throughout	Presentation includes occasional interest points or twists. Organized enough to generally hold audience attention	Simple presentation of facts with little imagination. No points that raise audience eyebrows or perk interest. Presentation strays off topic. No perception that audience is being brought along with argument	Imperceptible subject thread. Audience lost or could not determine point of presentation

➤ Language	Uses language appropriate to topic and audience, persuasive and not overly technical. Important terms and concepts are explained. Tone of presentation is collegial but with bold advocacy of argument	Occasional use of jargon or overly technical terms without description. Tone is somewhat polemic or critical. Tone is somewhat academic or lectured	Frequent use of technical or non-persuasive terminology. Occasional use of informal or otherwise improper language. Incorrect grammar. Tone is overly polemic or critical. Tone is overly lectured	No real discussion. Frequent use of improper language. Tone is argumentative or dissertated. Poor grammar, incorrect words
Technical ➤ Structure	Presentation follows BARAC and Extemporaneous Debate structure	Inability to identify proper argument structure in a few instances. Argument remains well-organized and identifiable	Frequent, ineffective deviation from proper argument structure. Structure contains unrelated or unimportant material, or incorrect within structure. Main theme of argument is still developed	Proper argument structure rarely identifiable. Vague development of main theme
➤ Components	Effective attention getting device in opening statement electrifies audience. Clear statement of question and answer. Entire Extemporaneous Debate structure implemented	Clear AGD and statement of question and answer. Audience understands roadmap of upcoming argument. Entire Extemporaneous Debate structure implemented	No real AGD. Ineffective or overly dramatic AGD. Missing parts of Extemporaneous Debate structure	Absent or failed statement of question and answer. Audience has unclear or incorrect view of upcoming argument
Technical ➤ Time	Presentation is comfortably within time limit	Presentation within time limits but is rushed to fit constraints	Presentation is dramatically rushed to fit time constraints, or is obviously cut short	Presentation must be prematurely terminated

Argument ➤ Depth	Accurate presentation. Demonstrates insights and thought beyond surface level of topic. Use of unexpected to full advantage	Few inaccuracies. Some depth of thought and originality but identifiable areas where audience is left wanting	Demonstrates general understanding of subject but shows little depth beyond basic principles of topic. Little originality or interpretation. Still presents material beyond obvious common understanding	Frequent inaccuracy. Minimal surface knowledge demonstrated. Perception of no expertise beyond common knowledge
➤ Credibility	Multiple facts used to support point. Multiple points used covering a variety of support points. Support makes argument convincing	Basic facts used to support points. Audience is convinced of argument but not overwhelmingly so	Few or incorrect facts are used to support points. Argument is logical but believability is subject to challenge	Argument lacks factual support. Argument cannot be credibly convincing
➤ Conclusion	Clear statement of conclusion, which is naturally arrived at from argument. Reiterates question and summarizes path to answer. Entire Extemporaneous Debate structure implemented. Concluding solution is well-believed and eminently follows from argument	Conclusion reasonably follows from argument but not overwhelmingly convincing or lacks strong emphasis. Missing parts of Extemporaneous Debate structure	Clear statement of conclusion, but does not follow from argument. Limited believability	Unclear statement of conclusion. Concluding solution cannot be reasonably believed
➤ Rebuttal	Clear overturning of opposing arguments. Statements made specific to opponent arguments. Weak points are acknowledged and defused to the best extent possible	Clearly address general opposing arguments but not specifically in response to opponent	Rebuttal is clearly understood to address opposing arguments but lacks solid support. Arguments reasonably derive from facts but believability is subject to challenge	Rebuttal fails to address opposing arguments with any credibility. Arguments are spurious or non-sequitors given discussion

➤ Challenge	Questions and challenges from instructor are competently handled. Speaker is perceived to have expected challenges and confidently prepared response. Speaker remains adamant but avoids any belligerence	Speaker comes up with valid responses and is perceived to have competently determined them after deliberation. Few lags in response that are properly spoken through	Noticeable delays in response. Speaker is perceived to be genuinely challenged and not in complete control of the discussion. Speaker generates any threat or genuine insult in the audience due to tone of response	Failure to respond to challenges in a convincing manner. Main argument is perceptibly weakened. Speaker falls into argumentative traps, such as being distracted from topic. Speaker takes challenges as ad hominem attacks
➤ Tone	Respect shown to opponents along with an attitude of "agreeing to disagree". Speaker nevertheless establishes the perception that their position is correct one	Competent argument of opposing side, but with detectable perception of contempt for opponent's position.	-	Shows disrespect for opposing position. Shows disrespect for opponent. Shows lack of understanding of opposing position. Multiple attempts to interrupt opponent before completion of point

Scoring

There are fourteen (14) total rubric elements, with a maximum total score of 42 points. A student must score at 30 points or better on this oral argument portion of the course in order to satisfy their Oral Competency requirement