Creating a Quality ToK Presentation
General Requirements

- 10-15 Minutes
- Written Plan
- Topic
- Technology Integration
Topic

• Relevance
• Problems of Knowledge
• Essential Question
• Consultation
• No Repeats
Planning Tools

• Outline
• Self-Evaluation Form
• Teacher-Provided Tools
• Inspiration
PLANNING THE TOK
PRESENTATION

Subject

Questions:
1. What makes this an issue?
2. Why is it a contemporary issue?

Divergent Points of View

What are the implications of the various points of view?

Evaluation

Linking question

Clarity

Knowledge Issues
- Recognition and understanding
- Relevance
- Originality & Creativity

Quality of Analysis
- Critical insight
- Engagement
- Logical rigor of arguments

Clarity and logical coherence

Application to contemporary issues

Knowledge at Work

Counterclaims?

Others?

Yours?

Method of verification

Justification

Limitations

Possible Bias

Problems of Knowledge

Uncertainty
What makes this an issue?

Why is it a contemporary issue?
Divergent Points of View

To what disciplines is the issue linked?

What are the implications of the various points of view?

What knowledge claims are made?

How are values represented?

Counterclaims?

How are they evaluated?

Others? Yours?
Self-Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DURATION OF PRESENTATION (APPROX):</strong></th>
<th>minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Write a concise description of your presentation, including brief answers to the following questions. (Alternatively, a single word processed page may be attached to this form.)

- What was the main objective of the presentation? Explain briefly.
- What methods were used to present the topic and why were these methods selected?
- Was the presentation well-organized, thought-provoking and engaging?
- If a group presentation, what was your personal contribution?
- What were the strong and weak points of the presentation? If you were to do it again for a different audience, what, if anything, would you do differently?

|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
ToK Assessment Criteria

- Knowledge Issues (5)
- Quality of Analysis (5)
- Knowledge at Work (5)
- Clarity (5)
ToK Assessment Criteria

Criterion A: Knowledge Issues (5 points)

• Is/are the problem(s) of knowledge appropriate to the given topic recognized and understood, and are the candidate’s ideas developed in a relevant and imaginative way?

• Achievement Level
  • 0 no recognition of problem(s) of knowledge
  • 1 a very poor recognition and understanding—presentation irrelevant
  • 2 a poor recognition and understanding—presentation generally irrelevant
  • 3 a satisfactory recognition and understanding—generally relevant—shows some imagination
  • 4 a good recognition and understanding—consistently relevant—imaginative and reflects the candidate’s own ideas.
  • 5 an excellent recognition and understanding—consistently relevant—highly imaginative and reflects the candidate’s original thinking.
Tok Assessment Criteria

Criterion B: Quality of Analysis (5 points)

Do the analysis of the topic and the treatment of divergent points of view show critical reflection and insight in addressing the problem(s) of knowledge?

Achievement Level
• 0 no concern with the problem(s) of knowledge appropriate to the given topic.
• 1 very poor level of critical reflection—entirely superficial—does not adequately engage issues—little awareness of personal viewpoints or those of others; arguments may be non-existent or logically invalid or main points may not be justified.
• 2 poor level of critical reflection—presentation generally superficial, or does not adequately engage with the issues—little recognition of personal viewpoints or those of others; arguments may not be logically valid or main points may not be justified.
• 3 satisfactory level of critical reflection and some insight; given the time constraints, the presentation adequately engages with the issues; some relevant personal viewpoints are recognized, and those of others are acknowledged; in general, arguments are logically valid, main points are justified, and there is an account of their implications.
• 4 good level of critical reflection and insight into the analysis of the topic and the treatment of divergent points of view; given the time constraints, the presentation engages with the issues in some depth; relevant personal viewpoints are recognized, and those of others are acknowledged in some depth; arguments are logically valid, main points are evaluated and justified, and there is a thoughtful account of their implications.
• 5 excellent level of critical reflection and insight into the analysis of the topic and the treatment of divergent points of view; given the time constraints, the presentation thoroughly engages with the issues; relevant personal viewpoints, values and biases are explicitly recognized, and those of others are fully acknowledged; arguments are logically valid, main points are evaluated and cogently justified, and there is a meticulous and thoughtful account of their implications.
ToK Assessment Criteria

Criterion C: Knowledge at Work (5 points)

To what extent does the presentation demonstrate the application of TOK thinking skills to a contemporary issue?

- **Achievement Level**
  - **0** no application of TOK thinking skills to a contemporary issue.
  - **1** a very poor application of TOK thinking skills to a contemporary issue; there is very little attempt to relate abstract elements of the TOK programme to a contemporary issue.
  - **2** a poor application of TOK thinking skills to a contemporary issue; there is some attempt to relate abstract elements of the TOK programme to a contemporary issue.
  - **3** a satisfactory application of TOK thinking skills to a contemporary issue; the presentation relates abstract elements of the TOK programme to a concrete, contemporary issue.
  - **4** a good application of TOK thinking skills to a contemporary issue; the presentation explicitly relates abstract elements of the TOK programme to a concrete, contemporary issue.
  - **5** an excellent application of TOK thinking skills to a contemporary issue; the presentation explicitly and successfully relates abstract elements of the TOK programme to a concrete, contemporary issue.
ToK Assessment Criteria

Criterion D: Clarity (5 points)

Is the presentation clear and logically coherent?
• This criterion is not intended to assess linguistic skills. Rather, it is intended to assess the extent to which the main ideas are clearly and coherently conveyed.

Achievement Level
• The presentation demonstrates:
• 0 no clarity or coherence.
• 1 a very poor level of clarity and logical coherence.
• 2 a poor level of clarity and logical coherence.
• 3 a satisfactory level of clarity and logical coherence.
• 4 a good level of clarity and logical coherence.
• 5 an excellent level of clarity and logical coherence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion A:</th>
<th>Knowledge Issues: Are Problems of Knowledge recognized and understood?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Recognition and Understanding**:
  - Excellent
  - Good
  - Satisfactory
  - Poor
  - Very poor
  - None

- **Relevance of Ideas to TOK**:
  - Consistently relevant
  - Generally relevant
  - Generally irrelevant
  - No relevance

- **Imagination and Originality**:
  - High degree of both
  - Evidence of both
  - Some imagination
  - Neither

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion B:</th>
<th>Quality of Analysis: Are Problems of knowledge/ different views handled critically and reflectively?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Levels of Critical Reflection and Insight**:
  - Excellent critical reflection and insight
  - Good critical reflection and insight
  - Satisfactory critical reflection; some insight
  - Poor level of critical reflection
  - Very poor level of critical reflection

- **Engagement with Issues**:
  - Thorough engagement with issues
  - Engages with issues in some depth
  - Adequate engagement
  - Generally superficial; inadequate engagement
  - Entirely superficial; inadequate engagement

- **Recognition of Multiple Viewpoints**:
  - Explicitly recognised; fully acknowledged
  - Recognised & acknowledged in some depth
  - Some recognition and some acknowledgement
  - Little recognition
  - Little awareness

- **Logical Rigour of Arguments**:
  - Logically valid; cogent justification
  - Generally valid and justified
  - May not be valid; main points may not be justified
  - No argument or completely invalid and unjustified

- **Concern with Implications of Main Points**:
  - Meticulous and thoughtful
  - Thoughtful
  - Some account
  - None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion C:</th>
<th>Knowledge at Work: To what extent does the presentation apply TOK to a contemporary issue?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Application to Contemporary Issue**:
  - Excellent; explicit and successful application of abstract principles
  - Good; explicit application of abstract principles
  - Satisfactory; abstract principles related to issue
  - Poor; some attempt to apply abstract principles to issue
  - Very poor; very little attempt to apply abstract principles to issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion D:</th>
<th>Clarity: Is the presentation clear and logically coherent (linguistic skills are not assessed here)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Clarity and Logical Coherence**:
  - Excellent
  - Good
  - Satisfactory
  - Poor
  - Very poor
  - None
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NB This is only a guide; the IB documentation remains the definitive version.
Summary

• Develop Your Topic
  – Essential Question
  – Topic Approval
• Plan Your Presentation
  – Planning Document
  – Make Audience Materials
• Present
• Submit Self-Evaluation