Structured Debate Rubric

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Poor
	7 Points	5 Points	3 Points
Post 1	The team's first	The team's first	The team's first
Original Post	post was well	post was contained	post contained
	thought out,	some details and	very little details
	details and	defined the issue.	on the stance,
	defined the issue.	The post included	evidence to
	The post stated	the stance and	support it and
	the stance clearly	provided some	relevant data and
	at the beginning	relevant data or	references. The
	and provided data	references but	team's post was
	or references to	more details could	not supported by
	support the	have been	readings, lectures
	stance. The first	provided. The first	and logical
	post gave specifics	post gave general	thinking.
	as to the course of	recommendations	
	action that should	as to the course of	
	be taken and	action that should	
	supported the	be taken and	
	decisions with	supported the	
	evidence from the	decisions with	
	readings, lectures	evidence from the	
	and logical	readings, lectures	
	thinking.	and logical	
De et 2		thinking.	The shellow sizes
Post 2	The challenging	The challenging	The challenging
Challenging	questions were	questions were	questions were
Questions/Rebuttal	interesting, well	relevant but they could have been a	not relevant to the
	developed and thought out. Your	little more direct	case study. Very
	rebuttal clearly	to the to the case	little thought was put into questions
	answer the	study.	for their
	questions asked of	Some of the	opponent.
	you and provided	questions were	opponent.
	details and	very simple and	
	evidence to	did not challenge	
	support your	their opponent.	
	stance.		
Final Arguments	The video	The video included	The video did not
Barronoo	included a short	a short summary	contain a case
	summary of the	of the case but	study summary,
	Sammary of the	or the case but	stady summary,

O'Callaghan/McMahon/Bohman (October 2016) This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <u>http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/</u>



	case, key findings to support stance and defend the stance against opponent's key evidence. The video is organized, interesting and well produced.	lacked some details. The video contained key findings to support stance but the information was	key findings to support stance or defend the stance against opponent's key evidence.
Connection to Readings/Lectures	The post included evidence of the readings, lectures and professional experience. At least two sources were used to support the stance.	The post included evidence of the readings, lectures and professional experience. At least one source were used to support the stance.	The post included evidence of the readings, lectures and professional experience. No sources were used to support the stance.
Criteria	Excellent 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
Spelling and Grammar	There were no grammar or spelling errors.	There were some grammar and spelling errors.	

O'Callaghan/McMahon/Bohman (October 2016) This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <u>http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/</u> CC O S O

