Rubric for Dam Debate/Presentation Activity

Criteria	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Developing (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score
Research & Content	Demonstrates in-depth understanding of stakeholder's position & ecological impacts; uses multiple, credible sources; provides specific scientific evidence.	Shows good understanding of stakeholder's position & ecological impacts; uses credible sources; provides relevant scientific evidence.	Shows basic understanding; uses limited sources; evidence is general or sometimes lacking.	Lacks understanding; uses few or unreliable sources; little to no evidence provided.	
Argumentation & Logic	Presents clear, logical, and compelling arguments from stakeholder's perspective; effectively anticipates and counters opposing points.	Presents clear arguments; generally logical; attempts to address opposing points.	Arguments are somewhat unclear or illogical; struggles to address opposing points.	Arguments are unclear or illogical; fails to address opposing points.	
Collaboration & Role-Play	Actively participates and contributes significantly to team's success; consistently stays in character; supports teammates.	Participates and contributes to team's success; generally stays in character; generally supportive of teammates.	Participates minimally; contribution to the team is limited; inconsistent character; sometimes unsupportive.	Does not participate or contribute; hinders team's progress; breaks character.	
Presentation Skills	Confident, clear, and engaging delivery; excellent use of visuals (if applicable); maintains eye contact.	Clear delivery; good use of visuals (if applicable); generally maintains eye contact.	Delivery is sometimes unclear or hesitant; limited use of visuals; inconsistent eye contact.	Delivery is unclear or mumbling; no use of visuals; avoids eye contact.	
Rebuttal/Q&A	Effectively challenges opposing arguments with evidence; provides insightful, well-supported responses to questions.	Challenges some opposing arguments; provides adequate responses to questions.	Attempts to challenge arguments but lacks depth; responses to questions are weak.	Fails to challenge arguments; unable to answer questions effectively.	
Reflection (Individual)	Thoughtful and comprehensive reflection; demonstrates deep learning and critical self-assessment; connects to broader ecological concepts.	Good reflection; demonstrates understanding of key concepts and some self-assessment.	Basic reflection; shows limited understanding or self-assessment.	Minimal or no reflection; shows little understanding.	
Total Score					