

## Structured Debate Rubric

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



	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.
<b>Connection to Readings/Lectures</b>	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.
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Excellent 2 Points</b>	<b>Poor 1 Point</b>	
<b>Spelling and Grammar</b>	There were no grammar or spelling errors.	There were some grammar and spelling errors.	

