**Energy Source Proposal Marking Rubrics**

**Group Members:**

**Ideas Included:**

* + Where the fuel/energy source comes from
  + How the fuel/source is gathered
  + How the fuel/source is used to generate electricity
  + Ecological Impacts
  + Community Impacts
  + Advantages of this form of electricity generation
  + Disadvantages of this form of electricity generation

**Presentation Rubric**

**How it Works**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| * Presentation contained little to no valuable material * Presentation lacked organization and had little evidence of preparation * Presenters were unconfident and demonstrated little evidence of preparation or planning | * Presentation had a few pieces of good material was lacking content as a whole * Presentation showed minimal signs of organization * Presenters were not consistent with their preparedness for the presentation | * Presentation had a good amount of material or included all suggested ideas * Presentation is organized with a clear flow * Presenters were occasionally confident with their presentation; a few presentation mistakes were made | * Presentation had an exceptional amount of material or included excellent detail * Presentation is well organized and easy to follow * Presenters were confident with their knowledge and delivery. They did an excellent job of engaging the class |

**Debate: Team “For New Installation”**

**Members:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| * Did not have any convincing reasons or arguments * Was not able to provide any counter-argument * Did not provide any impact on nearby communities | * Had one or two reasons or arguments with little or no supporting facts * Was not able to provide a sound counter-argument * Did not provide much of an impact on communities | * Had clear reasons and arguments * Was able to provide a sound counter-argument * Included impact on communities | * Had clear reasons, logic and arguments, with supporting facts * Was able to provide counter-arguments with clear and accurate arguments * Included a detailed impact on communities |

**Debate: Team “Against New Installation”**

**Members:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| * Did not have any convincing reasons or arguments * Was not able to provide any counter-argument * Did not provide any impact on nearby communities | * Had one or two reasons or arguments with little or no supporting facts * Was not able to provide a sound counter-argument * Did not provide much of an impact on communities | * Had clear reasons and arguments * Was able to provide a sound counter-argument * Included impact on communities | * Had clear reasons, logic and arguments, with supporting facts * Was able to provide counter-arguments with clear and accurate arguments * Included a detailed impact on communities |