

Unit 3 – Grading rubric (49 total points)

Pre-debate tasks	1 Point	0 Points	Earned Points
Group practiced debate points as a stakeholder group.	Completed requirement	Did not complete requirement	/ 2
Group uploaded talking points at least 24 hours before debate; reviewed other groups' points.	Completed requirement	Did not complete requirement	/ 2
Total Points			/ 4

Debate content	3 points	1 Point	0 Points	Earned Points
Opening statement	Group clearly introduced its stakeholder position and outlined the main points of its recommendations, demonstrating connections between their assigned role and offered solutions.	Group introduced its stakeholder position, but did not clearly outline main points of all of its recommendations or did not make explicit connections between recommendations and role.	Group did not sufficiently introduce its position and did not outline any main points of its recommendations.	/ 3
Strength of recommendations	Group supported recommendations with relevant weather-related and community data; recommendations demonstrated knowledge of and systems thinking approach to social, environmental, and political risks related to hazard mitigation in response to major storms.	Group made some reference to data in support of its recommendations, but data was not strongly relevant to points made. Or group did not demonstrate systems thinking approach to risks related to hazard mitigation in response to major storms.	Group did not support its recommendations with any relevant data and did not demonstrate systems thinking approach to risks related to hazard mitigation in response to major storms.	/ 3
Defense of recommendations	Group was able to justify its recommendations when challenged by others by referring to data and/or by demonstrating that they had anticipated possible challenges and were prepared with suggested solutions.	Group was not able to justify all of its recommendations with data when challenged by others by referring to data. Or group did not demonstrate that they had prepared possible solutions to potential challenges.	Group was not able to justify any of its recommendations and was not prepared for potential challenges.	/ 3

Ability to persuade	Group demonstrated they were listening to and evaluating others' claims by responding to points made in debate by others (i.e., did not present previously determined talking points or repeat themselves); elements of the group's recommendations were included in the final town hall agreement.	Group did not demonstrate the ability to respond to others' claims appropriately, by only sticking to established talking points rather than new information. Or few elements of the group's recommendations were included in the final town hall agreement.	Group did not respond appropriately to any other groups' recommendations and none of the group's recommendations were considered for the final town hall agreement.	/ 3
Total Points				/ 12

Debate delivery	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point	0 Points	Earned Points
Connections	Clear connections made between social, political, and environmental data and hazard mitigation plan recommendations. Original answers with supporting explanations, and details made in suggestions.	New ideas and connections made, but lack of supporting explanations or detail provided in responses to other groups' recommendations and challenges.	Limited, if any connections, and vague generalities made in response to other groups' recommendations and challenges.	No connections made and off topic; not a lot of thought provided in answering question and lacking suggestions.	/ 3
Format of delivery	Remained within allotted time. Conveyed the "so what" in just a few seconds. Very helpful and respectful in contributions.	Needed to be reminded to stay within allotted time. "So what" is there, but may take a moment to see. Respectful in contributions.	Occasionally needed to be cut off. Explains the "what" but not the "so what." Somewhat respectful in contributions.	Needed to be cut off repeatedly. Does not explain the "what" or the "so what." Disrespectful in contributions.	/ 3
Participation	All group members participated in some way (sharing info with group, formulating response, speaking, etc.) to present recommendations and defend group's position.	Most group members participated in some way, but not everyone made significant contributions during the debate.	Group relied on one or two members for the majority of work in debate.	No member of the group contributed significantly to the debate. Or only one member spoke.	/ 3
Total Points					/ 9

Policy Paper	6 Points	3 Points	1 Point	0 Points	Earned Points
Mechanics & Format		Followed directions on formatting, included all required sections, clear writing style, and proper grammar and spelling.	Not correctly formatted. Or missing 1–2 required section(s). Or did not exhibit a clear writing style due to poor spelling and grammar.	Did not complete assignment.	/ 3
Stakeholders		Group included all relevant stakeholders needed in order to appropriately implement proposed hazard mitigation plan.	Group included some relevant stakeholders, but did not accurately identify all who need to take action in response to proposed hazard mitigation plan.	Did not complete assignment.	/ 3
Data Identification & Analysis	Group demonstrated that they collected and evaluated relevant weather-related and community data to determine community preparedness and vulnerabilities by incorporating appropriate statistics and quotations to support their recommendations. Paper accurately presented information for the type and phase of the storm assigned.	Paper included some relevant data, but it was not accurately presented and/or was not appropriate for the type and phase of the storm assigned.	Paper did not use any statistics or quotations to support the aims of the proposal. Paper did not accurately present info for type and phase of the storm assigned. Group did not demonstrate that data had been evaluated or analyzed.	Did not complete assignment.	/ 6

Hazard Mitigation	Paper communicated how the included stakeholders should appropriately respond to the hazard mitigation proposal and what successful preparedness and resilience measures would entail.	Paper communicated some recommendations, but did not fully address how stakeholders should appropriately respond to the hazard mitigation proposal. Or paper did not communicate what successful preparedness and resilience measures would entail.	Paper did not communicate any specific response required for stakeholders.	Did not complete assignment.	/ 6
Systems Thinking	Group demonstrated that a systems thinking approach was considered in the development of the hazard mitigation plan by addressing potential environmental, economic, social, and political impacts of the proposed actions in the context of preparedness, management, and resilience.	Group demonstrated some consideration of a systems thinking approach in the development of its hazard mitigation plan by addressing potential impacts of proposed actions, but did not fully address all categories: environmental, economic, social, and political impacts.	Group did not demonstrate connection between stakeholders' proposed actions and more than one category of potential impacts, which indicates failure to use systems thinking approach in developing hazard mitigation plan.	Did not complete assignment.	/ 6
Total Points					/ 24