## Evolution–ID Debate Dialog Grading Rubric

### Framing the debate – opening statement
- **Excellent**
  - Dialog opening statements (4-5 pts)
    - Clearly describe the issue and why it has generated controversy.
    - Accurate presentation of concepts
    - Ideas well-articulated in the writer’s own words.
- **Fair**
  - Dialog opening statement. (2-3 pts)
    - Purpose is discussed but not why this issue has generated controversy.
    - Aspects are unclear, or not well written
    - Some aspects are inaccurate
- **Poor**
  - No attempt in the opening statements to discuss, the main issue or why it is controversial. (0-1 pt)
    - Poorly written
    - Many aspects are inaccurate

### Discussing the main tenets of evolutionary theory and intelligent design.
- **Excellent**
  - Dialog clearly articulates the main tenets of evolutionary theory and intelligent design. (8-10 pts)
    - Written in a manner that shows me you understand the concepts being discussed in the dialog
    - Accurate presentation of concepts
    - Ideas well-articulated in the writer’s own words.
- **Fair**
  - Less clear discussion of the main tenets of evolutionary theory and intelligent design. (5-7 pts)
    - Some of writing leaves me wondering whether you fully understand the concepts (i.e. complex scientific terms not defined etc.)
    - Writing is a bit “verbose”.
    - Some inaccuracies in presentation
    - Some information is not well articulated (difficult to understand)
- **Poor**
  - Unclear or no discussion of the main tenets of evolutionary theory and ID (0-4 pts).
    - I do not sense that you understand the concepts
    - Poorly written (overly detailed, not understandable, very verbose etc…)
    - Many inaccuracies
    - Most information in not well articulated (unintelligible!)

### Discussing the specific claims of intelligent design
- **Excellent**
  - Clearly discussed specific claims made by proponents of ID which support their main tenets. (4-5 pts)
    - Accurate/clear discussion of 3 or more specific claims
    - Accurate/clear discussion of evidence proponents of ID use to support their specific claims.
- **Fair**
  - Discussed specific claims made by proponents of ID which support their main tenets. (2-3 pts)
    - Presented only 1-2 specific claims
    - Some aspects of presentation have some inaccuracies or are hard to follow.
- **Poor**
  - Specific claims made by proponents of ID which support their main tenets are (0-1 pt)
    - Not discussed
    - Many inaccuracies
    - Writing is unclear or hard to follow
    - Quotes are used inappropriately (i.e. quoting information)

### Discussing evolution and the nature of science
- **Excellent**
  - Clearly discussed evidence/concepts which support evolutionary theory. (8-10 pts)
    - Accurate/clear discussion of evidence for evolution and the nature of science.
    - Discussed how and why evidence/concepts refute the claims of ID discussed in the statement.
    - Discussed how and why ID does or does not sit within the tenets of the nature of science (as defined by scientists).
- **Fair**
  - Discussed evidence/concepts which support evolutionary theory. (5-7 pts)
    - Some inaccuracies
    - Discussion is somewhat hard to follow
    - Discussed evidence/concepts which refute claims of ID, but little or no discussion of how or why.
    - Suggested that ID does or does not sit within the tenets of the nature of science (as defined by scientists) but little or no discussion of how or why.
- **Poor**
  - Discussed evidence/concepts which support evolutionary theory. (0-4 pts)
    - Many inaccuracies
    - Discussion is VERY hard to follow
    - No discussion of evidence/concepts which refute claims of ID.
    - No discussion of how ID does or does not sit within the tenets of the nature of science.

### Policy Recommendations on teaching ID in public high school biology classes - *Note – at least one of the characters in your dialog must make specific recommendations that will be evaluated based on the following!*
- **Excellent**
  - Dialog has character(s) make specific policy recommendations and provides support: (8-10 pts)
    - Draws upon scientific/ biological knowledge and evidence discussed throughout policy statement
    - Draws upon other (non-science) support for recommendations (i.e. legal/historical/ethical etc…).
    - Arguments are logical
- **Fair**
  - Specific recommendations are made but: (5-7 pts)
    - Some inaccuracies of use of scientific/ biological knowledge and evidence
    - Some inaccuracies in the use of other (non-science) support for recommendations (i.e. legal/historical/ethical etc…).
    - Arguments have some flaws in logic.
- **Poor**
  - Specific recommendations: (0-4 pts)
    - Are not made??
    - Many inaccuracies or no use of scientific/ biological knowledge and evidence.
    - Many inaccuracies or no use of other (non-science) support for recommendations (i.e. legal/historical/ethical etc…).
    - Argument is illogical (i.e. recommendations do not fit with evidence or recommendations are based solely on belief or egocentric thinking).

### General Writing/Research
- **Excellent**
  - Works cited included and correctly formatted according to a APA citation format (4 pts)
  - Had a sufficient number/quality of sources to address the issue. (3 pts)
  - No spelling or grammar errors. (3 pts)
- **Fair**
  - Works cited included but does not follow APA style citation format. (2 pts)
  - Sufficient number or quality of sources is questionable (1 pt)
  - 1-2 spelling or grammar errors (2 pts)
- **Poor**
  - No works cited provided (0 pts)
  - Insufficient number or sources or poor quality of sources (i.e. no way to establish the validity of the source, using Wikipedia etc…) (0 pts)
  - More than 2 spelling or grammar errors (0 pts)

**Bonus (up to 5 point)** - Additional creative aspects of the letter that made it more interesting or easier to understand.