

Argument-Centered Component	2	4	6	8	10
<b>Evidence and Reasoning</b>	Very little if any evidence and reasoning used at all ---- No demonstrated understanding of the role of evidence and reasoning in argument ---- No reference to other teams' evidence	Some limited use of evidence and reasoning ---- Partial understanding of the role of evidence and reasoning in argument ---- Evidence lacking in warrants and credibility ---- Evidence not aligned with claims ---- Evidence highly insufficient	Most arguments supported with evidence and solid reasoning ---- Basic understanding of the role of evidence and reasoning ---- Evidence has some warrants and some credibility ---- Evidence sometimes properly cited ---- Evidence at least partially aligned with claims ---- Evidence partially sufficient	All arguments supported by evidence and strong reasoning ---- Evidence is aligned with claims, though not always perfectly ---- Often properly cited ---- Some examples of especially persuasive reasoning ---- Evidence mostly or nearly sufficient	Evidence and reasoning very precisely supportive of each argumentative claim ---- Evidence contains or is supplemented by highly persuasive warrants ---- Evidence properly cited throughout ---- Evidence highly credible ---- Evidence highly sufficient ---- Evidence sometimes used creatively or with special insight
<b>Engagement with Other Views</b>	Very little if any refutation of counter-arguments ---- Almost or actually no engagement at all with other views ---- No use of response templates ---- No evidence of critical thinking	Some limited and incomprehensive refutation of counter-arguments ---- Very limited use of response templates ---- Occasional but inconsistent reference to others' views ---- Partial or inaccurate summary of others' views ---- Refutation often indirect ---- Not much depth of critical thinking	Most arguments made are responsive ---- Adequate use of response templates ---- Speaking is more engaged with other students than not engaged ---- Counter-arguments are sometimes refuted ---- Summary of others' views mostly accurate though imperfect ---- Refutation sometimes direct, sometimes indirect ---- Refutation has signs of critical thinking depth	Almost all arguments made are responsive ---- Strong use of response templates ---- Speaking is almost completely engaged ---- Reference to views that both agree and disagree with their position ---- Summary of others' views is strong ---- Basically comprehensive refutation of counter-arguments ---- Refutation mostly direct ---- Solid, engaged level of critical thinking	All arguments are highly responsive ---- Expert and completely fluid use of response templates ---- Engaged with the most important points made throughout the seminar ---- Summary of other views is concise, accurate, and strategic ---- High-level counter-arguments responded to or refuted ---- Refutation both very direct and very comprehensive ---- Advanced critical thinking leading to persuasive refutation