Save Your City and The Earth – Rubric **Worksheet ( /16 marks)**

| **Criteria** | **R** | **Level 1**  **(1–4 pts)** | **Level 2**  **(5–8 pts)** | **Level 3**  **(9–12 pts)** | **Level 4**  **(13–16 pts)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appropriateness of Solution** (4 marks) | Vague or unsupported explanation of the solution. | Identifies a viable green-city solution. | Identifies a viable green-city solution with some explanation. | Provides logical, city-specific rationale for their chosen solution. | Insightfully explains why the chosen solution suits the city's climate, land/water, and resources. |
| **Feasibility & Solution Plan**  (4 marks) | Unclear or unrealistic plan. | Plan is clearly stated but lacks feasibility. | Plan is generally realistic, with some missing details. | Clear plan with explanation of where, how, and by whom. | Detailed, realistic plan with deep thinking around logistics and individuals involved. |
| **Community Impact Evaluation**  (4 marks) | Little to no mention of community. | Reference to location-specific details. | General reference to how the community may be involved or affected. | Discusses both positive and negative community outcomes. | Thorough analysis of cultural, economic, and social impacts with strong supporting reasoning. |
| **Completeness & Communication**  (4 marks) | The majority of sections are incomplete or unclear. | Most questions are answered, but lack development. | Most questions are answered with some development. | All questions are answered clearly and in full sentences. | Answers are detailed, well-thought-out, and clearly communicate ideas. |

#### 

#### **Student Presentation ( /16 marks)**

| **Criteria** | **R (0 pts)** | **Level 1 (1–4 pts)** | **Level 2 (5–8 pts)** | **Level 3 (9–12 pts)** | **Level 4 (13–16 pts)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Solution Evaluation**  (4 marks) | Mentions a solution but with no relevance or understanding. | Mentions a solution but with little relevance or understanding. | Evaluates one solution with some connection to the city context. | Thoughtfully evaluates more than one solution; matches each to the city reasonably. | Provides a deep and critical evaluation of multiple solutions, selecting the most feasible with strong rationale. |
| **City-specific details**  (4 marks) | No understanding of city-specific factors. | Basic or surface-level understanding of city-specific factors. | Identifies some relevant city characteristics. | Connects city characteristics (climate, resources, etc.) to chosen solution. | Provides a clear and nuanced analysis of the city and how it influences and supports the solution. |
| **Argumentation & Persuasion**  (4 marks) | No clarity | Lacks clarity or persuasiveness; unconvincing delivery. | Attempts persuasion with some logical reasoning. | Compelling argument with clear structure and delivery. | Highly persuasive, engaging, and convincingly advocates for the idea with strategies discussed. |
| **Presentation Skills & Variety of Speakers**  (4 marks) | Presentation is disorganized or hard to follow. | Presentation has some clarity but is hard to follow. | Mostly clear, with minor issues in pacing, organization or equal. | Clear, structured, and rehearsed with all group members incorporated. | Polished, confident delivery with engaging speaking style from all group members equally. |