**Minimum Wage Bill: Are you for or against it? What do you do?**

Names\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Hour: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Score |
| 1. Your ability to maintain your role | Completely clear and orderly presentation. | Mostly clear and orderly in all parts. | Clear in some parts but not overall. | Unclear and disorganized throughout. |  |
| 2. Participation in debating of HR 555 | Excellent explanation of of why or why not minimum wage should be raised by using many definitions and descriptions | Many good facts and definitions were given with only minor gaps | Some decent descriptions but little supporting facts given. | Few or no real definitions or explanations given. |  |
| **3.** **How effectively/convincingly you speak** | Very persuasive arguments are supported by research | Many good arguments given with only minor problems | Some decent arguments, but little research to support it | Few or no real arguments given and no supporting research |  |
| 4. Affirmative Rebuttals:  Your fellow political party members that you represent were able to defend you and themselves against attack by extending own position using additional facts to support claim | Used excellent new researched facts to support their side | Many good facts which supported their side | Had some problems coming up with facts to defend their side | Was unable to give any facts to defend its side |  |

Total Score \_\_\_\_\_/16

: