

Skill area: Description	Score of 10	Score of 9	Score of 8	Score of 7	Score of 6
<p><b>Relevancy:</b> Is the Contestant’s argument pertinent to welfare issues, including questions of both science and ethics?</p>	<p>Conveys an <i>in-depth</i> understanding of the Scenario and the welfare and ethical issues to be considered;</p> <p><i>Effectively discriminates between relevant and irrelevant information and between fact and opinion</i></p>	<p>Conveys a <i>Mostly complete</i> understanding of the Scenario and the welfare and issues to be considered;</p> <p>Discriminates between relevant and irrelevant information and between fact and opinion</p>	<p>Conveys a <i>somewhat basic</i> understanding of the Scenario and the welfare and ethical issues to be considered;</p> <p>Attempts to discriminate between relevant and irrelevant information and between fact and opinion</p>	<p>Conveys a <i>superficial</i> understanding of the Scenario and the welfare and ethical issues to be considered;</p>	<p>Conveys a <i>confused</i> understanding of the scenario or provides <i>no evidence</i> of understanding the the welfare or ethical issues to be considered</p>
<p><b>Accuracy:</b> Are the contestant’s points accurate as depicted in the scenario? Are the contestant’s cited facts accurate in regard to animal welfare, animal behavior, animal science and/or veterinary science?</p>	<p>All examples from the scenario provided are accurate. The student provides accurate and specific data from the scenario to back up their argument.</p>	<p>Uses accurate information to support their argument, however, does not provide specific data from the scenario.</p>	<p>Uses accurate information to support their argument but lacked some key information (missing info)</p>	<p>Info provided was <i>mostly</i> accurate but had some minor misunderstanding of the information provided. (wrong info)</p>	<p>Makes frequent mistakes regarding the information provided in the scenario.</p>
<p><b>Terminology:</b> Does the contestant use appropriate terminology relevant to animal welfare, animal behavior, animal science, and/or veterinary science?</p>	<p><i>Stylistically sophisticated</i>, uses language that is <i>precise and engaging</i>, with notable awareness of audience and purpose</p>	<p>Uses language that is <i>fluent and original</i>, with evident awareness of audience and purpose</p>	<p>Uses <i>appropriate language</i>, with some awareness of audience and purpose</p>	<p>Relies on <i>basic vocabulary</i>, with little awareness of audience or purpose</p>	<p>Uses language that is <i>imprecise or unsuitable</i> for the audience or purpose; uses language that is <i>incoherent</i> or inappropriate</p>
<p><b>Organization:</b> Is the contestant’s defense easy to follow? Is it logical?</p>	<p><i>Skillfully</i> exhibits logical and coherent structure; “a well-crafted argument”</p>	<p><i>Effectively</i> exhibits a logical sequence of ideas</p>	<p>Exhibits a logical sequence of ideas but within sections may be inconsistent</p>	<p>Exhibits a basic structure but is repetitious or lacks order in places</p>	<p>Exhibits an attempt to organize ideas into a structure, but often lacks coherence; complete lack of organization and coherence</p>

<b>Grants:</b> Does the contestant acknowledge the positive points (if applicable) of the management situation that he/she did not place highest?	Student effectively identifies and acknowledges the strengths and weaknesses of both options in the scenario.				Student's argument is one-sided; does not mention the weaknesses of their favoured option and does not acknowledge strengths of their lower placed scenario
<b>Presentation style:</b> Presentation style (e.g., voice level, tone, inflection, posture) should be informative yet conversational, and not overly formal. Is the contestant at ease? Does he/she make eye contact? Does he/she make excessive use of notes (use of one 3"x5" or 4"x6" note card for bullet points or to cite references is permissible).	Uses excellent presentation skills; speaks clearly and confidently, good pace, makes eye contact and minimal use of notes. Uses voice tone to emphasize points.	Good presentation skills; speaks clearly, comfortable pace; acceptable eye contact, does not rely too heavily on the use of their notes.	Adequate or average speaking skills;	Speaking skills need work; monotone voice; nervous, little eye contact; speaking too quickly.	Poor speaking skills; reads reasons from their notes card, minimal eye contact. Difficult to hear or understand.
<b>References:</b> The extent to which existing scientific literature and accepted standards used to support the arguments made.	<i>Effectively integrates</i> evidence and <i>synthesizes</i> information from a <i>variety</i> of sources, e.g., scientific refs + standards docs (?? More than 5 refs??)	Incorporates and explains <i>specific textual evidence from a variety of sources (good but less effective)</i>	Uses some textual evidence but without much elaboration or from <i>limited sources</i>	<i>Textual evidence is vague, repetitive, or unjustified</i>	Does not include textual evidence
	<b>Score of 5</b>				<b>Score of 3</b>
<b>Blending of science and ethics:</b> Limitations of the knowledge of science in resolving questions about animal welfare.	Provides an ethical framework for developing their science-based argument.  Recognizes that value systems affect the weighting of evidence.				No acknowledgement of differing perspectives that are used to identify and weight scientific evidence

**Maximum 75 points – Minimum 45 points recommended**