Marking Guide for Judging Discussion Debates

Proposition (Team code ___)		Criteria for individual evaluation A scale of 1 to 5, 1 is poor and 5 is excellent	Opposition (Team code ___)	
Name _____	**Name** _____		**Name** _____	**Name** _____
1st Proposition	2nd Proposition		1st Opposition	2nd Opposition
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	**Organization:** The speech should be well structured, logical & coherent, containing and effective introduction and conclusion	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	**Evidence/Logic:** Facts, statistics & authorities offered in support of contentions must be sound. Credit should be given for thorough and relevant research.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	**Delivery:** Poise quality & use of voice, combined with emphasis, variety and enunciation. Effectiveness and ease of gestures, and eye contact should be assessed.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	**Refutation/Clash:** The ability to apply logic and evidence in refuting the opponents' contentions while defending your own.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	**Format:** Each student is expected to participate. Questions & answers should be concise & well phrased revealing a sound understanding of the issues. The students should be courteous & cooperative.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
___ /25	___ /25	**Totals** (please double check addition)	___ /25	___ /25

Discussion: Each student is expected to participate. Questions & answers should be concise & well phrased revealing a sound understanding of the issues. The students should be courteous & cooperative.

Rule of Thumb: Start with 3 as average and go up or down.

Junior High Debate (Discussion) Scoring Rubric

	1	2	3	4	5
Organization – The speech should contain an effective introduction and conclusion. It should be well structured, logical and coherent. Argumentation and logic should be straightforward and relevant and, as much as possible, strategy and organization should complement each other.	No introduction or statement of resolution	Has an introduction but does not state the resolution.	Introduces the resolution.	Introduction was interesting. Clear statement of resolution.	Introduction grabs your attention. Clear statement of resolution.
	Little sign of organization. Difficult to follow. Little, if any, notes making it impossible to verify information.	Some sign of organization is demonstrated but speech does not flow smoothly. Inadequate notes and unable to find information.	Speech shows some signs of organization. Some weakness in overall flow. Adequate notes but took time to find information.	Well structured and interesting speech. Able to follow the flow. Good notes and information can be retrieved, as needed.	Awesome speech which keenly holds your interest. Logical and easy to follow. Excellent notes and readily accessible information.
	No conclusion	Uncertain conclusion.	Stated conclusion.	Clear conclusion brings closure to the topic.	Effective conclusion convinces you.
Evidence – Facts, statistics, and authorities offered in support of contentions must be sound. Credit should be given for thorough and relevant research.	Does not seem to address the topic. No facts are given to support the topic	Seldom addresses the topic. Few facts are given to support the topic.	Tries to address the topic. Some facts are given to support the topic.	Usually addressed the topic. Uses facts to support the topic.	Always addresses the topic issues. Uses many sound facts to accurately support the topic.
	Contentions are missing or unclear.	Contentions are vague and hardly convincing.	Contentions are clear and plausible.	Contentions are clear, somewhat concise and usually convincing.	Contentions are clear, concisely stated and convincingly.
	No evidence of any research or serious factual errors. Details/examples conflict with the position.	No direct credit given for any research. Details/examples do not contribute to the position.	Credit given for some research. Details/examples have a minor influence in the clarity of the position.	Credit given for most research. Details/examples attempt to add clarity to the position.	Credit given for thorough and relevant research. Details/examples clarify the position.
Delivery – The mechanics of good speech should be faithfully observed throughout. Poise, quality and use of voice, effectiveness and ease of gesture, emphasis, variety, and enunciation should be assessed.	Appeared very nervous and did not use gestures. No eye contact.	Difficulty with voice control and ineffective gestures. Little eye contact.	Appropriate attempt to control voice and gestures. Some eye contact.	Good control of voice and gestures. Good eye contact.	Excellent control of voice and gestures. Excellent eye contact.
	Limited vocabulary, often repetitive, and somewhat monotone.	Minimal descriptive language with very little tone change.	Some descriptive language with occasional tone change for emphasis.	Some descriptive language presented with good variance of tone.	Very descriptive language presented with varied emphasis.
	Appears very nervous. Bad posture coupled with many distracting movements.	Appears unsure and nervous. Bad posture and a number of distracting movements.	Body language shows control. Good posture but some distracting movements.	Body language exhibits confidence. Good posture with not too many destructive movements.	Appears confident and comfortable at all times. Excellent posture and no distracting movements.
Refutation/Clash – Each speaker should demonstrate an ability to apply evidence and logic in refuting his opponent's contentions.	No clash	Little clash to show the opposing arguments have been understood.	Clash shows some understanding of the opposing arguments.	Good clash demonstrating an understanding of the opposing arguments.	Clashes are appropriate and show a clear understanding of the opposing arguments.
	No counter-arguments made.	Almost no counter arguments made.	Few effective counter-arguments made.	Some effective counter arguments made.	Many effective counter-arguments are made.
Format: Discussion. – Has each student participated in the discussion period? Are questions and statements concise and well-phrased? Is the student courteous, respectful and cooperative? Does the student reveal a sound understanding of the issues?	No participation in the discussion. No interaction with partner. No questions asked. Unable to answer questions posed.	Little participation in the discussion and very limited interaction with partner. Few questions asked. Answers do not necessarily reflect an understanding of the questions posed.	Participated in the discussion and some interaction with partner. Asks questions. Answers questions posed.	Contributed to the discussion and interacted with partner. Questions asked clash with opponents' contentions. Answers are somewhat concise.	Actively contributed to the discussion. Lots of interaction with partner. Questions clearly clash with opponent's contentions/pillars. Answers are concise and discussion is redirected with a new question
	Speaker is rude or disrespectful.	Speaker occasionally speaks disrespectfully.	Speaker is courteous and respectful.	Speaker is courteous and cooperative.	Speaker looks and acts professionally.

Suggested Scoring Range

The vast majority of speeches that you will judge will range between 60% and 90%. Go above and below this range only for very strong reasons.

% Range	Mark out of 25	Debate skills required to attain this mark
96-100	25 24	• Practically impossible – reserved for the gods! • You are privileged to be in the presence of such greatness. • Excellent
84-92	23 22 21	• Much factual evidence; varied types of evidence with many examples • Clearly understands all aspects of the issue; clear logic shown • Case is clearly outlined and coordinated with partner; time used effectively • Persuasive, memorable delivery – effective use of voice and body language • Refutes all points of opposition; rebuilds own case; summarizes key themes • Good
72-80	20 19 18	• Considerable factual evidence; gives several supporting examples for claims • Understands both sides of issue well; considerable logic is evident • Case is clearly outlined and coordinated with partner; speaker may run out of time • Pace, tone, diction, eye contact are mostly evident; does not rely solely on written speech; fairly persuasive delivery • Refutes most points of opposition; rebuilds own case strongly • Average
60-68	17 16 15	• Some factual evidence; some support for claims with some examples • Basically understands one side of the issue well; some logic evident in arguments • Case is clearly outlined but team work may not be sufficient; time may not be used well • Delivery flaws in pace, tone, diction may reduce persuasiveness; much reliance on notes • Refutes some points of opposition; weak rebuilding of own case • Below average
48-56	14 13 12	• Little factual evidence; little support for claims with few examples • Little understanding of overall issue; case does not hang together well; little logic evident • Outline of case unclear; little coordination with partner; time not used well • Speaker is uncomfortable, lacks confidence; tends to read notes • Refutes few opposing points; fails to rebuild own case
Below 48%	Sub 12	• **Impossible** – no mark below this level may be given