Debate Judging Rubric

There are two ways to prove that a proposition is true (has not been proved either irrelevant or untrue by the opposition):

1. You can look at every known instance and show that in each case the proposition holds true.

2. You can analyse the proposition and show that it is supported by other known principles.

In debating it is usually impossible to use the first type of reasoning, because we debate generalisations with millions if not billions of known instances. So, we have to use the second type of reasoning.

Criteria		A	B	C	D
Style	Definition	32-30	28	26	24
	Style covers the tone and persona of a given speech. Terminology, comedy, emotions, speed, volume, and movement will play a role in how a speaker delivers their argument, and the message the speaker wishes to convey. Please note that we are not grading accents nor mispronunciations, but rather how well a student's style is at the given moment, and how this impacts the message they are searching to convey.	- Speaker conveys confidence and enthusiasm in the topic. They express this through body movements and volume that are unique to themselves. - Speaker maintains effective eye contact, body language, and vocal projection in order to engage audience; - Speaker enunciates clearly throughout presentation and uses tone as a mechanism to address importance	- Speaker is confident and enthusiastic during most but not all of presentation. - Speaker has minor lapses in effective eye contact, body language, or vocal projection or engages the audience irregularly. - The speaker's voice is at a level that is sometimes hard to hear or they need to pronounce words more distinctly and clearly. - The speaker shows notable signs of nervousness that are distracting to their speech	- Speaker appears to lack confidence or seems unenthusiastic about presentation. - They avoids eye contact, maintains stiff posture. - Speaker has lapses in clear vocal projection; presenter is hard to understand.	- Speaker lacks enthusiasm, voice is monotone. - Speaker looks down throughout most of the presentation, or relies entirely on written notes. - They either maintain a wooden posture or continually move around and fidget. - Speaker is disengaged from the audience, and mumbles.
Content	Definition	32-30	28	26	24
	Content covers the arguments that are used, divorced from the speaking style. It is as if you are seeing the arguments written down rather than spoken. You must assess the weight of the arguments without being influenced by the magnifence of the orator that presented them. Each argument's significance must be weighted simply on it's empirical importance throughout the debate. Content will also include an assessment of the weight of rebuttal or clash. It includes the quality and basis of the information presented, be it physical or abstract.	- The speaker follows the definitions, criteria and/or mechanism at hand. - The speaker has a structured central argument directly involving the motion. - The central argument is supported by claims and evidence. - The evidence provided is reliable and justified against the central argument. - Rebuttals and Points of Information are used to add depth and support the central argument.	- There are changes or contradictions to the definitions, criteria and/or mechanism throughout the speech. - The speaker has a structured central argument directly involving the motion. - The central argument is supported by claims and evidence but there are some fallacies or flaws in the logic. - The evidence provided is somewhat reliable and linked to the central argument. - Rebuttals and Points of Information are sometimes used to support the central argument.	- The speaker does not follow the definitions, criteria and/or mechanism throughout their entire speech in regards to the motion. Changes and contradictions subtract from central argument. - The speaker's central argument is loosely connected to the motion. - The claims are not directly related to the central argument or the evidence does not support the claims. - The evidence provided is not extensively justified or there are gaps in the logic of the evidence. - Rebuttals and Points of Information do not add nor subtract from the team's central argument.	- The speaker disregards the motion when presenting or developing the team's definitions, criteria and/or mechanism at hand. - The speaker's central argument is not connected to the motion. - The central argument is not supported by claims and evidence. The central argument is logically flawed. - The evidence provided is not reliable or of general knowledge and is distanced from the central argument. - Rebuttals and Points of Information are not taken or are used to the advantage of the opposing team.
Strategy	Definition	16-15	14	13	12
	Strategy is based on the timing and structure of the speech as well as the importance that content is given to. A good speech has a clear beginning, middle and end with signposts to help us see where the speaker is going. The sequence of arguments is logical and flows naturally from point to point, and allotted time is dedicated to specific points throughout the speech. Also, the team must prove coherent and subsequent in their line of analysis, content and narrative, directly related to the motion at hand..	- Speaker introduces a roadmap of their speech at the beginning of it, and end with a conclusion. - Speaker references the roadmap when transitioning from one point to the other. Transitions are smooth. - Speech stays above 7 minutes and below 8. - The speaker gives an allotted time to each of the main claims/points of the speech to go in-depth with their argument. - Rebuttals and Points of Information are directly linked to the central argument or claim that is being made. - The conclusion summarizes both the main points that support the central argument and the main points of clash depending on the speech. - The speaker is coherent with what said throughout the debate, and follows team's line of analysis, providing significant analysis and/or insight	- Speaker introduces a roadmap of their speech at the beginning of it, but fails to follow it throughout the entire presentation. - The speaker's transitions are not clear. - The speaker manages time correctly most of the speech but fails to go in-depth with a claim or point. - Rebuttals and Points of Information are somehow linked to the central argument or claim that is being made. - Conclusion is sudden and lacks a sense of the main arguments of the speech or opposing team's argument. - Speaker begins to analyse and develop team's line of analysis, yet fails to provide depth to their point	- Speaker makes little effort to preview the structure of the speech. - The body of the speech has significant gaps or needs transitions - The speech seems rushed or sparse. - Rebuttals and Points of Information are distantly linked to the central argument or claim that is being made. - Conclusion is unclear or does not follow from the central argument. - Speaker fails to develop on his team's line of analysis, yet mentions it or begins to try and develop it	- Speaker fails to preview the structure of the speech. - The body of the speech lacks logic or signposting. - Arguments are explained too fast or developed poorly. - Rebuttals and Points of Information are not made or not linked to the motion or argument at hand. - There is no conclusion. - The speaker regards nothing his/her team has said throughout the debate - Speaker changes team's definitions, content and general line of analysis/narrative

Debate Judging Rubric

Reference: https://mkf2v40tlr04cjqkt2dtlqbr-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/notes_adjudicators.pdf