1. Rubric for Grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student was prepared for the debate with all background information for</td>
<td>position weak;</td>
<td>ideas ok;</td>
<td>knew all sides</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their role.</td>
<td>ideas not clear;</td>
<td>left out crucial</td>
<td>up and down</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student defended reasons with factual information; the student did</td>
<td>all emotion with</td>
<td>emotion high;</td>
<td>factual info. used</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not stray with emotion.</td>
<td>no facts to</td>
<td>more factual info.</td>
<td>to defend cause</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student was open to other’s ideas. The student listened and</td>
<td>narrow-minded;</td>
<td>considered others</td>
<td>very open to others’</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considered others’ ideas.</td>
<td>only see one side</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>ideas</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student had a professional demeanor during the debate.</td>
<td>rude; did not</td>
<td>chatty;</td>
<td>peacemaker; one</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>follow rules</td>
<td>followed rules</td>
<td>fine delegate</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Debate Scoring Rubric

**Arguments**
4 - Superior: Arguments were eloquent, complex, elaborated, and supported with evidence and examples.
3 - Proficient: Arguments were complex, elaborated, and supported with evidence and examples
2 - Essential: Arguments were supported with evidence and examples.
1 - Unsatisfactory: Arguments lacked evidence and support.

**Rebuttal**
4 - Superior: Rebuttal directly addressed each of the opponents’ arguments with counter-evidence.
3 - Proficient: Rebuttal directly addressed most of opponents’ arguments with counter-evidence.
2 - Essential: Rebuttal directly addressed some of opponents’ arguments with counter-evidence.
1 - Unsatisfactory: Rebuttal did not directly address opponents’ arguments and/or did not present counter-evidence.

**Teamwork**
4 - Superior: Each member of the team presented an argument that built on the arguments of those that came earlier.
3 - Proficient: Each member of the team presented different but complementary arguments.
2 - Essential: Each member of the team presented a different argument, with minimal overlap and repetition.
1 - Unsatisfactory: Arguments were overlapping, repetitive, or contradictory.
3. Debate Rubric

Scoring: the debater will receive a score for each:
- Knowledge (K),
- Reasoning (R), and
- Communication (C).

Final score shall be an average of these 3 scores.
Scores for each debater shall be totaled for the team score.
Each member of the higher scoring team shall earn an additional 0.5 (of possible 4.0 total) to their individual scores.

Score Description

4 (A)
- K - information offered extends beyond that provided by symposium speakers & materials (clear evidence of additional research); 4+ arguments given to support stance; presenter clearly demonstrates understanding of topic, describing concepts correctly, & using notes minimally or not at all; effective use of sources (4+ citations) adds validity to arguments
- R - all arguments are strong & are presented convincingly; presenter artfully uses information to discredit opponents; all rebuttals are thorough & effective, as presenter effectively attacks opponents’ areas of weakness
- C - presentation is fluent & well organized; speaker uses high energy, effective eye contact & strong, confident voice; uses all allotted time effectively

3 (B)
- K - information includes most of what was provided by symposium speakers & materials; 3 arguments given to support stance; presenter demonstrates understanding of topic; uses notes but does not read directly from them; uses 2-3 citations
- R - most arguments are strong & somewhat convincing; presenter effectively uses information to discredit opponents; all rebuttals are effective
- C - presentation is well organized; speaker uses high energy & appears confident; uses most of speaking time fairly effectively

2 (C)
- K - information covers some of what was provided; 2 arguments given to support stance; speaker demonstrates fair understanding of topic, but some of time reads directly from notes; uses 0-1 citation
- R - some arguments are weak & open to effective rebuttal; presenter has some success in discrediting 1 or more of opponents’ arguments
- C - presentation is fairly well organized; presenter speaks directly to audience &/or opponents some of the time; uses most of speaking time

NC Does not meet at least “2” standards
4. Class Debate Rubric

5 Exemplary
4 Accomplished
3 Developing
2 Beginning
1 Score

Understanding of Topic
5 The team clearly understood the topic in-depth and presented their information forcefully and convincingly.
4 The team clearly understood the topic in-depth and presented their information with ease.
3 The team seemed to understand the main points and presented those with ease.
2 The team did not show an adequate understanding of the topic.

Use of Facts/Statistics
5 Every major point was well supported with several relevant facts, statistics and/or examples.
4 Every major point was adequately supported with relevant facts, statistics and/or examples.
3 Every major point was supported with facts, statistics and/or examples, but the relevance of some was questionable.
2 Every point was not supported.

Organization
5 All arguments were clearly tied to an idea (premise) and organized in a tight, logical fashion.
4 Most arguments were clearly tied to an idea (premise) and organized in a tight, logical fashion.
3 All arguments were clearly tied to an idea (premise), but the organization was sometimes not clear or logical.
2 Arguments were not tied to an idea (premise).

Presentation Style
5 Team consistently used gestures, eye contact, tone of voice and level of enthusiasm in a way that kept the attention of the audience.
4 Team usually used gestures, eye contact, tone of voice and level of enthusiasm in a way that kept the attention of the audience.
3 Team sometimes used gestures, eye contact, tone of voice and level of enthusiasm in a way that kept the attention of the audience.
2 One or more members of the team had a presentation style that did not keep the attention of the audience.
5. **CLASSROOM DEBATE RUBRIC**

1. **Organization and Clarity:**
   5 Viewpoints and responses are outlined both clearly and orderly
   4 Completely clear and orderly presentation
   3 Most clear and orderly in all parts
   2 Clear in some parts but not over all
   1 Unclear in most parts

2. **Use of Arguments:**
   5 Reasons are given to support viewpoint
   4 Most relevant reasons given in support
   3 Most reasons given: most relevant
   2 Some relevant reasons given
   1 Few or no relevant reasons given

3. **Use of Examples and Facts:**
   5 Examples and facts are given to support reasons
   4 Many relevant supporting examples and facts given
   3 Many examples/facts given: most relevant
   2 Some relevant examples/facts given
   1 Few or no relevant supporting examples/facts

4. **Use of Rebuttal:**
   5 Arguments made by the other teams are responded to and dealt with effectively
   4 Many effective counter-arguments made
   3 Some effective counter-arguments made
   2 Few effective counter-arguments made
   1 No effective counter-arguments made

5. **Presentation Style:**
   5 Tone of voice, use of gestures, and level of enthusiasm are convincing to audience
   4 All style features were used convincingly
   3 All style features were used, most convincingly
   2 Few style features were used convincingly
   1 Few style features were used; not convincingly
### Rating Scale for Evaluating the Speakers in a Formal Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: Needs Improvement</th>
<th>1st Affirmative Speaker</th>
<th>1st Negative Speaker</th>
<th>2nd Affirmative Speaker</th>
<th>2nd Negative Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2: Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Organization and Strategy
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. As much as possible strategy and organization should complement one another.

#### Evidence
Evidence may be facts, statistics and authorities offered in support of contentions. Credit should be given for thorough, relevant research.

#### Delivery
The mechanics of good speech should be faithfully observed throughout: poise, quality, use of voice, effectiveness, ease of gesture, emphasis, variety and enunciation.

#### Refutation
Each speaker should demonstrate ability to use evidence and logic to refute the contentions of his opponents and defend those of his own side.

#### Parliamentary Procedure
Each speaker should demonstrate understanding of parliamentary procedure through adherence to the rule as well as correct, relevant use of questions, points of order, points of personal privilege and heckling.

#### Judge’s Decision
The debate should be awarded to the team that best supports its contentions through logic and evidence, and best refutes the contentions of its opponents.

If neither team meets its obligations, then the debate should be awarded to the team that best demonstrates the basic skills of debate.

This debate has been won by

- [ ] Affirmative
- [ ] Negative