

# Debate Speaker Points Rubric

ASDA Core Values of Conversational, Collaborative, Congenial should be evident in all events	<b>1 Unacceptable</b> <i>Well below expectations of ASDA competitors</i>	<b>2 Fair</b> <i>Growth necessary to successfully compete with others in this room</i>	<b>3 Good</b> <i>Prepared, competent competitor compared to others in this room</i>	<b>4 Excellent</b> <i>Top Half of Room. Polished, well-spoken competitor compared to others in this room</i>	<b>5 Superior</b> <i>Exceeding other competitors in this room in preparation, polish and presentation</i>
<b>Constructive Speech</b> <i>Debater provides a compelling speech affirming or negating the resolution</i>	Lack of preparation, attitude of disregard for opponent and judge	Lack of understanding, little convincing argumentation	Understanding of the issues, adequately convincing argumentation	Deep research, clear and compelling argumentation	Comprehensive research, mature and persuasive argumentation
<b>Cross-Examination</b> <i>Debater asks questions to clarify the round</i>	Aggressive time manipulation or belittling of opponent	Inability to comprehend the issues or formulate clarifying questions	Inquiries and responses that show knowledge of the issues	Skill in asking and answering questions that enhance the round	Strong use of questions and answers to strengthen position and weaken opposing view
<b>Rebuttal Speech</b> <i>Debater refutes earlier argumentation and strengthens position</i>	Misrepresentation of evidence, introduction of new argumentation, or use of other unkind and unfair tactics	Inability to understand the issues or deliver reasonable rebuttal speeches	Adequate understanding of the issues and some refutation of earlier arguments	Refutation of earlier arguments, clarification of misunderstandings, strengthening of position	Compelling ability to refute arguments, simplify the round, and convincingly clarify position
<b>Evidence</b> <i>Debater uses evidence in the form of advocacy, examples or logic to support claims</i>	Misuse of evidence through ignorance or willful manipulation or misapplication of advocacy, examples, or logic	Lack of advocacy, irrelevant examples, illogical arguments, or incorrect citations	Appropriate amount of advocacy, examples or basic logic	Excellent use of relevant advocacy, helpful examples, and clear logical connections that show depth of research	Superior use of extensive advocacy, enriching examples, or advanced logic that shows comprehensive research
<b>Organization</b> <i>Debater organizes speeches so that ideas flow logically</i>	Weak and hard to follow organization	Some organization of arguments around a thesis, somewhat logical presentation	Organizational techniques that add meaning to the round	Organization that helps the judge understand the arguments and the flow from speech to speech	Organization that simplifies the round and flows logically from the constructive speech to the final conclusion
<b>Delivery</b> <i>Debater uses speech and body language to uphold ASDA values</i>	Poor delivery that is disrespectful, aggressive, unkind or inappropriate	Discomfort on stage, awkward speech or body language	Comfort on stage, polite speech and body language	Stage presence that shows kindness and respect to the opponent and judge	Ability to build a relationship with the judge and opponent