Debate Speaker Points Rubric

AMERICAN SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION

ASDA Core Values of Conversational, Collaborative, Congeniality, and Community should be evident in all events	1 Unacceptable *Disrespectful or unethical competitor*	2 Fair *Growth necessary to successfully compete*	3 Good *Prepared, competent competitor*	4 Excellent *Top Half of Room. Polished, well-spoken competitor*	5 Superior *Exceptional preparation, polish and presentation*
Constructive Speech *Debater provides a compelling speech affirming or negating the resolution*	Attitude of disregard for opponent and judge or lacks verbal citations	Lack of preparation, lack of understanding and little convincing argumentation	Understanding of the issues, adequately convincing argumentation	Deep research and clear and compelling argumentation	Comprehensive research and mature and persuasive argumentation
Cross-Examination *Debater asks questions to clarify the round*	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
Rebuttal Speech *Debater refutes earlier argumentation and strengthens position*	Misrepresentation of evidence, introduction of new argumentation in final affirmative rebuttal or use of other unkind and unfair	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 and strengthening of position	Compelling ability to refute arguments, simplify the round and convincingly clarify position
Evidence *Debater uses evidence in the form of advocacy, examples or logic to support claims*	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
Organization *Debater organizes speeches so that ideas flow logically*	Lacks full plan in first affirmative speech or does not follow speaking order	Weak and hard to follow organization	Some organization of arguments around a thesis, somewhat logical presentation	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
Delivery *Debater uses speech and body language to uphold ASDA values*	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

© 2026 American Speech and Debate Association All rights reserved.