

DEBATE GRADING RUBRIC

On the right side of the rubric, please write the number representing what you think was the performance level of the debate team in question for each criterion below. Then calculate the average for each team.

**Levels of Performance for AFFIRMATIVE Team**

| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>4</b>  | <b>3</b>  | <b>2</b>   | <b>1</b>  | <b>Grade:</b>                |
|--|---|---|--|---|------------------------------|
| <b>1. Organization &amp; Clarity:</b><br><br>Main arguments and responses are outlined in a clear and orderly way.   | Completely clear and orderly presentation                           | Mostly clear and orderly in all parts                   | Clear in some parts but not overall                                    | Unclear and disorganized throughout   |                              |
| <b>2. Use of Argument:</b><br><br>Reasons are given to support the resolution  | Very strong and persuasive arguments given throughout               | Many good arguments given, with only minor problems     | Some decent arguments, but some significant problems                   | Few or no real arguments given, or all arguments given had significant problems   |                              |
| <b>3. Use of cross-examination and rebuttal:</b><br><br>Identification of weakness in Negative team's arguments and ability to defend itself against attack.                             | Excellent cross-exam and defense against Negative team's objections | Good cross-exam and rebuttals, with only minor slip-ups | Decent cross-exam and/or rebuttals, but with some significant problems | Poor cross-exam or rebuttals, failure to point out problems in Negative team's position or failure to defend itself against attack. |                              |
| <b>4. Presentation Style:</b><br><br>Tone of voice, clarity of expression, precision of arguments all contribute to keeping audience's attention and persuading them of the team's case. | All style features were used convincingly                           | Most style features were used convincingly              | Few style features were used convincingly                              | Very few style features were used, none of them convincingly  |                              |
|  |   |   |  |   | <b>TOTAL SCORE:</b><br>_____ |

(Divide by 4)

AVERAGE FOR AFFIRMATIVE TEAM: \_\_\_\_\_

**Levels of Performance for NEGATIVE Team**

| <b>Criteria</b>                       | <b>4</b>                                  | <b>3</b>                              | <b>2</b>                            | <b>1</b>                            | <b>Grade:</b> |
|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>1. Organization &amp; Clarity:</b> | Completely clear and orderly presentation | Mostly clear and orderly in all parts | Clear in some parts but not overall | Unclear and disorganized throughout |               |

|  |  |  |   |   |                       |
|--|--|--|---|---|-----------------------|
| Main arguments and responses are outlined in a clear and orderly way.  |  |  |   |   |                       |
| <b>2. Use of Argument:</b><br><br>Reasons are given against the resolution   | Very strong and persuasive arguments given throughout                  | Many good arguments given, with only minor problems    | Some decent arguments, but some significant problems                  | Few or no real arguments given, or all arguments given had significant problems   |                       |
| <b>3. Use of cross-examination and rebuttal:</b><br><br>Identification of weakness in Affirmative team's arguments and ability to defend itself against attack.                          | Excellent cross-exam and defense against Affirmative team's objections | Good cross-exam and rebuttal, with only minor slip-ups | Decent cross-exam and/or rebuttal, but with some significant problems | Poor cross-exam or rebuttal, failure to point out problems in Affirmative team's position or failure to defend itself against attack. |                       |
| <b>4. Presentation Style:</b><br><br>Tone of voice, clarity of expression, precision of arguments all contribute to keeping audience's attention and persuading them of the team's case. | All style features were used convincingly                              | Most style features were used convincingly             | Few style features were used convincingly                             | Very few style features were used, none of them convincingly  |                       |
|  |  |  |   |   | TOTAL SCORE:<br><hr/> |

(Divide by 4)

AVERAGE FOR NEGATIVE TEAM: \_\_\_\_\_

STUDENT NUMBER (to remain confidential): \_\_\_\_\_