



# SPEAKER PERFORMANCE RUBRIC

SCORE & DESCRIPTION	ARGUMENTATION	REFUTATION	ORGANIZATION	PRESENTATION
<p><b>“(Nearly) Flawless” (95-100)</b></p> <p>Difficult to identify any error of omission or commission. Unlikely that there will be even one speech of this ranking in several years. Truly displays the “WOW factor”.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Understands major issues and opponent strategies</li> <li>◦ Develops arguments with multiple causes and diverse consequences</li> <li>◦ Creates clever impromptu arguments</li> <li>◦ Utilizes variety of evidence</li> <li>◦ Introduces and analyzes more evidence as debate develops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Integrates advanced refutation into argumentation</li> <li>◦ Uses ideas from opponent to advance speaker’s own side</li> <li>◦ Accounts for every important point of the opposing team</li> <li>◦ Uses <b>POIs</b> and heckles as an opportunity for refutation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Employs a clear, well-organized and efficient narrative speech structure</li> <li>◦ Provides for even complex issues to be followed by nearly any listener</li> <li>◦ Restores order to any confusing debate issues</li> <li>◦ Uses effective structure, clear transitions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Delivers information in a highly entertaining and informative manner</li> <li>◦ Displays outstanding verbal and non-verbal skills</li> <li>◦ Shows mastery of eye contact, volume, pace, clarity and humor (when appropriate)</li> <li>◦ Adjusts behavior to suit opponent ability</li> </ul>
<p><b>“Brilliant” (90-94)</b></p> <p>An outstanding debater delivering a highly successful speech in <b>ALL</b> respects. A rousing speech for a general audience and a substantive presentation for an audience of field experts. Some room for improvement can be identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Makes powerful, on the spot arguments</li> <li>◦ Describes detailed and complex issues</li> <li>◦ Provides substantial evidence to support sound reasoning</li> <li>◦ Supplies and analyzes multiple examples for evidence</li> <li>◦ Displays mastery of <b>AREI</b> usage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Understands how arguments interrelate</li> <li>◦ Investigates inconsistencies among opponent’s claims</li> <li>◦ Identifies and exploits opportunity costs, assumptions and logical fallacies</li> <li>◦ Uses <b>4-step method of refutation</b> clearly and effectively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Uses strong narrative structure</li> <li>◦ Includes persuasive introduction and conclusion</li> <li>◦ Creates sophisticated yet easy to follow speech</li> <li>◦ Integrates arguments from both sides seamlessly into one compelling presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Employs rhetorical devices like humor, pausing, and vocal inflection to add depth to speech</li> <li>◦ Engages the judge/audience</li> <li>◦ Gives <b>POIs</b> in a clever manner</li> <li>◦ Responds to <b>POIs</b> quickly and effectively</li> <li>◦ Utilizes appropriate argumentative heckling</li> </ul>
<p><b>“Extraordinarily Fine” (85-89)</b></p> <p>An extraordinarily fine speech from a consistently strong debater. Confident and capable, the speaker is an effective model for new debaters to learn the craft of public speaking and debating.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Creates clear positions that demand a sophisticated reply</li> <li>◦ Uses <b>AREI</b> with highly effective reasoning and consistent application of different varieties of evidence</li> <li>◦ Explains/analyzes evidence</li> <li>◦ Establishes significance (impact) for all major issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Includes opportunity cost evaluation and turn/capture of opposing positions</li> <li>◦ Expresses significance and impact assessment of opposing side’s major arguments</li> <li>◦ Uses basic <b>4-step method of refutation</b> often</li> <li>◦ Uses some direct refutation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Creates logical narrative which is easy to flow and follow</li> <li>◦ Includes either effective introduction or conclusions, but unlikely to include effective versions of both</li> <li>◦ Organizes own positions and opponent’s positions into a well-integrated speech</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Presents an animated image</li> <li>◦ Distracted by the other team only on rare occasion</li> <li>◦ Offers consistent <b>POIs</b> and effectively replies to <b>POIs</b> offered from the opposing team</li> <li>◦ Displays strong public speaking skills in all but one respect</li> </ul>
<p><b>“Clearly Above Average” (80-84)</b></p> <p>A consistently good debate speech. Speaker appears comfortable with format, eager to participate and confident. A few inconsistencies in performance, but they are likely only minor distractions. Sufficiently strong presentation requiring effective reply.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Makes effective arguments throughout speech</li> <li>◦ Uses <b>AREI</b> format</li> <li>◦ Applies reasoning and often presents evidence to support issues</li> <li>◦ Has knowledge of and is prepared for the major issues of the debate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Maintains own positions and supplements them with analysis and examples</li> <li>◦ Has difficulty with some of the opposing team’s arguments but does effectively reply to many arguments of the other side</li> <li>◦ Uses only direct refutation, but does so consistently/effectively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Uses effective narrative structure for own arguments</li> <li>◦ Has some difficulty integrating multiple counter-positions into speech</li> <li>◦ Uses speaking time effectively</li> <li>◦ Organizes speech in such a way that those flowing the debate are easily able to follow issue development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Speaks in engaging manner, but only occasionally entertaining or persuasive</li> <li>◦ Offers relevant, concise <b>POIs</b> and heckles</li> <li>◦ Displays a level of confidence</li> <li>◦ Shows occasional verbal pauses (e.g. “umm”)</li> <li>◦ Is unclear, ineffective at a few times</li> </ul>

**(SIDE 2) Note: Orange County Debate League performances are judged from the direction of bottom to top. Updated 2015-2016**



# SPEAKER PERFORMANCE RUBRIC

SCORE & DESCRIPTION	ARGUMENTATION	REFUTATION	ORGANIZATION	PRESENTATION
<p><b>“Average – High” (75-79)</b></p> <p>Speaker is competent and does some things well but is just as likely to make significant errors. He/she is capable and confident, although there are inconsistencies in style and substance. Speaker knows his/her role and tries to accomplish it.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Follows <b>AREI</b> consistently but may be missing reasoning or strong evidence</li> <li>◦ Repeats reasoning as evidence</li> <li>◦ Identifies obvious issues but does not develop nuanced or complex issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Understands and repeats own positions rather than developing/amplifying them</li> <li>◦ Does not establish the qualitative &amp; quantitative significance of issues</li> <li>◦ Does not compare opposing views</li> <li>◦ Uses some direct refutation and some general refutation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Generally effective</li> <li>◦ Attempts a narrative structure, but somewhat inconsistent</li> <li>◦ Loses clarity in integrating opposing arguments</li> <li>◦ Uses time effectively</li> <li>◦ Displays a slight imbalance of focus on own arguments and opponent arguments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Speaks clearly, comprehensibly</li> <li>◦ Shows consistent nonverbal communication (eye contact, gestures)</li> <li>◦ Appears competent but not highly confident</li> <li>◦ Employs monotonous tone, not dramatic tone</li> <li>◦ Attempts 1-2 <b>POIs</b>; gives simple responses to opponent <b>POIs</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>“Average – Low” (70-74)</b></p> <p>A near average performance for an experienced debater and an average or slightly above average performance for a new debater. The speaker is inconsistent – some speech elements are done well and others are unsuccessful.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Understands argumentation but only occasionally uses <b>AREI</b></li> <li>◦ Confuses reasoning and evidence, offering only one of the elements rather than both</li> <li>◦ Does not make effective, argumentative heckles</li> <li>◦ Establishes significance (impact) for only 1-2 issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Discusses own arguments rather than answer an opponent's argument in a direct/forceful way</li> <li>◦ Uses some refutation with limited effectiveness</li> <li>◦ Offers general refutation rather than a combination of general and specific counters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Has basic structure (introduction, body, conclusion) but strays from it during speech</li> <li>◦ Organizes own arguments but loses structure when addressing opponents points</li> <li>◦ Slows pace when confronted with <b>POIs</b> and heckles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Speaks clearly but there are noticeable pronunciation errors that are sufficiently distracting for the audience or disrupt natural flow of debate</li> <li>◦ Attempts <b>POIs</b>, but they are obvious questions, not carefully considered or analyzed ones</li> <li>◦ Is distracted by opponent <b>POIs</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>“Below/Near Average” (65-69)</b></p> <p>A below average performance for an experienced debater but may be a more common “average” score for beginning debaters. Generally, the speaker is modestly successful in one element (e.g. argumentation) but is ineffective in <i>all</i> other major elements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Does not use <b>AREI</b> format, may be an exception or two</li> <li>◦ Uses very little evidence to support claims</li> <li>◦ Displays obvious inconsistencies, logic gaps and/or logical fallacies in major arguments</li> <li>◦ Rarely integrates arguments from teammates into own speech</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Is not able to clash with or reply to the majority of arguments from the other side</li> <li>◦ Repeats previous ideas rather than developing, analyzing or comparing them</li> <li>◦ Does not use general or direct refutation</li> <li>◦ No analysis of opportunity cost, assumptions, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Has little organization to the full speech, although 1 or 2 individual points may be organized</li> <li>◦ Has <i>neither</i> adequate introduction nor conclusion</li> <li>◦ Speech not easy-to-follow</li> <li>◦ Unclear transitions from one point to another</li> <li>◦ Does not allocate sufficient time to key issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Loses clarity for sustained periods</li> <li>◦ Has poor eye contact and infrequent use of gestures</li> <li>◦ Unconvincing, unconfident</li> <li>◦ Rarely attempts <b>POIs</b> and is distracted by opponent <b>POIs</b></li> <li>◦ Does not use full speaking time, yet needs to add to speech</li> <li>◦ Does not work effectively with teammate or participate in positive/negative heckling</li> </ul>
<p><b>“Clearly Below Average” (60-64)</b></p> <p>This score may be slightly below average for a new/anxious speaker. Lower markings of this sort indicate that a student has yet to master <i>any</i> element of public speaking/argumentation. Not a “failure”; this just reveals a skill level based on a single debate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Does not use <b>AREI</b> format</li> <li>◦ Offers assertions with little analysis or negligible reasoning</li> <li>◦ Little or no evidence to support argumentation</li> <li>◦ Does not amplify arguments of partners</li> <li>◦ Displays little understanding of issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Does not reply to any of major points from opposing team</li> <li>◦ Repeats own arguments without development or comparison to opponent's arguments</li> <li>◦ Employs tactics that make for little/no clash in the debate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Disorganized in replies to opposing issues/arguments</li> <li>◦ Has no structure to speech (introduction, body, conclusion)</li> <li>◦ Does not differentiate one argument/response from another</li> <li>◦ Fails to use full speaking time</li> <li>◦ Allows for difficult-to-follow speech</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Seems distracted, anxious</li> <li>◦ Halting delivery, little to no eye contact</li> <li>◦ Excessive note use limits connection with judge</li> <li>◦ May reject or accept <i>all</i> <b>POIs</b></li> <li>◦ Mumbles and has numerous, unintended pauses (e.g. “umm”)</li> <li>◦ Disrupts effectiveness of partners' speeches (e.g. note passing, etc.)</li> </ul>

**(SIDE 1) Note: Scores below 60 are reserved for students who are unsuccessful as debaters as well as uncooperative, mean-spirited or disruptive during the debate. Updated 2015-2016**