

Debate Rubrics

Adapted from rubric by David Shoemaker (<http://www.csun.edu/~ds56723/phil338/hout338rubric.htm>)

Affirmative Team

Criteria	4	3	2	1
<p>Organization and Clarity Main arguments and responses are outlined in a clear and orderly way.</p>	Completely clear and orderly presentation	Mostly clear and orderly in all parts	Clear in some parts but not overall	Unclear and disorganized throughout
<p>Use of Argument Reasons are given to support the resolution.</p>	Very strong and persuasive arguments given throughout. All arguments are supported by relevant and credible evidence	Many good arguments given, with only minor problems. Most, but not all, of the arguments are supported by relevant and credible evidence	Some decent arguments, but some significant problems. Very few of the arguments are supported by relevant or credible evidence	Few or no real arguments given, or all arguments given had significant problems. The few arguments provided are opinions
<p>Cross Examination and Rebuttal Identification of weaknesses in other team's arguments and ability to defend itself against attack.</p>	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.
<p>Presentation Style Tone of voice, clarity of expression, precision of arguments all contribute to keeping the audience's attention and persuading them of the team's case.</p>	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

Negative Team

Criteria	4	3	2	1
<p>Organization and Clarity</p> <p>Main arguments and responses are outlined in a clear and orderly way.</p>	Completely clear and orderly presentation	Mostly clear and orderly in all parts	Clear in some parts but not overall	Unclear and disorganized throughout
<p>Use of Argument</p> <p>Reasons are given to support the resolution.</p>	Very strong and persuasive arguments given throughout. All arguments are supported by relevant and credible evidence	Many good arguments given, with only minor problems. Most, but not all, of the arguments are supported by relevant and credible evidence	Some decent arguments, but some significant problems. Very few of the arguments are supported by relevant or credible evidence	Few or no real arguments given, or all arguments given had significant problems. The few arguments provided are opinions
<p>Cross Examination and Rebuttal</p> <p>Identification of weaknesses in other team's arguments and ability to defend itself against attack.</p>	Excellent cross-exam and defense against Affirmative 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 Affirmative team's position or failure to defend itself against attack.
<p>Presentation Style</p> <p>Tone of voice, clarity of expression, precision of arguments all contribute to keeping the audience's attention and persuading them of the team's case.</p>	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