Adjudication Rubric

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
CONTENT (40) Please note: Adjudicate on what is said, not on what you would have said. Your knowledge should inform, not decide. Examples do not have to be used, but where used must be accurate & informative.	**24** Little to no content, totally irrelevant. Totally flawed.	**25** Little argumentation. Totally flawed argumentation. Largely descriptive. Major irrelevancies.	**26** Basic argumentation evident, with flaws. Little to no attempt to prove assertions. Some aspects irrelevant.	**27** Some argumentation, on a basic level. Some examples, but not fully explained/ relevant/corr ect. Difficulty in convincing.	**28** Picks out & explains issues somewhat. Some argumentatio n. Some use of example/ analogy/ some attempt to prove arguments.	**29** Picks out & explains relevant issues. Clear attempt at argumentatio n. Examples/ analogies/ proofs are correct & explained competently.	**30** Good explanation of relevant issues. Argumentati on is evident & sound for a large portion of the speech. Relevant examples/ analogy used well & analyzed.	**31** Issues engaged with & explained very well. Argumentati on is sound for most of the speech. Uses examples/ analogy well to back up argumentatio n. Very convincing.	**32** Almost flawless argumentatio n. Subtle analysis. Excellent use of examples/ analogy/ proof. Totally convincing. Sophisticated.
STYLE (40) Please Note: We do not mark down or up for certain accents. Speakers may have a variety of different accents. This should not affect your marking.	**24** Very flawed. Very difficult to follow. Style makes it impossibl e to follow content.	**25** Many flaws make the speech difficult to follow/ listen to. Style impacts negatively on content & ability to convince.	**26** Flaws are evident & impact negatively on ability to convince.	**27** Can communicate, but with some flaws (e.g., boring, nervous, stumbles, badly structured, etc).	**28** Competent, can communicate , some flaws. Largely fluent. Can follow internal structure. Style does not interfere with content.	**29** Communicat es well. Fluent & pleasant. Evidence of internal structure. Some flaws.	**30** Communicat es well. Pleasant & convincing. Easy to follow & listen to. Well-structured Fluent. Some very minor flaws.	**31** Communicat es very well. Very pleasant to listen to & very convincing. Very well-structured. Fluent. Very few/ minor flaws. Style enhances content.	**32** Style is superlative. Convincing, fluent & very pleasing communicatio n. Perfectly structured. Enhances content to a large degree.
STRATEGY (20) Please note: This category covers understandi ng of issues, team structure, timing, role fulfilment & team work.	-	-	**12** Little to no understandin g of issues. Timing & team structure very problematic. Little/no role fulfilment.	**13** Attempts to grasp issues. Problems with internal/team structure/timin g. Problems with role fulfilment.	**14** Shows some understandin g of issues; knows team role & fulfils some aspects. Evidence of team structure. Some flaws.	**15** Understands & articulates issues, good team structure & timing with minor flaws. Fits into team structure, role fulfilled.	**16** Excellent understandin g & articulation of issues. Timing is perfect. Fits very well into team structure. Team role fulfilled.	-	-

PLEASE REMEMBER: We mark between 60 and 80. A 60 is the worst speaker you have ever seen, and expect ever to see. The speaker has no merit in content, style or strategy. 70 is the average speaker who has a roughly equal number of flaws and good aspects in all three categories (or excels in one but is quite weak in another). An 80 is the best speaker you have ever seen or expect ever to see. This is an unlikely score. Please note that not every characteristic has to be fulfilled to gain a certain mark – there is some flexibility to the rubric, and it is meant to guide your assessment. Your own experience and discretion are still very important when assessing a speaker. We do not mark according to the average of a particular debate, but the average of school debaters in general. It is thus important to watch as many debates as you can in order to improve your adjudication