

## CCofSE Speaker Point Rubric

For Team Policy and Lincoln-Douglas Policy Debate

Speaker Points	1 = weak	2 = below average	3 = average	4 = above average	5 = strong
Argumentation / Refutation	Poor refutation skills. Consistently missed, by error or intent, the points being made by the opponent.	Displayed limited ability to identify and counter the opponent's arguments. May have misunderstood some arguments.	Correctly identified most of the opponent's arguments and was able to make reasonable and thoughtful arguments in return.	Quickly and accurately made sense of the opponent's major arguments and consistently responded with solid argumentation.	Exceptionally skilled in identifying the core of the opponent's arguments and presenting persuasive rebuttals to every argument.
Cross-Examination	Unprepared to ask or answer questions, unwise use of time, or behaved in an extremely rude manner.	Asked confusing questions, gave vague or unconvincing answers, or was somewhat rude. Did not maximize time	Asked reasonable questions and gave effective answers. May have been slightly pushy, evasive or needed firmness.	Asked probing questions and gave compelling answers. Generally, courteous, yet firm when needed. Used time beneficially.	Asked excellent questions that exposed or weakened the opponent's arguments. Answered persuasively. Courteous yet in control.
Delivery	Displayed poor delivery skills: lacked confidence, distracting habits or mannerisms, ineffective vocal delivery. Appearance distracting etc	Fair speaker with moments of confidence, but may have also rambled or ended speeches early. Neat appearance. Lacked vocal skills.	Good speaker who spoke clearly and evenly, though not with full confidence; voice, volume could improve. Neat appearance.	Confident above average speaker who was easy to listen to, free from distracting habits; enunciation clear with effective gestures. Professional.	Highly polished speaker whose voice, volume, gestures, and appearance greatly enhanced each speech. Professional in all aspects.
Evidence / Logic	Little or no evidence or logic used in support of arguments, or evidence /logic was irrelevant, inappropriate, or confusing.	Minimal evidence, examples, or logic used to support arguments. Evidence did not always relate to the issue at hand.	Most points supported by good evidence or reasoning, though some reasoning or evidence may have been confusing and irrelevant.	Consistent use of relevant evidence, examples, and logic to support the major arguments in the round.	Presented interesting and understandable evidence, examples, and / or reasoning in support of every major argument.
Organization	Disorganized in presentation and handling material. Poor job of telling judge where they were on the flow.	Speeches appeared to have some structure but lacked an overall connection between points. Did not always follow flow.	Average organization. Most evidence and arguments followed a general outline. Usually followed the flow.	Good organization of arguments and evidence in a manner that gave meaning to the round. Good job of following the flow.	Superior organization of arguments and evidence throughout the whole round. Judge easily followed along the flow.
Persuasiveness	Speaker presented weak arguments and/or lacked credibility or believability.	Speaker presented some clear arguments; some moments of confusion or lack of conviction.	Speaker presented clear arguments that could be followed and understood.	Speaker presented convincing arguments that were well constructed and easily understood.	Speaker presented extremely convincing arguments that were interesting and relevant; gave compelling arguments.