

Discussion Scoring Rubric

	1	2	3	4	5
Organization – The speech should contain an effective introduction and conclusion. It should be well structured, logical and coherent. Argumentation and logic should be straightforward and relevant and, as much as possible, strategy and organization should complement each other.	No introduction or statement of resolution	Has an introduction but does not state the resolution.	Introduces the resolution.	Introduction was interesting. Clear statement of resolution.	Introduction grabs your attention. Clear statement of resolution.
	Little sign of organization. Difficult to follow. Little, if any, notes making it impossible to verify information.	Some sign of organization is demonstrated but speech does not flow smoothly. Inadequate notes and unable to find information.	Speech shows some signs of organization. Some weakness in overall flow. Adequate notes but took time to find information.	Well structured and interesting speech. Able to follow the flow. Good notes and information can be retrieved, as needed.	Awesome speech which keenly holds your interest. Logical and easy to follow. Excellent notes and readily accessible information.
	No conclusion	Uncertain conclusion.	Stated conclusion.	Clear conclusion brings closure to the topic.	Effective conclusion convinces you.
Evidence – Facts, statistics, and authorities offered in support of contentions must be sound. Credit should be given for thorough and relevant research.	Does not seem to address the topic. No facts are given to support the topic	Seldom addresses the topic. Few facts are given to support the topic.	Tries to address the topic. Some facts are given to support the topic.	Usually addressed the topic. Uses facts to support the topic.	Always addresses the topic issues. Uses many sound facts to accurately support the topic.
	Contentions are missing or unclear.	Contentions are vague and hardly convincing.	Contentions are clear and plausible.	Contentions are clear, somewhat concise and usually convincing.	Contentions are clear, concisely stated and convincingly.
	No evidence of any research or serious factual errors. Details/examples conflict with the position.	No direct credit given for any research. Details/examples do not contribute to the position.	Credit given for some research. Details/examples have a minor influence in the clarity of the position.	Credit given for most research. Details/examples attempt to add clarity to the position.	Credit given for thorough and relevant research. Details/examples clarify the position.
Delivery – The mechanics of good speech should be faithfully observed throughout. Poise, quality and use of voice, effectiveness and ease of gesture, emphasis, variety, and enunciation should be assessed.	Appeared very nervous and did not use gestures. No eye contact.	Difficulty with voice control and ineffective gestures. Little eye contact.	Appropriate attempt to control voice and gestures. Some eye contact.	Good control of voice and gestures. Good eye contact.	Excellent control of voice and gestures. Excellent eye contact.
	Limited vocabulary, often repetitive, and somewhat monotone.	Minimal descriptive language with very little tone change.	Some descriptive language with occasional tone change for emphasis.	Some descriptive language presented with good variance of tone.	Very descriptive language presented with varied emphasis.
	Appears very nervous. Bad posture coupled with many distracting movements.	Appears unsure and nervous. Bad posture and a number of distracting movements.	Body language shows control. Good posture but some distracting movements.	Body language exhibits confidence. Good posture with not too many destructive movements.	Appears confident and comfortable at all times. Excellent posture and no distracting movements.
Refutation/Clash – Each speaker should demonstrate an ability to apply evidence and logic in refuting his opponent’s contentions.	No clash	Little clash to show the opposing arguments have been understood.	Clash shows some understanding of the opposing arguments.	Good clash demonstrating an understanding of the opposing arguments.	Clashes are appropriate and show a clear understanding of the opposing arguments.
	No counter-arguments made.	Almost no counter arguments made.	Few effective counter-arguments made.	Some effective counter arguments made.	Many effective counter-arguments are made.
Format: Discussion. – Has each student participated in the discussion period? Are questions and statements concise and well-phrased? Is the student courteous, respectful and cooperative? Does the student reveal a sound understanding of the issues?	No participation in the discussion. No interaction with partner. No questions asked. Unable to answer questions posed.	Little participation in the discussion and very limited interaction with partner. Few questions asked. Answers do not necessarily reflect an understanding of the questions posed.	Participated in the discussion and some interaction with partner. Asks questions. Answers questions posed.	Contributed to the discussion and interacted with partner. Questions asked clash with opponents’ contentions. Answers are somewhat concise.	Actively contributed to the discussion. Lots of interaction with partner. Questions clearly clash with opponent’s contentions/pillars. Answers are concise and discussion is redirected with a new question
	Speaker is rude or disrespectful.	Speaker occasionally speaks disrespectfully.	Speaker is courteous and respectful.	Speaker is courteous and cooperative.	Speaker looks and acts professionally.

Cross Examination Scoring Rubric

	1	2	3	4	5
Organization – The speech should contain an effective introduction and conclusion. It should be well structured, logical and coherent. Argumentation and logic should be straightforward and relevant and, as much as possible, strategy and organization should complement each other.	No introduction or statement of resolution	Has an introduction but does not state the resolution.	Introduces the resolution.	Introduction was interesting. Clear statement of resolution.	Introduction grabs your attention. Clear statement of resolution.
	Little sign of organization. Difficult to follow. Little, if any, notes making it impossible to verify information.	Some sign of organization is demonstrated but speech does not flow smoothly. Inadequate notes and unable to find information.	Speech shows some signs of organization. Some weakness in overall flow. Adequate notes but took time to find information.	Well structured and interesting speech. Able to follow the flow. Good notes and information can be retrieved, as needed.	Awesome speech which keenly holds your interest. Logical and easy to follow. Excellent notes and readily accessible information.
	No conclusion	Uncertain conclusion.	Stated conclusion.	Clear conclusion brings closure to the topic.	Effective conclusion convinces you.
Evidence – Facts, statistics, and authorities offered in support of contentions must be sound. Credit should be given for thorough and relevant research.	Does not seem to address the topic. No facts are given to support the topic	Seldom addresses the topic. Few facts are given to support the topic.	Tries to address the topic. Some facts are given to support the topic.	Usually addressed the topic. Uses facts to support the topic.	Always addresses the topic issues. Uses many sound facts to accurately support the topic.
	Contentions are missing or unclear.	Contentions are vague and hardly convincing.	Contentions are clear and plausible.	Contentions are clear, somewhat concise and usually convincing.	Contentions are clear, concisely stated and convincingly.
	No evidence of any research or serious factual errors. Details/examples conflict with the position.	No direct credit given for any research. Details/examples do not contribute to the position.	Credit given for some research. Details/examples have a minor influence in the clarity of the position.	Credit given for most research. Details/examples attempt to add clarity to the position.	Credit given for thorough and relevant research. Details/examples clarify the position.
Delivery – The mechanics of good speech should be faithfully observed throughout. Poise, quality and use of voice, effectiveness and ease of gesture, emphasis, variety, and enunciation should be assessed.	Appeared very nervous and did not use gestures. No eye contact.	Difficulty with voice control and ineffective gestures. Little eye contact.	Appropriate attempt to control voice and gestures. Some eye contact.	Good control of voice and gestures. Good eye contact.	Excellent control of voice and gestures. Excellent eye contact.
	Limited vocabulary, often repetitive, and somewhat monotone.	Minimal descriptive language with very little tone change.	Some descriptive language with occasional tone change for emphasis.	Some descriptive language presented with good variance of tone.	Very descriptive language presented with varied emphasis.
	Appears very nervous. Bad posture coupled with many distracting movements.	Appears unsure and nervous. Bad posture and a number of distracting movements.	Body language shows control. Good posture but some distracting movements.	Body language exhibits confidence. Good posture with not too many destructive movements.	Appears confident and comfortable at all times. Excellent posture and no distracting movements.
Refutation/Clash – Each speaker should demonstrate an ability to apply evidence and logic in refuting his opponent’s contentions.	No clash	Little clash to show the opposing arguments have been understood.	Clash shows some understanding of the opposing arguments.	Good clash demonstrating an understanding of the opposing arguments.	Clashes are appropriate and show a clear understanding of the opposing arguments.
	No counter-arguments made.	Almost no counter arguments made.	Few effective counter-arguments made.	Some effective counter arguments made.	Many effective counter-arguments are made.
Format: Cross Examination – Has each student demonstrated an ability to develop a series of questions which challenge the witness? Did the examiner remain in control? Did the witness show an understanding of the issues? Was the witness cooperative?	Questioning tactics are very poor. Questioner reads questions, appears to have no goal in mind. Questions are of a simplistic nature. Questioner lost control.	Questioning tactics are fair, but Questioner appears to have no goal in mind. Questions are reasonably phrased. Questioner at times loses control.	Questioning tactics are good but are single and do not form a series. Phrasing of questions is good. Questioner retains control.	Questioning tactics are clear and appear to have purpose in mind. Phrasing of Questions is well done. Questioner keeps questioning on target.	Questioning tactics are excellent. Questions form a series designed to get witnesses to admit contradictions. Questioner knows where he wants questions to lead.
	Witness appeared to have problems answering questions. Often answers were of a one-word variety. Often witness appeared to be hostile and made personal remarks. Examiner dominated questioning process.	Witness appeared to have difficulty answering. Often responses were uncertain and short. At times hesitated in making responses. Examiner took advantage of his uncertainty.	Witness answered questions honestly, courteously and was cooperative. He did not abuse the questioning process.	Witness shows a good understanding of issues. Is cooperative and courteous. Was able to dominate questioning process. Controlled cross examination exchange	Witness shows an excellent understanding of issues. Is always cooperative and courteous. Was able to take over control of questions. Dominated cross examination exchange.
	Speaker is rude, disrespectful, uncooperative, makes personal remarks.	Speaker occasionally shows disrespect & resistance. Appears to make personal remarks	Speaker is courteous and respectful, does not make personal remarks.	Speaker is courteous and cooperative. Does not make personal remarks.	Speaker looks and acts professionally, deliberately refrains from making personal remarks.