CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE RUBRIC FOR SPEECHES

This table of evaluation standards may be used by judges, who would like assistance in determining the scores for speeches.

	2 Fair	3 Average	4 Proficient	5 Excellent	6 Superior
Content: Organization, Evidence & Language	Speaks for ½ to 3 min. **Minimum** research, if any. Language use is **unclear or ineffective** **No stated purpose** or introduction or conclusion.	Speaks 2 to 3 min. Claims are asserted with **generalizations** & **no real evidence** Language use is **moderately clear** or with minimal effectiveness.	Speaks 2 ½ to 3 min. Purpose is present, however the speech **lacks organization** and/or developed ideas Analysis of evidence fails to connect its **relevance** to the speaker's claims Use of **language is weak**.	Speaks 2 to 3 min. Clear **purpose** is apparent. **Organization** may be somewhat loose. **Weak introduction**, conclusion, transition between points. **Diction** represents a grasp of language. Much **evidence** is presented, but **not in a persuasive** or effective manner; or the speaker relies on **one piece** of evidence but does effectively.	Speaks 2 ½ to 3 min. Content is **clear** and logically **organized** and characterized by **depth** of thought and **development** of ideas, supported by a variety of **credible quantitative** (statistical) and **qualitative** (testimony) **evidence, analyzed** effectively to draw conclusions. Compelling **language**, poignant conclusion. Purpose clearly stated.
Argument & Refutation	Speaker does **not offer points**. **Minimal** conviction.	Speaker offers mostly **unwarranted** assertions, which often simply **repeat/rehash** previous arguments.	Speaker needs to introduce **new arguments** (simply repeating previous arguments) or the speaker fails to **refute** previous argument; No real **clash** is present.	**New ideas and responses** to previous arguments are offered, but in an **unbalanced** manner (too much refutation or too many new arguments). Questions are answered **adequately**.	Contributes to the **spontaneity** of debate effectively. The speaker **synthesizes the response** refutation of previous ideas with **new arguments**. Response to questions with **confidence** and **clarity**.
Delivery	No **eye contact**. **Reads** directly from paper.	**Little eye contact**. **Gestures** and/or movement are present. Vocal presentation is inarticulate due to soft **volume** or lack of **enunciation**.	Presentation is **satisfactory**, but **unimpressively read** (perhaps monotonously) from prepared notes with errors in **pronunciation** and/or **minimal eye contact**. **Awkward gestures/movement** may be distracting.	The **presentation is strong,** but contains a few mistakes, including **some problems** with **pronunciation** and **enunciation** The speech may be **partially read** with **satisfactory** fluency. Physical presence may be awkward at times.	Speaker's voice control & physical poise are **polished, deliberate, crisp**, and **confident**. Delivery should be **extemporaneous**, with **few errors** in pronunciation. **Eye contact** is effective and consistent.