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 and 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/correct. Difficulty in convincing.	**28** Picks out and explains issues somewhat. Some argumentation. Some use of example/ analogy/ some attempt to prove arguments.	**29** Picks out and explains relevant issues. Clear attempt at argumentation. Examples/ analogies/ proofs are correct and explained competently.	**30** Good explanation of relevant issues. Argumentation evident and sound for a large portion of the speech. Relevant examples/ analogy used well and analysed.	**31** Issues engaged with and explained very well. Argumentation sound for most of speech. Uses examples/ analogy well to back up argumentation. Very convincing.	**32** Almost flawless argumentation. 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 impossible to follow content.	**25** Many flaws make the speech difficult to follow/ listen to. Style impacts negatively on content and ability to convince.	**26** Flaws are evident and impact negatively on ability to convince.	**27** Can communicate, but with some flaws (eg boring, nervous, stumbles, badly structured….)	**28** Competent, can communicate, some flaws. Largely fluent. Can follow internal structure. Style does not interfere with Content.	**29** Communicates well. Fluent and pleasant. Evidence of internal structure. Some flaws.	**30** Communicates well. Pleasant and convincing. Easy to follow, well structured and listen to. Fluent. Some very minor flaws.	**31** Communicates very well. Very pleasant to listen to and very convincing. Very well structured. Fluent. Very few/ minor flaws. Style enhances content.	**32** Style is superlative. Convincing, fluent and very pleasing communication. Perfectly structured. Enhances content to a large degree.
STRATEGY (20) Please note: this category covers understanding of issues, team structure, timing, role fulfilment, team work.			**12** Little to no understanding of issues. Timing and team structure very problematic. Little/ no role fulfilment.	**13** Attempts to grasp issues. Problems with internal/team structure/timing. Problems with role fulfilment.	**14** Shows some understanding of issues; knows team role and fulfils some aspects. evidence of team structure. some flaws	**15** Understands and articulates issues, good team structure and timing with minor flaws. Fits into team structure, role fulfilled.	**16** Excellent understanding and articulation of issues. Timing 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 is 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.