



Oregon's Muslim Youth (OMY) Debate

Speaker Point Assessment Rubric

*Please rate each speaker on a scale from 1 to 10
1 = lowest; 10 = highest*

Score	Description	Argumentation	Structure & Organization	Presentation
1	A score of 1 should be reserved for debaters who are using obnoxious, disruptive, or mean-spirited techniques.			
2	Below average performance	Offers assertions with negligible reasoning or evidence.	Not organized. Arguments not clearly distinguished from one another. Doesn't use full time.	Mumbles, doesn't look up from notes, appears anxious, disengages from debate after speech.
3	Speech is moderately successful in a few areas & unsuccessful in others	Inconsistent argument, missing reasoning & evidence.	Speech is difficult to follow at times. May fill up time, but not effectively.	Speech loses clarity for sustained periods, poor eye contact & body language, points are largely ineffective
4	Near average, an inconsistent performance	Missing some reasoning and evidence.	Little support of partners' arguments, inconsistent organization of general & specific argumentation.	Speaks clearly, but errors distract audience & undermine content.
5	Average performance, competent debater	Identifies obvious opposing issues, misses nuanced or complex issues.	Organized & generally effective, attempts a narrative structure but not able to consistently adhere to it, good use of time.	Speaks clearly, speech errors noted by audience, but doesn't undermine content, may exclude some presentation elements (eye contact, volume, gestures, etc.)
6	Above average, good debate speech with more style & content than expected for the circumstances	Able to make an effective argument & identify key opposing arguments, likely to use only direct refutation, but does so effectively.	Simple narrative structure for own arguments but has some difficulty integrating effective counter-positions into speech.	Speaks in an engaging manner, demonstrates some confidence & credibility, occasional verbal pauses (umm...), ineffective with some presentation elements (eye contact, volume)
7	Quite exceptional, strong debater delivering an above average speech, consistent in delivery & argumentation	Able to establish clear position requiring a sophisticated reply, has highly effective reasoning & use of evidence.	Logical but inconsistent organization, missing effective intro or conclusion, adds to teammates' arguments rather than repeating previous arguments.	Animated speaker, able to present clear & coherent position about debate rather than offering individual arguments, solid presentation skills.
8	A well above average debater giving an exceptional speech	Constructs correct arguments on-the-spot to respond to new issues in the debate, constructs detailed arguments with substantial evidence to support sound reasoning.	Organized in a way that's logical & easy to understand, integrates major supporting & opposing arguments into the speech.	A persuasive presentation that effectively uses humor, effective pausing, & vocal inflection to add depth to the speech.
9 or 10	Near flawless performance	Sophisticated understanding of issues & opponent strategies, critiques underlying assumptions & offers alternative plans of action	Uses stable narrative speech structure, organizing by categories relevant to the debate, restores order to a confused debate round.	Has exceptional knowledge about the subject, is very involved in debate, outstanding verbal & non-verbal skills including pace, clarity, & humor.