

# Mini - Debate Rubric for Judges

Name of Judge: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of PRO: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of CON: \_\_\_\_\_

	5-4	3	2	1	SCORE
<b>Preparation and Presentation:</b> Preparation includes the research process and the organization of materials to make the presentation.	The debater was fully prepared and organized. They communicated clearly, using effective vocabulary, good grammar, volume and rate of delivery. They were confident and persuasive. Also, the debater was respectful and courteous to opponents without dominating the discussion	The debater was prepared and organized. They communicated effectively most of the time and were persuasive. Also, the debater was respectful and courteous to opponents without dominating the discussion	The debater was not prepared or organized. Their speaking skills were good, but sometimes hard to understand due to ineffective vocabulary and/or volume. The debater was respectful and courteous to opponents, but may have dominated the discussion on occasion.	The debater was not prepared or organized. Their argument was limited due to ineffective vocabulary and/or they could not be heard due to low volume.  Regardless of how well they did, if they were disrespectful they automatically score low.	Pro:
					Con:
<b>Evidence:</b> Evidence refers not only to statistics, facts and references to authority, but also to items of common or general knowledge.	The debater supplied strong, sufficient evidence to support its arguments. The debater showed strong, clearly logical connections between many events or issues and large social, economic, and/or political concerns, trends or developments.	The debater supplied appropriate and sufficient evidence to support its arguments, and/or applied that evidence clearly and logically, most of the time. The debater showed good connections between a few events or issues and concerns.	The debater supplied some evidence and/or applied that evidence clearly and logically some of the time. The debater showed one or two connections between events or issues and/or concerns.	The debater had very little evidence and/or it was not clearly applied. No connections were made between events or issues and large social, economic, and/or political concerns, trends or developments.	Pro:
					Con:
<b>Argumentation:</b> Systematic reasoning	The debater strongly addressed the topic in an organized and consistent manner by presenting logical, <u>reasonable</u> , and convincing arguments.	The debater sufficiently addressed the topic in an organized and consistent manner by presenting logical, <u>reasonable</u> , and convincing arguments.	The debater attempted to address the topic in an organized manner by presenting <u>reasonable</u> and/or convincing arguments.	The debater did not present an organized, reasonable, convincing argument.	Pro:
					Con:
<b>Analysis:</b>	The debater demonstrated a strong understanding of the issues involved by explaining the evidence during the debate clearly and effectively. They responded directly to opposing arguments, and/or analyses, with clear explanations of the weakness of opposing arguments.	The debater demonstrated a good understanding of the issues involved by explaining the evidence during the debate clearly or effectively. They responded reasonably to opposing arguments and/or analyses, with explanations of the weakness of opposing arguments.	The debater demonstrated a limited understanding of the issues involved by explaining the evidence during the debate effectively. They attempted to respond to opposing arguments, but with limited explanations of the weakness of opposing arguments.	The debater was unable to demonstrate an understanding of the issues involved effectively and/or they were unable to identify any weaknesses in opposing arguments.	Pro:
					Con:
<b>Cross-Examination</b>	The debater provided strong, focused and brief questions to the opposition. When in the position of answering, the debater responded effectively to questions.	The debater provided relevant, brief questions, though a little unclear. When answering, the debater responded effectively to questions, but not clearly at first.	The debater provided relevant questions, but they weren't brief or they were unclear. When answering, the debater responded to questions, but not clearly.	The debater did not ask relevant questions. When responding to questions, they were not able to answer them.	Pro:
					Con:

Rubric adapted from ProQuest Teacher Mini-Debate Guide

TOTAL SCORES: Pro: \_\_\_\_\_ Con: \_\_\_\_\_