

**ONTARIO PRO-CON DEBATING FORUM**  
**DEBATING RUBRIC**

Category	Level 1 (60-69%)	Level 2 (70-79%)	Level 3 (80-89%)	Level 4 (90-100%)
<b>Delivery (Out of 10)</b> The way debaters present themselves through the use of voice, tone, eye-contact and gesture.	<b>Range: 6.0-6.9</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Reads prepared text, but without fluency <input type="checkbox"/> Speaker is uncomfortable and lacking in confidence	<b>Range: 7.-7.9</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Mostly reads rather than delivers text <input type="checkbox"/> Speaker is comfortable for the most part with some evidence of pace, tone, diction, eye contact	<b>Range: 8.-8.9</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Does not rely solely on written text <input type="checkbox"/> Speaker's pace, tone, diction, eye contact is mostly evident	<b>Range: 9.-10.0</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates command of the text <input type="checkbox"/> Speaker's use of pace and tone are polished, convincing, persuasive, and memorable
<b>Content (Out of 20)</b> The content of speeches that includes claims made and examples given with an understanding of the central issue. There is evidence of the structure and organization of ideas. Speeches acknowledge the claims made or to be made by opponents ensuring some level of <i>clash of ideas</i> . As team that defines the resolution, Affirmative team has more responsibility to establish the case and prove its merits.	<b>Range: 12.0-13.9</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Makes little or no claims; has little supporting evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Gives few examples to illustrate arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Little understanding of the overall issue <input type="checkbox"/> Case is not clearly outlined; arguments are difficult to follow; not coordinated with partner's case <input type="checkbox"/> Little or no awareness of opponents' arguments with reference to specific details <input type="checkbox"/> Fails to refute opponents' arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Speaker makes poor use of allotted time	<b>Range: 14.0-15.9</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Makes some claims; has some supporting evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Gives some examples to illustrate arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Shows basic understanding of one side of the issue <input type="checkbox"/> Case is partially outlined without limited detail; case may not be coordinated at times with partner's case <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates some awareness of opponents' arguments with reference to specific details <input type="checkbox"/> Seldom refutes opponents' arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Speaker makes some good use of allotted time	<b>Range: 16.0-17.9</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Makes considerable claims; has lots of supporting evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Gives numerous examples to illustrate arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Understands both sides of the issue well <input type="checkbox"/> Case is clearly outlined with some very good insights; case is coordinated with partner's case <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates very good awareness of opponents' arguments with reference to specific details <input type="checkbox"/> Regularly refutes opponents' arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Speaker makes very good use of allotted time	<b>Range: 18.0-20.0</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Makes impressive claims; supporting evidence is compelling <input type="checkbox"/> Gives varied examples to illustrate arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Understands all aspects of the issue completely <input type="checkbox"/> Case clearly outlined, summarized and coordinated with partner <input type="checkbox"/> Structure and pacing of speech enhance arguments presented <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates excellent awareness of opponents' arguments with reference to specific details <input type="checkbox"/> Impressively refutes opponents' arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Expert handling of allotted time
<b>Questioning (Out of 6)</b> The way examiners ask questions of the witness.	<b>Range: 3.5-3.9</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Line of questioning, does not cohere, make logical sense or challenges opponent's arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Never addresses weaknesses in opponent's case	<b>Range: 4.0-4.9</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Line of questioning, demonstrates some logic and coherence in challenging opponent's arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally addresses weaknesses in opponent's case	<b>Range: 5.0-5.4</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Line of questioning, demonstrates very good, consistent attack of opponent's arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Often addresses weaknesses in opponent's case	<b>Range: 5.5-6.0</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent line of questioning that consistently, effectively challenges opponent's arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Consistently addresses weaknesses in opponent's case
<b>Answering (Out of 6)</b> The way in which witnesses answer questions from the examiner.	<b>Range: 3.5-3.9</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely gives direct, honest answers; may concede obvious points but often yields to opposition arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely answers directly; looks insecure, frustrated and intimidated <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely ever qualifies answers	<b>Range: 4.0-4.9</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally gives direct, honest answers; may concede obvious points but often yields to opposition arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally answers directly; occasionally looks confident and cooperative <input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally qualifies answers	<b>Range: 5.0-5.4</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Often gives direct, honest answers; may concede obvious points but occasionally yields to opposition arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Often answers directly without being evasive; looks very confident and cooperative <input type="checkbox"/> Often qualifies answers with detailed responses	<b>Range: 5.5-6.0</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Always gives direct, honest answers; concedes obvious points but never yields to opposition arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Always answers directly; always looks confident and cooperative <input type="checkbox"/> Always qualifies answers with detailed responses
<b>Rebuttal (Out of 8)</b> The method of summarizing and rebuilding one's case. The Negative team must counter the Affirmative team's case and cast doubt on its validity to win.	<b>Range: 5.0-5.4</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Refutes few or none of opponents' arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Fails to rebuild case following refutations raised by opponents <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely casts doubt on opponent's case	<b>Range: 5.5-6.4</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Refutes some of opponents' arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Rebuilds case competently following refutations raised by opponents <input type="checkbox"/> Casts doubt on some of opponent's case	<b>Range: 6.5-7.0</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Refutes most of the arguments of the opponent <input type="checkbox"/> Rebuilds case strongly following refutations raised by opponents <input type="checkbox"/> Able to cast doubt on opponents' case	<b>Range: 7.1-8.0</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Refutes all of opponents' arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Rebuilds own case convincingly <input type="checkbox"/> Finds the crux of the debate, summarizes key themes clearly, compellingly

\* For use in Pro-Con Debates. Diane Lang. (2007). Toronto: University of Toronto Schools. Adapted by Santino Bellisario. (2010). De La Salle College.