

LC-1117 Debate rubric (Max points 20p)

Criteria & points	1p	2p	3p	4p	5p
<p>Structure and organisation of speeches</p> <p>-Clarity of message & focus -Fulfilment of task in the overall structure of the team's debate</p>	<p>Introduction (omitted an opening line reinforcing the team opinion) was missing or lacked relevance of the topic and message to the audience. Body of the speech was disorganized or did not support the overall team opinion. Topical focus was lost several times / the speech was very difficult to follow. Conclusion was missing or did not reinforce the team opinion. Significant time-management issues.</p>	<p>Introduction did not include an opening line reinforcing the team opinion or relevance thereof was not altogether apparent. Body of the speech was mostly organized but topical focus lost once or twice. Overall, the speech was somewhat easy to follow. Conclusion was satisfactory but may not have reinforced the team opinion clearly. Time was somewhat effectively managed.</p>	<p>Introduction (included an opening line reinforcing the team opinion) demonstrated the relevance of the topic and message to the audience. Body of the speech was organized and mostly supported the overall team opinion, but topical focus may have been occasionally a little unclear. Overall, the speech was quite easy to follow. Conclusion summarized the main points and reinforced the team opinion. Time was fairly effectively managed.</p>	<p>Introduction (included an opening line reinforcing the team opinion) demonstrated the relevance of the topic and message to the audience. Body of the speech was well organized and supported the overall team opinion. Topical focus maintained in most parts of the speech, and the speech was easy to follow. Conclusion summarized the main points and convincingly reinforced the team opinion. Time was effectively managed.</p>	<p>Introduction (included an opening line reinforcing the team opinion) demonstrated the relevance of the topic, using imagination and capturing audience interest. Body of the speech was clearly organized and convincingly supported the overall team opinion. The speech stayed focused on the topic throughout. The speech was coherent and very easy to follow. Conclusion summarized the main points effectively & reinforced the team opinion using imagination & capturing audience interest. Time was managed very effectively.</p>
<p>Delivery: motivating the audience to listen</p> <p>-Voice usage & pace -Attention grabber and use of persuasive appeals (ethos, pathos, logos) -Level of complexity and targeting the main message for the audience -Suitability of vocabulary range and expressions for the purpose -Use of transitions to move between points and guide the audience -Preparation and confidence in contents</p>	<p>No attention grabber and/or no use of persuasive appeals. Unenthusiastic or monotonous delivery. Problems in voice usage and pace. The level of complexity was insufficient with regard to the background knowledge of the audience. Too much technical jargon/inadequate vocabulary range. Appears unprepared: used notes too often / rambled aimlessly / poor eye contact. Used no transitional phrases.</p>	<p>Ineffective attention grabber and/or use of persuasive appeals. Somewhat unenthusiastic delivery and/or some problems in voice usage and/or pace. Message comes through but level of complexity inconsistent or at times inappropriate. Vocabulary range: mostly fair but may occasionally include irrelevant technical jargon. Appears somewhat unprepared: used notes often/ only occasional eye contact. Used few transitional phrases.</p>	<p>Satisfactory attention grabber and/or use of persuasive appeals. Sufficiently engaging and interesting delivery. Voice usage and pace mainly ok. Level of complexity mostly appropriate. Technical jargon, if used, mostly explained with an adequate vocabulary range. Used occasional transitional phrases. Contents sufficiently elaborated: Spoke fairly freely and confidently / good rapport most of the time.</p>	<p>Good attention grabber and/or use of persuasive appeals. Mostly engaging and interesting delivery. Good pace and voice usage. Level of complexity is appropriate and vocabulary range suits the occasion/audience. Used transitional phrases in most parts of the talk. Appears well-prepared: spoke freely and confidently / very good rapport most of the time.</p>	<p>Effective / imaginative attention grabber and/or use of persuasive appeals. Engaging and interesting delivery that showed enthusiasm. Voice usage and pace varied naturally and effectively. Message presented in a very clear and audience-friendly manner: The level of complexity fully appropriate. The presenter shows the ability to link new information with audience's prior knowledge. Consistently used transitional phrases. Very well prepared: Contents elaborated upon expertly & confidently. Spoke very naturally &, when needed, emphatically /excellent rapport throughout.</p>

<p>Challenging and defending team position</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Refuting points & arguments by the opposing team -Responding to Points of Information (POI) -Challenging the opposing team with POIs 	<p>Did not challenge the opposing team's viewpoint: Refutations missing or poorly presented / justified. Unable to respond to or recover from Points of Information. No or badly thought-out POIs given to challenge the opposing team.</p>	<p>Refutations presented but may have been occasionally somewhat poorly presented / justified. Fair attempt at responding to most POIs received, but occasional unsatisfactory responses or had some difficulties recovering from POIs. May have raised POIs to challenge the opposing team but the point remained somewhat unclear or ineffective.</p>	<p>Refutations were satisfactorily presented & justified. Answered Points of Information sufficiently to defend team position. Sufficient presentation of relevant POIs to challenge the opposing team.</p>	<p>Refutations were presented & justified in a structured manner. Handled Points of Information well and recovered to sustain team position. Good presentation of relevant POIs to challenge the opposing team.</p>	<p>Well-structured refutations were convincingly and consistently presented & justified. Handled Points of Information extremely well - counter-arguing fluently, and/or using the POI to strengthen their own team's position. Thought-provoking POIs presented to challenge the opposing team.</p>
<p>Fluency/Intelligibility</p>	<p>Pausing for grammatical & lexical planning & self-correction was very evident, affecting intelligibility. Poor control of pronunciation with mistakes that often hindered understanding. Poor vocabulary & grammar with noticeable mistakes.</p>	<p>Occasional self-correction which sometimes affected intelligibility. Satisfactory control of pronunciation with mistakes that sometimes hindered understanding. Satisfactory vocabulary & grammar but with occasional, noticeable mistakes.</p>	<p>Language contained some hesitation as speaker searched for patterns and expressions. Good control of pronunciation with a few mistakes. Good vocabulary & grammar with occasional 'slips' or non-systematic errors.</p>	<p>Expressed themselves fluently. Very good control of pronunciation. Very good vocabulary & grammar; errors or 'slips' were rare.</p>	<p>Expressed themselves fluently and spontaneously, almost effortlessly. Very good or excellent control of pronunciation. Very good or excellent vocabulary & grammar; errors or 'slips' were rare & difficult to spot.</p>