

Canadian Student Debating Federation

SCORE SHEET

Date: _____ Round: _____ Location: _____ Judge: _____

(Circle) Style of Debating: Academic Cross-Examination Parliamentary

Affirmative / Government

Negative / Opposition

First Debater

Second Debater

First Debater

Second Debater

Weak Aver. Strong

Weak Aver. Strong

Weak Aver. Strong

Weak Aver. Strong

			Analysis			
			Material			
			Delivery			
			Rebuttal			
			Organization			
			Debate Skills			

Please check that you have evaluated each debater in every category.

Comments:

First Affirmative:

First Negative:

--	--

Second Affirmative:

Second Negative:

--	--

Criteria

We do not ask you to work with numbers when scoring the debaters. Simply mark the box that you think best describes each debater's level of skill for each of the six categories of evaluation. Please look for the following elements when evaluating debaters:

Analysis

Are the definitions and the interpretation of the resolution sound and reasonable? Does the debater understand the whole question being debated, the essence of his/her opponent's objections to his/her arguments, and how the particular issues that emerge during the debate relate to one another? Is the logic of the debater sound? Does the debater recognize and expose weaknesses in opponents' evidence and reasoning? Does he/she distinguish between substance and rhetoric?

Material

"Material" is not simply another word for "facts" but includes any means a debater may use to substantiate an assertion, including humour. Does the debater choose a reasonable means to substantiate his/her assertions and is there sufficient substantiation for all important assertions? Does it appear that the debater has thoroughly researched the topic? Does the debater adequately substantiate assertions by relying on reasoning and evidence?

Delivery

Does the debater demonstrate an effective style for presenting his/her arguments or does he/she merely read a prepared speech? Does he/she observe the mechanics of good speech as well as choosing an appropriate style (including posture, use of gestures, variety and the mannerisms and personality he/she conveys)? Is his/her delivery smooth and spontaneous?

Rebuttal

Is the debater able to identify and summarize the important contentions raised by his/her opponents and then answer those contentions directly or by clear implication? Does the debater refute specific points as well as the case in general? Is he/she able by the use of appropriate material to respond successfully to the important challenges and objections to his/her arguments raised by his/her opponents? Does the debater demonstrate the ability to make good use of logic and evidence in refutation?

Organization

Does the debater present his/her case in a clear, logical fashion that allows the listener to understand the relevance of and the transition between arguments? Do all speakers for the team present a unified, coherent case? Is there an effective introduction and conclusion? Are ideas within a speech developed in a fluent, logical order?

Debate Skills (as relevant)

Does the debater demonstrate knowledge of and make effective use of the rules? Can the debater heckle and handle heckling (where permitted) with ease? Does the debater use humour and rhetorical devices to advantage? Is the debater successful at answering as well as questioning an opponent? Is the debater a good listener? Is he/she courteous?

Parliamentary style - Is the use of Points of Order, Points of Privilege and Points of Information appropriate? Do the interruptions serve to identify an error or merely disrupt the debate? Are the interruptions as succinct as possible? Is heckling appropriate? Is it short, succinct and witty? Does it serve to identify inaccurate material or reasoning?

Questioning - Does the questioner elicit valuable admissions from his/her opponent? Are the questions well organized and relevant? Are the questions clear and precisely phrased? Is the questioner courteous? Is what is sought relevant and fair? Does the questioner avoid speech making?

Answering - Are the answers honest? Are the answers resourceful or merely evasive? Does the witness through his use of material or his knowledge of the subject demonstrate the fallacies in the arguments implicit in the questions put to him/her? Is the witness courteous? Does he/she respect the right of the examiner to control the examination? Does he/she attempt to provide answers or merely counter with further questions?