

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_

Chamber Senate \_\_ IA \_\_ IB \_\_ IC \_\_ ID \_\_ IIA \_\_ IIB \_\_ IIC \_\_ IID \_\_ Resolution \_\_\_\_\_ Speech # \_\_\_\_\_ Score (1-10) \_\_\_\_\_

Students may have qualities from more than one category (strong, effective, emerging) of the rubric. The score should be assigned based on where the speaker has the majority of the his/her strengths.

Points	1-2 Emerging	3-4 Developing	5-6 Effective	7-8 Strong	9-10 Very Strong
Content: Evidence & Language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The speech is too short (30 seconds or less)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claims are only asserted with generalizations and no real evidence.</li> <li>Language use is unclear or ineffective.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence is minimal or fails to connect its relevance to the speaker's claims.</li> <li>Use of language is weak.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diction represents a grasp of language.</li> <li>Much evidence is presented, but not in a persuasive or effective manner; or the speaker relies on <i>one</i> piece of evidence, but does so effectively.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content is supported by a variety of credible quantitative (statistical) and qualitative (testimony) evidence</li> <li>Compelling language, a poignant introduction and conclusion and lucid transitions clearly establish the speaker's purpose and frame the perspective of the issue's significance.</li> </ul>
Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The speech has no attempt at organization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The speech lacked a clear thesis and organizational structure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the speaker's purpose is present, the speech lacks logical organization and/or developed ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While a clear purpose is apparent, organization may be somewhat loose (weak introduction/conclusion; no transitions between points).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content is clearly and logically organized, and characterized by depth of thought and development of ideas</li> </ul>
Analysis: Argument & Refutation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The speech is incomplete</li> <li>The speech does not relate to the debate on the floor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The speaker offers mostly unwarranted assertions</li> <li>Arguments often simply repeat/refresh previous arguments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The analysis of evidence fails to connect to the claims made by the speaker.</li> <li>The speaker fails to either introduce new arguments (simply repeating previous arguments)</li> <li>The speaker fails to refute previous opposing arguments; in other words, no real clash is present.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The analysis of the topic is effective, but may not be derived directly for the evidence.</li> <li>New ideas and response to previous arguments are offered, but in an unbalanced manner (too much refutation or too many new arguments).</li> <li>Questions are answered adequately.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ideas are analyzed effectively to draw conclusions from evidence.</li> <li>The speaker contributes to the spontaneity of debate, effectively synthesizing response and refutation of previous ideas with new arguments.</li> <li>If the speaker fields questions, he/she responds with confidence and clarity.</li> </ul>
Delivery		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little eye contact, gestures and/or movement are present.</li> <li>Vocal presentation is inarticulate due to soft volume or lack of enunciation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation is satisfactory, yet unimpressively read (perhaps monotonously) from prepared notes,</li> <li>The speaker has errors in pronunciation and/or minimal eye contact.</li> <li>Awkward gestures/ movement may be distracting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presentation is strong, but contains a few mistakes, including problems with pronunciation and enunciation.</li> <li>The speech may be partially read with satisfactory fluency.</li> <li>Physical presence may be awkward at times.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The speaker's vocal control and physical poise are polished, deliberate, crisp and confident.</li> <li>Delivery should be extemporaneous, with few errors in pronunciation.</li> <li>Eye contact is effective and consistent.</li> </ul>

Scores of **less than three (3)** are rarely encouraged, and should be reserved for such circumstances as abusive language, a degrading personal attack on another legislator, or for a speech that is extremely brief (30 seconds or less) or delivered without purpose or dignity for the cause exhorted by the legislation. Substantial written comments and description of specific incidents should accompany such scores.

Comments: (use the back if more space is needed)