WODL Speech Preparation Sheet

Bill Title: _____

Affirmation or **Negation** (circle one)

Claim:

Reason 1:

Evidence:

Reason 2:

Evidence

Counterargument:

Evidence:

Response to Counterargument:

Conclusion (restate claim):

Wayne-Oakland Debate League-Speaker Ballot

Speaker School: _____ Speaker Name: _____

Division: **N / V** Chamber #: _____ Seat #: _____ Session I II

Scoring:

1=POOR 2=FAIR 3=AVERAGE (starting point) 4=EXCELLENT 5=SUPERIOR

Speech: Constructive Comments:

Reasoning: 1 2 3 4 5

Evidence: 1 2 3 4 5

Counter: 1 2 3 4 5

Organization: 1 2 3 4 5

Delivery: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

TOTAL SCORING: Total Speech: _____

BEST SPEECH SCORE (0 if non given) = _____

Overall Impact (quality questions, Appearance, Professionalism) 1 2 3 4 5 = _____

Total Score = SPEECH and IMPACT = _____

Where total scores are tied, the judge's discretion will decide the rank   *RANK* = _____

Judge: _____   School: _____

EXTRA NOTE SPACE FOR SPEAKER:

Legislative Debate Judging Rubric

	1 POOR	2 FAIR	3 AVERAGE	4 GOOD	5 SUPERIOR
DELIVERY *NOTE SCORE RANGE IS 1 – 10	1-2 Reserved for only the most casual presentations, or where the student is **not engaged**.	3-4 **Some substantial or significant failures** in vocal delivery or presentation.	5-6 Student demonstrates **competence** in delivery.	7-8 Student speaks with confidence, **broadly professional**, some vocal mannerisms may remain	9-10 Speaker is **polished in delivery and poise**. The style is natural, with vocal variety as appropriate.
ORGANIZATION	The speech rambles. **Lacks discernible organization** or point of view.	One or more **parts of the speech is missing**. Conclusion or introduction may be perfunctory.	Point of view is presented; **major sections present**.	Speaker **presents point of view**, signposts internal argument	**Well rounded in structure**, with clear introductions, development and conclusion. The point of view is carried throughout.
REASONING	An abusive speech. Speaker employs *ad hominem* attacks; states categorical approval or disapproval **without support**.	Speaker **appeals to personal experience**, appeals to emotional truth or moral truth as self-evident.	Speaker **provides reasons for position**. May have some logical fallacies.	Speaker provides reasons for position, links to previous points in debate. **Avoids logical fallacies**.	Speaker links position to broader issues of significance; **points relate in a unified view**.
EVIDENCE *MUST HAVE A CITED SOURCE INCLUDING "WHO, WHAT, WHEN" *	**No properly cited evidence** presented. Relies on personal experience or anecdote.	Cited evidence presented **minimally supports case**; may come from contested or biased sources.	Provides **at least one piece of** cited evidence pertinent to the point, drawn from press reports and analyses.	Provides **two or three pieces of** pertinent cited evidence. Quality may be mixed	Provides **multiple pieces of pertinent evidence with credible citations**.
CLASH	1 **Does not engage opposing views or** objections in speech. For authorship speeches, does not anticipate any arguments.	2 Speaker addresses general objections. **Not specific**. For authorship speeches, does not anticipate many arguments.	3 Provides **objections to other side**, argues for superiority of own case. Reacts to what has been said, but does not provide analysis. For authorship speeches, anticipates at least one opposing argument.	5 **Provides refutation**. May quote other side directly. Answers objections, explains superiority of his or her position. For authorship speeches, anticipates some opposing arguments.	5 Speaker **engages other arguments directly** with analysis, counters with superior cited evidence; advances new arguments. For First Aff. speeches, anticipates <u>most</u> opposing arguments.