

## DSABC Judging Scoresheet

Judge Name:

Room Number:

<b>Proposition Team Name:</b>		<b>Opposition Team Name:</b>	
<b>1st Proposition Name</b>	1st Proposition Score (75-95)	<b>1st Opposition Name</b>	1st Opposition Score (75-95)
<b>2nd Proposition Name</b>	2nd Proposition Score (75-95)	<b>2nd Opposition Name</b>	2nd Opposition Score (75-95)
<b>Total Proposition Score (sum speaker 1 and 2)</b>		<b>Total Opposition Score (sum speaker 1 and 2)</b>	
<p><b>The debate is therefore awarded to (circle one): Proposition / Opposition</b>  <i>The winning team must receive the higher scores.</i></p>			

### Scoring Range Guidelines

*The champion speaker usually averages ~90. The average is 85. Bottom-ranking speakers usually average ~82.*

	75-79	80-84	85	86-90	91-95
<b>Overall</b>	Debaters having difficulty with the topic, rules, and format. Hesitant speakers who do not fulfill their role.	Debaters with rudimentary skills. They understand the format but likely have significant gaps in arguments, refutation, and/or style.	Average debaters for the level of the tournament. They fulfill their role, show some insight into the topic, and provide adequate content.	Good debaters with convincing arguments, rebuttal, and questioning skills. Style is engaging and interesting.	Exceptional debaters with skills far beyond the rest of the field. They are articulate, eloquent, and captivating, with few/no flaws.
<b>Evidence &amp; analysis</b>	No or very poorly constructed arguments. Content may be irrelevant to the topic.	Mediocre arguments with clear flaws, little evidence, and/or minimal connection to the topic.	Good arguments relevant to the motion with some evidence and critical thinking.	Excellent arguments clearly linked to the motion with ample evidence, logic, and critical thinking.	Outstanding arguments. No flaws in the arguments and extremely difficult to refute.
<b>Rebuttal &amp; clash</b>	No or very poorly constructed responses to opponents' material.	Minimal response to their opponent's material. Responses may not address the 'true' nature of the point.	Adequate refutation that addresses the main points of the other side, perhaps with some flaws.	Excellent refutation that clearly addresses the main points of the other side.	Outstanding refutation that comprehensively rebuts their opponent's points.
<b>Organisation &amp; structure</b>	No or poor organisation. Speech is extremely difficult to follow.	Substandard organisation. Speech is difficult to follow.	Adequate organisation that does not hinder understanding.	Well-organised speech that is easy to follow and clearly structured.	Perfectly organised speech that is extremely easy to follow.
<b>Delivery &amp; etiquette</b>	Hesitant, halting, and/or very rude speakers.	Hesitant speakers who lack confidence and/or breach etiquette.	Adequate speakers with some public speaking skills. No etiquette concerns.	Great speakers who are engaging and dynamic. No etiquette concerns.	Excellent speakers with impeccable style. No etiquette concerns.
<b>Questions &amp; responses</b>	No questions asked or answered (assuming questions were offered).	Off-topic questions asked and questions answered poorly.	Asks and answers questions adequately.	Good use of questioning and responding to support their side.	Excellent questions and answers that support their side of the debate.

*You do not need to weigh each category equally - try to judge holistically. Do not let your prior knowledge or biases affect your adjudication of the round.*