

Marking Guide for Judging Parliamentary Debates

Government (Team code ____)			Opposition (Team code ____)	
Name _____	Name _____		Name _____	Name _____
Prime Minister	Gov't Member	Criteria for individual evaluation A scale of 1 to 5, 1 is poor and 5 is excellent	Opp. Member	Leader of Opp.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Organization: The speech should be well structured, logical & coherent, containing and effective introduction and conclusion	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Evidence/Logic: Facts, statistics & authorities offered in support of contentions must be sound. Credit should be given for thorough and relevant research.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Delivery: Poise quality & use of voice, combined with emphasis, variety and enunciation. Effectiveness and ease of gestures, and eye contact should be assessed.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Refutation/Clash: The ability to apply logic and evidence in refuting the opponents' contentions while defending your own.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Format: Each student is expected to participate. Questions & answers should be concise & well phrased revealing a sound understanding of the issues. The students should be courteous & cooperative.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
____/25	____/25	Totals (please double check addition)	____/25	____/25

Parliamentary: Does each debater demonstrate an understanding of parliamentary procedure & adhere to the rules of the house/ Are points of order & privilege appropriately used? Are heckles short, witty & relevant?

Rule of Thumb: Start with 3 as average and go up or down.

Suggested Scoring Range

The vast majority of speeches that you will judge will range between 60% and 90%. Go above and below this range only for very strong reasons.

% Range	Mark out of 25	Debate skills required to attain this mark
96-100	25 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practically impossible – reserved for the gods! • You are privileged to be in the presence of such greatness. • Excellent
84-92	23 22 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much factual evidence; varied types of evidence with many examples • Clearly understands all aspects of the issue; clear logic shown • Case is clearly outlined and coordinated with partner; time used effectively • Persuasive, memorable delivery – effective use of voice and body language • Refutes all points of opposition; rebuilds own case; summarizes key themes • Good
72-80	20 19 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considerable factual evidence; gives several supporting examples for claims • Understands both sides of issue well; considerable logic is evident • Case is clearly outlined and coordinated with partner; speaker may run out of time • Pace, tone, diction, eye contact are mostly evident; does not rely solely on written speech; fairly persuasive delivery • Refutes most points of opposition; rebuilds own case strongly • Average
60-68	17 16 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some factual evidence; some support for claims with some examples • Basically understands one side of the issue well; some logic evident in arguments • Case is clearly outlined but team work may not be sufficient; time may not be used well • Delivery flaws in pace, tone, diction may reduce persuasiveness; much reliance on notes • Refutes some points of opposition; weak rebuilding of own case • Below average
48-56	14 13 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little factual evidence; little support for claims with few examples • Little understanding of overall issue; case does not hang together well; little logic evident • Outline of case unclear; little coordination with partner; time not used well • Speaker is uncomfortable, lacks confidence; tends to read notes • Refutes few opposing points; fails to rebuild own case
Below 48%	Sub 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impossible – no mark below this level may be given