

## DANEIS Parliamentary Debate Scoring Guide

70-74	75-79	80-84	85-89	90-94	95+
Serious flaws	Some flaws	Average/Good	Very Good	Outstanding	Goin' to Worlds!

- 95+            This person is among the very best debaters you will ever see and must receive an award today. This lawyer will not only get you acquitted of murder even when the State has mountains of rock-solid evidence against you, (s)he will successfully sue the State for harassing you.
- 90-94        An outstanding performance on every level. Should be in the running for an award today. This lawyer will probably get you acquitted.
- 85-89        An accomplished debater. This person may have a few minor flaws in his/her case, but all in all this is a very, very strong performance. This lawyer will get you 4 years in a minimum-security prison that has a full-service gym and free premium cable channels.
- 80-84        An average performance. This debater does well in all areas, but may also have a few logic flaws, a few missed opportunities in refutation, some hiccups in delivery, some weak evidence. This lawyer will plead your case down to manslaughter; you're facing eight-and-a-third to twenty-five.
- 75-79        A flawed performance. This debater is likely short on time or is very repetitive. (S)he is not well-organized, has serious logic flaws, minimal evidence, and vague refutations. This debater is unsure on his/her feet and is not a particularly smooth speaker. The jury finds you guilty.
- 70-74        A weak performance. Probably significantly under time, with little development of the case. Scant evidence and refutation. Unexplained leaps in logic. Halting, fidgety, delivery that fails to connect to the listener. This lawyer might get you convicted of murder even if you were demonstrably out of the country at the time of the crime.

Individual categories:

W	NI	F	G	VG	E
Weak	Needs Improvement	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent

- Organization:** Does the debater have a clear flow from point to point? Are the points properly sign-posted? Is there a unifying theme, or a stated common value/first principle at play?
- Analysis:** How thoroughly does the debater understand this issue? Is the case superficial, or does it delve deeply into nuances and complications? Does the debater see all sides of the issue?
- Logic:** Is the debater making observations and arguments that make sense given the topic and evidence on the table? Is the debater making unfounded or unexplained claims? Are the thought links present?
- Evidence:** Is the debater bolstering and illustrating his/her points with specific details that support his/her contentions? Is the rhetoric grounded in facts? Is the evidence being used related to the argument being presented? Is the debater's "spin" on that evidence, clever and convincing?
- Refutation:** Has the debater attacked the points of his/her opponent with logic and evidence? Has the debater successfully used what his/her opponent has said against him/her? Is the refutation vague, or specific, going point-by-point?
- Delivery:** How well does the debater command an audience? Does (s)he speak clearly and loudly? How is his/her eye contact and stance? Does (s)he connect with listeners? Does (s)he follow the rules of the House?

## DANEIS Parliamentary Debate Scoring Sheet

Resolution: \_\_\_\_\_

Round (circle): 1      2      3

Level (circle): Novice      Advanced

Government Code: \_\_\_\_\_

**PM:**

**MC:**

	Organ.	Analysis	Logic	Evidence	Refutation	Delivery	<b>Total</b>	Rank in Room
Prime Minister								
Minister of the Crown								

PM Comments:

MC Comments:

Team Total: \_\_\_\_\_



Opposition Code: \_\_\_\_\_

**MO:**

**LO:**

	Organ.	Analysis	Logic	Evidence	Refutation	Delivery	<b>Total</b>	Rank in Room
Member of the Opp.								
Leader of the Opp.								

MO Comments:

LO Comments:

Team Total: \_\_\_\_\_



I award this debate to the (circle):

Government

Opposition

Reasons for decision: \_\_\_\_\_

Judge's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Code: \_\_\_\_\_