



Toronto Debating Society | Debating.ca  
**Adjudication Score Card**

	Lacking (0 pts)	Satisfactory (1 pt)	Outstanding (2 pts)
<b>Argument</b> PM: <input type="text"/> LO: <input type="text"/> MG: <input type="text"/> MO: <input type="text"/>	few arguments, marginal relevancy, unclear	more than one clear, relevant argument	multiple, interesting arguments
<b>Content</b> PM: <input type="text"/> LO: <input type="text"/> MG: <input type="text"/> MO: <input type="text"/>	arguments are not supported with evidence	evidence for key premise in arguments	strong evidence for all arguments
<b>Rebuttal &amp; Refutation</b> MG: <input type="text"/> *2 LO: <input type="text"/> MO: <input type="text"/>	no counter arguments	no missed arguments, one clear rebuttal	devastating rebuttals and/or new arguments to support antithesis
<b>Style &amp; Rhetoric</b> PM: <input type="text"/> LO: <input type="text"/> MG: <input type="text"/> MO: <input type="text"/>	poorly organized, hesitations, flat, distracting mannerisms	crisp delivery, some flair	outstanding speech; uses humour and other rhetorical devices
<b>Teamwork</b> PM: <input type="text"/> LO: <input type="text"/> MG: <input type="text"/> MO: <input type="text"/>	no set-up or follow-through; some contradictions	speakers share in partial development of arguments	focused and seamless presentation, balance of styles
<b>Overall</b> PM: <input type="text"/> LO: <input type="text"/> MG: <input type="text"/> MO: <input type="text"/>	Poor definition; unpersuasive and incomprehensible	Good definition; more "hits" than "misses," generally solid performance	Good definition; perfect execution, interesting arguments, entertaining and persuasive
<b>TOTAL</b> GOV      OPP <input type="text"/> /12 <input type="text"/> /12			
Best Debater(s):			