

## VIRTUAL BIOMEDICAL DEBATE AFFIRMATIVE RATING SHEET

Section # \_\_\_\_\_  
Team Names & # \_\_\_\_\_

Judge's Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Division: SS \_\_\_\_ PS \_\_\_\_

<b>1. Affirmative Constructive Speech by Team</b>						
	<b>Excellent 10 points</b>	<b>Good 8 points</b>	<b>Average 6 points</b>	<b>Fair 4 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
A. Arguments & Evidence (Persuasiveness)	The arguments & evidence clearly expresses the team's viewpoint in a highly persuasive manner.	The arguments & evidence mostly expresses the team's viewpoint and provides responses that are persuasive.	The arguments & evidence somewhat express the team's viewpoint and provides moderately persuasive responses.	The arguments & evidence are slightly persuasive.	The arguments are not persuasive or there is not an argument presented	
B. Flow & Logic of speech	The content of the speech flows smoothly, is thoughtfully constructed and makes logical sense.	The content of the speech flows smoothly and makes sense.	The speech flows moderately smoothly and makes sense most of the time.	The speech has an inconsistent flow and makes sense some of the time.	The speech does not flow or make logical sense.	
	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
C. Relevance of arguments	All arguments were accurate, relevant and strong. Was able to defend position.	Majority of arguments were accurate, relevant and strong. Was able to defend position.	Some of the arguments were accurate, relevant and strong. Was somewhat able to defend position.	Arguments were not accurate and/or relevant. Was unable to defend position.	No arguments were made. Unable to defend position.	
<b>Negative Constructive Speech (key points read by judges)</b> -----						
<b>2. Affirmative Rebuttal by Team</b>						
	<b>Excellent 10 points</b>	<b>Good 8 points</b>	<b>Average 6 points</b>	<b>Fair 4 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
A. Evidence and effectiveness	The affirmative rebuttal was clear and highlighted the point of view with confidence.	The affirmative rebuttal was effective.	The evidence used in the affirmative rebuttal was mediocre.	Not enough evidence was used in the affirmative rebuttal.	No evidence was provided in the affirmative rebuttal.	
B. Clarification of argument	The affirmative rebuttal was clear and significantly strengthened the affirmative point of view	N/A	The affirmative rebuttal reiterated the position but did not add anything to the argument.	N/A	No affirmative rebuttal was provided.	
C. Relevance of rebuttal	Rebuttal was articulately stated and offered strong relevant, researched data to support the argument.	The rebuttal offered good research and supported the argument.	The rebuttal offered mediocre researched data to support the argument.	Little relevancy was offered in the rebuttal. More data/supporting information needed to support the point.	No rebuttal was offered or the rebuttal was not relevant to the topic.	

<b>3. Overall Debate Qualities</b>						
	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>A. Decorum,</b> professional behavior	All statements and responses were respectful and appropriate.	N/A	Most statements and responses were respectful.	N/A	Decorum was not professional. Statements and responses were consistently not respectful.	
<b>B. Voice</b> Pitch, tempo, volume, quality	Each competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitors varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	Each competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitor varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	Each competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitors attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.	Most of the competitor's voices were low. Judges have difficulty hearing the presentation.	Judge had difficulty hearing and/or understanding much of the speech due to low volume. Little variety in rate or volume.	
	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>C. Stage Presence</b> Poise, posture, eye contact, and enthusiasm	Movements & gestures were purposeful and enhanced the delivery of the speech and did not distract. Body language reflects comfort interacting with audience. Facial expressions and body language consistently generated a strong interest and enthusiasm for the topic.	The competitors maintained adequate posture and non-distracting movement during the speech. Some gestures were used. Facial expressions and body language sometimes generated an interest and enthusiasm for the topic.	Stiff or unnatural use of nonverbal behaviors. Body language reflects some discomfort interacting with audience. Limited use of gestures to reinforce verbal message. Facial expressions and body language are used to try to generate enthusiasm but seem somewhat forced.	Most of the competitor's posture, body language, and facial expressions indicated a lack of enthusiasm for the topic. Movements were distracting.	No attempt was made to use body movement or gestures to enhance the message. No interest or enthusiasm for the topic came through in presentation.	
<b>D. Diction*, Pronunciation** and Grammar</b>	Delivery emphasizes and enhances message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. No vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone heightened interest and complemented the verbal message.	Delivery helps to enhance message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. Minimal vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone complemented the verbal message	Delivery adequate. Enunciation and pronunciation suitable. Noticeable verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Tone seemed inconsistent at times.	Delivery quality minimal. Regular verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Delivery problems cause disruption to message.	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	
<b>E. Team Participation</b>	Two team members spoke and carried equal parts of the debate.	N/A	N/A	N/A	One team member dominated the debate.	
<b>Total Points (80):</b>						