

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
CONTENT 40	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32
Argumentation: Claims well supported by adequate reasons. Examples: Accurate Relevant Clear logic	Little to no argument, totally irrelevant. Totally flawed.	Mostly one-line argumentation. Largely descriptive. Major irrelevancies.	Basic argumentation evident, with flaws. Use of examples absent or poor. Some aspects irrelevant.	Some argumentation, on a basic level. Some examples, but not fully explained. Difficulty in convincing.	Picks out and explains issues. Some argumentation. Some use of example/analogy. Some attempt to prove arguments.	Picks out and explains relevant issues. Clear attempt at argumentation. Uses examples/analogy/proof.	Good explanation of relevant issues. Argumentation sound for a large portion of speech. Relevant examples/analogy used well.	Issues engaged with and explained very well. Argumentation sound for most of the speech. Uses examples or analogy well to back up argumentation. Very convincing.	Almost flawless argumentation. Subtle analysis. Excellent use of examples/analogy or proof. Totally convincing. Sophisticated.
STYLE 40	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32
Presentation: Convincing, audible, clear Structure: External structure Internal structure	Very flawed. Style makes it impossible to follow content. Little or no structure.	Style impacts negatively on content and ability to convince. Little or no structure.	Flaws are evident and impact negatively on ability to convince. Some structure, but not clearly sign-posted.	Can communicate, but with some flaws (boring, nervous, stumbles etc). Some external and internal structure evident.	Competent, can communicate, some flaws. Largely fluent. Style does not interfere with content. Structure is relatively clear.	Communicates well. Fluent and pleasant. Clear structure. Some flaws.	Communicates well. Pleasant and convincing. Easy to follow and listen to. Very clear structure. Some very minor flaws.	Communicates very well. Very pleasant and very convincing. Fluent. Very clear structure. Very few / minor flaws. Enhances content.	Style is superlative. Convincing, fluent and very pleasing communication. Enhances content to a large degree. Structure is crystal clear.
STRATEGY 20			12	13	14	15	16		
Understanding of issues Prioritisation of arguments (team strategy) Role fulfillment Timing			Little or no understanding of issues. Timing problematic. Little or no role fulfillment. Arguments poorly prioritised.	Attempts to grasp issues. Some evidence of prioritisation and team strategy. Problems with role fulfillment and timing.	Shows some understanding of issues. Arguments fit team strategy. Knows team role and fulfils some aspects. Some minor flaws.	Understands and articulates issues. Good timing and prioritisation with minor flaws. Fits into team structure, role fulfilled.	Excellent understanding and articulation of issues. Perfect timing and prioritisation. Fits very well into team structure. Team role fulfilled.		

Please remember: We mark between 60 and 80. 60 is the worst speaker you have ever seen, and expect ever to see. The speaker has no merit in content, style or strategy. 70 is the average speaker who has had roughly an equal number of flaws and good aspects in all three categories (or excels in one, but is quite weak in another). An 80 is the best speaker you have ever seen or expect ever to see. This is an unlikely score. Any speaker scoring above 74 should be considered for the provincial or SA Squad.

Please note: NOT every characteristic has to be fulfilled to gain a certain mark – there is some flexibility to the rubric and it is meant to guide your assessment.