

	Indicators	70-75	76-81	82-87	88-93	94-100
		Not Yet	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
Argument	Definition (First speakers only)	No definition was presented or the definition that was presented was irrelevant to the topic.	The definition that was presented was vague and did not provide clear boundaries for the team's argument.	The definition was relevant to the topic. The key words of the topic were clearly defined.	The speaker clearly defined the key words of the topic and explained the team's interpretation of the topic as a whole.	The key words of the topic were clearly and precisely defined and the team's interpretation of the topic as a whole was presented in a clear and unambiguous way.
	Rebuttal (First Affirmative is exempt)	The speaker had very little or no rebuttal.	The speaker's rebuttal needs work as it did not address the opposition's points in any substantial way.	The speaker's rebuttal was satisfactory for this level and generally addressed the points raised by the opposition. Each rebuttal point was clearly linked back to the topic.	The speaker's rebuttal was very good for this level and clearly addressed key points raised by the opposition in a substantial way. Each rebuttal point was clearly linked back to the topic.	The speaker's rebuttal was excellent for this level and clearly addressed key points raised by the opposition in a substantial way. The rebuttal was so effective that it appeared very difficult for the opposition to recover the addressed points. Each rebuttal point was clearly linked back to the topic.
	Relevance and substance of arguments	The quality of argument was unsatisfactory as the arguments were developed in a basic way, lacked substance and were mostly irrelevant to the topic.	The quality of argument needs work and was below what is expected at this level. Arguments were not always relevant or explained in a clear way.	The quality of argument was satisfactory for this level. Arguments were generally relevant and substantial. Arguments were generally well explained.	The quality of argument was very good for this level, and was relevant and substantial. Arguments were explained in depth by the speaker and were very compelling.	The quality of argument was well above what is expected at this level. Arguments showed insight and a great deal of personal reflection. Arguments were explained in depth by the speaker and were very compelling.
	Evidence and reasoning	There was little or no evidence or reasoning presented for arguments.	There was some evidence/reasoning in the speech. The speaker did not explain how the evidence/reasoning linked back to the argument.	There was clear evidence/reasoning in the speech. The speaker linked this evidence/reasoning back to the argument.	The evidence/reasoning in the speech was good for this level which was generally well explained and linked back to the argument. The source of any research was clearly stated.	There was excellent evidence and reasoning, well above what is expected at this level. The evidence/reasoning was presented clearly, explained and linked back to the argument. The source of any research was clearly stated.
Presentation	Presentation and engagement	The speaker made little to no engagement with the audience.	The speaker's engagement with the audience needs work. The speaker rarely made eye contact and/or could not be heard.	The speaker's engagement with the audience was satisfactory for this level. The speaker showed evidence of a reasonable level of eye contact, and use of voice. No nervous behaviour was observed.	The speaker's engagement with the audience was very good. Eye contact, gestures and an easy to understand manner were present.	The speaker's engagement with the audience was excellent, well above what is expected at this level. The speaker consistently maintained eye contact, used gestures, spoke in a clear and easy to understand manner that was appropriate for the material being presented. The speaker seemed confident and comfortable when speaking.
Structure	Speaker roles and teamwork	The speaker failed to address a substantial number of his/her speaker responsibilities.	The speaker did not address all of his/her speaker responsibilities.	The speaker covered all of the jobs for his/her speaking role.	The speaker covered all of the jobs for his/her speaking role. There was some evidence of team work.	The speaker covered all of the jobs for his/her speaking role. There was clear and consistent evidence of team work.
	Organisation of ideas (structure)	Speech was very poorly structured, with little overall organisation. It was difficult to understand what the speaker intended.	Speech was poorly structured, with limited overall organisation. It was sometimes difficult to understand what the speaker intended.	Speech was satisfactorily structured, with adequate overall organisation. Concepts were generally used clearly. The time limit was met sufficiently.	Speech was well structured, with a clear overall organisation. Concepts were used or developed clearly. The time limit was met sufficiently.	Speech was very well structured, with effective overall organisation. Concepts were used clearly and, where appropriate, refined by helpful explanations. The time limit was met sufficiently.