

# Revolutionary Rhetoric

## Student Congress Amendment Form

Round \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Chamber \_\_\_\_\_

Author: \_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_

Bill/Resolution Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Lines: \_\_\_\_\_

Strike: \_\_\_\_\_

Lines: \_\_\_\_\_

Insert: \_\_\_\_\_

# Presiding Officer's Ballot

Round \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Committee or Chamber \_\_\_\_\_

Member's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Member's School \_\_\_\_\_

Presiding Officer's Name \_\_\_\_\_

---

Use one ballot for each member. **Please write legibly** and score each member in each category. Please also, as your time allows, comment under each area and/or make summary comments at the bottom as these really help the competitor improve. Additional comments can be made on the reverse.

## Positive Engagement and Activity

Was the member an active and courteous participant throughout the meeting by being actively engaged throughout the proceedings by being an active listener, asking quality questions and otherwise show continuous engagement?

\_\_\_\_\_ (1-20)

## Rules

Did the competitor show a strong understanding of the rules in their use of motions, amendments and their general familiarity with procedure? Did you have to rule them out of order or rule a motion to be not germane or to be dilatory?

\_\_\_\_\_ (1-20)

## Individual Legislative Goals

Did the member actively and effectively meet their legislative goals, be it passing their own legislation, or working to pass or kill other legislation that they spoke on and/or amended?

\_\_\_\_\_ (1-20)

## Party Goals

Did the member actively and effectively work to further the goals of the party through their speeches, amendments, questions and other activity?

\_\_\_\_\_ (1-20)

## Bipartisanship

Was the member regularly active in making good faith efforts to find compromises in order to achieve the committee or chamber's legislation goals even if they ultimately could not vote for a bipartisan agreement?

\_\_\_\_\_ (1-20)

# Revolutionary Rhetoric Congress Speaker's Ballot

Round \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Chamber \_\_\_\_\_ Authorship Speech (Circle One) YES/NO  
Speaker's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Speaker's School \_\_\_\_\_  
Length of Speech \_\_\_\_\_ Aff/Neg \_\_\_\_\_  
Topic/Bill # \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Name \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

Use one ballot for each speech. Rank each speech 1-5 (using no fractions or decimals and 5 being the highest) in each category. **Please write legibly** and comment under each area. Additional comments can be made on the reverse. Oral critiques are not permitted.

## Delivery:

Is eye contact comprehensive and natural, or is the speaker reading?  
Seriousness of purpose, style, poise, coherency, etc.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1-5)

## Originality of Thought:

Does the speech advance the debate with new ideas, information, and/  
or analysis, or does it simply rehash previous arguments and evidence?

\_\_\_\_\_ (1-5)

## Organization and Unity of Speech:

Is organized? Does it develop? Does it ramble?

\_\_\_\_\_ (1-5)

## Evidence and Logical Basis for Statements

Breadth of knowledge on the subject  
Cites valid sources

\_\_\_\_\_ (1-5)

## Overall Impact and Impression

Comments

\_\_\_\_\_ (1-5)

# Revolutionary Rhetoric Congress Legislation Ballot

**ENTER SCORE (0-25)** \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Committee \_\_\_\_\_

Speaker's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Speaker's School \_\_\_\_\_

Topic/Bill # \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Name \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

Use one ballot for each piece of legislation. Rank each speech 1-25 (using no fractions or decimals) **Please write legibly** and comment under each area. Additional comments can be made on the reverse.

Consider the legislation against the following criteria:

- Is the legislation something that could be accomplished given the technological and historic limitations of the period?
- Does the legislation discuss which government organizations are involved? Timing? A broad plan of action to implement? Any penalties involved? Any need to raise taxes and/or spend money?
- Is the legislation thought out and logical? Is it clear and well-written? Does it meet the form requirements?
- Does the bill offer meaningful opportunities for competitors to speak in both support and opposition to the bill?

Using the above criteria, apply your findings against the scoring scale:

0: Participant has no legislation submitted.

1-5: The bill is offensive and unacceptable—hate legislation or otherwise demonstrating contempt for the event and the participants. This score will also be given if the legislation clearly does not meet Rule 7.9.

6-10: While non-offensive, the legislation is otherwise nonsensical or absurd, showing little to no effort from the competitor.

11-15: Basic legislation without much detail or substance. Leaves many loopholes or unanswered questions.

16-20: Solid legislation. May have some flaws but demonstrates real effort to solve a problem or create a sound law.

21-25: This is an amazing bill. Purpose is clear, solution is specific, form is perfect. Cannot be significantly improved in any way the judge can see.

**COMMENTS:**