

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

| | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Student Name: Siddiqi | | School Code: |
| Session: 2 | Room: 409 | Chamber #: 3 |

DIRECTIONS: AWARD A RATING of 1-6 points per hour of presiding, with one being the worst, six being the best. You will RANK students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form. You may or may not include the presiding officer in your ranking. The presiding officer may also have an evaluation ballot for speaking – please be sure to circle the same rank at the bottom of the speech and presiding forms. Auditions are not scored.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly below. **PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE** (clear in explaining protocols and rulings); **RECOGNITION** (fair and efficient in recognizing speakers and questioners, and maintains appropriate speaker precedence and recency); **CONTROL** (maintains decorum of delegates, and willing to rule dilatory motions/business out of order); **DEMEANOR** (fosters a respectful, professional, and collegial atmosphere); **COMMUNICATION** (overall use of language, avoiding unnecessary verbiage).

| FIRST HOUR OF SERVICE | SECOND HOUR OF SERVICE | THIRD HOUR OF SERVICE |
|---|---|---|
| Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS: Explain your evaluation and justify your rating, providing constructive suggestions for improvement:

Your presiding was very well managed & professional, keeping congress moving along at a steady pace. All of the procedures were followed & I was impressed by your professionalism.

| |
|---|
| PRINT Judge Name: Ashlynn Timmerman |
| School/Affiliation: None - UC Berkeley |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |
| Reminder: POs may or may not be considered in your ranking. | | | | | | | | |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Student Name: Siddiqi | | School Code: |
| Session: 2 | Room: 409 Shah | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: Safety of Conventional Cars vs Auto | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: 3:05 Easy to understand statistics & well-related to argument. Point of responsibility well articulated. No questions posed. | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: Animals in Entertainment | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: 3:03s Statistics good to negate previously made points, backed up & explained very well. Had plethora of info. Response to questions given well & quickly. | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Vantendu</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: <u>2</u> | Room: <u>409 Shah</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Safety Concerns of Auto Pilot Cars</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>2:58s</u> <u>Interesting points covering wide range of subjects. Posed many thought provoking scenarios. Passionate & clear. Acknowledgement of other position, but remained consistent with point</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Banning Use of Entertainment Animals</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>2:46s</u> <u>Good use of various statistics to bolster points. Pointed out serious negatives of caging. Response to questions clear if not a bit hypothetical</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: _____
 School/Affiliation: _____

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Student Name: Mehrotra | | School Code: |
| Session: 2 | Room: 409 Shah | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: Benefits of Self-driving Cars | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: 2:30s Spoke well with a distinct draw into the given speech. Held interest throughout with many examples. Gave very holistic approach. Questions answered very well. | | Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: Unjust Treatment of Entertainment Animals | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: 3:04s Good use of examples + sources, as well as an ethos appeal. Good thought to future consequences. Answered questions well, very passionate. | | Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Sun, Isabella</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: <u>2</u> | Room: <u>409 Shah</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Cruelty of Animal Entertainment</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>2:17s</u> <u>Stumbled over words frequently, Made good points with some clear backing. Redundant answering to questions, some confusion on responses</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|--|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Ashlynn Timmurman</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>Nona- UC Berkeley</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Yuan, Melinda</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: <u>2</u> | Room: <u>409 Stan</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Joy Animals Receive from Entertainment</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>3:00s</u> <u>Speaks about relevant cultures which would be hurt. One example of study. Good twist of questions to help her point. Redundant answering</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← 5 4 3 2 1 lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← 5 4 3 2 1 lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← 5 4 3 2 1 lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|--|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Ashlynn Timmerman</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>None - UC B</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Jin</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: <u>2</u> | Room: <u>409 Shah</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Responsibility in Self-Driving Cars</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>2:36s</u> <u>Speech appealed to the languages of the masses. Gave good examples of how self-driving cars are still under the persons control. Not too great of a response to questions.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Jahangiri</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: <u>2</u> | Room: <u>409 Shah</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Detriment on Workforce by Auto-cars</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>2:42s</u> <u>Great ethos appeal. Good relationship drawn between jobs + the unemployment rate. Question answering not as strong.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← (4) → lowest |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Proper Treatment of Animals in Entertainment</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>3:00s</u> <u>Revival of species on brink of extinction. Points were to a side note or low (zoos). Well-rounded thoughts. Couldn't answer questions well. Read bill closer.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← (2) → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Sun, Andrew</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: <u>2</u> | Room: <u>409 Shah</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Benefits of Self-Driving Cars</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>2:58s</u> <u>Good explanations of possible benefits</u> <u>Out-of-the box connection between obesity + driving, well described. Decent response to questions, slightly confusing.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Failure of Bill on Entertainment Animals</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>2:50s</u> <u>Unique take on bill, pointed out detriment of specific scope of bill. Point made somewhat well, slightly redundant. Answering of questions missed point somewhat</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Singh, Anoop</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: <u>2</u> | Room: <u>409 Shoh</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Danger of Autopilot Cars</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>1:56s</u> <u>Well formatted speech, spoke well with clear concise points that had backing. Answered questions with to the point answers addressing the question</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← <u>5</u> 4 3 2 1 lowest → |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Benefits of Animal Entertainment</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>2:23s</u> <u>Changed argument towards zoos, argue the topic. Dangers of relocating animals cited well. Answered questions well, clarified point well despite being confusing initially</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← <u>4</u> 5 3 2 1 lowest → |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← 5 4 3 2 1 lowest → |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Lan, Alex</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: <u>2</u> | Room: <u>409 Shah</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Benefit of Self-Driving Cars</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>2:30s</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← (5) 4 3 2 1 lowest |
| <p>Good logos appeal, given description of car capabilities. Good statistics with clarifications, addresses possible rebutals. Bit unclear on answering questions.</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Immoral use of Animals for Entertainment</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>2:37s</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← (5) 4 3 2 1 lowest |
| <p>Good points made about captivity vs wild. Well spoken & gave solid explanation. Refutes questions well w/ clear purpose.</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← 5 4 3 2 1 lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

1-Sun

3.5

APP

Speech

- + Good voice + pleasant
- Not engaging cause teacher
- Not moving

+ Humor

- Not clear on position

[Didn't answer the question's]
40.

Juan

- Didn't introduce her name.

+ Good voice.

~~+~~ ~~was~~ ~~up~~ stayed seated, mostly.

~~+~~ Less engaging, since she read from back, rarely glanced.

+ Good structure.

+ Good content

- Fumbled and gave disingenuous (animals enjoy boxes? performing?) answer, also got Nervous

4

Neg

| | | |
|------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <i>Siddiqi</i> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <i>Traffic safety</i> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>Great example to on accidents per mile to support your point. Great example of traffic violation & who to blame. Issues with Great points raised to sett that really made me wonder open issues with driverless cars</i> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <i>Wild life</i> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|---------------------------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: <i>Selvi Prasad</i> |
| School/Affiliation: <i>DVHS</i> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Vonteddu</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Traffic safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Very energetic & passionate. Example of criminals was well thought of & unique. Good logical analysis of the bill.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|--|------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Wildlife</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Empathy for wildlife was clear, good start. Articulated pain & torture done on animals well. Good point of why they are called wild. I see strong conviction in whatever you say. Just support more with stronger data/evidence.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|---------------------------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Salit Prasad</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>D VHS.</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: Mehrotra | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: Traffic safety | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: Good reasoning. Responded well, took time to understand questions. Confident speaker. | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← (5) 4 3 2 1 lowest |

| | | |
|--|----------------------|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: Wild animals. | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: Great, smart. Connected with emotion, empathy with animals. Refuted other speakers. Logical. Use some ^{more} data to make your points. | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← (5) 4 3 2 1 lowest However mostly subjective. |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← 5 4 3 2 1 lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| | |
|---------------------|--------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: | Savit Prasad |
| School/Affiliation: | DVHS |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Jin</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Traffic safety.</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Nice reasoning to start with, refuted other speakers well about auto-pilot being an option. Go liked the humor. However reasoning was not strong enough to justify auto-pilot.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest <u>5</u> 4 3 2 1 lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← 5 4 3 2 1 lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← 5 4 3 2 1 lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|-------------------------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Sau Prasad</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>DVHS</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Lan</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Traffic Safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Good examples used (recent news) to support for auto pilot. Good opening, loud voice connecting with audience. Using Hobby as example was not great example; didn't seem to contradicting yourself</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Wild animals</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Emphatic speech. Great modulation. Good arguments & good start. Connected well with audience. Didn't have enough points/argument to make the case.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: Sally
School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

| | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Jahangiri</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Traffic safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Opening statement didn't have any connection to main theme.</u> <u>Good modulation ^{voice} & To support unemployment argument, use no. of drivers who drive are actually car drivers by profession & not just drivers in general.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|--|---------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Wild animal</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Proper closing missing. Emphatic speech.</u> <u>Good arguments but not enough enough to make the case. Seemed to deviate from topic.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|---------------------------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Salil Prasad</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>DVHS</u> |

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Sun</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Traffic safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Didn't explain very well advantages of driverless cars, use facts. Most points seemed opinion. Diction was clear, you were confident. Made good eye contacts. Pleasing outlook & connected well with audience. Relation of obese obese & driverless car streets did not make sense.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Wild life.</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Why human human have endangered wild life - was not clear.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|---------------------------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Savit Prasad</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>DVHS.</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Singh</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Traffic safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Why traffic safety is important issue. Confident speaker. Too much focus on Tesla, traffic safety is broader topic. Spend some time to think before responding to questions.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Wild life</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Good coordination of voice modulation & body movement. Good points. Clear diction.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: | <u>Sahil Prasad</u> |
| School/Affiliation: | <u>DVHS</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>1-Sun</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Wild animals</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Good reasoning but missing facts. Didn't make any ^{eye} contacts. Responses didn't make sense</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|---------------------------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Sally Prasad</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>DVHS</u> |

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: Arshia Menta | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | |
|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 Topic: Syrian Refugees resettlement | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>clear in answering questions. active listen to others and pose questions.</i> | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | |
|---|--|
| SPEECH 2 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | |
|---|--|
| SPEECH 3 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: **Emily Li**

School/Affiliation: **DV High School**

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd **3rd** 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: Soham Gupta | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | |
|--|---|
| SPEECH 1 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>Spoke calm w/ good pace. Answer question convincing.</i> | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | |
|---|--|
| SPEECH 2 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | |
|---|--|
| SPEECH 3 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|---|
| PRINT Judge Name: Emily Li |
| School/Affiliation: DV High School |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|---------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: Edmond Wen | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | |
|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>Maybe listens closely to know the speaker's position before asking questions. use San Bernardino Killing as evidence to support opposition of the bill.</i> | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | |
|---|--|
| SPEECH 2 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | |
|---|--|
| SPEECH 3 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|-----------------------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: <i>Emily Li</i> |
| School/Affiliation: <i>DV HS</i> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <i>Pujita Tangirala</i> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <i>Syrian Refugee Resettlement</i> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>Nice speech clear speech tone but needs a little more confidence and convincing power. Try not read too much. contents in general is good</i> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← (4) (5) → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| |
|--|
| QUESTIONING of other speakers |
| Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc. |

| |
|---|
| PRINT Judge Name: <i>Lu Zhang</i> |
| School/Affiliation: <i>Gale Ranch MS.</i> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | (6th) | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|---|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <i>Mohid Jahangiri</i> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <i>Syrian Refugee Resettlement</i> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>Speech style is decent, but contents are a little simplified and not backing up with enough evidences. And conclusion seems not that convincing.</i> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| | |
|---------------------|------------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: | <i>Lu Zhang</i> |
| School/Affiliation: | <i>Gale Ranch M.S.</i> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <i>Vaibhav Tripathi</i> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | |
|--|---|
| SPEECH 1 Topic: <i>Syrian</i> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>explained refugee screening process in detail. clear mind in answering questions</i> | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | |
|---|--|
| SPEECH 2 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | |
|---|--|
| SPEECH 3 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| |
|--|
| QUESTIONING of other speakers |
| Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc. |

| |
|---|
| PRINT Judge Name: <i>Emily Li</i> |
| School/Affiliation: <i>DV High School</i> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Ooha Reddy</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Syrian Refugee Resettlement</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>try to avoid reading from your script and actually present. Contents needs more originality and back up with some evidences. the logic of whole speech needs more clear.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 <u>3</u> 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|--|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Lu Zhang</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>Gale Ranch M.S.</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | <u>None</u> |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Carolina Tarango</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); ORGANIZATION AND UNITY (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); EVIDENCE AND LOGIC (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); DELIVERY (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

SPEECH 1 Topic: Syrian Refugees resettlement

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating: 4
 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
could use more of the time to address the bill
could be more firm in answering questions

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating:
 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating:
 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: Emily Li

School/Affiliation: DV High School

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Pranav Kumar</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Syrian Refugee Resettlement</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>clear speech and points, but bring some new ideas regarding disease but majority of speech is not original enough.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|--|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Lu Zhang</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>Gale Ranch M.S.</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <i>Aditya Venkatram</i> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker ANSWERS QUESTIONS for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <i>Syrian Refugee Resettlement</i> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>work on your presentation style a little, try not reach too much from your script. Generally repeats the other people's points won't give you advantage. Build more confidence through practice</i> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: | <i>Lu Zhang</i> |
| School/Affiliation: | <i>Gule Ranch MS.</i> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------------------------------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | <input checked="" type="radio"/> None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <i>Nakul Bajaj</i> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <i>Syrian Refugees resettlement</i> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>Some reading of quotes</i> <i>use of statistic data.</i> <i>active listen to other speaker & ask questions.</i> <i>second speech to cite other speaker's point of view, analyze & use to support</i> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

own side.

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: *Emily Ri*

School/Affiliation: *DV High School*

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <i>Rishi Jammy</i> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

SPEECH 1 Topic: *Syrian Refugee Resettlement*

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating:
6 5 4 3 2 1
highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
*Nice presentation style and convincing, confidence voice
Quite strong proposal for a increased number of refugees (to 100,000). But not back up, good job monitoring the whole*

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating:
6 5 4 3 2 1
highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating:
6 5 4 3 2 1
highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: *Lu Zhang*

School/Affiliation: *Gale Ranch Middle S.*

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st **2nd** 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

| | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <i>Bishi Jammy</i> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: AWARD A RATING of 1-6 points per hour of presiding, with one being the worst, six being the best. You will RANK students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form. You may or may not include the presiding officer in your ranking. The presiding officer may also have an evaluation ballot for speaking – please be sure to circle the same rank at the bottom of the speech and presiding forms. Auditions are not scored.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly below. **PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE** (clear in explaining protocols and rulings); **RECOGNITION** (fair and efficient in recognizing speakers and questioners, and maintains appropriate speaker precedence and recency); **CONTROL** (maintains decorum of delegates, and willing to rule dilatory motions/business out of order); **DEMEANOR** (fosters a respectful, professional, and collegial atmosphere); **COMMUNICATION** (overall use of language, avoiding unnecessary verbiage).

| FIRST HOUR OF SERVICE | SECOND HOUR OF SERVICE | THIRD HOUR OF SERVICE |
|---|---|---|
| Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS: Explain your evaluation and justify your rating, providing constructive suggestions for improvement:

In general, Student controls the pace and process pretty well. Moderator did excellent job to oversee the whole process (Jammy) and show great confidence in control.

PRINT Judge Name:

Lu Zhang

School/Affiliation:

Gale Ranch Middle S.

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

Reminder: POs may or may not be considered in your ranking.

| | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|
| Student Name: Edmond Wen | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: 407 |
| Chamber #: | |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous and the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: Syria Refugee risk. | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>economical - refutes opponent's points. Good examples & refutes. Really good speaking, almost memorized. covered all bases.</i> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest (6) |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

only one to confirm same side (good thing)

| |
|--|
| PRINT Judge Name: Andrew Ding |
| School/Affiliation: UC Berkeley |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| (1st) | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: Vaibhav Tripathi | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: 407 | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: Syria before Reset Act, not treaty | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: Finally focuses on a new point (initially addresses & explains a problem (why ISIS will be hard pressed to infiltrate) - Good references and original points. Doesn't really address socioeconomic factors. Good answers | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: **Andrew Ding**

School/Affiliation: **UC Berkeley**

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st **2nd** 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

| | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Nakul Bajaj</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: <u>407</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Resettle Syrian refugees.</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>- By not welcoming them, it helps the org that made them refug.</u> <u>- Very clear, answered questions clearly & made a strong message.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Negation counter</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Focuses entirely on rebuttal, brings new ideas to advance the argument. Very original.</u> <u>Answering questions, half repeat, half new intelligent.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|--|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Andrew Ding</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>UC Berkeley</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | (3rd) | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Pujita Tangirala School Code: _____
 Session: _____ Room: 407 Chamber #: _____

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

SPEECH 1 Topic: Syria Refugee Resett, homeland Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

Brings new points to advance argument. Terrorists don't come in with weapons. homeland safety & security are more of a priority. Directly responds to opponents. Answers questions well

Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 2 Topic: _____ Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 3 Topic: _____ Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: _____
 School/Affiliation: _____

RANK THIS SPEAKER
 Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Soham Gupta</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: <u>407</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker ANSWERS QUESTIONS for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Syrian Refugee Resef</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Military aid, counter-argued & brought up many original points. answered all questions well.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|--|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Andrew Ding</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>UC Berkeley</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Rishi Tammy</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: <u>407</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Increase Syrian refugees.</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Gives really good broad goes beyond w/ originality, really good use of speaking gestures & eye contact. Not super detailed. 1 mistake in the numbers (38 million in currency). Answered questions, relatively well-</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 <u>4.5</u> 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|--|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Andrew Ding</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>UC Berkeley</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | <u>6th</u> | 7th | 8th | None |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Rfanav Kumar</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: <u>407</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker ANSWERS QUESTIONS for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Syrian Benefits -</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>- 3 reasons -> good speech tactics, references - the guardian, good eye contact. but - Does address previous points.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: ^{4.5} 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

only 1 unit ref

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|--|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Andrew Ding</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>UC Berkeley</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

| | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <i>Aditya Venkatesh Atrani</i> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: <i>1107</i> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <i>Syrian Refugee Mentality/ISIS</i> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>Delivery was shaky but strong conceptually. Syrians might perform similar. Did not have much concrete evidences. Answers questions creatively.</i> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

Lots of prefaces

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: | <i>Andrew Ding</i> |
| School/Affiliation: | <i>UC Berkeley</i> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: Arshia Mehta | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: U07 | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

SPEECH 1 Topic: **Syrian Refugee Jobs**

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1
highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
 - Focuses pretty much just on jobs.
 - Uses credible sources. → lots of evidence, 1/2 backed up.
 - Didn't answer questions correctly.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1
highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1
highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: **Andrew Ang**

School/Affiliation: **VC Berkeley**

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9.

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th **None**

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Carolina Tarango</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: <u>u07</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Talking Syrian refugees</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>read mostly off manuscript, restates points, does give concrete examples, doesn't give concrete responses for why economy helped</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|--|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Andrew Ding</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>UC Berkeley</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | <u>None</u> |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: Mohid Jahangiri | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: 407 | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

SPEECH 1 Topic: **Syria Refugee regarding the countries**

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 **3** 2 1
highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

- did bring up a new point, tacky speaking
 - not a ton of actual substance
 - completely ignores moral aspect.

SPEECH 2 Topic: **ISIS Syria refugee facts**

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 **2** 1
highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

Directly addresses other opponents (+ allies)
 speech was shaky but points were clear. gave exact comments for when he answered questions

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1
highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: **Andrew Ding**

School/Affiliation: **UC Berkeley**

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th **None**

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Ooha Reddy</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: <u>407</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Threat to national security.</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>- Read off manuscript. Repeats everything without advancing argument. Does not refute the opponent's points, speaking abilities are were shaky.</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: | <u>Andrew Drag</u> |
| School/Affiliation: | <u>UC Berkeley</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | <u>None</u> |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Kushi Wadhwa</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>A bill to ensure traffic safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>1, confident and mature</u> <u>2, Argument is very logical and effectively use specific example to claim against opponent's arguments</u> <u>3, Resopnded questions with a calm and confidence</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Banning the use of wild animals</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>1, use very specific examples to support her argument</u> <u>2, good hand posture</u> <u>3, response to questions are very prompt and well addressed</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: | <u>Meizi Li</u> |
| School/Affiliation: | <u>Young Genius</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| <u>1st</u> | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <i>Abhinav Morbad</i> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <i>A bill to enforce traffic safety</i> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>1, very confident and expressed a sense of humor in the opening.</i> <i>2, good eye contact, hand posture.</i> <i>3, The claim is supported by warrant and evidence</i> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 <i>highest</i> ← → <i>lowest</i> |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 <i>highest</i> ← → <i>lowest</i> |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 <i>highest</i> ← → <i>lowest</i> |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: | <i>Meizi Li</i> |
| School/Affiliation: | <i>Young Genius</i> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|
| <i>Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None 9 |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Miranda Chen</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>A bill to ensure traffic safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>1, believe a message with confidence.</u> <u>2, Argument is supported by a good structure.</u> <u>3, pay attention on the speed of speech!</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|---|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Meizi Li</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>Young Genius</u> |

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Anred Won</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>A bill to ensure traffic safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>1. Utilized comparable to support his claim.</u> <u>2. Good voice and confident.</u> <u>3. Responded answers with confidence and smile</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Banning the use of wild Animals</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>1. Confident and present logically</u> <u>2. more eye contact is recommended</u> <u>3. when response to questions, please keep up voice</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: | <u>Meizi Li</u> |
| School/Affiliation: | <u>Young Genius</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

(长安大学)

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Student Name: <u>Anouki Parthagani</u> | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>A bill to ensure traffic safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |
| <p>1, Very confident</p> <p>2, Emphasize key words to draw attention</p> <p>3, Argument is very logical and well presented</p> <p>4 respond opponent's questions with more explanation</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|---|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Meizi Li</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>Young Genies</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------|--|
| Student Name: <u>Katharam Lam</u> | | School Code: | |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: | |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>A bill to ensure traffic safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>1. In the speech, properly addressed opponents' argument with example</u> <u>2. supported her claim with very specific example.</u> <u>3. Encourage to have more eye contact</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|---|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Meizi Li</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>Young Genius</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Miradad Prasad</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>A bill to ensure traffic safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>1. Argument is logic and clear</u> <u>2. Use movement & body language properly</u> <u>3. Address opponents' questions with examples and evidence</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: | <u>Meizi Li</u> |
| School/Affiliation: | <u>Young Genings</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Litesh Kwella</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>A bill to ensure traffic safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |
| <p>1, use body language, movement properly</p> <p>2, respond to opponents' questions promptly and explain with examples</p> <p>3, less pause and to make speech more smoothly!</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Banning the use of wild animals</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |
| <p>1, address the opponent's claim in the speech</p> <p>2, work more on smoothness</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|---|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Meizi Li</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>Young Genius</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <i>Ada Argueta</i> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <i>A bill to ensure traffic safety</i> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>1. Argument is structured clearly 2. good voice, eye contact 3. pay more attention on the questions raised by the opponent</i> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|---|
| PRINT Judge Name: <i>Meizi Li</i> |
| School/Affiliation: <i>Young Genius</i> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|---|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None | 9 |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Vivels Sarkar</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

SPEECH 1 Topic: A bill to ensure traffic

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point-Rating:
6 5 4 3 2 1
highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

- 1, very good eye contact
2. Argument is stated clearly and logically
3. be more confident
4. keep up voice

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating:
6 5 4 3 2 1
highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating:
6 5 4 3 2 1
highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: Meizi Li

School/Affiliation: Young Genius

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None 9

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Saurav Kumar</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>A bill to ensure Traffic Safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |
| <p>1, stated argument with a clear structure</p> <p>2, Arguments are supported by examples and evidence</p> <p>3, use more body language and movement in future.</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: | <u>Meizi Li</u> |
| School/Affiliation: | <u>Young Genius</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None <u>9</u> |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

| | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <i>Meizi Li</i> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: AWARD A RATING of 1-6 points per hour of presiding, with one being the worst, six being the best. You will RANK students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form. You may or may not include the presiding officer in your ranking. The presiding officer may also have an evaluation ballot for speaking – please be sure to circle the same rank at the bottom of the speech and presiding forms. Auditions are not scored.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly below. **PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE** (clear in explaining protocols and rulings); **RECOGNITION** (fair and efficient in recognizing speakers and questioners, and maintains appropriate speaker precedence and recency); **CONTROL** (maintains decorum of delegates, and willing to rule dilatory motions/business out of order); **DEMEANOR** (fosters a respectful, professional, and collegial atmosphere); **COMMUNICATION** (overall use of language, avoiding unnecessary verbiage).

| FIRST HOUR OF SERVICE | SECOND HOUR OF SERVICE | THIRD HOUR OF SERVICE |
|--|--|--|
| Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← lowest | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← lowest | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← lowest |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS: Explain your evaluation and justify your rating, providing constructive suggestions for improvement:

Sarkur

Morbad

chen

| |
|---|
| PRINT Judge Name: <i>Meizi Li</i> |
| School/Affiliation: <i>Young Genius</i> |

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

Reminder: POs may or may not be considered in your ranking.

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Miranda Chen</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: <u>1</u> | Room: <u>MAIN 9</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

SPEECH 1 Topic: PP

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating:
 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

- Topic
- Good line of attack as business, "fraud"
- attack on legislation
- other
- good "congressional" phrase
- excellent delivery
- excellent hands, eye contact
- excellent projection & inflection
- excellent walking about

- ToDo
- excellent delivery
 - just

SPEECH 2 Topic: _____

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating:
 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

- cross exam
- good forceful responses to us

SPEECH 3 Topic: Syrian Refugee Resettlement

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating:
 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

- good cross exam on PP
- excellent leading question on fellow "aff" senator. this is the first one I recall hearing X 2

PRINT Judge Name: RYAN MONAGHAN

School/Affiliation: YB

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: Andrew Won | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: MAW 9 | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--------|---|---|---------|---|--|--|--|--------|
| SPEECH 1 Topic: Homeland Protection | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | Circle Point Rating: <table border="1"> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>highest</td> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: center;">←</td> <td>lowest</td> </tr> </table> | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | highest | ← | | | | lowest |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| highest | ← | | | | lowest | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Topic - great line reframing the debate - they do not need the money - great - other - great interaction in class room, response to cross-exam Q's | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delivery - great projection - great eye contact - very forceful | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To Do - Great line of attack - Great line reply - practice delivery - only a little bit more | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--------|---|---|---------|---|--|--|--|--------|
| SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugee Resettlement | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | Circle Point Rating: <table border="1"> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>highest</td> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: center;">←</td> <td>lowest</td> </tr> </table> | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | highest | ← | | | | lowest |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| highest | ← | | | | lowest | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Topic / restated - great interaction of opposing speeches into intro - good moral stand - good reference to Syrian integration - Cross Exam: - great response to security threats | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delivery - great delivery - great projection - good movement | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--------|---|---|---------|---|--|--|--|--------|
| SPEECH 3 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | Circle Point Rating: <table border="1"> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>highest</td> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: center;">←</td> <td>lowest</td> </tr> </table> | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | highest | ← | | | | lowest |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| highest | ← | | | | lowest | | | | | | | | |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.
Good p/b on abolition statistics of Sender Ponthajon;

PRINT Judge Name: **RYAN Mangan**

School/Affiliation: **46**

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st **2nd** 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Khushi Wadhwa</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: <u>1</u> | Room: <u>MAW 9</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

SPEECH 1 Topic: PP

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

- Topic
 - great intro dragging in current events to topic
 - good transition expanding the topic away from just abortion
- other
 - classroom: excellent response in abortion, in security

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating:
 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

- Delivery
 - great projection, expressiveness
 - great use of eye contact, hands
 - great presence in class, form questioning

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating:
 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating:
 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

- Great framing debate of Syrian Resettlement risks

PRINT Judge Name: RYAN MATHAN
 School/Affiliation: YS

RANK THIS SPEAKER
 Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9
 1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Uvek Sarkar</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: <u>1</u> | Room: <u>MAW 9</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker ANSWERS QUESTIONS for each speech should be considered.

SPEECH 1 Topic: Planned Parenthood

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

- Topic
 - nice historical context
 - good line of attack by highlighting induction in unwanted pregnancies
 - nice opening
- Delivery
 - good measured delivery
 - good eye contact
 - good projection

- To Do
- very good delivery
 - just practice this a bit more and it will be great

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugee Resettlement

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

- Topic
 - Good forceful intro
 - good use of and integration of facts into argument
 - Delivery
 - again good measured delivery
 - great eye contact
 - great inflection
 - good projection
- Cross-Exam: Good response

- To Do:
- more projection of your voice
 - cons. don't side track yourself

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: RYAN MOWASHAN

School/Affiliation: YB

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Student Name: <u>Abhinav Morbad</u> | School Code: |
| Session: <u>1</u> | Room: <u>MAN 9</u> |
| Chamber #: | |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Planned Parenthood</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: - Topic - excellent intro, flipping, quotes on head - excellent citations & evidence - excellent time of attack on PP - other = great referencing Sen Portman = great cross-exam responses - Delivery - good, powerful, projection of voice - animation, expressive | | Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Syrian Refugee Resettlement</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: - Topic - good flowing debate with facts - nice use of finding facts on Syrian refugee integration - Delivery - good inflection - great use of hands - great eye contact - good asking about | | Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|--|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: other: - good responding directly to "neg" speeches - good emotional appeal on children | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.
 - Good questions of Sen Kaine
 - Good response to other questions
 - Great response to

PRINT Judge Name: KYAN MONAGHAN
 School/Affiliation: YG

RANK THIS SPEAKER
 Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9
 1st 2nd 3rd 4th (5th) 6th 7th 8th None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Student Name: Anaoki Panthagani | School Code: |
| Session: (| Room: MAIN 9 |
| Chamber #: | |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | |
|--|---|
| SPEECH 1 Topic: pp | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>Topic/Research</i> - good basis - research - good expansion of topic from "just" abortion <i>Delivery</i> - good expressiveness, suspense, hand gestures <i>Overall</i> - good intro - good rebuttal of senate curbing of "abortion" only services - probably could do more research in preparation | Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |
| SPEECH 2 Topic: - probably could do more research in preparation | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | |
|---|---|
| SPEECH 3 Topic: SYRIAN Refugee Resettlement | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <i>Topic/Intro</i> - nice intro - good angles of attack - nice use of numbers for unemployment - nice research of parallels in Turkey - security - good use of current events <i>Delivery:</i> - good expressiveness - good eye contact Cross Exam: good stand.ig by your position Other: good deflection of refugees to other countries | Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | |
|--|--|
| QUESTIONING of other speakers | <i>to do:</i> - a little bit more practice on this speech to give you the chance to work on forcefulness of delivery & forcefulness on cross-exam responses |
| Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc. | |

| |
|--------------------------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: RYAN MURPHY |
| School/Affiliation: Y6 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: Katharine Lam | | School Code: |
| Session: 1 | Room: MAN 9 | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

SPEECH 1 Topic: **PP** Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

Topic:
- good line of attack on its fraudulent practices
- good use of manograms
Cross-QAM:
- good points, presence on classroom

- Delivery
- good eye contact
- good movement
- good hand movement
- excellent expressiveness

Circle Point Rating:
6 5 4 3 2 1
highest ← → lowest

- TODO
- work on delivery of the speech to make it more other and more forceful

SPEECH 2 Topic: Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

- Topic resound
- Good emotional appeal on security threat
- good basic use of facts
Cross-QAM:
- good basic standing on points
- Delivery
- good word gestures
- good inflections
- great eye contact
- good projection

Circle Point Rating:
6 5 4 3 2 1
highest ← → lowest

- TODO
- practice, practice, practice and you will be great!

SPEECH 3 Topic: Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

Circle Point Rating:
6 5 4 3 2 1
highest ← → lowest

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: **RYAN MONASTHAN**
School/Affiliation: **Y6**

RANK THIS SPEAKER
Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9
1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>LITESH KURELLA</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Planned Parenthood - Defund</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: - Topic/Research - Good research/citations - interesting numbers - overall - Delivery - more practice in delivery - more animation - more use of words, S.M.S, more expressiveness | | Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Sup on Refugee Resettlement</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: - Topic/Research - nice intro - good use of difficulty of refugee resettlement - good use of basic facts of lack of security threat - cross exam - good response to questions - Delivery - good eye contact - good movement - pretty good expressiveness | | Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest - To do - practice speech some more - maybe even videotape yourself to work on expressiveness |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|---|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>RYAN MONAGHAN</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>46</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Student Name: Ada Argueta | School Code: |
| Session: 1 | Room: MAIN 9 |
| Chamber #: | |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | |
|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 Topic: TP | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: Topic - Delivery - good overall line of attack - good handals - good eye contact - good walking about cross-exam - reasonable responses | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | |
|---|--|
| SPEECH 2 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

ToDo:
 - some more research details/facts
 - more practice of the speech itself
 which will make you ready for delivery & for taking cross-exam!
 - Good work, keep it up!

| | |
|---|--|
| SPEECH 3 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name:
RYAN MONASTHAN

School/Affiliation:
46

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th **8th** None

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Mr. Dul Prasad</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: <u>MAIN 9</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Planned Parenthood</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Topic - good intro</u> <u>- good use of facts in attacking PP</u> <u>Delivery - good movement</u> <u>- good eye contact</u> <u>- other - very good incorporation of "AFF" and "NEG" arguments into speech</u> | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← <u>4</u> → 2 lowest 5 3 1 <u>- To Do - Practice speech even more to allow for time to practice delivery; projection, intonation</u> |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← 4 → 2 lowest 5 3 1 |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← 4 → 2 lowest 5 3 1 |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

Good basic question on Syria Refugee Resettlement

| |
|---|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>P. YAN MANAGHAN</u> |
| School/Affiliation: <u>Y6</u> |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | <u>8th</u> | None |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Saurav Kumar</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: <u>1</u> | Room: <u>MAN 9</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

SPEECH 1 Topic: PP Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

Topic: good basic use of facts
 - good highlighting all the
 - have facts
 - good citations
 Delivery
 - good delivery
 - good eye contact
 - good use of hands
 - good responses

Circle Point Rating:
 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

To Do:
 - Good delivery and practice the speech more to allow to you to work on projection, inflection.

SPEECH 2 Topic: Refugee Resettlement Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

Circle Point Rating:
 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 3 Topic: Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:

Circle Point Rating:
 6 5 4 3 2 1
 highest ← → lowest

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: RYAN McMAHON
 School/Affiliation: YS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

| | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Student Name: RISHI JAMMY | | School Code: |
| Session: 2 | Room: Shah 407 | Chamber #: 2 |

DIRECTIONS: AWARD A RATING of 1-6 points per hour of presiding, with one being the worst, six being the best. You will RANK students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form. You may or may not include the presiding officer in your ranking. The presiding officer may also have an evaluation ballot for speaking – please be sure to circle the same rank at the bottom of the speech and presiding forms. Auditions are not scored.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly below. **PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE** (clear in explaining protocols and rulings); **RECOGNITION** (fair and efficient in recognizing speakers and questioners, and maintains appropriate speaker precedence and recency); **CONTROL** (maintains decorum of delegates, and willing to rule dilatory motions/business out of order); **DEMEANOR** (fosters a respectful, professional, and collegial atmosphere); **COMMUNICATION** (overall use of language, avoiding unnecessary verbiage).

| FIRST HOUR OF SERVICE | SECOND HOUR OF SERVICE | THIRD HOUR OF SERVICE |
|---|---|---|
| Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS: Explain your evaluation and justify your rating, providing constructive suggestions for improvement:

- (1) highlighted comments related to preface
- (2) Always had the control of the floor
- (3) Interpreted cross examination questions thoroughly and avoided the senators getting repetitive
- (4) Controlled and managed the time accurately
- (5) Controlled the house by taking right decision on time

| |
|---|
| PRINT Judge Name: MALLIK VONTEDDU |
| School/Affiliation: |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |
| Reminder: POs may or may not be considered in your ranking. | | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: Katherine Lam | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: Main 1 | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: Traffic Safety | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: - Autopilot Reduces Drunk driving • Good logic but where is evidence for this? - Fight Autopilot Issues • "If" statement, how does this support your argument - Refutations: Where is evidence? Good logic but no support | | Circle Point Rating: 3.5 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |
| - nicely structured and good delivery - try not to read off of notes as much CROSS-EX | | |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|--|
| PRINT Judge Name: Evan Koretsky |
| School/Affiliation: |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: Ada Arqueta | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: Main 1 | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | |
|---|--|
| SPEECH 1 Topic: Traffic Safety/ Autopilot | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| <p>Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourages Reckless driving - Arguments need more structure and support. Hard to follow - Refutations: warnings do nothing - needs <u>evidence</u>, why? | <p>Circle Point Rating:</p> <p>6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest</p> <p><u>Cross-E</u></p> <p>- be more confident in responses</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| SPEECH 2 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | <p>Circle Point Rating:</p> <p>6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| SPEECH 3 Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | <p>Circle Point Rating:</p> <p>6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest</p> |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|--|
| PRINT Judge Name: Evan Koretzky |
| School/Affiliation: |

| RANK THIS SPEAKER | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|------|
| Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | None |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Student Name: <u>Arjun Prasad</u> | | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: <u>Main 1</u> | Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>Traffic Safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: - Human Error • Self-driving cars? Clarify <u>contradiction</u> - Poor driving skills by <u>more</u> people • 2 nd argument needs more structure - try not to say "un" ^{and "like"} as much - good movement - when concluding try to restate arguments and tie them to main point | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 <u>3</u> 2 1 highest ← → lowest |
| | | <u>Cross-EX</u> - More confidence in responses |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

| |
|---------------------------------------|
| PRINT Judge Name: <u>Evan Korotky</u> |
| School/Affiliation: |

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|
| Student Name: <u>Harold Wong</u> | School Code: |
| Session: | Room: Chamber #: |

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the worst, six being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SPEECH 1 | Topic: <u>A Bill to ease traffic safety</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>on 1. Self drive cars that better than human,</u> - compare with how human actions (i.e. drunk activities, will not be cutting gas) - demand, people use cars to drive people far the demand. - self drive cars will be done as it will save car company. | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| SPEECH 2 | Topic: <u>Banning the use of wild animals</u> | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: - Harming species unintentional but humans - cannot control what animals are - animals are taken to the point of death | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| SPEECH 3 | Topic: | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG |
| Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: | | Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest |

QUESTIONING of other speakers

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name: Henry Huang

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None