

Student Name: Siddiqi	School Code: DVHS
Session:	Room: Part 7 56 56
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: Job Change	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: 2:46 Good intro, gets to the point in rebuttals and gives specific arguments. Detailed. Answers questions both squash & advances argument. (so good)	Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 2 Topic: Summary.	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: 3:04 - Addresses direct aff, restate + counter. Actual evidence. Less reliable on other countries. Harms economy → imp, both important points, still advances case.	Circle Point Rating: 6 (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 Pily
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: Jammy	School Code: DVHS
Session:	Room: Patil SB
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: Keystone pipeline boosts economy	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>2:53 - Focuses on environment, good evidence and facts. Delivery was on point. Started so (A)</p> <p>- Answers questions well, memorized most</p>		

SPEECH 2	Topic: Counter	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>2:54 - Rebuttal of negation was strong</p> <p>- Leads in with a strong point & gives evidence to back it up. Wasn't ultra ultra detailed. Answers questions well.</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: **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: BajaJ	School Code: Harker
Session:	Room: Patil 56 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: Pitting things vs each other.	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: 3:07 <i>Economic & environmental issues</i> <i>- read off notes mainly with lots of evidence and follows up main ideas further explanations. Answers questions with new responses</i>	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: **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>Gupta</u>	School Code: <u>DVHS</u>
Session:	Room: <u>Patil 36</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>Won't detriment environment.</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>3006</u> - Create more jobs. we wouldn't be funding the pipeline → new point. Good answers to questions.	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 Dird
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>Meh+ a</u>	School Code: <u>DVHS</u>
Session:	Room: <u>Lat. 5b.</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>Hurtling/introduces with Canada</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>2:41</u> - New → harms Canada's ecosystems. - Provides many warrants on why this should be. - Didn't answer questions well.		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>Chen</u>		School Code: <u>Autonomy Debate</u>
Session:	Room: <u>Patil 86</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:	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>2:08 - Focused on economics & environment. - Does have broad topics but not ultra detailed speech was too short & was slightly shaky. Answers questions well & poorly.</p>	

SPEECH 2 Topic:	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

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>Ventelddn</i>	School Code: <i>DVHS</i>
Session:	Room: <i>Pat. 56</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>Harmful to economic</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>First are to state that it's new but already existed (extension) last to speak first (-11) stated already evidence, doesn't focus on economic aspect. Answers questions without substance.</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: *Andrew Dwy*
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>w ad h wa</u>		School Code: <u>NHS</u>
Session:	Room: <u>Patil 56</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>Helps locally to environment & econ</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>2:17 - Good into rd little basic.</u> <u>- Fix roads & bridge, a diverse argument with new points. New points. Answers questions & refuting well. Makes assumptions though.</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>Sun</u>	School Code: <u>Harber</u>
Session:	Room: <u>Patil 56</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>Dependence on oil</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>3:07</u> See - Really good intro. Advances and says why. didn't say "area" though. Basically reading off of it. Did have pauses. Answers questions without ultra solid 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: <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: <i>Morbael</i>	School Code: <i>DVHS</i>
Session:	Room: <i>Paril 56</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>Do more good than bad.</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:		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest
<i>2:33 Didn't have insome content or advancement. Super shaky answers.</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 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>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

Student Name: <u>Won</u>	School Code: <u>DVHS</u>
Session:	Room: <u>Patil 56</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>Sustainable economy</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>2:55</u> - Counters the aff and brings up new top 2. - focusing on the reusable. Answered 1 question very poorly. - Ignored environment.		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← (4) → lowest

SPEECH 2	Topic: <u>Constituent priority</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>1:31</u> - Does give a "finishing" speech to directly address opponents. Read extremely from page constituents over fact & economy. Answers questions poorly.		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: 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>Mehnotra</u>	School Code: <u>DVHS</u>
Session:	Room: <u>Patil 56</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>Part 1 on job market</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>Doesn't have stray is substance.</u> <u>3:02 Does rebuttal and give numerical evidence, stumbles a lot.</u> <u>Answers questions decently 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 D. W.</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 Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Gupta</u>	School Code:
Session:	Room: <u>patil 56</u> 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:

Timmy was off

PRINT Judge Name: <u>Andrew Diky</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
Reminder: POs may or may not be considered in your ranking.								

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: Siddiqi		School Code:
Session:	Room: Paril 56	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:

- Missed first knock - (2x)

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Won</u>		School Code: <u>DVHL</u>
Session:	Room: <u>Pub. 56</u>	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 <u>5</u> 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:

— sometimes stuttered.

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: Mehrotra		School Code: DHS
Session:	Room: Dutil 56	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:

Mella messed up

PRINT Judge Name: Andrew Ditz
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
Reminder: POs may or may not be considered in your ranking.								

Parliamentarian Ballot

Session:

Room:

Chamber No.:

Please **rank**, in order of preference (1=most preferred) **through the total number** of legislators in your chamber. Consider each contestant's holistic performance in the session, including an aggregate consideration of the quality of speaking or presiding. Did the contestant's actions enhance the chamber's ability to conduct legislative business, or did his/her focus on the minutia of procedures and competitive framework detract from time for others to speak?

Rank	Name (print legibly; use first initial if two in chamber have same last name)	School Code
1 st	Jammy	
2 nd	Siddiqi	
3 rd	Mehta	
4 th	Gupta	
5 th	Bajaj	
6 th	Wadhwa	
7 th	Wan	
8 th	Vonteddu	
9 th	Chen	
10 th	Morbad	
11 th	Mehrotra	
12 th	Sun	
13 th		
14 th		
15 th		
16 th		
17 th		
18 th		
19 th		
20 th		
21 st		
22 nd		
23 rd		
24 th		
25 th		
26 th		
27 th		
28 th		
29 th		
30 th		

Print Judge Name: Evan Koratsky

School/Affiliation:

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <i>Mehra</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>Pipeline</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>- Intro: Obama rejects pipeline</i> <i>- Threatens Aqua.</i> <i>• One of world's largest source of clean water</i> <i>• Great Impact: Very clear</i> <i>• Closest to Aqua, (Jammy failed to mention ✓)</i> <i>- Canada Environment</i> <i>• Very clear + again very impactful (lots of great evidence but from where?)</i> <i>• Great delivery, very effective</i>	Circle Point Rating: 6 highest ← 5 4 3 2 1 lowest <i>Cross-Ex</i> <i>- Only Oklahoma has benefited</i> <i>- Hesitant in overresponse</i> <i>- older model has leaked ✓</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 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: <i>Evan Koretsky</i>
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>Siddiqi</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>Pipeline</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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmers are upset as pipeline will run through farms - This happens to people every day why is this important? • Loss of Jobs - Refute to Jammy + Gupta ✓ - Previous case (great example) • Open up Tar Sands - Not environmentally friendly (where did you get this evidence?) 	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest Great delivery as always Cross - EX strong responses

SPEECH 2 Topic: <u>Pipeline</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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refutation to Morbas + Washwa • Lower classes disproportionately affected - temporary jobs, good logic but needs evidence • Oil from other companies - Russia case with Chevron ✓ 	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest UC Berkeley Law! ← Great source Harm Environment Any evidence? Cross - EX Again strong responses Great clarification to Russia example

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 Koretzky</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>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>Pipeline</u>	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG
<p>Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainable economy will create more jobs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great evidence • Key stone will cause job loss - evidence? - Fossil Fuel companies are cutting jobs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great evidence • invest in a different sector ✓ 	<p>Circle Point Rating:</p> <p>6 <u>5</u> 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest</p> <p><u>Cross-Ex</u> • How does solar pertain to keystone pipeline? response was a bit of a stretch</p>

SPEECH 2 Topic: <u>Pipeline</u>	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"> - Refutation to Chen <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jobs cut from agriculture and oil outweigh (evidence?) ← - Sustainable Economy Clarification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great logic, very clear <p><u>1:31</u></p>	<p>Circle Point Rating:</p> <p>6 5 <u>4</u> 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest</p> <p><u>Cross-Ex</u> • Very heated responses</p>

SPEECH 3 Topic:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG
<p>Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:</p>	<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: <u>Evan Koretsky</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	<u>7th</u>	8th	None

Student Name: <u>Pajas</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>Pipeline</u>	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG
<p>Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - California senator. Is this really an effective intro? - Would not better economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good warrants, but not very well structured - Managing would worsen the situation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cut GDP, good source - Worse for environment <p><i>- Try not to read off of notes!</i> <i>Good delivery but somewhat monotonic</i></p> <p><i>Overall great evidence but needs better structure. I felt like your evidence was all over the place</i></p> <p><i>Cross-EK</i> <i>- Temporary jobs won't last</i> <i>- Boom only for Oklahoma and Texas and short-lived</i> <u>3:07</u></p>	<p>Circle Point Rating:</p> <p>6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest</p>

SPEECH 2 Topic:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG
<p>Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:</p>	<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
<p>Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:</p>	<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: <u>Evan Koretzky</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>Jammy</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>Pipeline</u>	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"> - Boost economy + provide jobs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • southern leg, case • Great evidence - Safest Mode <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dep't state "minimal environmental risk" • Good refute to environmentalist concern <p>- A bit repetitive but great speaking, very clear</p>	<p>Circle Point Rating:</p> <p>6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest</p> <p><u>5</u></p> <p><u>Cross-Ex</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great responses obviously very knowledgeable over issue • A bit of a stumble in one response

SPEECH 2 Topic: <u>Pipeline</u>	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"> - Refutations to Mahla + Bajaj <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • environment will be harmed in Canada - whether or not pipeline is built, oil will be extracted just exported in more dangerous ways • "Only for Texas + Oklahoma economics" - Great evidence (from where?) • Trans Canada is building • Lots of jobs 	<p>Circle Point Rating:</p> <p>6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest</p> <p><u>5</u></p> <p><u>Cross-Ex</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great evidence for not hurting env. • Strong responses

SPEECH 3 Topic:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG
<p>Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:</p>	<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: <u>Evan Koretsky</u>
School/Affiliation:

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: Washwa		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: Pipeline	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"> - Personal Anecdote Intro - Taxes produced will help fund nearby Areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New point ✓ • Good logic, lots of "could"s (more evidence needed) - Decrease dependency on middle Eastern countries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stop funding corruption in these countries (what countries? what corruption? Why does the U.S. care?) <p style="text-align: right;">- Great delivery but try not to read off notes</p>	<p>Circle Point Rating:</p> <p>6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Cross-Ex</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calm, strong responses • Repetitive

SPEECH 2 Topic:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG
<p>Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:</p>	<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
<p>Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:</p>	<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 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: <u>Gupta</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>Pipeline</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: - Relatable Intro ✓ - pipeline will create jobs • where did you get #'s from • temporary can find another job in the field ✓ - TransCanada funds pipeline maintenance • and pays US. for property - ↓ gas prices - Refutations very very logical ✓ - weak response to environmental issues • otherwise strong responses		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← 1 → lowest <u>3:06</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 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 Koretsky</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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Morbad</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>pipeline</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: - Intro: Great Info. (sources?) - Creates Jobs • Nice Projection • Needs stronger impact - Manufacturing help • good logic • evidence?		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← [4] → lowest Cross - Ex • GOP-cut: No response • temporary jobs: nice response

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>Evankoratsky</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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <u>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>Pipeline</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: - Economy • "ould"s and "wouid"s (where from) • refutation to job cuts - ↓ Reliance on Foreign Energy needs more evidence!		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 <u>4</u> 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest <i>Cross-ex strong responses</i>
- Refutation • Cannot rely on sustainable energy like solar • In response to won, weak refutation point no evidence on permanent vs. temp jobs • Good delivery but some trip-ups		

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 Kortsky</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	<u>None</u>

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: Pipeline	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: - Intro: Good refutation - Unemployment rates ↑ • Refutation to Chen - Good Evidence • but how does this ↑ Unemployment in the long run? - Hurt Middle Class • Confusing, Clarify how evidence relates to		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest [3]
- ok delivery try not to read off of notes - Good responses - last response was weak on temporary jobs CROSS EX 3:02		

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: <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>Pipeline</u>	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG
<p>Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not reduce dependence on oil - reputations - Canada ships more oil to U.S. than any other country already - arguments are somewhat confusing - Robs Farmers of land - has stronger impact <p style="text-align: right;"><u>3:07</u></p>	<p>Circle Point Rating:</p> <p>6 5 4 <u>3</u> 2 1 highest ← → lowest</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Cross-EX</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK responses • TOO much emphasis on farmers land

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: <u>Evan Koretsky</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>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>Pipeline</u>	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG
	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest <i>4</i>
Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: - Expansion to keystone pipeline, good clarification - Obama Admin. against - Aqueduct (Drinking water) + Greenhouse Emissions ↑ - good evidence } needs stronger impact - Risk is hypothetical - Loss of jobs - very hypothetical but good logic (needs more evidence) - good delivery, try not to read off of paper	
- Again very hypothetical responses - Overall good 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: Evan Koratzky

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 Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: Mehrotra		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:

Decent, one issue

PRINT Judge Name: Evan Koresky
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.								

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Wan</u>		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: <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> 6 <u>highest</u> 5 4 3 2 1 lowest </div>	Circle Point Rating: <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> 6 <u>highest</u> 5 4 3 2 1 lowest </div>	Circle Point Rating: <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> 6 <u>highest</u> 5 4 3 2 1 lowest </div>

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

Great!

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: Gupta		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:

Great: very experienced

PRINT Judge Name: Eran Korotzky
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.								

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: Siddiqi		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:

Great at P.O.

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Gupta</u>		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:

- Very well done
- By the book
- No critiques

PRINT Judge Name: Asahynn Timmerman
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.

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Won</u>		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:

- Procedural things done well
- Slightly informal at times

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: Mehrotra		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:

- Few procedural errors
- Maintained good moving chamber

PRINT Judge Name: Ashlynn Timmerman
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.								

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: Siddiqi		School Code:
Session: Finals	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:

- Everything by protocol
- Maintained a quick moving chamber
- did a very good job
- no critiques

PRINT Judge Name: Ashlynn Timmerman
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: <u>Jammy</u>		School Code:
Session: <u>Finals</u>	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>Keystone Pipeline</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>2:53s</u> <u>Strong opening speech; spoke of state benefits; jobs available, speaking cadence good, looked at paper ~25%. Description of possible damages done very thoroughly. Listed points again at end. Gasoline question only weak one, good statistical reference when answering questions. Easy to understand</u>		Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 2	Topic: <u>Keystone Pipeline</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>2:54s</u> <u>States that there may be other options, but this extraction is the safest way. Addresses other arguments with better explained claims. Looked at paper ~10% time. Very well paced + good speaking cases. One question & dodged around</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: Siddiqi		School Code:
Session: Finals	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: Keystone Pipeline	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: 2:46s Farmers appeal-ethos+pathos; Statistics about CEO's corruption & embezzling of money very strong point, fairly decent analysis. Long-term analysis of potential dangers; gave a source, but didn't really analyze. Addressing of solar power incomplete. Looked at paper ~10% time		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 2	Topic: Keystone Pipeline	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: 3:04s Gave good points w/ sources. Backing more needed for hurting families. Interesting points about hurting internat. rel. Asking for long term perspective-good. Looked @ paper ~20%. Didn't answer some questions to the point. Some confusing points made arguing about international relations		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

Student Name: <u>Meha</u>		School Code:
Session: <u>Finals</u>	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>Keystone Pipeline</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>2:41s</u> <u>Obama-authority opinion; Aquifer points very well thought out & proved. Showed wide spance of how much the water impacts the world. Talks about canadrian environment & the neg. impact w/ good statistics & explanations. Looks @ paper ~15% time, good speaking cadence. Answers to questions was not addressing points & at all times. Very short w/ answering & didn't present sources</u>		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← (4) → 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

Student Name: <u>Gupta</u>		School Code:
Session: <u>Finals</u>	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>Keystone Pipeline</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>3:06s</u> <u>Witty intro to speech. Good linkage btwn skills learned to get new jobs. Trans-Canada paying for cost of building pipeline. Layed out benefits of laying pipeline to connecting. Good points about having to buy land. Look at paper ~10% time. Didn't back up environmental question w/ any concrete facts.</u>		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← (4) → 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

Student Name: <i>Bogaj</i>		School Code:
Session: <i>Finals</i>	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>Keystone Pipeline</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>3:07s</i> <i>Comparison string very interesting. Looks at paper ~60% time. Gives good statistics as to why economy doesn't need pipeline. Statistics of CO₂ prod by pipeline vs crude to provide good point. Used very good quotes, however analysis should be increased. Answering to questioned seemed slightly hypotheticals, + at times avoided subject.</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:

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>Wadhwa</u>		School Code:
Session: <u>Finals</u>	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>Keystone Pipeline</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>Personal connection at beginning good, but seemed unrelated.</u> <u>Statistics good + explained well, good points of funding corruption</u> <u>Looked at paper ~40% time. Answering questions about environment lacking. Said yes</u> <u>to all questions, even global warming + other neg aspects. Good pacing</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>Won</u>		School Code:
Session: <u>Finals</u>	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>Keystone Pipeline</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>Sustainable economy, not temporarily. Good introduction of solar power as an alternative outlet. Looked @ paper ~ 90% time. Speaking cadence very good w/ emphasis on appropriate words. Points out inefficiency of heating min-wage jobs in gas industry. Jobs question answer was slightly round-about.</u>		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 (4) 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 2	Topic: <u>Keystone Pipeline</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>1:31s</u> <u>Good Further explanation as to why solar power is so beneficial. Answering to questions done very well & to the point. Very heated</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>Vonteddu</u>		School Code:
Session: <u>Finals</u>	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: Keystone Pipeline

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

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

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: 2:29
Many good sources & explanations about them. Describe XL vs orig. good. Very good ethos appeal about persevering for the future. Looked at paper ~50%. Responding to questions, not super strong. Cadence fairly good.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: Sponsor AFF NEG

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

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>Sun</u>		School Code:
Session: <u>Finals</u>	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>Keystone Pipeline</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>3:07s</u> <u>Brings up good point about how oil is being exported, but poorly backed up. Confusion about point trying to be made. Spoke clearly + good pace. Farmers point good, but could have been better explained. Speech cut off. Texas point about exporting seemed poorly backed up</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>Morbad</u>		School Code:
Session: <u>Finals</u>	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>Keystone Pipeline</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>2:33s</u> <u>Benefits of XL vs orig. Said benefits (health) can be gotten from jobs but no promises/evidence. Looked @ paper ~50%</u> <u>Didn't give amazing examples explaining points. Answering questions not great & lacked good backing.</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>Mehrotra</u>		School Code:
Session: <u>Finals</u>	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>Keystone Pipeline</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>3:02s</u> <u>Point about 500/20,000 very good, backed up well & analyzed. Speaking cadence very stop & go. Statistics very reliable & useful, put into easier to understand terms. Looked @ sheet 70% time. Answering to questions very sparatic.</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>Chen</u>		School Code:
Session: <u>Finals</u>	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>Keystone Pipeline</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>2:08</u> <u>Spoke passionately, some spacey gaps saying "um". Statistics about jobs, slight analysis. Point about jumping on job opportunities good</u> <u>Answering questions - didn't really address questions + restated irrelevant points</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**