

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: ADITYA VENKATRAM		School Code:
Session: 4	Room: 407	Chamber #:

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

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

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

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

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

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

PRINT Judge Name: NUPUR MEHROTRA
School/Affiliation: DVHS

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: PUSITA TANGIRAI		School Code:
Session: 4	Room: 407	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Banning Football	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>Was able to argue the affirmation point with great facts. Very good content. Nicely presented.</i>	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

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

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

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

PRINT Judge Name: **NUPUR MEHROTRA**
 School/Affiliation: **DVMS**

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: RISHI JAMMY		School Code:
Session: 4	Room: 407	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1	Topic: BANNING FOOTBALL	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: Content was good. Raised a good point, "Why Ban not Fix". Good comparisons.		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:	NUPUR MEHROTRA
School/Affiliation:	DVHS

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: JOHA REDDY	School Code:
Session: 4	Room: 407
Chamber #:	

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Banning Football	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: Voice was not very clear, rushing through his speech. Anyway to cross examinations were more clear.	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: NUPUR MEHROTRA
School/Affiliation: DVHS

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: ARSHIA MEHTA	School Code:
Session: 4	Room: 407
Chamber #:	

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Banney Football	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: Very good points. Should be a little more clear while communicating. very good points in cross examination. Confident in all her points.	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: NUPUR MEHROTRA
School/Affiliation: DVHS

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: MOHID JAHANGIRI	School Code:
Session: 4	Room: 407
Chamber #:	

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Banning Football	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: Very unclear in his points. Not sure of his speech in the 2nd part.	Circle Point Rating: 4 6 highest ← 5 ← 4 ← 3 ← 2 ← 1 lowest

SPEECH 2 Topic: Meditation	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 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: NUPUR MEHROTRA
School/Affiliation: DVHS

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: EDMOND WEN		School Code:
Session: 4	Room: 407	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Banning Football	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: Very good points Forceful in his presentation aggressive in his stance	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

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

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

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

PRINT Judge Name: NUPUR MEHROTRA
School/Affiliation: DVHS

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: SOHUM GUPTA	School Code:
Session: 4	Room: 407
Chamber #:	

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: <u>Banning Football</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>liked the idea of giving another option. Nice rebut during speech.</u>	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

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

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: NUPUR MEHROTRA
School/Affiliation: DVMS

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: NAKUL BAJAJ		School Code:
Session: 4	Room: 407	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: BANNING FOOTBALL	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: Has good points, Clear communications, Nicely answered all the questions.	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 2 Topic: Meditation.	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: NUPUR MEHROTRA
School/Affiliation: DVHS

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: VAIBHAV TRIPATHI		School Code:
Session: 4	Room: 407	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1	Topic: Banning FOOTBALL	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: Cross examination answers were not very informative and repetitive		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 2	Topic: Meditation	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:	NUPUR MEHROTRA
School/Affiliation:	DVHS

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: PRANAV K KUMAR	School Code:
Session: 4	Room: 407
Chamber #:	

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: BANNING FOOTBALL	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: should be a little more clear while presenting. voice decibal is not up & down.	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: NUPUR MEHROTRA
School/Affiliation: DVHS

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: CAROLINA TARANGO		School Code:
Session: 4	Room: 407	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1	Topic: Banning Football	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>was not very clear in presentation. Voice was not understandable due to rushing. Not good points presented in cross examination.</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:	NUPUR MEHROTRA
School/Affiliation:	DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: ADITYA VENKATARAMO	School Code:
Session: 4	Room: 407
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 <i>highest</i> ← → <i>lowest</i>	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 <i>highest</i> ← → <i>lowest</i>	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 <i>highest</i> ← → <i>lowest</i>

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

PRINT Judge Name: NUPUR MEHROTRA
School/Affiliation: DVMS

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: SONUM GUPTA		School Code:
Session: 4	Room: 407	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 5 4 3 2 1 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center; margin-top: 5px;"> highest ← → lowest </div>	Circle Point Rating: <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> 6 5 4 3 2 1 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center; margin-top: 5px;"> highest ← → lowest </div>	Circle Point Rating: <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> 6 5 4 3 2 1 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center; margin-top: 5px;"> highest ← → lowest </div>

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

was going to be same speaker for cross exam questions.

PRINT Judge Name: NUPUR MEHROTRA
School/Affiliation: DVHS

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

Student Name: Arshvia Wehla	Session: 4
School Code:	Room: 407
Chamber #:	

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

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

Topic: Football	SPEECH 1
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 6 5 4 3 2 1 ← lowest

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

- She was impressive for own quality
- She looked at the other side of court on football
health benefit
- She clearly provided the economy over the health (-)

Topic:	SPEECH 2
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 6 5 4 3 2 1 ← lowest

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

Topic: SPEECH 3	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG
Circle Point Rating: highest ← 6 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: Abraham Shalizi

School/Affiliation: Golden State

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:	Oohna Kelly
Session:	4
Room:	407
School Code:	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: Football
Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: - spoke a little fast and mumbled words	
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 6 5 4 3 2 1 ← lowest

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

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

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

PRINT Judge Name: Abraham Strain
School/Affiliation: Golden State

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:	Carolina Tarango	
Session:	4	Room: 407
School Code:	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** (cite credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

SPEECH 1	Topic:	
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating:	<p>highest ← lowest</p> <p>6 5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>①</p>

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

-she was speaking too fast.
- I could not understand most of her points
- she doped most of the questions

SPEECH 2	Topic:	
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating:	<p>highest ← lowest</p> <p>6 5 4 3 2 1</p>

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

SPEECH 3	Topic:	
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating:	<p>highest ← lowest</p> <p>6 5 4 3 2 1</p>

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:	Abraham Shalizi
School/Affiliation:	Groden State

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

Student Name: Edmond Wen	Session: 4
School Code:	Room: 407
Chamber #:	

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the best, providing 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.

Topic: Football	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG
Circle Point Rating: highest ← 6 5 4 3 2 1 ← lowest	

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- good job in returning to other speaker points
- good arguments

Topic: Meditation	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG
Circle Point Rating: highest ← 6 5 4 3 2 1 ← lowest	

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- should calm down a bit.
- should focus on certain points to add emphasis
- arguments back by evidence
- deduct questions
- certain

Topic: SPEECH 3	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG
Circle Point Rating: highest ← 6 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: Abraham Shelton
School/Affiliation: Golden State

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: Mohid Jahangir	Session: 4
School Code:	Room: 407
Chamber #:	

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

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

SPEECH 1	
Topic: <u>Football</u>	Circle Point Rating: <u>4</u>
Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: - the "violation of first comment" request was very unique and unexpected - his answer was well thought out

SPEECH 2	
Topic: <u>Meditation</u>	Circle Point Rating: <u>5</u>
Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: - his content was very well written - his combination of request was very unique - the pursuit of happiness

SPEECH 3	
Topic:	Circle Point Rating:
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:

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

PRINT Judge Name: <u>Abraham Shalizi</u>	School/Affiliation: <u>Golden State</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: John Gupta	Session: 4	Room: 407	Chamber #:
School Code:			

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the best, six being the worst, 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: Football
Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:		
- his alternate solution was well complete - he did not respond to the question well		
Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 ← lowest highest →	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG	

SPEECH 2		Topic: Meditation
Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:		
- argument of religion was very supported by evidence - good analysis of the bill - interesting argument did not make sense		
Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 ← lowest highest →	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG	

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

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

PRINT Judge Name: Horikawa Steiner
School/Affiliation: Golden State

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: Nakul Bajaj	Session: 4
School Code:	Room: 407
Chamber #:	

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one 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: Football	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG
Circle Point Rating: highest ← 1 2 3 4 5 6 → lowest	4

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

- good statistics
(100+ hrs)
- very clear speaking (good hand gestures)
- gave logical responses

SPEECH 2	
Topic: Meditation	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG
Circle Point Rating: highest ← 1 2 3 4 5 6 → lowest	3

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

- Harvard! (good source)
- link to a student performance
- ~~speech~~ argument was very logically sound
- his response was very different

SPEECH 3	
Topic:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG
Circle Point Rating: highest ← 1 2 3 4 5 6 → 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: Abraham Shalit	School/Affiliation: Golden State
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

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: Ranav Pranav Kumar	Session: 4	Room: 407	Chamber #:
School Code:			

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>football</u>	Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: - good use of evidence and statistics - good flow of argumentation
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 1 2 3 4 5 6 → lowest	

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

SPEECH 3	Topic:	Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 1 2 3 4 5 6 → 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>Kishi Tammy</i>	Session: <i>4</i>
School Code:	Room: <i>407</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>Football</i>	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 1 2 3 4 5 6 → lowest
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>accepts that we should try to limit the dangerous side of football - great word economy - offered other solutions to the bill - analyzed bill very well</i>

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

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

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

PRINT Judge Name: <i>Abraham Shalizi</i>	School/Affiliation: <i>Golden State</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: Vaibhav Tripathi	Session: 4
School Code:	Room: 407
Chamber #:	

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one 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: Football
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 1 2 3 4 5 6 → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- spoke a little too fast
- little emphasis

SPEECH 2	Topic: Meditation
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 1 2 3 4 5 6 → lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- his personal anecdote not give me a reason
- poor emotional data
- I had added into psychology

SPEECH 3	Topic:
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 1 2 3 4 5 6 → 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: **Abramson Shalin**

School/Affiliation: **Golden State**

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



Invitational Form

Student Name: Pujita Tangirala	Session: 4
School Code:	Room: 407
Chamber #:	

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-6 points, with one being the best, six being the worst, 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: Football
Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating: 4

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

-her evidence was very had a very large sample size
-her argument about football players should play over sports" ~~was not~~ was very well argued
-her school-like answer stood very well

SPEECH 2	Topic: Meditation
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating: 3

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

-Nice introduction!
-nice evidence (not good explanation of money problem)

SPEECH 3	Topic:
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating: 1

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: Abraham Shalizi	School/Affiliation: Golden State
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: Ariya Venkatesh	Session: 4
School Code:	Room: 407
Chamber #:	

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

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

Topic: Meditation	SPEECH 1
Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 6 5 4 3 2 1 ← lowest

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
He has overview of his case was very helpful - he just a demonstrated a good amount of background information

Topic:	SPEECH 2
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 6 5 4 3 2 1 ← lowest

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

Topic:	SPEECH 3
Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 6 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: Abraham Shalizi	School/Affiliation: Golden State
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: John Gupta	Session: 4	Room: 407	Chamber #:
School Code:			

DIRECTIONS: AWARD A RATING of 1-6 points per hour of presiding, with one being the best, six being the worst. 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); **DEMANOR** (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: highest ← 6 5 4 3 2 1 → lowest	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 6 5 4 3 2 1 → lowest	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 6 5 4 3 2 1 → lowest

SPECIFIC COMMENTS: Explain your evaluation and justify your rating, providing constructive suggestions for improvement:
- displayed a very sound understanding of the role

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.

PRINT Judge Name: Abraham Shultz

School/Affiliation: Golden State

Student Name: Aditya Venkatesh	Session: 4
School Code:	Room: 407
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 questions, and maintains appropriate speaker precedence and recency); **CONTROL** (maintains decorum of delegates, and willing to rule dilatory motions/business out of order); **DEMANOR** (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: highest ← 6 5 4 3 2 1 ← lowest 1	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 6 5 4 3 2 1 ← lowest 1	Circle Point Rating: highest ← 6 5 4 3 2 1 ← lowest 1

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

- Made several mistakes
 - the other senators had to verbally reprove him

PRINT Judge Name: **Abraham Sklar**
 School/Affiliation: **Crolden State**

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: FOS may or may not be considered in your ranking.