

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Ronit Patel</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:						Circle Point Rating:						Circle Point Rating:								
6	5	4	3	2	1	6	5	4	3	2	1	6	5	4	3	2	1			
highest	←				→	lowest	highest	←				→	lowest	highest	←				→	lowest

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

Excellent job in recognition and demeanor
Excellent job in parliamentary procedure

PRINT Judge Name: <u>Means</u>
School/Affiliation: <u>JHS</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 Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Christian Butlerfield</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>Elaborate College</u>	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: <u>Strong evidence & logic</u> <u>Exhibit originality</u> <u>Strong organization & unity</u>		

SPEECH 2	Topic: <u>Hemp</u>	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: <u>Strong originality of thought</u> <u>Strong organization</u> <u>Strong evidence (fun facts)</u>		

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Lauren Craven</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>Prescription drugs</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
<u>Excellent organization</u> <u>Strong answers to questions</u> <u>Strong evidence & logic</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>Means</u>	RANK THIS SPEAKER Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th <u>(8th)</u> None
School/Affiliation: <u>JHS</u>	

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Cameron Ernst</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:	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 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>Means</u> School/Affiliation: <u>JHS</u>	RANK THIS SPEAKER Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9 1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None
--	---

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Nicole Gomez</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:	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 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>Means</u>
School/Affiliation: <u>JHS</u>

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Peter Gauthrie</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:	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 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>Means</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
School/Affiliation: <u>JHS</u>	

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Nicholas Katsikas</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>Electoral College</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>Excellent organization</u> <u>Strong delivery</u>	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 2	Topic: <u>Prescription drugs ADS</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>Strong organization</u> <u>Strong evidence</u>	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

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

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

PRINT Judge Name: <u>Means</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
School/Affiliation: <u>JHS</u>	

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Zechariah Martin</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>Trade</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>Excellent points (personal) Strong responses</u> <u>Relevant</u> <u>Excellent eye contact</u>	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

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

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

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

PRINT Judge Name: <u>Means</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
School/Affiliation: <u>JHS</u>	

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Kennedy Nodler	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: Trade	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: Excellent delivery Excellent evidence/logic/originality of thought Great job responding to questions		Circle Point Rating: (6) 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 2	Topic: Prescription drugs	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: Truly excellent delivery Excellent evidence logic Strong organization Excellent originality of thought		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: Means School/Affiliation: JHS	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>Preston Romanov</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>Hectoral college</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>Excellent delivery - very heartfelt & engaging</u> <u>Excellent organization & unity</u>	Circle Point Rating: <u>6</u> 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 2	Topic: <u>Presing peng</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: <u>Strong organization</u> <u>Excellent evidence & logic</u>	Circle Point Rating: <u>5</u> 6 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>Wears</u>
School/Affiliation: <u>JHS</u>

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Correna Tate</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>Trade</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: <u>Excellent eye contact</u> <u>Excellent responses</u> <u>Excellent volume & clarity</u> <u>Clear points</u>	Circle Point Rating: 6 <u>5</u> 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 2	Topic: <u>Homop</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: <u>Strong evidence & logic</u> <u>Strong answer to questions</u>	Circle Point Rating: 6 <u>5</u> 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 3	Topic: <u>Prescription drug Abs</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>Strong originality of thought</u> <u>Excellent delivery</u>	Circle Point Rating: 6 <u>5</u> 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Eugash Upad</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>Trade</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>Excellent points (evidence & logic)</u> <u>Excellent eye contact & volume (delivery)</u> <u>Answered questions very well</u>		Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 2	Topic: <u>Electoral College</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: <u>Excellent delivery</u> <u>Excellent evidence & logic</u> <u>Very strong answer to questions</u>		Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

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

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

PRINT Judge Name: <u>JHS / means</u>
School/Affiliation: <u>JHS</u>

RANK THIS SPEAKER								
Circle one. <u>8</u> 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>Autumn Webster</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>Herndon College</u>	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG
	Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: <u>Excellent evidence & logic</u> <u>Strong delivery</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>Means</u>
School/Affiliation: <u>JHS</u>

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Cooper Winrich</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>Trade</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

Excellent delivery
Excellent evidence & logic
Strong originality of thought

SPEECH 2	Topic: <u>Trump</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

Excellent originality of thought
Excellent delivery

SPEECH 3	Topic: <u>Prophet drugs</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

Strong delivery
Strong organization

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

PRINT Judge Name:	<u>Means</u>
School/Affiliation:	<u>JHS</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: Cooper Winrich	School Code: Trinity
Session: 2	Room: Library
	Chamber #: 1

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: Kurdistan	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:		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest
Good eye contact. Good presence. Good Volume. Reuters Rural Stability Good Sources implications. economics IRAN		3:11

SPEECH 2	Topic: Rec. m.	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
1. Crime increase 2. Adolescent use 3. Solid answers to questions. Clash Sources eye contact Reasoned arguments		2:2? Ser.

SPEECH 3	Topic: Saudi	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
Clearly states your position. Clash w/ upper Clash w/ Guthrie Clash w/ Kate Guardians Reuters Volume is good. Rate is good. "But next..." U.S. News F.P. clash w/ Patel. Good eye contact. Good brand gestures. "Funding? Helms"		3:09

QUESTIONING of other speakers
Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.
Hand. (111) 1111 11

PRINT Judge Name: Janet Martin	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
School/Affiliation: BGHS	

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Peter Guthrie	School Code: BGHS
Session: 2	Room: Lib.
	Chamber #: 1

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: Kurdistan	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
1. Not \$ viable - too dependent 2. Ethnic Cleansing & Dictatorship 3. Destroy, not enhance stability Reasoned arguments ✓ Nice volume Nice Rate. Atlantic ✓ Economist Foreign Pol. Finally, Clash ✓		3:11

SPEECH 2	Topic: Roc. Med.	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
Nice hook w/ Question Nice volume Tie it together a little better w/ ^{changes} transitions Do you clash? Sources? ✓		3:03

SPEECH 3	Topic: Saudi	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
Good Clarification of the issue. Clear statement of your position. Good signposting. Good support. "Cozy relationships through the sales of arms." Clearly presents ideas. Authoritative. "Morally Icky"		

QUESTIONING of other speakers
Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc. III The 1 was a little more ^{consistently} active throughout the round. You gave some <u>SOLID</u> speeches!

PRINT Judge Name: Janet Martin	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
School/Affiliation: BGHS	

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Katsikas	School Code: Ryle
Session: 2	Room: Lib
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: Kurdistan	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFF <input type="checkbox"/> NEG	2:44
Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest	
1. aligned w/ American values you have the beginnings of a powerful speaker 2. presence, but your stammers interfere with your overall speaker strength you tapped the podium throughout it was distracting Are you citing sources? Are you clashing directly?			

SPEECH 2	Topic: Rec. m.	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:		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest
More eye contact, please. Watch tapping the podium. Occasionally, purposefully for emphasis is ok. Your speech is well written, but I felt like you were reading to me more than speaking to me. Engage w/ audience more. Are you strong answers to Q's?		

SPEECH 3	Topic:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEG
Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest
You did a great job staying engaged & active. #1 & #2 Gave more speeches and had more solid delivery of speeches.		

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

4/11/11 Bypass economic fallout - Well worded
1/1

PRINT Judge Name:	Janet Martin
School/Affiliation:	BGHS

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:	Suyash Uppal		School Code:	Jeffersonville	
Session:	2	Room:	Lib	Chamber #:	1

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:	Saudi	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 Given more eye contact would improve your overall performance. It felt more like you were reading to me than really engaging me. use pronounce woman women correctly. Handled questions well.			

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			

Others ahead of you had more speeches, were more solid in their delivery, and more consistently engaged throughout the session.

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

1/1/1 Immediately or later? Good Q.

PRINT Judge Name:	Janet Martin
School/Affiliation:	BGHS

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>Lauren Cravens</u>	School Code: <u>BGHS</u>
Session: <u>2</u>	Room: <u>L.b.</u>
	Chamber #: <u>1</u>

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

Reasoned arguments ✓
Nice transitions ✓
You make me interested? about
to listen to you.

Need more eye contact.
Do you look up?
Do you clash?

Did you cite all papers.

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

You had some nice moments in
your speech, and show great poise and polish.
Those who finished ahead of you ~~were~~ spoke more, were

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

1

a little more solid in
their delivery and more
consistently engaged throughout

PRINT Judge Name: <u>Janet Martin</u>
School/Affiliation: <u>BGHS</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:	Webster, Autumn	School Code:	Jeffville
Session:	2	Room:	Lib.
		Chamber #:	1

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:	Saudi	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

Class w/ Martin
Clearly stated position. Good eye contact w/ judge. Shared eye contact w/ other senators as well. Nice volume. You have a pleasant speaking voice. Good clarification. You seem a little new to this, but I'm excited to see how you'll grow.

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

you show great promise to be exceptional!

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

Those who finished ahead of you gave more speeches, were ~~also~~ more solid in their delivery, and more consistently engaged throughout the session.

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

11

PRINT Judge Name:	Janet Martin
School/Affiliation:	BGHS

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: Martin, Zack	School Code: BGHS
Session: 2	Room: Lib.
	Chamber #: 1

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: Saudi	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

Hook?
Make your thesis clear. Did you state at the beginning whether you are supporting? Why? We need to vote for this bill because...
Speaking rate a little slow and halting

Sources ✓
Sort of got ahead of yourself w/ this speech.

2:34
Q

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

Those who finished ahead of you gave more speeches, were more solid in their delivery, and more consistently engaged throughout. Work to be more consistent in your speech structure & it will clear up what some confusion.

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

1111

You seem very passionate when you speak.

PRINT Judge Name: Janet Martin	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
School/Affiliation: BGHS	

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Ronit Patel	School Code: BGHS
Session: 2	Room: Lib.
	Chamber #: 1

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: Saudi Arabia	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:		Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest
<p><i>Nice volume, nice rate.</i></p> <p><i>My 2nd Contention Destroying infrastructure</i></p> <p><i>Your argument is a little unclear. As an author</i></p> <p><i>front load w/ what the bill means</i></p> <p><i>some info. NO source</i></p> <p><i>Sources? CNN</i></p>		

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

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

Those who finished ahead of you gave more speeches, more solid delivery, and were more consistently engaged. You have some great strengths in

QUESTIONING of other speakers	<i>this activity and that great promise.</i>
Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.	

PRINT Judge Name: Janet Martin
School/Affiliation: BGHS

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: Christian Butterfield		School Code: BGHS
Session: 2	Room: Library	Chamber #: 1

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:

A little timid
 Good to remind chamber of being recognized before they speak.
 Confused a little over what to do: Roberts Rules.
 And all in favor — approved. You can't
 approve w/out also asking for opposed.
 ↳ you did that at least 2x.
 Do you know which votes need voice & which need to
 stand? Do you know which need 2/3 & which need
 majority?
 (Over)

PRINT Judge Name:	Janet Martin
School/Affiliation:	BGHS

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name:	Tate, Correna	School Code:	Assumption
Session:	2	Room:	Lib.
		Chamber #:	1

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:	Saudi	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:															
<p><i>Your speaking rate is a little rapid. You must either slow down slightly or enunciate even more. If you slow down a little, that may help you avoid so much repetition. Did you clash? You present a strong argument. Iron out the delivery and make sure you have clash & reference every source.</i></p>			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>highest</td> <td colspan="4"></td> <td>lowest</td> </tr> </table>				6	5	4	3	2	1	highest					lowest
			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:															
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>highest</td> <td colspan="4"></td> <td>lowest</td> </tr> </table>				6	5	4	3	2	1	highest					lowest
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:															
<p><i>You show incredible potential in this activity. Those who finished ahead of you had more speeches, were more polished in their delivery, and were more consistently engaged throughout the session.</i></p>			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>highest</td> <td colspan="4"></td> <td>lowest</td> </tr> </table>				6	5	4	3	2	1	highest					lowest
			6	5	4	3	2	1										
highest					lowest													

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

11

PRINT Judge Name:	Janet Martin	RANK THIS SPEAKER
School/Affiliation:	BGHS	
		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: Kennedy	Room: Nodler	School Code: Assumption
Session: 2	Room: L:b.	Chamber #: 1

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

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

SPEECH 1	Topic:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input 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 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.

||||

Solid questions, but no speeches.

PRINT Judge Name:	Janet Martin
School/Affiliation:	BGHS

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: Cameron Ernst	School Code: Trinity
Session: 2	Room: Lib.
	Chamber #: 1

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

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

SPEECH 1	Topic:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input 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 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. 1 Question asked, no speeches

PRINT Judge Name: Janet Martin School/Affiliation: BGHS	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 9
--	---

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Ronit Patel		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: Keystone XL Negotiation	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

- comfortable movement and good vocal quality
- good idea to bring up safety concerns
- a few arguments about environmental impact were not fully clear to me
- answers were not very concise

SPEECH 2	Topic: Capital Punishment	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

- awkward intro to speech
- good idea to list contentions at the beginning
- the overcrowding argument sounded like you were arguing for extermination because there are too many prisoners
- good appeal to emotion as last contention - a

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

- good start with a rhetorical question
- very linear arguments - argument that US has to be "perfect" was less effective

QUESTIONING of other speakers

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

- good question to support your point on capital punishment

PRINT Judge Name:

Michael Morris

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: Lauren Cravens		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: Capital Punishment	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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - brought up the lost argument which was a good addition to the debate - smart to bring up ethical theories - very linear and well-thought speech - wish you had more questions good answer 		

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Christian Butterfield		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: Keystone XL (Pro)	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:	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

- Humorous - good movement
 - impressive vocal range - had very specific sources to help argument
 - concise answers to first round of questions - ended speech in the middle

SPEECH 2	Topic: Capital Punishment (Pro)	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:	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

- Very unique argument about discrimination very well defended
 - did not have enough time to defend second point as much as the first

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.

- good questions supporting your bill

PRINT Judge Name: Michael Morris	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
School/Affiliation:	

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Nicholas Katsikas		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: Keystone XL	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: - Very good vocal quality - sounded <i>passionate</i> - Very good appeal to emotion and ethics - answered both questions very well	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 2	Topic: Federal Oversight	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: - status rights - good listing of your 3 key points - status right argument was very effective - for - voter fraud status were a good addition - good answers, short but effective	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.

- sought clarification and asked very insightful questions
- good prefaced to capital punishment question

PRINT Judge Name: Michael Morris 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: Peter Guthrie		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: Federal Elections	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"> - Bush v. Gore was a great example - brought argument of discrimination to debate - Very specific examples - brought up how new technology - very good answers 	<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
<p>Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.</p> <p>- Very good Capital Punishment question - well thought out</p>

PRINT Judge Name: Michael Morris School/Affiliation:	<table border="1"> <tr> <th colspan="9">RANK THIS SPEAKER</th> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="9">Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1st</td> <td>2nd</td> <td>3rd</td> <td>4th</td> <td>5th</td> <td>6th</td> <td>7th</td> <td>8th</td> <td>None</td> </tr> </table>	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
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: Preston Romanov		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: Capital Punishment	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"> - good use of the constitution argument - great addition to the debate - brought in new statistics to support claims - concise answers but not as well formed - good vocal quality and speed - weak ending 	<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.

- good clarification on sources for election - good jury murdering question

PRINT Judge Name: Michael Morris 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: Cooper Winick		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 good introduction
- Very good control of the congress
- good indicators of going over time or if how time has passed
- good following of procedure

PRINT Judge Name: Michael Morris
School/Affiliation: Assumption

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

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Zachary Martin		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: Keystone XL Negotiation	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: - introduced speech with economic focus - very good - However, there was not much of an economic focus once you started - very good speaking demeanor	
		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. - Very good questions, The rerouting question was very good

PRINT Judge Name: Michael Morris 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>Cameron Ernst</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>Keystone XL</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 <u>4</u> 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>More Vocal Fluctuation</u> - <u>Good Argument</u> → <u>well written con speech</u> - <u>did not answer one question but good answers to others</u> 		

SPEECH 2	Topic: <u>Capitol Punishment</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 <u>4</u> 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>good idea to bring up popular opinion</u> - <u>the crime deterrent argument was not well defended</u> - <u>good argument about violence inside prisons</u> → <u>good answers to first question</u> 		

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>Michael Morris</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	<u>8th</u> None

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Suyash Uppal</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>Federal Oversight</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>- bringing up founding fathers was effective</u> <u>- brought up many affirmative points</u> <u>- weak ending on speech</u>	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 <u>4</u> 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

- good point about looking verifiably

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.

- Very thought out question on elections

PRINT Judge Name: <u>Michael Morris</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: Correna Tate		School Code:
Session:	Room:	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1	Topic:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input 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 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.

Very good questions on Keystone XL, very good Capital Punishment question
Good question on voter ID laws

PRINT Judge Name: Michael Morris 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: Kennedy Nodur		School Code:
Session:	Room:	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1	Topic:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor <input type="checkbox"/> AFF <input 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 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.

-good clarification question on Capital Punishment

PRINT Judge Name: Michael Morris	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
School/Affiliation:	

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name: <u>Nicole Gomez</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:	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 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.

- good - question for clarification

PRINT Judge Name: <u>Michael Morris</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
--	---