

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber --	Student	Prep School or Code:
	Session --	Name	
	JUDGE --	Michael McClellan	Mindy Cook

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle)	AFF	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating	1	2	3	4	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 5	6
----------------------	-----	--------------------------------------	---------------	---	---	---	---	------------------------------------	---

Topic: *tablets*

Comments:

*Wont agree.
talks failed.
Obama not sincere.*

overall nice job.

*such small
Space does not need
such large space to
cover / you could make
the movements shorter.*

Speech 2 -- (Circle)	AFF	NEG	Circle Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6
----------------------	-----	-----	---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

Topic:

Comments:

looks awkward.

Speech 3 -- (Circle)	AFF	NEG	Circle Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6
----------------------	-----	-----	---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

Topic:

Comments:

Speech 4 -- (Circle)	AFF	NEG	Circle Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6
----------------------	-----	-----	---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

Topic:

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber --	Student	MW School or Code:
	Session --	Name	
	JUDGE --	Brady Klein Mindy Cook	

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4 5 6
---	--

Topic: Institutes

Comments:

Traffic/one dimension? How is that not relevant enough? If it rises - how is that ok?
 Book 1930s - FDA/relevant - how can you compare - better taxes?
 analysis needed to explain. Sort of done in questioning. needed in speech.
 Try to be more conversational. Better analysis is needed.

Speech 2 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
--	---------------------------

Topic:

Comments:

Speech 3 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
--	---------------------------

Topic:

Comments:

Speech 4 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
--	---------------------------

Topic:

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber --	Student	TRP School or Code:
	Session --	Name Jaliya Nagahawatte	
JUDGE -- Mindy Cook			

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 (4) 5 6
---	-----------------------------

Topic: Prostitution

Comments:

Quite a few main points...? Vague. you have 3 min should be concise.

would not know/Testing
not decline rape. fear they wont go to police - why? Not explained.

↑ Traffic / forced. Who's forcing them?

Speech 2 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
---	--------------------------------------

~~Topic:~~

~~Comments:~~

- Not a free choice / They choose their job.
- 18 yrs old.
Debate not furthered.
Keep practicing. overall speaking qualities are ok.
Not organized, lack of transitions, this was just a list.. not speech.

Speech 3 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
------------------------------	---------------------------

Topic:

Comments:

Speech 4 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
------------------------------	---------------------------

Topic:

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber --	Student	LNS School or Code:
	Session --	Name	
	JUDGE --	Bradley Weber Mindy Cook	

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 <u>6</u>
Topic: Prostitutes	

Comments:
Victimless crime
tax
Safe
no glaring critiques
Good organization. Good speaking. Good attack on the neg

Speech 2 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 <u>6</u>
Topic: Aid	

Comments:
for nothing we do not support.
overall great job / analysis.
What we have to see here - once good. ^{twice} ~~once~~ in questioning.

Speech 3 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 <u>6</u>
Topic: Soviet Amendment	

Comments:
headed - going to build more. Good reason.
multilateral best
overall great job!
"What we have to see" ATT ATT ← minus that.

Speech 4 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber --	Student	Prep School or Code:
	Session --	Name	
JUDGE --		Mindy Cook	

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) AFF <input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
---	---------------------------

Topic: Prostitution

Comments:

Logic versus stats. look at other nations.
Imported - traffic ↑
Labels.

Good pace. Speaking tone. The walking with your speech seemed unnatural. try to be more casual

overall good job refuting the aff.

Speech 2 -- (Circle) AFF <input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
---	---------------------------

Topic: Ad

Comments:

Not applicable.
Nice job w/ research. Good analysis.
Overall nice job.

Speech 3 -- (Circle) AFF <input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
---	---------------------------

Topic: Amendment

Comments:

Dangerous - but who says the DF would be dismantled?
Overall - nice job

Speech 4 -- (Circle) AFF <input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
---	---------------------------

Topic:

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber --	Student Name	LNS School or Code:
	Session --		
	JUDGE --	Mindy Cook	

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle)	AFF / <u>NEG</u>	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 <u>6</u>
Topic: <u>Prostitution</u>		

Comments:

overall nice job!

↓ Traffic
↑ jobs
12/14

"So we can see"
"We can also see" Limit this phrase.

Speech 2 -- (Circle)	AFF / <u>NEG</u>	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 <u>6</u>
Topic: <u>Avi</u>		

Comments:

changing failed

Good info
Overall nice job.

"^{So} But we can see" HTT III III

speech questions

↳ I should have talked this...

Speech 3 -- (Circle)	AFF / <u>NEG</u>	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> 6
Topic: <u>Amendment Swift</u>		

Comments:

Neg environment
cost effective to stop production

Nice Stats
Good analysis.

"What we can see" III III φ

speech questions

Speech should be more amendment related. It is relevant... sort of relevant...

Speech 4 -- (Circle)	AFF / NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:		

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber --	Student	Prep School or Code:
	Session --	Name Luke Bausch	
JUDGE --		Mindy Cook	

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 5 6
Topic: Prostitution	

Comments:

↓ violence
regulation
tax revenue

Well spoken. Good eye contact.
Good pace. Organization.
Overall well done.

Speech 2 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 5 6
Topic: Soviets	

Comments:

Randy
Transition?
\$

Very conversational.
cost to dismantle? Good
info to get.

"As we can see" 1 → not bad!

Speech 3 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 6
Topic: Amendment	

Comments:

not relevant on current stockpile. Nice!
China not a threat
won't reduce.

overall great job on this.

"As we can see" 11

Speech 4 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber --	Student	LNS School or Code:
	Session --	Name	
	JUDGE --	Ruben Aguilar Mindy Cook	

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 5 6
Topic: Prostitution	

Comments:

regulate brothels
tax / don't follow other nations
Unethical → Why is it unethical?
overall nice job!

Try to be conversational -
Seems like the tone /
Volume is constant...
Varying will improve how
it sounds.

Speech 2 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4 5 6
Topic: Aid	

Comments:

Only two other options? Was that researched and correct? Who says the NYT is creating the solution versus relaying info they've found? I know you want to regulate these but doesn't feel like an accurate analysis.

Speech 3 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 5 6
Topic: Amendment Savets	

Comments:

China / limited
overall nice job
in the Pentagon.

Pace is uneven - work on speaking more fluidly. Hard to follow.
Good points.

Speech 4 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber --	Student	Prep School or Code:
	Session --	Name	
	JUDGE --	Peter Owens Mindy Cook	

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> 6
Topic:	

PO-FM

Comments:

once you preside more frequently the phrases will be easier
Please be fair in your selection of reps.
Please be aware of times (questioning.)

Speech 2 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> 6
Topic:	

Comments:

overall doing a good job. Practice will help make everything easier.

Speech 3 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Speech 4 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber --	Student	prep School or Code:
	Session --	Name	
	JUDGE --	Nathaniel Lorenz Mindy Cook	

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4 5 6
Topic: Prostitution	

Comments:
 ↑ Quality of Life
 RI test. ↓ rapes ↓ STD - Thanks.
 Why made illegal again? may be helpful to do.
 Title of article - you don't have?
 Try to speak more naturally / can look it up yourself - try to be polite.

Speech 2 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 5 6
Topic: Smart	

Comments:
 Good organization.
 Better spoken than this speech.
 "Here we can see" 1 - not bad.

Speech 3 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Speech 4 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber --	Student Name	MW School or Code:
	Session --		
JUDGE --		Mindy Cook	

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4 5 6
Topic: <u>Art</u>	

Comments:

Try to be more casual with your delivery.
As a sponsorship speech you should define and have enough info fully understand the legislation.

Yom Kippur - ? Yom Ka-poor / pronunciation

Speech 2 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4 5 6
Topic: <u>Sovets</u>	

Comments:

nuclear power: way of future
Serve greater purpose - your
speech does not flow to lend
itself to easy listening.

Please be careful of
swaying the notepad
with your body.
Distracting to watch.

Speech 3 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Speech 4 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber -- 136	Student Name	School or Code:
	Session -- PM		
JUDGE --		Phil Maas	

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
------------------------------	---------------------------

Topic :

Comments:

Speech 2 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
------------------------------	---------------------------

Topic :

Comments:

Speech 3 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
------------------------------	---------------------------

Topic :

Comments:

Speech 4 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
------------------------------	---------------------------

Topic :

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber -- 132	Student	CP
	Session -- pm	Name Jaliya Nagahewatte	
JUDGE -- Phil Maas			

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) AFF <input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 5 6
Topic: 3	

Comments:

1- - good job addressing AFF cases.

2- non-elimination of abuse - found it difficult to figure out your points.

3- will not stop - rough delivery

2.54

Speech 2 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Speech 3 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Speech 4 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber -- 136	Student	Brady Klein	MW
	Session -- PM	Name		
	JUDGE --	Phil Maas		

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4 5 6
Topic: 3	

Comments:

2 - tax revenue

2.46

- had a hard time figuring out in the beginning if you were AFF or NEG

- Did not get your points (difficult to figure them out) - please clarify early

Speech 2 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Speech 3 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Speech 4 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber -- <i>B+</i>	Student	<i>Michael McEllean</i>	<i>CP</i>
	Session -- <i>PM</i>	Name		
JUDGE --		<i>Phil Meas</i>		

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle)	AFF	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating	1	2	3	4	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 5	6
----------------------	-----	--------------------------------------	---------------	---	---	---	---	------------------------------------	---

Topic: *5*

Comments:

- 1- Russia will not agree...*
 - 2- Ongoing talks are failing*
 - 3- US President Obama not sincere*
- 3.00*

good delivery, transitions, and evidence worked the room well, eye contact and body language - good

Speech 2 -- (Circle)	AFF	NEG	Circle Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6
----------------------	-----	-----	---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

Topic:

Comments:

Speech 3 -- (Circle)	AFF	NEG	Circle Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6
----------------------	-----	-----	---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

Topic:

Comments:

Speech 4 -- (Circle)	AFF	NEG	Circle Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6
----------------------	-----	-----	---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

Topic:

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber -- 13th	Student	Nathaniel Lorenz	CP
	Session -- PM	Name		
JUDGE --		Phil Maas		

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4 5 6
---	--

Topic: 3

Comments:

1 - increases quality of life (evidence cited) →
 2 - protection for workers (evidence cited)

- good job addressing other speeches but would have like to heard more from you and your views

3.10

Speech 2 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4 5 6
---	--

Topic: 5

Comments:

1 - extension of current agreement?
 2 - deterrence
 3 - extension to other countries - great point; more evidence

- need a more polished delivery

3.12

Speech 3 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
--	---------------------------

Topic:

Comments:

Speech 4 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
--	---------------------------

Topic:

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber -- 13 th	Student Name	CP School or Code:
	Session -- 1 st	Michael Brooks	
JUDGE --		Neil Maas	

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) AFF <input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 5 6
Topic: 3	

Comments:

41- doesn't protect anyone
42- putting more people in danger

- good use of evidence to support 2 points
- very energetic
- volume/time to emphasize main points
- good eye contact with congress

3.10

Speech 2 -- (Circle) AFF <input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 5 6
Topic: 4	

Comments:

1- 2 state solution
2-
3-

- did not clearly state your position AFF/NEG
- good delivery
- well done in making connections with others and utilizing evidence

3.11

Speech 3 -- (Circle) AFF <input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 6
Topic: 5	

Comments:

1- ballistic missile tech. bio/nuc missile tech.
2- range of missiles

very convincing speech
well put together with passion!
nice job

3.09

Speech 4 -- (Circle) AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber -- <u>11/6</u>	Student Name	<u>Kamryn Sannicks</u>	<u>CNS</u>
	Session -- <u>PM</u>			
JUDGE --		<u>Phil Meas</u>		

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) AFF <input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 6
---	--

Topic: 3

Comments:

- | | |
|--|------------------------|
| 1- not limit trafficking (evidence - <u>good</u>) | - good use of evidence |
| 2- undoing work (evidence - <u>6</u>) | - smooth transitions |
| 3- increase of jobs (evidence - <u>6</u>) | - good delivery |
| | - lots of passion |

3.04

Speech 2 -- (Circle) AFF <input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 6
---	--

Topic: 4

Comments:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1- relationship changing (evidence) | delivery, transitions were once again very good. Worked the room with eye contact
not enough time given to 3 rd point |
| 2- strategy has failed Israel and Palestine | |
| 3- strategy (middle east) | |

3.10

Speech 3 -- (Circle) AFF <input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 6
---	--

Topic: 5

Comments:

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 1- environmental negatives | good job delivering a speech that was not necessarily prepared. well done |
| 2- nuclear state | |
| 3- cost | |

3.03

Speech 4 -- (Circle) AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
--	---------------------------

Topic:

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber -- 13 th	Student Name	Ruben Aguilar	LNS
	Session -- PM			
JUDGE --		Phil Maas		

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4 5 6
Topic: 3	

Comments:

- 1- regulation
- 2- for revenue
- 3- moral arguments

- energetic speech
- flow between written speech and delivery - need some work

2.54

Speech 2 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 5 6
Topic: 4	

Comments:

- 1- only effective solution
- 2- Dual support
- 3- growth

- good delivery - worked the room
- evidence used to refute information already given
- nice passion during delivery

2.41

Speech 3 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4 5 6
Topic: 5	

Comments:

- 1- limit China
- 2- ineffective strategy
- 3- underfunded Amendments

- terminology used in speech
- Cindsey Graham wants us to use $\frac{2}{3}$ to dismantle nuclear weapons.
- good delivery - eye contact, body language

3.05

Speech 4 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:	

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber -- <u>PH</u>	Student	CP
	Session -- <u>PM</u>	Name	
JUDGE --		Phil Maos	

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) <u>AFF</u> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> 6
-------------------------------------	----------------------------------

Topic: #3

Comments:

- #1-
- #2 - regulation
- #3 - tax revenue

- statistics to back up each point!
- organized, nice flow/transitions
- good eye contact

2.47

Speech 2 -- (Circle) AFF NEG <u>Sponsorship</u>	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 <u>6</u>
---	----------------------------------

Topic: 5

Comments:

- 1 - 500 more than enough - not enough evidence to support ^{this} a point
- 2 - help relationship - needed more evidence
- 3 - save \$\$ - good evidence

- good delivery
- nice job restating your position

2.54

Speech 3 -- (Circle) AFF <u>NEG</u>	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> 6
-------------------------------------	----------------------------------

Topic: 9

Comments:

- 1 - China has few nuclear weapons
- 2 - China will not use nuclear weapons
- 3 - China will not reduce stockpile

Evidence questioning?
good points

2.20

Speech 4 -- (Circle) AFF NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
------------------------------	---------------------------

Topic:

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber -- 17b	Student Name	CNS School or Code:
	Session -- M	Brodey Weber	
JUDGE --		Phil Maas	

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 5 6
---	--

Topic: 3

Comments:

1- victimless crime	- good delivery
2- tax revenue ← (evidence cited)	- lots of energy
3- safe industry ← (evidence cited)	- nice use of evidence
	- mixed evidence for point #1
	- good flow

3.10

Speech 2 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input checked="" type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 6
---	--

Topic: 4

Comments:

1- weaken relations with Israel	- great delivery, energy, and passion
2- 2-state solution	- outstanding use of evidence to support your position
3-	- nice transitions
	- knowledgeable on subject

3.10

Speech 3 -- (Circle) <input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 6
---	--

Topic: 5

Comments:

1- China's nuclear ambition	outstanding intro and delivery very articulate and passionate speech.
2- multilateral disarmament	
3- US are leaders on subject matter	

3.07

Speech 4 -- (Circle) <input type="radio"/> AFF <input type="radio"/> NEG	Circle Rating 1 2 3 4 5 6
--	---------------------------

Topic:

Comments:

Congressional Debate Ballot	Chamber -- 131	Student Name	Devin Rerdel	School or Code: MMW
	Session -- 1m			
JUDGE --		Phil Mags		

Rate each speech, (1 = weak; 6 = strong), and justify your rating with constructive suggestions for improvement. Consider: Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments); Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas); Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims); Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker answers questions also should be considered. If the student speaks more than three times, write comments on the reverse side and award 1-6 points for each additional speech. You will rank students, holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form.

Speech 1 -- (Circle)	AFF	NEG	Sponsorship	Circle Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6
----------------------	-----	-----	-------------	---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

Topic: 4

Comments:

- 1 - boundaries
- 2 - suffering
- need to work on delivery
- good use of evidence to sponsor your bill

3.02

Speech 2 -- (Circle)	AFF	NEG		Circle Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6
----------------------	-----	-----	--	---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

Topic: 5

Comments:

- could not understand the main points of your speech. Points 1 Point 5 2 888
- good delivery and emphasis throughout your speech.

2.31

Speech 3 -- (Circle)	AFF	NEG		Circle Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6
----------------------	-----	-----	--	---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

Topic:

Comments:

Speech 4 -- (Circle)	AFF	NEG		Circle Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6
----------------------	-----	-----	--	---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

Topic:

Comments: