NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Yuan		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: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

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

- Spoke very clearly and effectively
- need more eye contact
- need more confidence

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

- good speech

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: I. Sun		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: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

- good speech
- good delivery of X-fire

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Jahangiri		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: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

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

- good and clear speech
- need better gesture

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

- need more eye contact
- good citation

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Sun		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: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

- good eye contact
- great speech
- good x-fire skills

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Lan		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: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

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

- good speech delivered
- very clear and well received

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Andrew Sun		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: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- Clear articulation
- try not to read off notes
- Understandable, clear arguments (~~arguments~~ maybe a little stretched)
- strong ~~[illegible]~~ statistics

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Evan Koretsky

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Eric Yan		School Code:
Session:	Room:	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Syrian Refugees

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

- Safety Risk
  - Paul Ryan quote good backup
- Lack of ~~screening~~ ~~ability~~ secure screening
  - great relation to recent attacks
- read off paper, good ~~delivery~~ articulation

} Need more evidence as to why it is a safety risk and why there is a lack of screening ability

- not 100% confident in cross-ex response

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Evan Koretsky

School/Affiliation: —

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: I Sun		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: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

- Try not to read directly off notes
- Clear arguments, well structured but needs to be more engaging

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Evan Koretsky

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Jin		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: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

- refrain from saying "um" and "like"
- be more confident in delivery
- liked how you were not reading off of notes
- stronger conclusion needed to tie arguments back to main point
- ~~trying not to~~ repetitive
- did not seem too

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Evan Koretsky

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: Siddiqi / ~~Jahangiri~~ Jahangiri / Lan		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:

Siddiqi
- Knew what he was doing, obviously very experienced in congressional debate

Jahangiri
- not 100% confident in leading an organized discussion with proper P.O. rhetoric

Lan
- very quiet
- knew what he was doing

PRINT Judge Name: Evan Koretsky	**RANK THIS SPEAKER**
School/Affiliation:	*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.*

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Jahangiri		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: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

- Opening on slavery not very relatable / make more clear
- Great statistics and outside information to support both contentions
- Stay within 3 min
- Cross-Ex: responses not as strong as contentions
- monotonic

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugees

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

- Obligation for U.S.?
  - back that up, U.S. would be a good example but why is it obligated
- Jobs ↑ from Syrians being employed
  - great statistics
- conclusion did not tie everything together
- strong delivery, great responses to cross-ex

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

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

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

- argument: benefits outweigh 3 states illegal income not as ~~very~~ convincing as other arguments
- Great delivery, and articulation
- Great structure, conclusion was very clear related back to main arguments
- well-thought responses to cross-examination questions (showed) confidence in knowledge on Topic

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Evan Korersky

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Alex Lan		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: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

- 1st argument strong, great backup with Texas case
- very strong delivery, try not to read off paper
- well structured arguments, very easy to follow
- well thought responses to cross examinations

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Evan Koretsky

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Siddiqi		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: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

- strong, confident delivery
- very-well structured arguments (strong evidence for funding spend less time on story in second argument, get to the point)

SPEECH 2 Topic: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

- added to debate with point on corruption and legality
  - great emphasis
- Response to Senator Sun's point was well-supported
- Again, great delivery

try to stay under 3 min

Cross-Ex
- Great clarifications

SPEECH 3 Topic: Syrian Refugees

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

- Relatable opening, very dramatic appealling to emotions of audience
- How do we know the refugees would help economy?
  - possibly use a different case study
- Steve Jobs argument a little bit stretched

- needs more support for argument on refugees being beneficial to U.S.

- Great Delivery, well-structured
- strong moral argument

under 3 min

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

great questions

PRINT Judge Name: Evan Koretsky	**RANK THIS SPEAKER**
School/Affiliation:	*Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9*
	[1st] 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Vonteddu		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: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- Sources for statistics would make arguments stronger
- Very engaging, confident
- Read off notes
- Well-structured arguments

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Evan Koretsky

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Melinda Yuan		School Code:
Session:	Room: Shah 409	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

- Great opening quote
- 2nd argument was confusing, make sure to tie back to main point

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugees

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

- Dangerous for Syrians to immigrate
  - "luring to death" + extreme
  - Nice evidence
- Put more emphasis on 2nd argument
- great conclusion relating back to opening ~~[illegible]~~ fable
- great delivery, very calm but persuasive

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Evan Koretsky

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Anoop Singh		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: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

Try not to read directly off notes
well structured arguments
strong, confident responses in cross examination

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Evan Koretsky

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Vishu Vonteddu		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: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

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

Excellent beginning explaining why you care about the topic. Good arguments supported by relevant data. Compare with overall numbers to help better understand how much they are contributing to society. Good conclu
I could feel you really cared about the topic & made good connection w/ audie

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: SALIL PRASAD

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Andrew Sun		School Code:
Session:	Room: 409	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: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

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

Spend little more time in setting context why you care, too quick in jumping to facts/figures. Good logical arguments. Good argument about long term financial impact & women's health. Conclusion was too short.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: SALIL PRASAD

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Divya Mehrotra		School Code:
Session:	Room:	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
Excellent beginning demonstrating why you care. Good delivery & paused at right points. Data supported very well your logical analysis. In closing, quickly remind why you made those assertions

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: SAIL PRASAD

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Isabella I. Suna		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: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
Make eye contacts & variation in tone. Good research and preparation.

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Salil Prasad

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Faraz Siddiqi		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: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

Include evidence why illegal. Why are other organizations ready to provide services for free - explanation missing.

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Salil Prasad

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Parak Siddiqui		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: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Starting was good, relating to everyday problem. However conclusion was insufficient why we should allow refugees. Data later used was good & supportive. Great example of Steve, everyone can relate to. Again your voice was loud, reaching entire audience. Good variation in tone & pauses. Include more ~~[illegible]~~ support for screening process, didn't understand why it is suffic

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugees. Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic: Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Salil Parnsad

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Melinda Yuan		School Code:
Session:	Room:	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Syrian Refugee

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

Didn't understand your ~~open~~ opening. Suggest memorizing that so that you can better eye connection & fluence for audience to start. Didn't understand why it could not help us.

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Salil Prasad

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Mohid Jahangiri		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: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugee

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Delivery was good, opening was ~~good~~ ~~relal~~ good quoting statue of liberty. Didn't see much logic/support how it would really benefit us or how we can safeguard our citizens.

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Salil Prasad

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

Eric Yan

4

Very easy to ~~to~~ follow you. Good diction, paused at right points, maintained good volume. Lacked ~~eng~~ enough evidence to support arguments. Make more eye contacts.

Judge: Salil Prasad

(8)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Sohan Gupta		School Code: DVHS
Session: 1	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: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Good voice modulation.
Loud & clear. Will help if you can slow down just a little bit. Also create short notes for yourself instead of reading the entire speech. Good responses to questions from aff.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: RAHUL BINDLISH

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

(9)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Mohd Jahangir i		School Code: DVHS
Session: 1	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: PP

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

Good impactful start. Good eye contact. Good use of space. Good recap at end. Try and not read entire speech. Don't be ~~ner~~ nervous. You did good.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: RAHUL BINDLISH
School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

(2)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Makul Bajaj		School Code: ?
Session: 1	Room: MAIN 18	Chamber #: 2

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: PP

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Maintain eye contact. Was clear most of the time. However got nervous when suggestions were made by others. You don't have to be nervous. You are in charge - you can disagree with a proposal.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: BINDLISH

School/Affiliation: BINDLISH

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

(2)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: Nakul Bajaj		School Code: ?
Session: 1	Room: MAIN 18	Chamber #: 2

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

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

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

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

Nervous. Was able to move along the discussion in a timely manner. It's a complex process - not easy, but you were able to manage the time and some of the conflicts well.

PRINT Judge Name: BINDLISH	
School/Affiliation: DVHS	

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: Farez Siddiqi		School Code:
Session:	Room:	Chamber #:

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

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

FIRST HOUR OF SERVICE	SECOND HOUR OF SERVICE	THIRD HOUR OF SERVICE
Circle Point Rating:	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:

Good articulation of protocols, & procedure. Good volume.

PRINT Judge Name: SALIL PRASAD

School/Affiliation: Dougherty Valley

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.*

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Yuan		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: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions: Good research Need more justication on why the claim made on untrustworthiness, make more eyecontacts. Don't get distracted with interruptions.

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Mohid Jahangir		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: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
Good opening & context setting. Confident speaker
Stats on funding & reasoning were not clear. Responded
well to questions / cross-exam.

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Alexander Lan		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: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Bold Great beginning. ~~Bto~~ Caught my attention. Good pause. Excellent delivery & emphasis on key points. Good arguments & supporting data.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Anoop Singh		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: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
Excellent opening, clarity in points. Refuted other speakers points very well. Suggest to include more data (numbers) to support argument.

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Faraz Faraz Siddiqui		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: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
Excellent opening; catight attention right away with the astounding numbers. Use the funding & expense no. sooner (when you refutted the point about funding). Make eye contacts with everyone in the room. Demonstrated confident style, loud voice reaching entire audience.

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: SALIL PRASAD

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Tony Jin		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: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

Good effort & prior study. Vary tone more to emphasize your point. Use more data, though points were logical., Speak louder.

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: SAGIL PRASAD

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: MIRANDA CHEN		School Code:
Session: I	Room: 9 – (main)	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:

(1) Needs to have more command and control of the house

(2) Time signalling was not done consistently

PRINT Judge Name: MALLIK VONTEDDU

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

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

(1)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Aditya Venkatraman		School Code: YG
Session: 1	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: PP

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

Good research. Loud & clear. Logical reasoning. Try not read entire speech. Maintain eye contact. Responses to questions were not convincing

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: RAHUL BINDLISH

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

(6) (12)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Carolina Tarango		School Code: Autonomy
Session: 1	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: PP

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

Good logical speech. Tried to maintain eye contact. Will help if you do not read the entire speech. Don't be nervous. You are good. Were not able to respond to cross questions because of nervousness.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: RAHUL BINDLISH

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

7

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Ooha Reddy		School Code: DVHS
Session: 1	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: PP

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Good Logical research.

Maintain eye contact. Try not to read entire speech. ~~Tocke~~ Relax - you have the capability to captivate audience. Do not use a laptop - use a note page instead while standing.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: RAHUL BINDLISH

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

(5)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Edmond Wen		School Code: Autonomy
Session: 1	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: PP

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Loud, clear oration. Brought in interesting arguments. Try and slow down and not read entire speech. Maintain eye contact with entire audience.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: RAHUL BINDLISH

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

(11)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Arshia Mehta		School Code: DVHS
Session: 1	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: PP

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Good eye contact and use of space. Loud & clear. Will help if you slow down just a bit. Try and not read the entire speech. Good use of real life example. Responses on cross questions were not convincing.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: RAHUL BINDLIsH	
School/Affiliation: DVHS	

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

12 6

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Pranav Kumar		School Code: YG
Session: 1	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: BP

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

Good cross question, Good pace and voice modulation. Good, logical reasoning to support your position. Good reference to previous senator positions. Try and maintain more eye contact - will help if you don't read entire speech.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: RAHUL BINDLISH

School/Affiliation: DNHS

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

(10)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: VAIBHAV Tripathi		School Code: DVHS
Session: 1	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: PP

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Loud clear speaking. Referred to what another Senator said. Do not read complete speech. Some of the responses were premeditated. For eg. response to question about corruption.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: RAHUL BINDLISH

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

(3)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Pujita Tangirala		School Code: YG
Session: 1	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: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Good, measured speech. Good use of gestures. Good attempt at eye contact and use of space. Try not to read the entire speech. Good use of example from real life (abortion) → very impactful. Good responses to cross question.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: RAHUL BINDLISH

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

(4)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Rishi Jammy		School Code: DVHS
Session: 1	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: P P

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Good use of space in the room However your maintained eye contact only with judges not other senators. Clear, well modulated speaking. Try not to read complete speech If you make a mistake, its ok to take a pause.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: RAHUL BINDLISH

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Saurav Kumar		School Code:
Session: 1	Room: main 9	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Planned Parent hood (Defense of)

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- Good road mapping
- Use hand gestures meaningfully
- Speak more clearly
- Don't make it too evidence heavy
- Write impacts

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

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugees

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Katherine Guo

School/Affiliation: Golden State Academy

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Vivek Sarkar		School Code:
Session: 1	Room: Main 9	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 (1) *highest* ↔ *lowest*

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- Don't doubt yourself in the middle of a sentence
- Beginning irrelevant in some
- Roadmap / signpost more
- confuses jargon
- Practice speech more
- Some awkward pauses
- Stuttering
- Overtime
- Don't make faces @ podium
- Answer more confidently

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugees

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 (2) 1 *highest* ↔ *lowest*

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- Better speaking
- Has no r bonus
- Paused also

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.
- Question slightly irrelevant
- Stuttered questions

PRINT Judge Name: Katherine Guo
School/Affiliation: Golden State Academy

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

3

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Abhinav Morbad		School Code:
Session: 1	Room: main 9	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- Good roadmapping/signposting
- When you speak, you have a confident voice
- Good emphasis
- Confident answers
- Better evidence
- Reputable sources
- Answer questions directly

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

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugees

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- Good signposting
- Empathy good
- Be confident in pronunciation
- Good direct refutation

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Katherine Gro

School/Affiliation: Golden State Academy

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Litesh Kurella		School Code:
Session: 1	Room: Main 9	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- Flubs : ||||
- Good answers; you don't get flustered easily

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

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugees

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- Be slightly more confident
- Good roadmapping
- Is all evidence relevant here?
- stuttering
- Overtime but in grace period
- Be sure in your answers

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Katherine Guo

School/Affiliation: Golden State Academy

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Andrew Won		School Code:
Session: 1	Room: Main 9	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

- Good emphasis
- Don't concede answers
- Stuttering at times
- Link back more
- Hand motions well used
- Roadmapped well
- Good response to all questions in whole
- Don't assume opponent
- Sudden voice changes in CX

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugees

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

- Good direct refution
- Agressive
- Do not read off as much
- Good roadmapping
- Interrupt more nicely

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

- On point questions are good

PRINT Judge Name: Katherine Guo	**RANK THIS SPEAKER**
School/Affiliation: Golden State Academy	*Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9*
	1st (2nd) 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Mridul Prasad		School Code:
Session: 1	Room: Main 9	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Planned Parenthood — Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- Good use of roadmapping
- Note majority
- Evidence heavy
- Good weighing of impact
- Don't contradict yourself

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

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugees — Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic: — Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.
- Note: fetuses are not considered human until past 27 weeks, but good question

PRINT Judge Name: Katherine Gro
School/Affiliation: Golden State Academy

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Anouki Panthagani		School Code:
Session: 1	Room: Main 9	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- When you reply, sound more sure and confident
- Try not to concede points in CX

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

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugees.

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- Be more confident
- Stuttering
- Filler words
- Most points on hypothetical
- More confident postre
- Be more sure in responses

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.
- Clarification good

PRINT Judge Name: Katherine Guo	**RANK THIS SPEAKER**
School/Affiliation: Golden State Academy	*Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9*
	1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th (7th) 8th None

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Khushi Wadhwa		School Code:
Session: 1	Room: Main 9	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- Good empathy
- Good roadmapping
- Linked well to negative impacts
- Contentions linked well together
- Good speaking
- well refuting questions

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

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugees

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.
- Good use of sources in questions

PRINT Judge Name: Katherine Guo

School/Affiliation: Golden State Academy

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Ada Argueta		School Code:
Session: 1	Room: Main 9	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

- stuttering
- Emphasis hands can be better used
- Clarity
- Decrease slang
- Roadmap Contentions
- Good roadmapping for Refutations
- Fill time
- Sound sms

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

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugees

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Katherine Guo

School/Affiliation: Golden State Academy

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

10

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Katharine Lam		School Code:
Session: 1	Room: Main 9	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

- Good sourcing
- Links good
- Good roadmapping
- Don't take about irrelevant topics
- Don't repeat yourself
- Answer directly

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugees

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

- Don't repeat
- Good roadmapping
- Try reading the case more @ home
- Stuttering
- Good analogies
- Good impacts

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

- Your question was good for clarification
- Good poking holes in evidence
- Confident asking

PRINT Judge Name: ~~Golden State Academy~~ Katherine Gue	**RANK THIS SPEAKER**
School/Affiliation: Golden State Academy	*Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9*
	1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th (8th) None

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Miranda Chen		School Code:
Session: 1	Room: Main 9	Chamber #:

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

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

SPEECH 1 Topic: Planned Parenthood

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

- Passionate
- Good roadmapping
- Slight stuttering
- Good linking
- Be clear in response

SPEECH 2 Topic: Syrian Refugees

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: Mehotra (1) / Vanteddu (2)		School Code: DVHS
Session: 3	Room: Shah 409	Chamber #: 3

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

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

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

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

- helpful, used all procedures correctly
- recognition was good to each speaker
- control was good
- communication was good

- good control
- rough start, were confused on rules

PRINT Judge Name:	
School/Affiliation:	

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Jahangiri		School Code: DVHS
Session:	Room: Shah 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Path to Citizenship 2:57

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

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

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- U.S. agriculture industry effect - impact on GDP
- workforce collapse - work for less wages and more hours -
- good resources - and good original ideas

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Singh		School Code: AD
Session:	Room: Shah 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Path of Citizenship 2:56

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

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

- Have criminal record and legislation explanations are too vague - posing new questions, they are not taking jobs
- good volume, better structure of points
- average cross-x

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

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)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Mehrotra		School Code: PVHS
Session: 3	Room: Shah 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Ban on football

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- health benefits.

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Yan		School Code: DVHS
Session: 3	Room: Shah 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Path to Affordable 2:50

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- low prices, more hours, less wages
- lower poverty line - revenue 11 million dollars to social security - take major responsibility
- good responses - good speech
- lined points on less wages

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Vonteddu		School Code: DVHS
Session:	Room: Shah 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Path to Citizenship (2:53)

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

- creating fear - massive expansion in bureaucracy
- many illegal immigrants cause job growth

- strong speech - good cross ✗

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: L. Sun		School Code: AD
Session: 3	Room: Shah 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Ban on Football 8:34

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- physically harms people - CTE
- start of issue in education

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Yan		School Code: YG
Session:	Room: Shah 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Path to Citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

- payoff Debts - taxpayers have payed 3.5 billion in taxes
- deportation, not option - illegals are 12 million and they are pyss
- speak more confidentally
- don't use (um)
- good responses

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

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)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Siddiqi		School Code: DVHS
Session: 3	Room: Shah 409	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: Path of Citizenship Neg 3:00

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- don't pay taxes, illegal immigrants gain all million jobs
- takes more jobs away from citizens
- taking advantages and rights of citizens
- good responses, confident but using same reasons over and over

SPEECH 2 Topic: Path of Citizenship 3:01

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- prices raise 7MIL part of revenue
- good responses - repition of original points

SPEECH 3 Topic: Ban on Football 3:00

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- harm on economy - ban would decrease knowledge of football - TV advertisers
- compilation
- best speech you gave - could have improved crossex

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Lan		School Code: YG
Session: 3	Room: Shah 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Path of Citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- illegal immigrants bring crime, illegals drive on street - illegals use US. taxes
- good responses - improve on original ideas

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: A. Sun		School Code: HKR
Session: 3	Room: Shoah 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Path to Citizenship 3:06

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- more crimes, more deaths - value economy than the economy - attraction of illegal immigrants - more 1/4 of high tech jobs lost
- great speech - good responses

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Jin		School Code: TCA
Session:	Room: Shah 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Path of Citizenship 2:05

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- more taxes contributed by the illegal immigrant
- helps get rid of debt - restrict crimes
- reusing the same ideas as previous senator
- good responses to questions

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

SPEECH 2 Topic: Ban on football 2:21

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:
- diseases - upper body - future is ruined - CTE
- weak on cross-x and speech

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: Mehrota ① / Vanteddu ②		School Code: DHUS / DVHS ②
Session: 3	Room: Shaw 409	Chamber #: 3

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

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

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

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

① PO:

PRINT Judge Name: Yanru Yang	**RANK THIS SPEAKER**
School/Affiliation: Harker	*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.*

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: A. Sun		School Code: HKR
Session: 3	Room: Shar 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

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

Very convincing arguments. powerful delivery.

Response to questions reasonable & convincing.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Yanrn Yang	**RANK THIS SPEAKER**
School/Affiliation: Hanker	*Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9*
	(1st) 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Singh		School Code: AD
Session: 3	Room: Shar 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

Great arguments & summary of previous arguments.
powerful delivery.
Response to questions combining.

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

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Yann Yang

School/Affiliation: Harker

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Siddiqi		School Code: DVHS
Session: 3	Room: Sher 409	Chamber #: 3

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: citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

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

Good arguments. powerful delivery.
Good response to questions.

SPEECH 2 Topic: citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

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

Better developed arguments. powerful delivery.
Good response to questions.

SPEECH 3 Topic: Ban on football

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

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

Great arguments. powerful delivery.
Great response to questions.

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Yann Yang	**RANK THIS SPEAKER**
School/Affiliation: Harker	*Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9*
	1st 2nd (3rd) 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Jim		School Code: TCA
Session: 3	Room: Sher 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Great arguments & fine delivery.
Response to questions reasonably convincing.

SPEECH 2 Topic: Ban on footban

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Great arguments & fine delivery.
Great response to questions.

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Yann Yang

School/Affiliation: Henker

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Mehrotra		School Code: DVHS
Session: 3	Room: Shar 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Ban on football

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

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

Great arguments. Convincing. Powerful delivery.

Response to questions could use more support.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Yanru Yang

School/Affiliation: Hunter

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Yuan		School Code: DVHS
Session: 3	Room: Shaw 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Great speech & arguments. fine delivery.
Response to questions could use a little more support.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Yann Yang	
School/Affiliation: Harker	

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: ~~A. Sun~~ Vonteddu		School Code: DVHS
Session: 3	Room: Shar 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Arguments developed fine. Great delivery.
Response to Questions convincing.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Yanru Yang

School/Affiliation: Harker

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Lan		School Code: YG
Session: 3	Room: Shar 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☒ NEG

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

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

Great speech. & arguments. powerful delivery.
Response to questions can use a little more support.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Yanin Yang

School/Affiliation: Harker

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Yan		School Code: YG
Session: 3	Room: Shar 409	Chamber #: 3

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: citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Good arguments. Fine delivery.
Good response to questions.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Yann Yang

School/Affiliation: Harker

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)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Jahangiri		School Code: DVHS
Session: 3	Room: Shar 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Fine arguments. powerful delivery.
Response to Questions can use a little more explanation.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Yann Yang

School/Affiliation: Harker

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)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: I. Sun		School Code: AD
Session: 3	Room: Shar 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Ban on football

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Great speech. Fine delivery.

Response to questions fine.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Yanru Yang

School/Affiliation: Harker

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)

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Presiding Evaluation

Student Name: DIVYA MEHROTRA		School Code: DVHS
Session: 3	Room: SAAH - 409	Chamber #: 3

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

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

FIRST HOUR OF SERVICE	SECOND HOUR OF SERVICE	THIRD HOUR OF SERVICE
Circle Point Rating: 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 (highest ↔ lowest)	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 (highest ↔ lowest)	Circle Point Rating: 6 5 4 3 2 1 (highest ↔ lowest)

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

Divya
Seems to have command of the proceeding. Gave opportunity to all to talk except one

Vontedda
well organized

PRINT Judge Name: Ram Panthagani

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: ERIC YAN		School Code: YG
Session: 3	Room: STAH - 409	Chamber #: 3

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: PATH To ~~the~~ Citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☒ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

delivery - read more towards manuscript than extempore
evidence - well researched and quoted a few sources
Org & Unity - more org but overshot time but a
Original - Routine argument
Q&A - Answered but lack logic and repeated answers but recovered later

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Ram Panthagani

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Alex Lan		School Code: Y6
Session: 3	Room: BHAH -409	Chamber #: 3

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: Path to citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

Delivery - 50% extempore & 50% manuscript - strong delivery
Evidence & logic - well researched and presented sources
Org & Unity - well org & presented smoothly
Originality - Unique but not very original
Q&A - Not answered very forcefully

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Ram Panthagani

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: ZAYD JAHANGIRI		School Code: DVHS
Session: 3	Room: SHAH - 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Path to Citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Delivery - Strong with 50% extempore & 50% manuscript
Evidence & Logic - Well researched and presented
Org & Unity - Not able to refute other contentions
Originality - Well presented but need more originality
Q&A - Answered but not very strongly need confidently

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: RAM DANTHAGANI

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: ANDREW SUN		School Code: HKR
Session: 3	Room: SHAH 409	Chamber #: 3

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: path to citizenship.

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

Delivery — 70% manuscript & 30% extempore — good pitch & need to work
Originality — Argued for health of immigrants
Org & Unity — Well organized and shot a bit o
Evidence & logic — sketchy relationship betn Evidence & topic.
Q&A — Answered politely and affirmatively

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Ram Panthagani

School/Affiliation: DYHS

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: MELINDA YUAN		School Code: DVHS
Session: 3	Room: SHAH- 404	Chamber #: 3

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: Path to Citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Delivery - more of extempore and good style and poise
Evidence & logic - Economic benefit evidence presented well
Org & Unity - Economical side well presented in time
Originality - Economical line is unique
Q&A - Answers to the point but not very confidently delivered.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Ram Panthagani

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: ANOOP SINGH		School Code: AD
Session: 3	Room: SAAH 409	Chamber #: 3

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: path to citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

Delivery – 70% manuscript and 30% extempore – Strong voice & decent poise
Evidence & logic – Not much facts of his own but logic.
Originality – Most of debate is rebuttal
Org & Unity – counterpoints and arguments well said.
Q&A – Answers are counter to his stance

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: RAM PANTHAGANI

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: YASHU VONTEDDU		School Code: DVHS
Session: 3	Room: SHAH - 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Path to Citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Delivery - Well delivered 50% extempore & 50% manuscript
Originality - Humanity angle diff from other & all Economic benefits.
Evidence & Logic - well researched and presented well.
Org & Unity - Not much rebuttal and presented in time
Q&A - Answered confidently stuff to the humanity angle

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Ram Parthagani

School/Affiliation: DVHS.

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: FARAZ SIDDIQI		School Code: DVHS
Session: 3	Room: SHAH 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Path to ~~[illegible]~~ Citizenship.

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

delivery ~ Strong and good counter points more of extempore.
Orginality - A little but Unique.
Org & Unity - well org and presented sources
evidence - well Researched and logical.
Q&A - Answered well to the points. logic a bit sketchy about Immigrant taxes

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

Delivery - Strong and to the point more extempore than manuscript
Originality - Giving idea but not convincing, Economy suffers
Org & Unity - Rebuttals, and Economy effects
Evidence - Some Evidence about Economy suffers but not sources provided
Q&A - Answered Questions well to the point

SPEECH 3 Topic: Ban football

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

Delivery - Strongly presented more extempore
Originally - Economic angle focused only
Evidence & logic - More about Economy of nation. but sketchy logic.
Org & Unity - well organized around economy but not health angle on time
Q&A - sketchy logic about health issues at young age.

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: RAM PANTHAGANI

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: T. Jin		School Code: TCA
Session: 3	Room: SHAH - 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Path to Citizenship.

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Delivery – 60% extempore & 40% manuscript
Evidency & Logic – Need more sources.
Orga & Unity – Did not present very structures.
Originality – Different style than others
Q&A – Answered humorously but short

SPEECH 2 Topic: Ban football

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Delivery: Interesting opening and mostly extempore
Evidence & logic – Well researched & logic a few cases
Originality – Health related attack may not be original
Org & Unity – Not many points to support his points
Q&A – Answers humorously but not very confident presentation.

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Ram Panthagani

School/Affiliation: DVHS

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Divya Mehrotra		School Code: DVHS
Session: 3	Room: Shah - 409	Chamber #: 3

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: Ban football

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☑ NEG

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

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

Delivery - strong presentation with pose more extempore
Evidence & logic - Not many sources quoted and
Originality - fitness angle unique
Org & Unity - Argument presented fitness and well presented like a fitness video but well
Q&A - Answered to strengthen her points.

SPEECH 2 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name: Ram Panthagani	**RANK THIS SPEAKER**
School/Affiliation: DVHS.	*Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9*
	1st 2nd (3rd) 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
Invitational Form

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE
Speech Evaluation

Student Name: Isabella Sun		School Code: AD
Session: 3	Room: SHAH - 409	Chamber #: 3

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: path to citizenship

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

SPEECH 2 Topic: Ban football

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☑ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

Delivery: extempore mostly eyecontact improvement later mostly manuscript
Evidence & logic: Quoted CNN and other sources of affect
Originality: Healthrelated more clarity into affect
Org & Unity: Norebuttal but short presentatory
Q&A - Answered the Qu to make her points - eye co missing

SPEECH 3 Topic:

Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG

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

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

QUESTIONING *of other speakers*

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

PRINT Judge Name:

School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

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

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