

Round _____
versus _____

Team _____

1st Speaker: _____

2nd Speaker _____

Team _____

1st Speaker _____

2nd Speaker _____

1 st Affirmative/ Prime Minister	2 nd Affirmative Gov't Member	Criteria for individual evaluation A scale of 1 to 5, 1 is poor and 5 is excellent. 2s and 5s are rare. 1s should not be used in this tournament	1 st Negative Opp. Member	2 nd Negative Leader of Opp.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Organization: The speech should be well structured, logical & coherent, containing an effective introduction and conclusion	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Evidence/Logic: Facts, statistics & authorities offered in support of contentions must be sound. Credit should be given for thorough and relevant research.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Delivery: Poise quality & use of voice, combined with emphasis, variety and enunciation. Effectiveness and ease of gestures, and eye contact should be assessed.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Refutation/Clash: The ability to apply logic and evidence in refuting the opponents' contentions while defending one's own.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Format: Cross-Ex Parliamentary—SEE BELOW!	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
/25	/25		/25	/25
Team total →	/50		Team total →	/50

PLEASE NO INDIVIDUAL SCORES BELOW 10. SCORES above 23 should be reserved for exceptional debaters

Special style specific things to keep in mind ("Format" row above): **Parliamentary:** Does each debater demonstrate an understanding of parliamentary procedure and roles? Do debaters adhere to the rules of the house? Are points of order & privilege appropriately used? Are heckles short, witty & relevant?