

Debate judging form for teams of five (3 vs. 2)

Debate team Blue team

Name of Judge: Vadim

Resolution: Marijuana should be legalized

Part I General Comments:

Give feedback on each of the speeches: structure, content and style & delivery

Govt team, 1st speaker (1st opening, 7th)

1st speech: introduced the topic quite well

2nd speech:

~~good use of logic~~ good use of logic

Opp team, 1st speaker (2nd, 6th)

1st speech: more enthusiasm, statistics and sources; good pace management, introduction, and conclusion

2nd speech: very good speech planning and preparation, examples

Govt team, 2nd speaker (3rd+9th closing)

1st speech: pathos-based introduction, handled 2 POI's quite well

2nd speech: real-life examples

Opp team, 2nd speaker (4th+8th closing)

1st speech: better flow and delivery, more enthusiasm could improve the perceived quality of the speech. Overall, good

2nd speech:

logical arguments and sources

Govt team, 3rd speaker (5th)

1st speech: Very good counterarguments, excellent POI's handling without disrupting the flow, the style and delivery are top-notch. Well-prepared and ready for POI's etc.

Debate judging form for teams of five (3 vs. 2)

Debate team Blue

Name of Judge: Sakari Salimathy

Resolution: Marijuana should be legalized

Part I General Comments:

Give feedback on each of the speeches: structure, content and style & delivery

Govt team, 1st speaker (1st opening, 7th)

1st speech: Confident, Delivery was a bit jerky, Structure was a bit all over the place. Used an example. Intro was good.

2nd speech: Good rebuttal of Govt. (Confident, smooth delivery. Dealt well with POI's while still having time for argument. Structure was good. Contextualized data in personal manner for audience.

Opp team, 1st speaker (2nd, 6th)

1st speech: Confident, delivery was smooth. Did a good job rebutting the gov. 1st speech. No real intro for the team however. Used anecdote. Argument was good, Structure was logical.

2nd speech: Good rebuttal of opp. Confident. Delivery was better. Structure was clear and logical. Addressing the POI could have been better, didn't feel it fully addressed the argument.

* responded well to question

Govt team, 2nd speaker (3rd+9th closing)

1st speech: Used personal example. Clear speaking, Did good job dealing with POI's. Confident delivery.

2nd speech: Confident delivery. Needed to stop and end notes. Structure was jumpy. Had good ending statement.

Opp team, 2nd speaker (4th+8th closing)

1st speech: Delivery was fairly rough. Did well with POI's. Structure was a bit hard to follow. Didn't really contextualize numbers.

2nd speech: Didn't fully counter gov. team's POI's. Structure unclear, hard to follow. Conclusion statement was not compelling.

Govt team, 3rd speaker (5th)

1st speech: Confident, good rebuttal of previous points by Opps. Dealt well with POI's. Delivery was smooth. Arguments were good. Structure easy to follow. Brought up past examples of bans that failed.

Part II Decision: In my judgement the winner of this debate is:

The Government Team

The Opposition Team

I believe they won this debate because overall, I found their arguments and
evidence behind the arguments to be more compelling. I also found
their conclusions to be more convincing and engaging. Finally, I
felt that they were more successful in refuting the oppositions
PO's than vice versa.

Debate judging form for teams of five (3 vs. 2)

Debate team Blue

Name of Judge: OK

Resolution: _____

Part I General Comments:

Give feedback on each of the speeches: structure, content and style & delivery

Govt team, 1st speaker (1st opening, 7th)

1st speech: kinda nice, not much to say

2nd speech: ~~Good refute, stats +~~ Good source, ^{other} state ~~good~~ good use. Kinda weak ~~response~~ response to POI. But overall good structure, easy to follow, good speech.

Opp team, 1st speaker (2nd, 6th)

1st speech: Good refute, stats +, lead into more consequences and studies, good conclusion, kinda iffy real life relation (the story about weed users using up resources in the hospital)

2nd speech: kinda iffy, slippery slope argument. Using emotional fallacies(?) to. But otherwise kinda nice

Govt team, 2nd speaker (3rd+9th closing)

1st speech: Using nicotine to prove point about marijuana, not bad. kinda iffy

2nd speech: children have access? (The stats about teen using marijuana is irrelevant since made in the case marijuana is illegal)

Opp team, 2nd speaker (4th+8th closing)

1st speech: ~~where that the stats sources, best~~ good sources to back argument up

2nd speech: (I wrote it in the wrong box sorry :/) } Stopping mid speech. Nice stats. Clear point. Real life examples

Govt team, 3rd speaker (5th)

1st speech: ~~for~~ Nice counter to Anton's

Nice answer to Magnus's POI, very very convincing, best speaker so far

Debate judging form for teams of five (3 vs. 2)

Debate team Blue

Name of Judge: Tuan Tran

Resolution: Marijuana should be legal.

Part I General Comments:

Give feedback on each of the speeches: structure, content and style & delivery

Govt team, 1st speaker (1st opening, 7th)

1st speech: Good structure, ~~not~~ the opening can be more passionate

2nd speech: ~~Causation is presented, this is not certain, Lots of data is prepared~~ Good refutation, point is hard to follow, but a very good point

Opp team, 1st speaker (2nd, 6th)

1st speech: logical, good structure, clear evidence

2nd speech: Causation is presented, with lots of backing data

Govt team, 2nd speaker (3rd+9th closing)

1st speech: good structure, point is clear, although the phrasing can make it ~~as~~ easy to be refuted

2nd speech: Good structure x

Opp team, 2nd speaker (4th+8th closing)

1st speech: good points, pois ~~not~~ ^{is} answered
are

2nd speech: point can be ~~presented~~ ^{delivered} more clearly,

Govt team, 3rd speaker (5th)

1st speech: good points, logical, points are presented ~~well~~, really well

Debate judging form for teams of five (3 vs. 2)

Debate team BLUE

Name of Judge: Tarm

Resolution: Marijuana should be legalized

Part I General Comments:

Give feedback on each of the speeches: structure, content and style & delivery

Govt team, 1st speaker (1st opening, 7th)

1st speech:

Clearly audible, good pace, good structure

2nd speech:

Good points, fluent delivery, logical order to content

Opp team, 1st speaker (2nd, 6th)

1st speech:

Good audibility, good pace, good structure, logical content

2nd speech:

Good points, good delivery, logical structure to the content

Govt team, 2nd speaker (3rd+9th closing)

1st speech:

Good audibility and pace, good structure, and ^{fluent} delivery

2nd speech:

Logical order to arguments, good closing speech

Opp team, 2nd speaker (4th+8th closing)

1st speech:

~~Good~~ Logical structure, ~~the~~ content is clear, fluent delivery.

2nd speech:

Good closing speech, logical structure, fluent delivery

Govt team, 3rd speaker (5th)

1st speech:

Logical order and structure, strong argument, fluent delivery.

