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Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Judge: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Teams: AFF: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ NEG: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Score each speaker on a ten-point scale (1 being needs improvement, 10 being excellent). After scoring each speaker, add the speaker points together on each team. The team with the highest speaker points usually wins the round, however, it could happen that the judge determines a team with better arguments should win the round. For each speaker, please comment on what was done effectively, as well as what needs improvement.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AFF 1 | NEG 1 | AFF 2 | NEG 2 |
| **Name Of Debater** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Connection to Universalization |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Respect |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Delivery |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Research |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Organization |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Argument Development |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Technical Perspective |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Persuasion |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Critical Thinking |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Cross Examination |  |  |  |  |
| SUBTOTAL (/100 pts) |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AFF 3 | NEG 3 | AFF 4 | NEG 4 |
| **Name of Debater** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Connection to Universalization |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Respect |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Delivery |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Research |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Organization |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Argument Development |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Technical Perspective |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Persuasion |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Critical Thinking |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Rebuttal |  |  |  |  |
| SUBTOTAL (/100 pts) |  |  |  |  |

COMMENTS: Team Total Points\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Winning Team: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Description** |
| 1. Connection to Universalization | Argument demonstrates valid understanding of universalization and valid application of the concept to their argument. Argument considers ethical perspectives. |
| 2. Respect | Respect is shown to teammates as well as opponents. Debater behaves ethically towards opponents and teammates. Passion over aggression is encouraged. **(Aggression -5 pts)** |
| 3. Delivery | Vocal Clarity, Intonation, Eye contact, Body Movements |
| 4. Research | Evidence given was based on valid sources clearly stated *(citation – website, publication/author (credibility), date).* |
| 5. Organization | Argument is well organized and gives good verbal transitions between points. |
| 6. Argument Development | Arguments are well developed and sound. |
| 7. Technical Perspective | Perspectives applying technical subject matter. |
| 8. Persuasion | The argument is very convincing in language and in logic. |
| 9. Critical  Thinking | Argument shows the ability to think clearly and rationally about the position. |
| 10. Cross Examination | This only applies to speakers 1 & 2. |
| 10. Rebuttal | This only applies to speakers 3 & 4.  Identification of weakness in Affirmative team’s arguments and strength of their team's argument. |