**JUDGE FEEDBACK EXAMPLES**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SPEECH** | **DEBATE** | **CONGRESS** |
| CONTENT:  Examples:   * “You really know your facts. And they were important facts that went beyond common knowledge” * “You know your facts, but you may want to look for more convincing evidence” * “Examples are perfect, impactful illustrations for your ideas” * “Connection between your ideas and your examples didn’t always connect for me” | * Creative, unique topic choice * Good use of examples * Clever introduction * Characters were distinct and believable * Well-paced, good use of time * Spoke with conviction * Poised and comfortable speaker * Choice of speech/topic was appropriate for the event * Strong, distinct facial expressions * Applicable body language and gestures | To Decide a Winner,  Ask Yourself:   * Which team/speaker better upholds their main arguments with evidence and reasoning? * Which team/speaker is more persuasive? * Which team/speaker provides more effective synthesis/closing statements? * Which team/speaker did the best job of answering his or her opponent’s arguments? * Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims) | * Originality of Thought (advances debate rather than repeats previously stated ideas; refutes opposing arguments) * Evidence and Logic (cites credible sources, connecting to claims) * Questions (how well the speaker answers questions also should be considered) * Main points were well supported |
| DELIVERY:  Examples:   * “Your tone was confidence, professional, and appropriate for the topic” * “Volume, stressing, and speaking rate were easy to follow” * “Strong eye contact” * “Good use of pauses” | * Organized, flows from idea to idea, and is easy to follow * Message was clear * Intro. set up the rest of the speech | * Logical connections from point to point * Good use of pauses and voice inflection | * Delivery (extemporaneous speaking vs. reciting a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise) * Use of notes (average 50% eye contact) * Lacking an impact, don’t just end it |
| STYLE:  Examples:   * “Great job with facial expression and pacing of your words to create a mood” * “Sometimes had a really hard time following everything- you spoke so quickly” * “You’ve obviously practiced where to put your pauses for dramatic impact- nice!” * “Be careful about distracting gestures or playing with the buttons on your shirt” | * Intro/Transitional comments * Vocal communication, articulation, pronunciation * Characterization and bodily communication * Author’s intent and communication of material | * Kept appropriate decorum | * Clear Contentions * Good analysis |
| ORGANIZATION:  Examples:   * “Loved the description in your intro- created a picture for me…” * “Thanks for the roadmap in the intro, but sounds like you forgot to bring up your 3rd point later in the speech” * “Great job connecting your conclusion to your intro- really helped me see the big picture” * “I was a little confused on the ending- didn’t seem like it was the end of the story” |  | * Fluent link-chain * Argument was easy to follow | Organization and Unity (cohesively links ideas) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Good Feedback:

Your speech was very persuasive; the loaded language that you used in the introduction really hooked the judges. Try adding more concrete examples to drive home your argument.

Bad Feedback:

Your speech needed a lot of work, put more effort into the material next time.

Good feedback is important because it addresses learning and motivates debaters. It shows the next steps students should take to be successful and it allows them to feel in control of their own learning, providing motivation.

For a new coach, a basic method of evaluating your students is provided below. If you answer no, that is an area of improvement.

Content

* Does the debater avoid both unsupported assertions and the continual citation of authorities?
* Are the contentions supported with sufficient well-documented evidence?
* Does the debater show convincing knowledge of the resolution?
* Has the debater highlighted the important issues that have emerged in the debate? Does the debater follow through on these issues?
* Are the definitions and the interpretation of the resolution sound and responsible?

Refutation

* Is the refutation clear-cut in its attack on significant points of disagreement between the two teams?
* Is significant new evidence or argumentation presented in refutation, or is it merely a repetition of ideas presented earlier?

Reasoning

* Is the reasoning sound? Is it quick and agile?
* Are fallacies avoided and detected?
* Is there evidence of original thinking?

Organization

* Is there a clear outline of constructive arguments?
* Do the members of the team co-operate to present a unified case?
* Is refutation well organized and easy to follow?
* Does the speech contain an effective, clear introduction and a summary conclusion?
* Is each argument organized in a logical fashion?

Persuasiveness

* Is the debater convincing and effective?
* Does the debater seem sincere?
* Does the debater use persuasive words and emotion to connect to the audience?

Delivery

* Does the debater speak with a clear style?
* Does the debater give the impression of genuineness and sincerity?
* Does the debater adapt, in manner and content, to opponents and the audience situation?
* Does the debater introduce variety and humor effectively?
* Does the debater use good diction and pronounce words correctly?
* Does the debater seem at home on the platform, in posture and gesture?
* Does the debater maintain eye contact with the audience?