



# Extemporaneous Informative Speaking

## Individual Evaluation Sheet

Note: Evaluate each speaker individually based on the total presentation. At the end of the round, rank the speakers in order of the quality of the presentations: Best is 1st, second best is 2nd, and so on. Rank every contestant. Do not tie any contestants.

Speaker # 0 Contestant Miles Tiger Round 1 Section 2

Topic What prompted president Trump's claims that he was subjected to wiretapping. Conference CA

The best critiques teach and encourage the student. Please offer areas of improvement and positive attributes of the speech.

4:41

Analysis and Content

- Did the speaker answer the question?
- Was the content informative?
- Was there sufficient use of logic, facts, examples and/or expert opinion?
- Was the information adequately documented?
- Was the information pertinent to the specific topic?

\* Great AGD and inclusion of Angela Merkel. → you could play this up more and mention how awkward it was when he brought it up to her at a press conference

Angela Merkel  
↳ Breitbart  
media sources  
Far right media

Organization

- Introduction**
- Did the speaker get attention?
  - Was the topic clearly stated?
  - Did the speaker preview and give focus to the key ideas?
- Body**
- Were divisions clear and appropriate to the topic?
  - Did the speaker make effective use of signposting, internal summaries, and transitions?
  - Was adequate time devoted to each division within the 7 minute time limit?
  - Was there a logical progression of ideas?
- Conclusion**
- Did the speaker tie the speech together?
  - Was the answer to the question clear?
  - Was there a note of finality?

\* The rest of your intro was a bit muddled → tighten it up

\* Consider other angles than just his media sources, this feels like an oversimplified answer  
\* What about shutting away from Russia inquiries or other conflicts/issues in his first 100 days → ACA failure, etc.

you do this later, my b!  
Good work!!

Delivery

- Language Style**
- Was the language suitable to informing the audience?
  - Was the language precise, grammatically correct and vivid?
  - Was the delivery natural and spontaneous?
  - Did it reinforce the ideas of the speech?
- Vocal Delivery**
- Was enunciation clear?
  - Was volume appropriate?
  - Was there sufficient variety in rate, pause and pitch?
- Physical Delivery**
- Did the speaker exhibit poise and confidence?
  - Were gestures varied, movement motivated and eye contact direct?
  - If note card was used, was it an unobtrusive part of the delivery?

\* Beef-up your sources → this question requires

\* Good mention of political smoke screen but you could beef this up and give more indep. analysis of this

Judge's Signature

Aliyah Conroy

I rank this contestant

5

Print Judge's Name

Aliyah Conroy

Please make certain the rank on this ballot matches the rank on the master ballot.

\* Good mention of Britain → what implications does this



**Texas Forensic Association**  
Poetry Interpretation Ballot

Contestant's Printed Name: Sage Shirley School Code: 21  
 Round: 1 Section: 3 Speaker Number: 6  
 Title/Author of selection: Don't "Tomatoes" - Shane Koyczan.

**Judge's Instructions:** Evaluate the speaker using the following **CRITERIA**. \* Please offer justification for the ranking in the round and provide constructive suggestions to improve the student's skills.

**\*NOTE: TIME LIMIT FOR THIS EVENT IS 7 minutes with a 30 second grace period.**

Criteria for Evaluation

**Choice of Material:** Does the material have literary merit? Is it appropriate for the speaker?

**Adequacy of Introduction:** Are the title and author clearly stated? Is the mood set? Is the information relevant and sufficient to get your attention?

**Insight and Understanding:** Does the speaker appear to fully understand the material? Does the speaker appreciate the author's intent?

**Interpretation:** Does the speaker convey his understanding of the material to you? If more than one poem is used, does the speaker develop an adequate theme?

**Voice and Diction:** Is pronunciation acceptable? Are rate, pitch, and volume appropriate? Is vocal variety adequate?

**Style:** Is body movement confined? Is the presentation excessively dramatic? Does the speaker draw attention to himself instead of the material?

**Bodily Action:** Are gestures used in an effective and restrained manner? Does the speaker appear poised?

**Overall Effectiveness:** Is the total effect of the performance pleasing?

Judge's Remarks

3 down

- take command of the room when you walk up.
- Slow Down!!!! → all emotion, jokes, and other things are being missed b/c we don't have the time to process it.
- Intro is pretty good - add in why this topic is important to you.
- work on vocal variety and pitch to get jokes to land more.
- Don't be afraid to use hand gestures.
- Don't hold your binder so far away from yourself - you look stiff.

Time (length of performance): 5:57

Rank the performer. Circle one (1<sup>st</sup> being best, etc. \*Each student must be given a rank- there cannot be a tie)


1<sup>st</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> 5<sup>th</sup> 6<sup>th</sup> 7<sup>th</sup> 8<sup>th</sup> No Show

Judge's Printed Name Sara Heaslip Affiliation LT

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

PF

FLIP: 23 Dintzner - Hardage v. 8 Hayes - Stogel

Public Forum Debate				Robin Martin (*2)			
Round 2		Flight 2		RR209		Sat 01/28/17 11:15AM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank	Points	Speaker	Con	Rank	Points
		(1-4)	(25-30)			(1-4)	(25-30)
1st	Dintzner	1	29	1st	Stogel	3	28
2nd	Hardage	2	28	2nd	Hayes	4	28
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature _____ School / Affiliation / Occupation			
(Circle Winner) Pro Con (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? _____							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Dintzner  
 • Interesting route on the AC → I like the idea of C<sub>2</sub> but the big impact at bottom isn't linked out as much as I would like it to be. Hit the link in AC.  
 • Excellent job hitting the improbability of reallocating the funds of the DoD  
 Nice summary speech → good job w/ voters and hitting the high points of the round  
 \* especially canal card

Hardage  
 • GOOD job running down the flow but watch the card attacks you apply  
 ↳ they are super blippy w/o any real meat or link behind them.  
 CX was good - watch tone though.  
 ↳ just make sure you're not rude.

Stogel  
 • I like the NC a lot!  
 ↳ the idea of offshore balance → good job hitting the impacts of the NC  
 • Great job hitting all the impacts coming down the flow in your summary speech  
 • Good job addressing the reallocation theory  
 ↳ tell me how this works  
 • Make sure we hit BIG impacts like energy grid impact on AC side.

Hayes  
 • Give me voters!  
 • Good job w/ NC! Extensions and attacks were perfect  
 • Great overview @ the top → solid way to make them have to pull for same issue at top.  
 • Get involved in GCF!  
 ↳ you are technically anchor for your team utilize that position  
 • Find a card to have on hand showing that reallocation is both easy and possible.  
 • Nice summary speech; make sure you hit the big impacts harder though.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1.....	4 min
Speaker 2.....	4 min
Crossfire (1 & 2) *.....	3 min
Speaker 3.....	4 min
Speaker 4.....	4 min
Crossfire (3 & 4) *.....	3 min
Speaker 1 Summary.....	2 min
Speaker 2 Summary.....	2 min
Grand Crossfire (all).....	3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus.....	2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus.....	2 min
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

RFD: Pro wins for 2 reasons.

First Pro shows that offshore balancing doesn't work if U.S. intervention is the trigger of conflict because U.S. is still there just right of picture.  
 Second Canal shows clearly that we don't have money to reallocate and the only way to solve is by increasing