

Baltimore Catholic Forensic League Debate Ballot

Division Varsity Round 1 Room 109 Judge Holtzman

Affirmative Team [redacted]

Negative Team [redacted]

1st Affirmative Speaker [redacted]

2nd Affirmative Speaker [redacted]

1st Negative Speaker [redacted]

2nd Negative Speaker [redacted]

Total Pts 28.9 Rank 4

Total Pts 29.3 Rank 1

Total Pts 29.2 Rank 2

Total Pts 29.3 Rank 3

Point range 30-20 unless approved by Tab Room. Points may be tied.

Ranks must be 1, 2, 3, 4 Ranks may not be tied

Low point wins permitted with explanation and notation below.

No disclosure or critiques in round permitted

In my opinion, this debate was won by Aff Neg

Representing School [redacted]

Judge Name [redacted]

Judge Signature [signature]

Affiliation Cover

Reasons for Decision:

Neg T definition was restrictive, Aff counter def was reasonable
Neg won Frameworks argument, Aff didn't adequately argue it

BUT...

Neg failed to adequately win under their own Framework
because when pushed for any specificity on their K aff
solvency they lacked concrete actionable details... No funding
source, no curriculum, no teaching methodology...

Volunteers? Their examples didn't stand up to scrutiny of
solvency or being applicable to whole society.

Neg tried to play both sides with Aff claiming neg ground & K
not CP when pushed for details but then trying to use it
like a CP but by not specifying funding or any solvency details
there is no way to weigh the Aff Posm argument that
Aff can solve through central change in system vs destruction
of system so I have to accept Aff Posm since neg can't
give enough details to fairly weigh...

Neg needs to pick a side on K... they said in ZNR

"We don't have to have a plan, it's not a plan" then in the next
sentence "so there is a greater chance of our plan working"
which is it??? Can't have it both ways.

Aff nailed Neg on contradiction of their K with solvency
details of a plan or solution

Baltimore Catholic Forensic League Debate Ballot

Division Policy Round 2 Room 109 Judge [REDACTED]

Affirmative Team [REDACTED] Negative Team [REDACTED]

1st Affirmative Speaker <u>[REDACTED]</u>	2nd Affirmative Speaker <u>[REDACTED]</u>	1st Negative Speaker <u>[REDACTED]</u>	2nd Negative Speaker <u>[REDACTED]</u>
Total Pts <u>28.7</u> Rank <u>2</u>	Total Pts <u>29</u> Rank <u>1</u>	Total Pts <u>28.2</u> Rank <u>4</u>	Total Pts <u>28.5</u> Rank <u>3</u>

Point range 30-20 unless approved by Tab Room. Points may be tied.
Ranks must be 1, 2, 3, 4 Ranks may not be tied

Low point wins permitted with explanation and notation below.
No disclosure or critiques in round permitted

In my opinion, this debate was won by Aff X Neg Representing School [REDACTED]

Judge Name [REDACTED] Judge Signature [Signature] Affiliation CC

Reasons for Decision:

ZAC - T should be at the top of your Roadmap
 - Spend less time answering the CP
 - you should not say that the dress code policy is better than a curriculum teaching boys not to rape - this is a huge deficit if true.

INC - read more case specific cards
 - say dress codes are good?

ZNC - more offense on case - most of your cards say the same thing

INR - spend more time on the DA or other offense given the ZNC

1AR - do more MPX calc on Aff v. Trump base DA b/c it is their ONLY offense in the debate, less time on 50 State fiat.

ZNR - need to pick either:

- Topicality
- DA + case + CP
- DA + case

must answer "swotus key" args if you are going for the CP
 must answer N/A claim on the DA if you go for the DA
 must answer w/ m + c/i if going for T

ZAR: need more MPX calc on "any risk of helping one person means you vote aff." arg
 ↑ the ZNR did none of these

RFD: Aff - no risk of non-unique DA, swotus is key - only aff has a risk of any (S) + advantage

Time: 8:48
10 min. w/ 30 sec. grace period

NATIONAL CATHOLIC FORENSIC LEAGUE
Critique Sheet for
ORAL INTERPRETATION OF LITERATURE

Do Not Write in this Space

Round 1 Room 212 Student's Name: [REDACTED] Code SV713 Rank 4 of 6
Selection Title: A tell tale Heart Author: Edgar Allen Poe
Judge's Name: [REDACTED] Judge's Code: _____
Judge's School /League: Catholic High

Criteria for judging:

- **Introduction:** The introduction must name the work and author, provide necessary background information and establish the mood. If using a teaser, or if lines from the selection are used in the introduction, the speakers must adhere to the rules of the event.
- **Projection of Literature:** The interpreter should demonstrate a clear understanding of the literature and project its meaning, message and tone. The speaker should capture and convey the plot and/or development. Imagery should be carefully colored so as to promote audience understanding and appreciation. In a presentation of a collection, there should be a unity to the program as a whole, made clear by the introduction and transitional material. Consideration should be given to the literary merit of the selection.
- **Narrator/Character Creation:** The narrator should be believable and conversational. The narrator should be able to lead the audience through the details of the literature, keeping a consistent and clear attitude toward people, objects and events within the literature. In collections, the interpreter should develop and maintain unique and distinct narrative voices for each selection within the program. If they are utilized, character voices should be distinctive, consistent and appropriate to the character. The interpreter should be able to demonstrate the characters' feelings and thoughts through the use of vocal inflections, facial expressions including visualization, and appropriate intensity.
- **Visualization:** The interpreter should help the audience to see the particular world of the narrator. The interpreter should establish a strong sense of environment. The interpreter should be able to see and replay the events described or recalled in the literature. The interpreter should use facial expressions and gestures appropriately to bring the script to life.
- **Vocal Variety:** The interpreter should appropriately vary pitch, volume, rate, and intensity to convey the various moods and messages in the literature. Appropriate words should be stressed for clarity and understanding. The interpreter should appropriately play with sound devices such as alliteration, and attend to the sound and meaning of every word. For poetry, the interpreter should capture and effectively vary existing poetic rhythm, making use of rhyme when necessary and avoiding it when not.
- **Audience and Script Contact:** The interpreter should invite the audience into the presentation, directing eye contact and expressing his or her feelings to individual audience members when appropriate and necessary and consulting the script when it is not. The interpreter should focus away from the audience and the script effectively during moments of internal and private thoughts. There should be a natural balance between the audience and script where one does not take precedence over the other. The interpreter should stay in the moment, with facial expression and emotional consistency, when making contact with the manuscript.
- **Overall Effect:** The overall performance should build to various moments and have a climax. The performance should be easy to follow and complete. The performance should display another world outside of the performance space.

PLEASE USE THE REVERSE TO COMMENT ON POSITIVE ASPECTS OF THE PERFORMANCE, AND TO PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS. BE CERTAIN TO INCLUDE JUSTIFICATION FOR YOUR RANKING.

- +
- great eye contact.
 - good characterization of narrator.
 - good gesturing.
 - good facial expressions.

-
- a bit too quick, pauses are important & help to make emotions larger.
 - intro is decent, but need to pause more
 - get louder with each "louder"
 - stress "dead".
 - really need to slow down.
can go fast to show madness of narrator, but absolutely need to have slow parts for contrast. bc there's no different characters, need to show vocal variance in other ways.
 - ending didn't feel like ending, your pacing was messy & since your tone was always so high, the crescendo to the end really wasn't, therefore it fell flat.

**BALTIMORE CATHOLIC FORENSICS LEAGUE
AUXILIARY SPEECH BALLOT**

Children's Literature

Code: SM417 Round: 2 Room: 101 Rank: 6 out of 6

Speaker's Name: [REDACTED]

Topic: The Day The Crayons Quit

Judge: [REDACTED] School: CHS

Criteria for judging:

- Presentation: use of vocal variety, good pitch, projection, articulation and pace used to convey the ideas, mood, and argument. Is the material enhanced by the use of character development? Is the language used to the fullest potential? Are the characters distinct? Would the presentation appeal to the children in the age group? Is there a balance of eye contact with the script and the audience
- Content: Is the selection appropriate for the age group? Is the language clear to the audience of age group children for which it is chosen?
- Body Language: Does the gestures enhance the presentation? Do the facial expressions reinforce the selection? Does the movement enhance the characterization?
- Overall Effect: Is the presentation an effective interpretation?

PLEASE USE THE REVERSE TO COMMENT AND EXPLAIN YOUR RANKING THROUGH SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT.

Ages 4-8 Have title and author. Was very detailed about the book in the intro.

Nice facial expression
Gestures are good

Each crayon has to stay in character for a long period of time. It seemed the characters ran together a few times.

Showed the book pictures at the end.

~~Great~~ Great job overall

8:19

**BALTIMORE CATHOLIC FORENSICS LEAGUE
AUXILIARY SPEECH BALLOT**

Children's Literature

Code: SM 417 Round: 1 Room: 108 Rank: 5 out of 6

Speaker's Name: [REDACTED]

Topic: The Day the Crayons Quit by Drew Daywalt

Judge: [REDACTED] School: LR

Criteria for judging:

- Presentation: use of vocal variety, good pitch, projection, articulation and pace used to convey the ideas, mood, and argument. Is the material enhanced by the use of character development? Is the language used to the fullest potential? Are the characters distinct? Would the presentation appeal to the children in the age group? Is there a balance of eye contact with the script and the audience
- Content: Is the selection appropriate for the age group? Is the language clear to the audience of age group children for which it is chosen?
- Body Language: Does the gestures enhance the presentation? Do the facial expressions reinforce the selection? Does the movement enhance the characterization?
- Overall Effect: Is the presentation an effective interpretation?

PLEASE USE THE REVERSE TO COMMENT AND EXPLAIN YOUR RANKING THROUGH SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT.

+

- good purple voice
- good Facial expressions
- good tone
- good book placement
- good attitude

-

- Keep eye contact with judges
- out of breath = exhausted?
- make sure to have purposeful hand gestures
- Not sure I understand the white crayon hand gesture



- punch that last ~~sign~~
line in the green crayon story

**BALTIMORE CATHOLIC FORENSICS LEAGUE
AUXILIARY SPEECH BALLOT**

Impromptu

Code: RE 812 Round: 3 Room: 306 Rank: 6 out of 6

Speaker's Name: ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

Topic: The heat of the moment

Judge: ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ School: Catonsville High

Criteria for judging:

- Presentation: use of vocal variety, good pitch, projection, articulation and pace used to convey the ideas, mood, and argument. The manner of speaking should be relaxed and assured. Notes, if used, should not infringe on the speaking style and flow of the presentation.
- Content: exhibit the ability to be original and fresh with little preparation time, contestant is expected to stay within the topic and have an organized approach to the presentation. This is not unrelated stand up jokes.
- Audience Response: the speech should entertain or inform, and contestant should show sensitivity to the mood of the audience in the conclusion.

PLEASE USE THE REVERSE TO COMMENT AND EXPLAIN YOUR RANKING THROUGH SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT.

- Good eye contact
 - Good volume
 - Nice, natural speaking style
 - Good gestures
 - Good use of personal story/example
-

- You stayed very still in the space.
It might be effective to move around in the physical space.
- Your presentation was
- A little rambling during your story
- Manage your time more effectively so that you can do a proper wrap-up.

**BALTIMORE CATHOLIC FORENSICS LEAGUE
STUDENT CONGRESS BALLOT**

13

SPEAKER'S NAME: _____
JUDGE'S NAME: _____

HOUSE: Finels
SCHOOL: Palotti

DATE: 3/22/18

CRITERIA FOR JUDGING	SPEECH 1	SPEECH 2	SPEECH 3
	Resolution/Bill # <u>5</u> (AFF) / NEG	Resolution/Bill # <u>3</u> (AFF) / NEG	Resolution/Bill # _____ AFF / NEG
1. DELIVERY Does the speaker take his/her purpose seriously? Was the speaker poised? Was the style professional? Does the speaker communicate effectively? Clear, audible, persuasive?	Word choices could be crisper + more specific Score 1-6: <u>4</u>	Word choices (sex offenders) not all child abuse Score 1-6: <u>4</u>	Score 1-6: _____
2. ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT Does the speaker advance new ideas, thoughts, & perspectives? Does he/she inspire new debate or just rehash old points?	40,000 lives lost both sides could claim to save lives Score 1-6: <u>4</u>	These people have a pattern, & need a way out of this issue Score 1-6: <u>4</u>	Score 1-6: _____
3. ORGANIZATION Does the speaker take a definite focus and approach? Does it develop or just remain stagnant and rambling? Is there an organizational pattern to the speech?	2 statements used for good use of time Score 1-6: <u>6</u>	softer environment for potential victims this is outwardly stated Score 1-6: <u>4</u>	Score 1-6: _____
4. EVIDENCE AND LOGIC Are material and references presented? Is it relevant? Does the speaker show clear knowledge of the topic? Is there a logical basis for his/her argument?	Bloomberg did do source w/ more information (date, author) CBO states \$2 trillion spent why? Score 1-6: <u>5</u>	gun control laws (conellate) not really connected to legislators or you have not made the connection Score 1-6: <u>3</u>	Score 1-6: _____
5. GENERAL EFFECTIVENESS Were you interested? Impacted? Was the speaker animated? Were you persuaded to his/her view?	Score 1-6: <u>5</u>	some of your ideas are disjoint Score 1-6: <u>4</u>	Score 1-6: _____
OVERALL SPEECH SCORE	Score 1-30: <u>24</u>	Score 1-30: <u>19</u>	Score 1-30: _____

Since this is a learning process, feel free to make additional comments on the back.

**NATIONAL CATHOLIC FORENSICES LEAGUE
STUDENT CONGRESS BALLOT FOR SPEAKERS**

Speaker: _____ **Judge:** _____ **Time of Day:** _____

DIRECTIONS: Rank each speech 1-6 in each category. Use one ballot for each speech. Feel encouraged to comment on the back of this ballot. In scoring, use whole numbers only – no decimals. 6 is the highest (best) rank).

CRITERIA AND COMMENTS	SCORING (1-6; 1= low; 6 = high)
DELIVERY. Seriousness of purpose, style, poise, coherency.	
ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT. Does the speech advance debate?	
ORGANIZATION AND UNITY OF SPEECH. Does it ramble? Does it develop?	
EVIDENCE AND LOGIC BASIS FOR STATEMENT. Breadth of knowledge on subject.	
OVERAL IMPACT AND IMPRESSION. Were you persuaded to his/her view?	
TOTAL SCORE	

**BALTIMORE CATHOLIC FORENSICS LEAGUE
STUDENT CONGRESS BALLOT**

SPEAKER'S NAME: _____
JUDGE'S NAME: _____

HOUSE: Final
SCHOOL: _____

DATE: _____

CRITERIA FOR JUDGING	SPEECH 1 <u>6</u>	SPEECH 2 <u>5</u>	SPEECH 3 <u>3</u>
	Resolution/Bill # <u>AFF/NEG</u>	Resolution/Bill # <u>AFF/NEG</u>	Resolution/Bill # <u>AFF/NEG</u>
1. DELIVERY Does the speaker take his/her purpose seriously? Was the speaker poised? Was the style professional? Does the speaker communicate effectively? Clear, audible, persuasive?	Connect with us and convince us. You have great info, but more persuasion. Score 1-6: <u>4</u>	← see. Score 1-6: <u>4</u>	mod volume and physicality w/ audience. Score 1-6: <u>4</u>
2. ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT Does the speaker advance new ideas, thoughts, & perspectives? Does he/she inspire new debate or just rehash old points?	- good 200yrd dir. pathos. Score 1-6: <u>5</u>	- good talking about the civilians. Score 1-6: <u>5</u>	- Good list of neglect. Score 1-6: <u>6</u> 5
3. ORGANIZATION Does the speaker take a definite focus and approach? Does it develop or just remain stagnant and rambling? Is there an organizational pattern to the speech?	- Good starts and pathos stories. Score 1-6: <u>5</u>	- Fantastic opening intro - back on your 3 topics in intro. Then go to body to explain. Score 1-6: <u>5</u>	- Correlation to Serial Killer = great You are organized laying out your points Score 1-6: <u>6</u>
4. EVIDENCE AND LOGIC Are material and references presented? Is it relevant? Does the speaker show clear knowledge of the topic? Is there a logical basis for his/her argument?	How does Brazil compare to USA. = \$bil - 8 billion expense Score 1-6: <u>5</u>	This is a deadly operation for all. Children = pathos. - freeing more good point Score 1-6: <u>6</u>	Great intro. 71% target pets. Great. Score 1-6: <u>6</u>
5. GENERAL EFFECTIVENESS Were you interested? Impacted? Was the speaker animated? Were you persuaded to his/her view?	Good talking question. Score 1-6: <u>5</u>	Score 1-6: <u>5</u>	use of operative words will help w/ your communication Score 1-6: <u>5</u>
OVERALL SPEECH SCORE	Score 1-30: <u>24</u>	Score 1-30: <u>25</u>	Score 1-30: <u>27</u>

Since this is a learning process, feel free to make additional comments on the back.

25.3

**NATIONAL CATHOLIC FORENSICES LEAGUE
STUDENT CONGRESS BALLOT FOR SPEAKERS**

Speaker: _____ Judge: _____ Time of Day: _____

DIRECTIONS: Rank each speech 1-6 in each category. Use one ballot for each speech. Feel encouraged to comment on the back of this ballot. In scoring, use whole numbers only – no decimals. 6 is the highest (best) rank.

CRITERIA AND COMMENTS	SCORING (1-6; 1= low; 6 = high)
DELIVERY. Seriousness of purpose, style, poise, coherency.	
ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT. Does the speech advance debate?	
ORGANIZATION AND UNITY OF SPEECH. Does it ramble? Does it develop?	
EVIDENCE AND LOGIC BASIS FOR STATEMENT. Breadth of knowledge on subject.	
OVERAL IMPACT AND IMPRESSION. Were you persuaded to his/her view?	
TOTAL SCORE	