

	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
Structure and organisation	Speaker poorly fulfilled his/her role during the debate in the overall structure and organisation:		Speaker satisfactorily fulfilled his/her role in the overall structure/organisation:		Speaker accurately fulfilled his/her role in the overall structure/organisation:	
	<input type="radio"/> Introduction (omitted an opening line reinforcing the team message) was missing or lacked relevance of the topic and message to the audience.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Introduction (included an opening line reinforcing the team message) demonstrated the relevance of the topic and message to the audience.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Introduction (included an opening line reinforcing the team message) demonstrated the relevance of the topic, using imagination and capturing audience interest.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1st round: provided info about the benefits of targeted ads → just better advertisements - 2nd round: reinforcing the other Opp speaker's point
	<input type="radio"/> Refutations missing or poorly presented / justified.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Refutations were satisfactorily presented & justified	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Refutations were convincingly presented & justified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in my view, your speech in the 1st round was more of a holistic refutation than selecting specific points made by the Gov team and then refuting them - 2nd round: privacy issues have little to do with targeted ads
	<input type="radio"/> Body of the presentation was disorganized or did not support the overall team opinion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Body of the presentation was well organized and supported the overall team opinion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Body of the presentation was clearly organized and convincingly supported the overall team opinion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - benefits of targeted ads to the consumers: advertising unavoidable, targeted ads recommend things we are interested in (good concrete info was given)
	<input type="radio"/> Topical focus was lost several times / the speech was very difficult to follow.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Mostly organized but topical focus lost once or twice. Overall, the speech was quite easy to follow.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> The speech stayed focused on the topic throughout. The speech was very easy to follow.	
	<input type="radio"/> Conclusion was missing or did not reinforce the team opinion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Conclusion summarized the main points and reinforced the team opinion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Conclusion summarized the main points & reinforced the team opinion using imagination & capturing audience interest.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "in my conclusion" + targeted ads have become the norm + summarised the team opinion and backed it up with examples - 2nd round: "in conclusion + summarising your main arguments effectively
	<input type="radio"/> Time was not effectively managed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Time was fairly effectively managed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Time was managed very effectively.	
Delivery	Delivery did not motivate the audience to listen:		Delivery showed effort to motivate the audience to listen:		Delivery successfully motivated the audience to listen:	
	<input type="radio"/> No attention grabber and/or no use of persuasive appeals (ethos, pathos, logos)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Satisfactory attention grabber and/or use of persuasive appeals (ethos, pathos, logos)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Effective / imaginative attention grabber and/or use of persuasive appeals (ethos, pathos, logos)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no actual attention grabber - logos – could have referred to some sources - pathos – drawn on well in connection with the examples of everyday life e.g. lifestyle, music preferences
	<input type="radio"/> Unenthusiastic or monotonous delivery. Problems in voice usage / pace	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Sufficiently engaging and interesting delivery. Voice usage / pace were mainly ok	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Engaging and interesting delivery that showed speaker's own enthusiasm. Voice usage / pace varied effectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - good pace, you also seemed enthusiastic and explained in your own words
	<input type="radio"/> Main message incorrectly targeted: The level of complexity was insufficient with regard to the background knowledge of the audience. Too much technical jargon/inadequate vocabulary range	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Presented the main message clearly enough to ensure the audience understood: The level of complexity was somewhat appropriate to the audience. Technical jargon, if used, was usually explained using an adequate vocabulary range.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Message was presented in a very clear and audience-friendly manner: The level of complexity was appropriate to the audience. The presenter shows the ability to link new information with audience's prior knowledge.	
	<input type="radio"/> Used few or no transitional phrases to move between points.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Used occasional transitional phrases to move between points and make the structure of the speech clear.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Consistently used transitional phrases to move between points and make the structure of the speech clear.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "first of all..." - "I want to make a point first...# - "also another benefit of..."
	<input type="radio"/> Unable to respond to or recover from Points of Information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Handled Points of Information sufficiently	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Handled Points of Information extremely well - counter-arguing fluently, and/or using the POI to strengthen their own team's position.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in round 1, the response to the POI remained a bit unclear

Fluency and grammar	<input type="radio"/> Did not know contents well: Used notes too often /rambled aimlessly / poor eye contact/ appears unprepared/ little rapport with audience	<input type="radio"/> Ert	<input type="radio"/> Contents sufficiently elaborated: Spoke freely and fairly confidently / good rapport most of the time/ appears well-prepared	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Contents elaborated upon expertly & confidently: spoke very naturally &, when needed, emphatically/excellent rapport throughout/ very well-prepared	
	<input type="radio"/> No or badly thought-out POIs given	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Sufficient use of POIs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Thought-provoking POIs presented	
	Fluency/intelligibility (B1 or below):		Fluency/intelligibility (B2):		Fluency/intelligibility (C1 or higher):	
	<input type="radio"/> Pausing for grammatical & lexical planning & self-correction was very evident, affecting intelligibility.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Language contained some hesitation as speaker searched for patterns and expressions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Expressed him/herself fluently and spontaneously, almost effortlessly.	
	<input type="radio"/> Satisfactory control of pronunciation with mistakes that sometimes hindered understanding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Good control of pronunciation with a few mistakes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Very good or excellent control of pronunciation	- some words remained a bit unclear ("data breach? bridge?". Remember to also pronounce the ends of the words accurately (e.g. singular or plural, verb forms...)
	<input type="radio"/> Satisfactory vocabulary & grammar but with noticeable mistakes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Good vocabulary & grammar with occasional 'slips' or non-systematic errors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Very good vocabulary & grammar; errors were rare & difficult to spot.	- overall, very good vocabulary. Some minor slips in verb forms ("local shops sells" → "sell") and tenses or singular/plural forms ("also another benefits of..." → "benefit") (might also be pronunciation-related rather than grammar-related?)