Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. B (Room 217)

Judge: AN1 Ronnie Perdue (Canton Central Catholic)

Entry: 11 Chad Wagner

Rank: 2

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

P.O.

-

Great job quickly moving through your procedures. Short and sweet.
--> GOOD not having an example of what 1, 2, and 3 gavel taps sound like. I hate that.

Watch that you aren't sitting at arbitrary times; general rule = if you are speaking, you are standing. You sat down at a somewhat awkward time in the middle of taking motions.

GREAT not waiting for a motion to begin debate--there's really no such thing as that.

Stand for the entire cross-ex period; don't PO from your seat--it's a position of power.

100% accuracy. Well done.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Sweden - Neg

-

Great intro. Good delivery.

Try to avoid using rhetorical questions in your speech; there's 2 reasons for that. (1) No one can answer you because this is your uninterrupted speech time, (2) Opponents can answer them later in a way that's negative.

Decent clash.

Well done for not relying on something pre-written! Good work.

Good cross- was your lucky day given that the questions you were asked were useless.

Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. B (Room 217)

Judge: T5 Jason Deuble (Perry)

Entry: 11 Chad Wagner

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

You did a great job of leading the first hour. I almost didn't know you were there because it ran so smooth.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Swedish Fish
- I enjoyed your opening even though are wrong...
- You did a great job of addressing the room
- When calling our a Representative I would have liked to see you look at them
- 2:31
- during questioning by Rep Gembali you showed your knowledge and research

Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. B (Room 217)

Judge: H2 Aaron Powers (Vermilion)

Entry: 11 Chad Wagner

Rank: 2

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

PO

You entertained too many unnecessary motions at the start. There is no 'motion to begin debate'; that's specifically listed in the NSDA's Congressional Debate Guide as something not needed, since the PO just does that as part of regular business. (Also, consider the ramifications of if that motion

failed for whatever reason...)

There's also no need for a specific motion to set the order of the agenda; it's just extra time used on something that was already established

When doing votes on legislation, you need to account for everyone; you had a 5-4 vote on the first piece, but there are 10 voting members, so you need to make sure to do that

In terms of regular business, not bad; had decent word economy and no recognition errors that I noticed; good job on that front

Speech #2 -- Score: 3
Intro was okay but should road map arguments

Source on sexual assault claims?

Improve eye contact during analysis

All sources need dates

You address opposing reps, but I prefer direct clash with the substance of their arguments, which you aren't doing in this speech

Could have brought your conclusion full circle; you had time

3+

Canton McKinley Alan B. Rubinstein Holiday Tournament - Dec. 16, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. B (Room 217)
Judge: AN1 Ronnie Perdue (Canton Central Catholic)
Entry: 11 Chad Wagner
Rank: 4

Speech #1 -- Score: 5
10am - Neg
-
Most previous comments apply.

Side note: It seems to me you got a little "sleepy" this round. Your activity dropped quite a bit. I think you know you had a fantastic first round and didn't really try this round knowing that you're going to place high enough to bid... Go the extra mile next time!

Canton McKinley Alan B. Rubinstein Holiday Tournament - Dec. 16, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. B (Room 217)
Judge: F2 Joy Kleinhenz (Wooster Middle School)
Entry: 11 Chad Wagner
Rank: 5

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Direct Clash - refer to 1 speaker & group
Extemporaneous Skills & Presentation - good eye contact, excellent gestures, clear vocal quality
Quality of Evidence/Sources - NYTimes, nice sources with different point of view
Response to Cross X - good, confident direct answers to varied questions
Understanding of Topic - great understanding of issue, well organized case, good examples w/ sources
Professionalism - confident, poised
Good word economy, nice intro
2:58

Canton McKinley Alan B. Rubinstein Holiday Tournament - Dec. 16, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. B (Room 217)
Judge: T4 Sonya Poirier (Perry)
Entry: 11 Chad Wagner
Rank: 5

Speech #1 -- Score: 5
Good volume, could hear very well. Great eye contact at the beginning and ending. In the middle, you referenced your paper a lot.

Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. A (Room 213)

Judge: AB5 Emma Curd (Hoover)

Entry: 12 Jackson Moore

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

School Start

Interesting point about traffic and rush hour it was a fresh take on the legislation. You have good inflection and diction. You do a good job speaking extemporaneously throughout your speech however I would like to see it mainly during your impacts which is where you don't generally have it. Overall good job.

Questions: You do an excellent job in questioning.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

POship

Good Job.

Canton McKinley Alan B. Rubinstein Holiday Tournament - Dec. 16, 2023

Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. A (Room 213)

Judge: I3 Brenda Martin (Louisville Middle School)

Entry: 12 Jackson Moore

Rank: 5

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Spoke in negation of the bill. Very well spoken, moves around the chamber well, easy to hear and understand. Points were made well and well organized. Good eye contact. Cited sources correctly. 3:07

Answered questions very well.

Speech #2 -- Score: 4

As PO, rules were clear and implemented correctly. PO was fair and consistent.

Canton McKinley Alan B. Rubinstein Holiday Tournament - Dec. 16, 2023

Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. A (Room 213)

Judge: H3 Patrick Anders (Vermilion)

Entry: 12 Jackson Moore

Rank: 4

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Driving point is new and relevant to safety-good point. Busing times is very important point for schools, and personal example helps tie-in legitimacy. 11:30 start time is important point that was hammered home. Costs mentioned are also important. This point was unchallenged through the round and was perhaps the strongest consideration throughout.

Expanding on students repeating behaviors is also strong with impacts of what actually happen with the bill. In future, tie more against what the other side has mentioned in speeches.

Cx- Being able to confidently explain point was very well done, shows confidence and belief. Especially bringing up source.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Good job! Questions and speeches were quickly handed. Make sure that you count the PO from the last session, as it counts as a speech. Also, if you're not POing first, it's a good idea to keep track of speeches and questions (questions can be harder to but speeches should be a given) if they will not reset in order to have a smoother flow and show that you've been preparing for your session as PO.

Canton McKinley Alan B. Rubinstein Holiday Tournament - Dec. 16, 2023

Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. A (Room 213)

Judge: AB5 Emma Curd (Hoover)

Entry: 12 Jackson Moore

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Swedish FISH

Thank you for adding clash to the first negation speech this aspect has been lacking in many speeches. The comments from your last speech apply here. You have an excellent presentation as well as speech content. You know what you are doing to the point where I can get into technical things like using pass/fail instead of affirm/negate.

Questions: Excellent job. You have a good way of sympathizing with the affirmation while still proving your negation point.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

POship

Good job

Canton McKinley Alan B. Rubinstein Holiday Tournament - Dec. 16, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. A (Room 213)

Judge: H2 Aaron Powers (Vermilion)

Entry: 12 Jackson Moore

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 3

Too much reading, get off script

Need more clear road map of arguments in intro

What is The Conversation? Qualify this source

You need to explain how the differences in population make this a poor solution

You keep addressing Rep. Embree as a springboard for whatever your claim at that time is, but you're not really engaging with the substance of her arguments; you need to specifically clash in debate

Speech #2 -- Score: 4

PO

Entertained unnecessary motion to resume debate (this is established by NSDA rules as part of standard PO action at start of round, so you don't need a motion for it)

Watch questioning and speech timing; you had some where your timing went way under my time

Orders of the day doesn't require a second; it's the decision of the chair (the PO, you, typically in consultation with the parli), and this is clearly laid out in the table of motions

Canton McKinley Alan B. Rubinstein Holiday Tournament - Dec. 16, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. A (Room 213)

Judge: D1 Morgan Price (Massillon Washington High School)

Entry: 12 Jackson Moore

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Your argument that prison workers aren't suited to help these individuals return to society already, contradicts the entire notion of our prison rehabilitation system. The system current mission is to imprison yes, which you said, but it's also intended to rehabilitate. Our own government says this. You have a good rhythm when speaking and you handled cross-ex very well. I don't think your argument about nordic countries having less prisoners and recidivism because of cultural differences is entirely supported. I think that's surely a piece of it but not entirely. Good use of fellow representatives in your speech.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Very short lived but solid job as P.O.

Canton McKinley Alan B. Rubinstein Holiday Tournament - Dec. 16, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. C (Room 219)

Judge: F2 Joy Kleinhenz (Wooster Middle School)

Entry: 13 Lukas Prominski

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Direct Clash - 1 reference, try to increase clash
Extemporaneous Skills & Presentation - try to increase eye contact, good movement & gestures, vocal quality was clear and accessible
Quality of Evidence/Sources - 1st step act, Social Worker quote, try to strengthen your sources
Response to Cross X - gave direct answers, try to use sources to strengthen answers
Understanding of Topic - great into, good transition to speech, organized case, details, nuance
Professionalism - confident, courteous
3:03

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Direct Clash - excellent, reference to 3 previous speakers
Extemporaneous Skills & Presentation - good eye contact, gestures, vocal quality
Quality of Evidence/Sources - include sources w/ percentages, Georgetown Law,   try to include more
Response to Cross X - good direct answer, try to include sources
Understanding of Topic - nice intro, good transition to speech, clear contention w/ main points, good signposting which enhances organization and the message
Professionalism - confident, courteous
Good use of time, word economy and nice clash 2:46

Canton McKinley Alan B. Rubinstein Holiday Tournament - Dec. 16, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. C (Room 219)

Judge: AL1 Jim Byrne (Wooster)

Entry: 13 Lukas Prominski

Rank: 2

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Great speech, it would be better if you read less and connected better. Don't read the facts to me, tell me the facts. Nice way to handle questions.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Great job. Reading less would greatly enhance your delivery. Your delivery doesn't match your great speech.

Canton McKinley Alan B. Rubinstein Holiday Tournament - Dec. 16, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. C (Room 219)

Judge: I2 Jacob Zartman (Louisville Middle School)

Entry: 13 Lukas Prominski

Rank: 4

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Swedish FISH//

I would generally avoid quoting Ted Kaczynski, even if it does set up your rationale for speaking fairly effectively. There have be dozens of better, and less obviously controversial, people you could cite to start off your speech. You have some solid warranting and broke down you impacts very effectively. I appreciated how comprehensively you lay out your arguments - that's a strength to capitalize on. Your speech was overall delivered very well, but I'd suggest reducing your dependence on reading from your notepad. Extemporaneous or memorized delivery will always be best in Congressional Debate! Otherwise, well done.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Immigration//

A powerful and creative introduction, but again think it could be a bit more concise. A solid 15-20 seconds will always be the best option. You offer a lot of good clash, and bring in some new warrants, but really need to avoid rehashing previous arguments. Backlogs have already been discussed a few times! Novel impacts are the only way to fully advance the debate. Otherwise and overall, well done.

Canton McKinley Alan B. Rubinstein Holiday Tournament - Dec. 16, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. C (Room 219)

Judge: I2 Jacob Zartman (Louisville Middle School)

Entry: 13 Lukas Prominski

Rank: 5

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Gender-disaggregate Data//

Please forgive me, but I always end up sounding like a broken record as a parliamentarian. A good chunk of my previous comments, especially those related to delivery, are also applicable to this speech. Solid warranting and impacting, you introduced the piece of legislation well. Otherwise and overall, well done.

Canton McKinley Alan B. Rubinstein Holiday Tournament - Dec. 16, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. C (Room 219)

Judge: S1 Jair Carrasquero (Centerville High School)

Entry: 13 Lukas Prominski

Rank: 9

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Good tone of voice
Good job covering the whole floor
Well structured speech
Should read less
Should cite his sources during his speech
Good pace
Good job defending his point of view

Canton McKinley Alan B. Rubinstein Holiday Tournament - Dec. 16, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. C (Room 219)

Judge: T5 Jason Deuble (Perry)

Entry: 13 Lukas Prominski

Rank: 9

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Gender

- You struggled with your speech in a few spots. I feel like more practice and working to memorize more of your speech will help you with that.

- I would have liked to see you use your notes less.

- You should have used more inflection in your voice during the speech. Where you did use it emphasized your points. The rest tended to blend together.

- 2:29

- during questioning you did a good job on answering the questions they asked

- You used the information in you speech to defend your points very well