

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 1 Sect. A (Room D204)

Judge: B1 Shaun Duniver (Stow)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 2

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

PO

Good job giving procedures

Personally great job

A lot of other judges are going to want you to be more poised and less laced in nature.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 1 Sect. A (Room D204)

Judge: N5 David Fraizer (Louisville)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 6

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

POship

You did very well overall, just a few mistakes and a few late taps.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 1 Sect. A (Room D204)

Judge: T2 Libby Adams (Perry)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 2

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Elderly Care P.O.

- Good jobs you kept the round flowing very well and you were fair

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 2 Sect. A (Room D204)

Judge: N5 David Fraizer (Louisville)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 4

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Very good speech, I don't have any real negatives besides going over time. Would have been a 6 if it was not over time.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

You have a very good speech, but you went way over time.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 2 Sect. A (Room D204)

Judge: H2 Chris DuPaul (Hawken School)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

You do a nice job of being able to navigate through large amounts of supporting data without breaking stride (most of the time).

Intellectually, you have architected a clean and robust argument supported by data

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Pharma advertisements increase drug cost - Good data point from NIH which is a credible source. Love the way you then link that to patients refusal of care based on affordability

You are totally losing me on this non-approved drug argument - You were doing so well but this half of your argument made no sense.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 2 Sect. A (Room D204)

Judge: L10 John Kerezy (Revere HS)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 7

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Trial by Jury -- PRO (2nd)

Constitutional rights -- quick, public, jury of our peers. NOT the case today. Good evidence.

Petty Crimes -- "not as serious" -- still a crime for a reason.

CX -- Does constitution clarify?

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Pharma Advertising -- PRO Joke about Chinese food

More like rat poisoning

1) Ads increase the \$\$\$ 10% prescriptions turned down due to PRICE

2) Some of these aren't approved by FDA "Publishing of drugs that are not FDA-approved made it market before they were shut down.....

Some clash -- good 3:10

CX: Drug ads not approved by the FDA

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 3 Sect. A (Room D204)

Judge: N5 David Fraizer (Louisville)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 2

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

You had a very good speech! That was one of the best intros that I heard in this chamber.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 3 Sect. A (Room D204)

Judge: B2 Nathan Marotta (Stow)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 4

Speech #1 -- Score: 4

Nice intro with good delivery behind, my only complaint would have been to delivery "make me eyes water" a little lighter and also the transition into suicide rates after was a little jarring.

Your speech is well organized and easy to follow.

Your 1st contention is well written and supported well with evidence. I could use a little more impact development to support and explain the depth of this medical impact, but even without the real development your emotional appeal when discussing your heart disease point was very effective.

Your 2nd contention was also well supported with evidence and had some good clash behind it, some minor stumbles. I liked the list at the end of the contention.

Conclusion was a little short and could have referenced back into the intro.

Your speaking was a little monotone and would benefit greatly from more passion, rise and fall, and variety in tone/volume.

Nice job in questioning

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

I really like how you maintain eye contact the entire intro, nice job. The intro was also unique and made sense for the topic. I wish the delivery had been a little different, I still want those rises and the falls to go with them.

Your 1st contention opens with reading the legislation which isn't so bad, but this late in the round I would prefer you to just jump into the points, or at least minimize the length of the quote. I could have used a little more impact development here. Why are schools constantly trying to pass levies? Won't this funding come from the legislation? I am essentially missing what makes the world of your speech better than the world of the oppositions speeches.

Your 2nd contention is a little bit of rehash and you don't really have any clash to help mitigate this. I do like the evidence used and believe that the impact was a little better developed here, but I could still use more.

Speaking style comments apply as per previous ballot.

Nice job in questioning.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 3 Sect. A (Room D204)

Judge: S3 Victor Colaanni (Northwest High School)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Very poised in position stance. Health related statistics fortify position. Appreciated less reliance on notes and focus on other reps and audience. Good clarity and progression as speech went on. That flow gave strength of position.

During questions, good response to opposition. Short and to the point. Referral to other reps citations - well done!!

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Your citation of laws and affects towards legislation at outset of speech was well placed and gave good strength to position. Affect on tax payer and also public also good references.

Your pace of speech and inflections are commendable.

Stay consistent on confidence throughout questioning from opposition.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Semifinal Sect. A (Room C212)

Judge: E3 Ben Kissinger (Wadsworth)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 6

Speech #1 -- Score: 4

Great memorized intro.

Hand motions good.

Memorize your signposting. This is the best place to not have to look at your paper.

Fourth neg in a row. Really? Cmon man. Write an aff.

Good tempo. Good volume.

Good enunciation and tonal variation.

Effective blocking.

I need a lot more clash.

The fourth neg in a row should in no circumstances be a constructive. Give me a crystal at this point.

5 minus 1 for being the fourth neg in a row.

Good Cx.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

PO

Great job.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Semifinal Sect. A (Room C212)

Judge: T2 Libby Adams (Perry)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 5

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Fish:

- good job analyzing the differences between in the US and Sweden
- Good delivery
- You inflection a presentation was very effective
- Good re-offending argument
- Good job analyzing implications of nuances of the program
- God job in questioning

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

P.O.ing

Good job thanks for volunteering, you did very well

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Semifinal Sect. A (Room C212)

Judge: G2 Nicholas McFadden (Highland)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Aff

Fish

Nice intro and solid eye contact. Seemed like you blanked on first contention

Nice clash backed with stats

You focus on disproving other representatives and not really the effect on your constituents. This late in the round its tempting to give the clash/crystal speech, but don't forget about they people your represent and the impacts on them.

I would have liked to see more passion, but your speaking pace is perfect.

Cross-x: Handled pretty well.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

PO Solid Procedure. Felt a little choppy at a few points. You had a few issue but nothing major. I think you had great control of the room

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Semifinal Sect. A (Room C212)

Judge: I7 Matthew List (GlenOak)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 2

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Speech 2:50

Very Good pace, pausing during key points and using vocal ques to highlight important points.

Addressing previous arguments in speech.

Clear points and usage of multiple facts to support each point.

Re-offending argument could have used some clear facts during speech and questions to support.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

2:40

Good Pace -

Brought for some key facts in pesticides. Connecting impact of pesticide to impact on pollinators would have improved argument.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Final Sect. FINAL (Room C212)

Judge: S1 Stephen Imler (Northwest High School)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 9

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Specify what kind of train we would be replacing. You say that if we replaced every train it would be 3b. Is that freight and passenger or just passenger?

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

some delivery hiccups on this speech. Pauses, etc...

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Final Sect. FINAL (Room C212)

Judge: N5 David Fraizer (Louisville)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 9

Speech #1 -- Score: 4

Your intro would make sense if the legislation was about EVs. There is a big disconnect here.

The train argument is ok? You need to explain why the cost for tickets would go up. Does the legislation replace all trains?

Your first point was way longer than your first point.

Speech #2 -- Score: 4

I'm honestly not sure how to feel about your intro, and that isn't a good thing.

You stumbled quite a bit throughout your speech.

Your points are almost entirely rehash.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Final Sect. FINAL (Room C212)

Judge: E3 Ben Kissinger (Wadsworth)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 9

Speech #1 -- Score: 3

Are electric vehicles a type of "transportation infrastructure that prioritize mass transit"?

Also why do the trains have to be electric? Isn't mass transit inherently greener than personal vehicles?

This speech was a constructive. You needed to give a crystal. Simply adding lines that reference and refute other speakers isn't effective -- you need to weave other speakers' positions into your own in a speech this late in the debate cycle.

Good knowledge of the topic.

Good pace. Good volume.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Better incorporation of clash in this speech. Nice work.

Excellent control of tempo and inflection.

Everything you say is deliberate and meaningful, which I appreciate. Great word economy.

This speech was leagues better than your last one.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Final Sect. FINAL (Room C212)

Judge: I7 Matthew List (GlenOak)

Entry: D13 Griffin Moore

Rank: 5

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

2:52

Starting out with a simple statement on your argument sets the stage, prepares people.

Cost of electric vehicles, unique view that also is in the public view.

Environmental impact, a difficult and brave view in this argument. It does directly attack the obvious reason to support this legislation.

Good address of questions, directly and well prepared.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

2:44

Good to start with a summary of arguments.

Unique approach to discuss issues with visa processing.

Bold approach to challenge the illegal immigration as the likely pro-bill position.

Questions - good; continued to deliver key points.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 1 Sect. C (Room D208)

Judge: S1 Stephen Imler (Northwest High School)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 6

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Great eye contact, great job utilizing different locations to speak. Explore more hand gestures and inflection in your voice.

Great job with the first speech of the day!

Great job during questioning.

(5)Delivery

The presentation is strong, but contains a few mistakes, including problems with pronunciation and enunciation. The speech may be partially read with satisfactory fluency. Physical presence may be awkward at times.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Your speech is strong. I think saying certain things more impactful (representatives, statistics, etc...) would take your speaking to the next level. Great job today!

(5) Delivery

The presentation is strong, but contains a few mistakes, including problems with pronunciation and enunciation. The speech may be partially read with satisfactory fluency. Physical presence may be awkward at times.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 1 Sect. C (Room D208)

Judge: R2 Emma Curd (Hoover)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 6

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Elderly Care Authorship Time: 2:48

Your voice stays the same throughout your speech and there are some good points where you could hit it home by adding some inflection into your voice. However, you do a good job overall presenting your points. You do a good job of backing up your logic with evidence and you do a good job tying all of your information together. I would like to see you use pass or fail instead of affirm.

Questioning: Overall good job answering the questions of other representatives however slow down a little so that we all can understand your answer.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Bilingual Edu

The comments from the last speech still stand. You spoke a little faster on this speech and it was hard to understand you at some points. Your body language is good and adds to the speech but your voice needs to match it. Flipping the page of your legal pad is a little awkward however it didn't stop you when you were speaking.

Questions: Good job answering Berlin and Talbot's line of questioning. This was a very repetitive line of questioning and you kept building on your answers which is good.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 1 Sect. C (Room D208)

Judge: H2 Chris DuPaul (Hawken School)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Opening on elders bill

good natural delivery even when checking notes

Opening comments were soft but volume improved throughout speech

Incentives and disincentives - argument was not made that it will attract people into the field, argument was well made around funding penalties on nursing homes

Q&A gave you the opportunity to reinforce the impact of ratios. Just wish you had made a stronger point of the burden placed on nurses keeping people out of the field. Overall very good

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Opening was a bit disjointed from the argument

Point 1 - good argument on the benefits of the study of foreign language

Don't let your papers throw off your delivery

I would suggest you play around with slowing or at least varying the tempo of your delivery

berlin offered no data that there is a teacher shortage, don't accept the premise of his argument with no basis.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 2 Sect. C (Room D208)

Judge: S1 Stephen Imler (Northwest High School)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 5

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Very interesting information regarding young workers. This new info to the round links to the bill and has a huge impact. Nice job!

6

Content

Content is clearly and logically organized, and characterized by depth of thought and development of ideas, supported by a variety of credible quantitative (statistical) and qualitative (testimony) evidence analyzed effectively to draw conclusions. Compelling language, a poignant introduction and conclusion and lucid transitions clearly establish the speaker's purpose and frame the perspective of the issue's significance.

Argument/Refutation

The speaker contributes to the spontaneity of debate, effectively synthesizing response and refutation of previous ideas with new arguments. If the speaker fields questions, he/she responds with confidence and clarity.

Delivery

The speaker's vocal control and physical poise are polished, deliberate, crisp and confident. Delivery should be extemporaneous, with few errors in pronunciation. Eye contact is effective and consistent.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Great job linking the impacts of the bill not only to court cases, but more so to the jurors themselves and the costs of this. This new information really added to the debate. Great work.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 2 Sect. C (Room D208)

Judge: T2 Libby Adams (Perry)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 4

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Driving:

- Your hook was good, it just needs cleaned up and more connected to the subject of your speech
- Good workforce argument
- Good argument about furthering the poverty cycle
- Good argument for the same amount of inexperience
- You say however often
- Good finish
- Good job staying calm and clear in questioning

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Juries:

- Good intro, that was funny
- Requires more court resources
- People already trying to settle the case before trial, in interest of time and money: good argument
- Good job calling out rational for previous arguments to further your own

- Don't Let Other Representatives Cut You Off in questioning, ask them to let you finish your response to first question

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 2 Sect. C (Room D208)

Judge: B1 Shaun Duniver (Stow)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 4

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Driving neg

Was not a huge fan of intro- okayish it transitioned into 1st contention.

You do an amazing job attacking Berlin

Did fumble in questioning- this costed you a 6

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Jury trial neg

Some stumbles

Good job creating clash

That not how juries work

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 3 Sect. C (Room D208)

Judge: S1 Stephen Imler (Northwest High School)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

1 of 2 countries. Your intro worked really well. This speech is great. You brought new (and relevant) information to the round and referenced other representatives.

Continue working on your delivery. Get out of your comfort zone in delivering. Explore more hand gestures and vocal inflections (pitch, speed, volume, etc...)

6

Content

Content is clearly and logically organized, and characterized by depth of thought and development of ideas, supported by a variety of credible quantitative (statistical) and qualitative (testimony) evidence analyzed effectively to draw conclusions. Compelling language, a poignant introduction and conclusion and lucid transitions clearly establish the speaker's purpose and frame the perspective of the issue's significance.

Argument/Refutation

The speaker contributes to the spontaneity of debate, effectively synthesizing response and refutation of previous ideas with new arguments. If the speaker fields questions, he/she responds with confidence and clarity.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Your second contention brought new information to the debate. Nice job.

6

Content

Content is clearly and logically organized, and characterized by depth of thought and development of ideas, supported by a variety of credible quantitative (statistical) and qualitative (testimony) evidence analyzed effectively to draw conclusions. Compelling language, a poignant introduction and conclusion and lucid transitions clearly establish the speaker's purpose and frame the perspective of the issue's significance.

Argument/Refutation

The speaker contributes to the spontaneity of debate, effectively synthesizing response and refutation of previous ideas with new arguments. If the speaker fields questions, he/she responds with confidence and clarity.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 3 Sect. C (Room D208)

Judge: L5 Sanchita Chandran (Revere HS)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 7

Speech #1 -- Score: 4

AFF: Drug Act

1: innovation could increase with budget shiftsâ€”good new point. I would have liked to a stronger impact statement for this contention.

2: skyrocketing costs of drugsâ€”expanded this point more than previous speakers.

I would have liked to see more eye contact and engagement with the room. Also at this point in the debate, I would like to see direct clash with previous speakers.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

NEG: School Start Times

Good intro.

Contention taglines could be developed beyond phrasesâ€”try to make them complete sentences with a clear impact.

Clashed with previous speakers.

Good point about cutting funding for struggling schools.

Good enunciation and emphasis.

Could use more eye contact throughout speech.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Rd. 3 Sect. C (Room D208)

Judge: R1 Sabrina Estevez (Hoover)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 7

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

4AFF- drugs

intro was solid and already had a humanizing impact - I like that!

your first contention flows nicely and I appreciate your delivery of evidence. everything is very easily digestible and easily to follow - thank you for this

make sure that your hand movements are intentional and being used for impact, not just because - it can get distracting

your intonation is very pleasing to listen to, but I feel like you could have just a bit more variation. maybe practice this?

impacts in CON2 were solid with a nice call to action at the end

nice outro

questioning

great answers to tough questions. you provide evidence and extend your speech which is awesome and exactly what im looking for

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

4NEG - school

intro was a bit canned but it worked well

transition to CON1 was a bit abrupt, but the actual physical movement helped with this. I appreciate that, keep that up

hand movements were a bit better in this speech, but rather than dropping your hand in between each vocal rise, maybe find like a happy medium or something? hard to explain but I think you will know what I mean

also, be careful letting your voice getting too high. I used to do this too. it isn't super super bad, but it can sometimes get like pitchy? otherwise like I

said in the last speech though you are very fun to listen to

impacts in outro were very good - nice job with this

questioning

you held up super well and I appreciate the way you let questioners finish their questions but also work to get out what you need to say.

try to avoid simple yes or no's unless that is what the questioner wants - sometimes makes it seem like you don't have an answer

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Semifinal Sect. B (Room C211)

Judge: S1 Stephen Imler (Northwest High School)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Great opening speech. Continue working on your delivery. Your speeches are written well and impactful, they would be at the next level if they were almost memorized.

6

Delivery

The speaker's vocal control and physical poise are polished, deliberate, crisp and confident. Delivery should be extemporaneous, with few errors in pronunciation. Eye contact is effective and consistent.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Nice job referencing other representatives speeches. You are doing a lot of things well, keep working to get your eyes up even more. Taking your congressional debate performance to the next level, maybe try being a PO.

6

Content

Content is clearly and logically organized, and characterized by depth of thought and development of ideas, supported by a variety of credible quantitative (statistical) and qualitative (testimony) evidence analyzed effectively to draw conclusions. Compelling language, a poignant introduction and conclusion and lucid transitions clearly establish the speaker's purpose and frame the perspective of the issue's significance.

Argument/Refutation

The speaker contributes to the spontaneity of debate, effectively synthesizing response and refutation of previous ideas with new arguments. If the speaker fields questions, he/she responds with confidence and clarity.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Semifinal Sect. B (Room C211)

Judge: O1 Arun Gunda (Mason)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 4

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Strong start - good confidence

strong response to questions.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Good references to other speakers as needed.

Used sources well.

Strong competition today.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Semifinal Sect. B (Room C211)

Judge: L6 Melanie Stuthard (Revere HS)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 9

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

AFF 2:49

Looked up quite a bit.

Tied ideas back to the Swedish system

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

-Your intro would have more impact if you memorized it.

-You faced tough questions after your speech, but you held your ground.

-I liked your spark change idea along with the argument that the bill will change nothing.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Semifinal Sect. B (Room C211)

Judge: T1 Zach Ferko (Perry)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 4

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Very good speech, you had some pretty decent contentions and good evidence to back up your sources. Questioning was handled well. You spoke very quickly. You had some room to slow down and speak a little more clearly. This would let you add some more emphasis on your big points.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Great references to the last question block in your speech. That made your point very strong. Overall a very good speech. Your first contention fell a little flat with your delivery, but you brought it back well with your second.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Final Sect. FINAL (Room C212)

Judge: N5 David Fraizer (Louisville)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 8

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

I thought your intro was alright, but it isn't as effective as it could be. Additionally, you need to have your intos memorized.

You have a pretty decent mix of extemping and reading your speech.

Your mass transit point was very original and decently well argued, could have been stronger.

You had rehash in your second point.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

This was a very good speech overall, but you spent a little bit too much time reading your speech.

Your points were well argued and you spoke well with little to no mistakes.

Just under a 6

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Final Sect. FINAL (Room C212)

Judge: S1 Stephen Imler (Northwest High School)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 9

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Nice job during questioning. A small hiccup during the speech, its all good it happens... its been a long two days.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Great speech, nicely done!

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023

Congress Final Sect. FINAL (Room C212)

Judge: E3 Ben Kissinger (Wadsworth)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 9

Speech #1 -- Score: 4

Don't read your intro. Please.

The arg that people won't use mass transit is shaky. People use mass transit in many cities across the country in the SQ. Wouldn't funding make mass transit better?

Great clash.

Chandran got you in Cx on the mass transit arg.

Burkholder did too. Yikes.

Good extemp delivery.

Speech #2 -- Score: 4

Great blocking.

Speak louder.

Good tempo.

Good eye contact.

NEED MORE CLASH.

You made tons of claims but didn't back many of them up. Not good debate practice.

Too fast in Cx. Slow down.

GlenOak Debate Tournament - Dec. 15-16, 2023**Congress Final Sect. FINAL (Room C212)**

Judge: I7 Matthew List (GlenOak)

Entry: D14 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 9

Speech #1 -- Score: 4

2:50

Good Pace.

Unique argument to address American behaviors. Discussion around lack of interest in public transit.

Connect to previous counterpoints offered supported your argument.

Several questions were addressed in your speech, restated your points would be an effective argument.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

3:10

Good argument by addressing directly what could be a concern in the view of the public.

Good to discuss the potential lose of talent was a unique and good argument. Connecting to specific examples could be positive.

Questions - directly addressed. Working to hold your time while answering questions will improve your overall score.