

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. C (Room W206)

Judge: A6 Shaun Duniver (Stow)

Entry: 07 Andrew Brantsch

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Neg-AI

Very good speech full of clash

Cross ex cost you a 6

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Po-

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. C (Room W206)

Judge: U1 Natalie Kern (Alliance High School)

Entry: 07 Andrew Brantsch

Rank: 2

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Neg

Intro could be made more poignant. Strong evidence supporting claims. Excellent job addressing counter-argument and supplying supporting evidence for negating claim. Great conclusion and turning of language from another rep's speech.

3:08

Q/A handled well with calm demeanor and logical argument despite multiple interruptions from opposition

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

PO

Clear protocols and communication of procedures. Well prepared and respectful. Great procedures and protocol. Clear understanding of responsibilities.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. C (Room W206)

Judge: XX2 Jared Baldwin (Independent Judges)

Entry: 07 Andrew Brantsch

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

3:08 Second Neg.

Well organized intro which lays out the roadmap for the argument to come. Continued argument follows this roadmap well. Use of testimony to reinforce rhetorical approach and to provide support to opinion. Statistics to back up the argument about total impact.

Delivery is effective and flips the language of the affirmative back on itself.

Responded to questions effectively

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Clear about procedure, controlled the room well, was helpful and was fair.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. C (Room W206)

Judge: J1 Jennifer Menegay (Lake High School)

Entry: 07 Andrew Brantsch

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Crop Burning

Affirmation 3:10

Very nice engaging intro. You had good pausing and you made sure everyone was with you. Once you finished your opening you started to speak quicker, be careful with that. As you spoke quickly but you wanted to land your sentence with a strong point it didn't hold- take a moment and let your words sink in.

Great eye contact and talking to the chamber about why your points make sense

Cross

very nice job engaging and bringing your point back to your stance

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023

Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. C (Room W206)

Judge: M6 Kani Hightower (Hudson High School)

Entry: 07 Andrew Brantsch

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Really good introduction and inflection. Good organization and outlining of argument. Great inclusion of facts and shows passion for the subject. Great use of speed and volume (increase/decrease) to iterate points. Great rebuttal of other arguments.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023

Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. C (Room W206)

Judge: A6 Shaun Duniver (Stow)

Entry: 07 Andrew Brantsch

Rank: 2

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Crop burning

Amazing intro

Truly a great speech

Great use of clash

Powerful conclusion

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. A (Room W202)

Judge: A4 Nathan Marotta (Stow)

Entry: 03 Andrew Loznianu

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Loznianu - POSHIP

Overall nice POship, some mistakes though.

Nice control over the room.

Your gavel taps are a little loud.

Made some strange announcements about novices, please do not do that.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

AFF - Cash - 3:11

Quote introductions are a little low-effort, but it was still good and your delivery definitely carried it.

I wish you had a little bit more life in your speaking ability, you come off as monotone at points.

Your evidence supported your contentions very well and your impact development was very effective.

Nice hand-motions and movements, you are clearly experienced.

Your use of existing cases was very effective and is, in my opinion, the best type of evidence one can use in a speech.

I really liked the organization of your speech and thought that it was easy to follow as well.

The personal appeal to the representatives of the chamber was very effective and landed exactly how you wanted it to.

Nice and emotional conclusion.

Nice job in questioning.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. A (Room W202)

Judge: XX1 Avery Fisher (Independent Judges)

Entry: 03 Andrew Loznianu

Rank: 2

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Great job as P/O.

Strong presence and ability to control room.

Good job at explaining procedures.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Great eye contact.

Watch doing the same motion with your hands.

Good use of research and facts to support your position.

Good flow of arguments.

Good inflection and enunciation.

Great delivery. Good job laying out the issue and your position.

Good use of logic in answering question.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. A (Room W202)

Judge: M6 Kani Hightower (Hudson High School)

Entry: 03 Andrew Loznianu

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Great introduction. Great supporting facts and speed and inflection. Good organization and great presentation of your position. Great answers to question and good passion about subject and position.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Score as P.O.

**The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. A (Room W202)**

Judge: U1 Natalie Kern (Alliance High School)

Entry: 03 Andrew Loznianu

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Aff

Clear intro. Organization punctuated with intentional movement and body language. Strong qualitative evidence supporting claim. Logical reasoning showing depth of thought and development of ideas. Strong quantitative evidence as well. Good use of pathos to drive home point. clear conclusion. good eye contact and connection with Chamber.

3:03

Q/A great handling questions with additional reasoning and evidence

**The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. A (Room W202)**

Judge: A4 Nathan Marotta (Stow)

Entry: 03 Andrew Loznianu

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

AUTH - Crops -

I like your introduction and the emotions were definitely there, the delivery started to feel a little off at the end, I would have liked you to actually get sad and somber, but it was not really there. You also started to make assumptions about the audience which is something I generally don't like, but yours was somewhat relatable so it's not so bad.

Your 1st contention was very well explained and had lots of evidence to support it as well as great impact development. You used in-practice evidence, which is still my favorite type of evidence. Relating your point to the cost of medical bills to our constituents was very effective.

Your 2nd contention was also very well written, essentially everything said above also applies to this 2nd contention.

Your tone is almost monotone, please be cautious that you do not become hard to listen to, keep things exciting.

Please do not taunt the chamber for not asking you questions.

Nice job in questioning, Gray nearly caught you though.

**The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. A (Room W202)**

Judge: XX2 Jared Baldwin (Independent Judges)

Entry: 03 Andrew Loznianu

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Aff.

Clear thesis establishing the problem and a roadmap of the argument. The argument flows logically and the speaking is natural. Eye contact made the speaker feel to confident and credible.

You handled the extensive grilling expertly and you handled yourself well.

3:03s

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. B (Room W204)

Judge: J1 Jennifer Menegay (Lake High School)

Entry: 11 Griffin Moore

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Restricted AI

Affirm 3:09

Overall work out your presentation of words. You start very much like a typewriter. Need to be careful as you had very strong points for your case. You researched and did a nice job with the information you found to present. Work inflection as your research can be lost if it all sounds the same. Great eye contact as you end your presentation

Very nice execution with cross-examination. Great eye contact you did a nice job great composure responding. Much more comfortable in cross

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

2nd PO

You kept a nice chamber, it was strong session. You held your own. Nice job keeping with your word following the gavel.

Overall very nice job

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. B (Room W204)

Judge: AA2 Jason McCormick (Wadsworth)

Entry: 11 Griffin Moore

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Aff/3m 9s

Overall good speech. Good use of quoted facts and figures. Well delivered, good voice. Keep in mind your presence on the floor and try not to wander around as much - at one point you were talking to the door. Good handling of Q&A

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Round 1 PO 2

Solid performance as a PO. Did a good job being clear with speakers. Consistent room management which was nice. Be careful on your parliamentary procedure - you let the discussion on the docket get away from you. Address each motion as it's made and stop people speaking out of term to "make a comment".

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. B (Room W204)

Judge: W6 Jason Deuble (Perry)

Entry: 11 Griffin Moore

Rank: 4

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Restricted AI

Good preparation and presentation

Your reply's to questions were well informed and direct

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Nuclear disarmament

PO

You did a great job running the session.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. B (Room W204)

Judge: K5 Jim Byrne (Wooster)

Entry: 11 Griffin Moore

Rank: 4

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Great speech fantastic presentation. I felt like you were talking to me instead of at me. Some of your movement seems scripted make it more natural. Great job.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023

Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. B (Room W204)

Judge: AA2 Jason McCormick (Wadsworth)

Entry: 11 Griffin Moore

Rank: 4

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Bail/Neg/3m8s

Well-delivered, well-spoken speech. Diction was excellent. Points were well-researched and delivered. Liked the book-ending of your Bismarck quotes. Great handling of the Q&A.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023

Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. B (Room W204)

Judge: XX1 Avery Fisher (Independent Judges)

Entry: 11 Griffin Moore

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Good analysis of bill and constitutional validity.

Good use of facts and showing the benefits of bail to communities and workforce.

Good use of other representative's assertions to support your position.

Good use of alternatives to bail and why bail is still the best option.

Good attention-grabbing opening statement and tying it into your conclusion.

Good use of logic to answer questions.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. D (Room C217)

Judge: Q10 Matthew List (GlenOak)

Entry: 09 Jackson Moore

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Presented new arguments tied to current issues and connected them to past issues of relevance to the larger population. Addressed previous arguments offered. Addressed current status of issue and potential outcomes of resolution. Showed knowledge of issue at hand and issues used in support of arguments.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. D (Room C217)

Judge: K5 Jim Byrne (Wooster)

Entry: 09 Jackson Moore

Rank: 9

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Great presentation, nice energy. Relax a bit and talk to people not at them. Nice way of handling questions.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. D (Room C217)

Judge: W3 James Miller (Perry)

Entry: 09 Jackson Moore

Rank: 9

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Good voice projection, room space, and body language.

You projected confidence and delivered well.

Great use of statistical backed arguments.

Held up well to questions

Very close to a 6 here in my opinion, just need a little smoother delivery.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. D (Room C217)

Judge: W3 James Miller (Perry)

Entry: 09 Jackson Moore

Rank: 8

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

I think you had great delivery and engagement.

Structured and logical argument.

Handled questioning well.

My only criticism is that I didn't hear many new points that were not covered.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. D (Room C217)

Judge: S6 Xuguang Zheng (Dublin Jerome)

Entry: 09 Jackson Moore

Rank: 9

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Great introduction! colorful language;

used effective rhetorical language; good body movement to support point.

clear conclusion

cited evidences will be further helpful

3:04

Q/A

Handle well with logic arguments; good communications

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023

Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. D (Room C217)

Judge: C3 Ryan Jochum (Olentangy Orange High School Speech and Debate)

Entry: 09 Jackson Moore

Rank: 8

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Fantastic opening. Overall good speech but would have been more interesting if more took the other side of the topic. Consider that to strengthen your speech versus others as you get into more important competitions.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023

Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. A (Room W202)

Judge: A4 Nathan Marotta (Stow)

Entry: 08 Jenny Baniya

Rank: 4

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Aff - AI - 3:00

I liked your introduction and thought that it was funny while still maintaining professionalism; however, I would've liked a little more rise and fall in your speaking.

Some minor stumbling around your speech.

"vote for our workers" was a good and cool line.

Robot captcha reference was also funny, but I always hesitate with the "I am sure everyone here..." lines.

Some of your emotional appeal is lost without very large rise and fall to support it.

A little more impact development for your 2nd contention would have been very beneficial.

Nice job in questioning, minor stumbling with Moore.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

AFF - Cash -

This intro was much better than your previous one, you had a lot more life behind it and the emotional appeal was much more effective.

Some minor stumbles at the beginning of your speech.

Nice impact on the word "people. NOT Criminals"

Even with substantial chamber interruption you did a really nice job continuing your speech.

Your 2nd contention had a lot of evidence to support it and you did a nice job explaining the impact of it.

Your speech overall was well delivered and had great evidence to support it

Nice Job in questioning.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023

Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. A (Room W202)

Judge: XX1 Avery Fisher (Independent Judges)

Entry: 08 Jenny Baniya

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

- Lost track of place in speech a few times.
- Focus on employment should be made more clearly in the beginning.
- Good job answering questions.
- Good use of research and facts to support case.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Strong and assertive delivery. Watch out for being perceived as aggressive. Also watch out for starting so strong then losing momentum when getting stuck on a word or losing place in speech.

Great use of facts. Watch out for stating too many numbers and percentages.

Good eye contact.

Good use of other representative's own words in answering questions.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023

Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. A (Room W202)

Judge: M6 Kani Hightower (Hudson High School)

Entry: 08 Jenny Baniya

Rank: 7

Speech #1 -- Score: 4

Good organization. Delivery a little fast so a little difficult to follow. Good eye contact. Delivers with passion. Good facts in support. Knows the facts. Maybe include some more persuasive language and reiterate your position a little more.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Good rebuttal of prior arguments. Good inflection and emphasis on important facts. Good use of statistics. Speed is a little fast. Good answer to question.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023**Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. A (Room W202)**

Judge: U1 Natalie Kern (Alliance High School)

Entry: 08 Jenny Baniya

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

PO

clearly explained preferences, routines, and protocols. Handled recess discussion and contention in chamber well. Good job maintaining control and keeping carefull track of number of speeches. Respectful and authoritative within the chamber.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Neg

Clear intro. Strong quantitative evidence used to support 1st contention. clear and logical reasoning. While strong in reasoning and elaboration, could use more qualitative evidence from reputable sources to balance the quantitative examples. Clear conclusion. Strong delivery, intentional movement, and body language.

2:59

Q/A good job maintaining calm demeanor in the face of oppositional questioning and providing additional reasoning

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023**Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. A (Room W202)**

Judge: A4 Nathan Marotta (Stow)

Entry: 08 Jenny Baniya

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

POSHIP

Nice job

No glaring mistakes

Nice control of the chamber

Your gavel taps are very loud, but maybe I just have old man ears.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

NEG - Crops -

Your intro was good and definitely had some emotion behind it, but I think you were limited by how non-dramatic your intro actually was.

The evidence you use in your 1st contention is very good and convincing, you effectively explain the impact as well as what that impact does to our constituents which is, frankly, something that has been missing this round.

Your 2nd contention was also well written and was adequately supported by evidence and developed with impact. Your emotion also increased in this 2nd contention, emphasizing the right words as well.

Your speech was well organized and also very effective.

Your speech could have used some clash to help further your point, especially as we enter the mid-round of this topic.

Nice job in questioning.Â

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023

Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. A (Room W202)

Judge: XX2 Jared Baldwin (Independent Judges)

Entry: 08 Jenny Baniya

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

PO

Established clear procedure at the beginning. Made a clear effort to make the distribution of speaking fair. Even where the room became unruly, you controlled the room effectively.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Neg.

The argument is strongly supported by both testimony and data. It felt like nearly every point or position taken involved some kind of authority being cited to. This makes the presentation very authoritative when paired with your confident presentation of the
Despite the intense questioning, you kept your head and responded without any major stumbles. You made it clear that you had studied well in preparation which lead to adequate response.

2:59s

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. D (Room C217)

Judge: K5 Jim Byrne (Wooster)

Entry: 04 Kristian Leseure

Rank: 4

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Really like your presentation. Good eye contact and movement. Nice handling of questions.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

Like the way you use your voice to get your points across. Be a little more relaxed in your movements and you'll be great.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. D (Room C217)

Judge: W3 James Miller (Perry)

Entry: 04 Kristian Leseure

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Great use of voice intonation and using the space of the room. Your body language projects confidence. Addressing counter arguments to previous speeches to reinforce your arguments. Good responses to questions.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

liked the use of humor to start things off.

structured well and backed up with data.

you looked comfortable and confident in delivery.

Handled questions well circling back to points made in speech.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. D (Room C217)

Judge: Q10 Matthew List (GlenOak)

Entry: 04 Kristian Leseure

Rank: 2

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

Good conflict, addressing previous arguments in speech sows good engagement with the congress. Demonstrated a good command of the legislation. Able to directly address questions and continue connection to arguments.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Good presence in connection with audience. Arguments were clear and supported. Well connected to knowledge presented in arguments and able to connect with question answered.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. D (Room C217)

Judge: S6 Xuguang Zheng (Dublin Jerome)

Entry: 04 Kristian Leseure

Rank: 5

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Clear and calm introduction; good body language with eye contact; Strong quantitative evidence to support claim; used effective rhetorical language; Very clear conclusion

2:56

Q/A

Handle Q/A well with logic arguments and additional evidence

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. D (Room C217)

Judge: C3 Ryan Jochum (Olentangy Orange High School Speech and Debate)

Entry: 04 Kristian Leseure

Rank: 2

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Quite a bit of emotion to connect with the audience and to bring us in. Carrying this through for the entire speech with no drop off is a difficult task; you were able to do so. Serious tone connected well with the material. I appreciate how during your speech you connect with the other members. You handle the technical information quite well and have quite a bit of confidence throughout. Well done

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023

Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. D (Room C217)

Judge: W3 James Miller (Perry)

Entry: 04 Kristian Leseure

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Good job on adjusting speech to address previous points by representatives.

Very smooth delivery and demonstrated knowledge of the problem.

Great engagement with the audience, very hard to find critiques.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. C (Room W206)

Judge: U1 Natalie Kern (Alliance High School)

Entry: 05 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 1

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Negate

clear and calm intro. strong quantitative evidence to claim. Clear body language and eye contact to support delineation between contentions.

2:51

Great handling of Q/A by staying calm and providing additional support for claim. I admire your ability to argue your point in the face of strong opposition.

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Aff

Clear concise intro and use of effective rhetorical techniques. Strong quantitative evidence supporting claim. Clear body language and movement to support logical organization of contentions. Strong qualitative evidence supporting second contention. Good balance of quantitative and qualitative evidence. Reasoning showed depth of thought. Clear conclusion reiterating contentions and claim.

2:51

Q/A great additional reasoning and citing of evidence

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. C (Room W206)

Judge: A6 Shaun Duniver (Stow)

Entry: 05 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 2

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

AI- neg

Very well written speech

Handled the problem well and didn't fall apart

Very bogged down in evidence

Speech #2 -- Score: 6

Crop burning-

Speech is much better use of emotion and data driven evidence.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 1 Sect. C (Room W206)

Judge: XX2 Jared Baldwin (Independent Judges)

Entry: 05 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 9

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

2:51s First neg. AI

Argument and logic flows well and datapoints are placed in good spots to reinforce points.

Argument is also well organized into each point of contention.

We could use additional clarity in response to some of the questions as it pertains to how small businesses will be negatively impacted especially.

Speech #2 -- Score: 5

2:51s 1st authorship (aff)

Effective use of language in opening which leads well into first main argument. Each point is clearly distinguished from the other and there is a clear organization as a result.

Main argument flows logically and is supported by strong rhetoric and statistical and testimony evidence.

Responses to questions are very strong, but you could benefit from slowing down just a little bit.

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. C (Room W206)

Judge: A6 Shaun Duniver (Stow)

Entry: 05 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 3

Speech #1 -- Score: 5

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. C (Room W206)

Judge: J1 Jennifer Menegay (Lake High School)

Entry: 05 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 2

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Nuke Disarm

Negation 3:00

A strong presence on the floor. You have great information in your speech and you do a nice job presenting it. You balance your tone, pace, and voice inflection. Eye contact was good. Your notes are a help, not a crutch. Very nice closing

Cross

Engaging nice job taking questions head on

The Suzanne Theisen Stow-Hudson Invitational - Oct. 28, 2023
Congressional Debate Rd. 2 Sect. C (Room W206)

Judge: M6 Kani Hightower (Hudson High School)

Entry: 05 Nadia Farrell

Rank: 6

Speech #1 -- Score: 6

Good intro and passion about the topic. Good speed and use of inflection and speed to reinforce her point. Good reference to other rep's positions. Good response to questions.