

Hearing Committee
Delegate Evaluation Form

Evaluator: _____ Committee: _____ Room Number: _____
--

Overall Rating Scale		3	Good
1	Poor	4	Excellent
2	Fair	5	Superior

Rate each delegate, awarding from 1 to 5 in each category and subcategory using the scale listed above. Please total your scores and turn your sheet in at The Arbor after you have finished evaluating all Hearing Committees. Thank you for your time and expertise.

Delegate Type/ Write Delegate Names below	Category 1: Debate Skills			Category 2: Relevance			Total Out of 25 Points
	Grammar and organization	Quality of oral delivery	Quality of questions	Relevance to debate	Relevance of technical questions		
EXAMPLE: Clement Duran	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5		
Comments: Mr. Duran debated well, but was very quiet and hard to understand.							
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5		
Comments:							
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5		
Comments:							
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5		
Comments:							
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5		
Comments:							

Delegate Type/ Write Delegate Names below	Category 1: Debate Skills			Category 2: Relevance		Total Out of 25 Points
	Grammar and organization	Quality of oral delivery	Quality of questions	Relevance to debate	Relevance of technical questions	
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
Comments:						
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
Comments:						
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
Comments:						
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
Comments:						
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
Comments:						
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
Comments:						

Delegate	Category 1: Debate Skills			Category 2: Relevance			Total
Type/ Write Delegate Names below	Grammar and organization	Quality of oral delivery	Quality of questions	Relevance to debate	Relevance of technical questions	Out of 25 Points	
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5		
Comments:							
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5		
Comments:							
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5		
Comments:							
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5		
Comments:							
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5		
Comments:							
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5		
Comments:							

Delegate Type/ Write Delegate Names below	Category 1: Debate Skills			Category 2: Relevance		Total
	Grammar and organization	Quality of oral delivery	Quality of questions	Relevance to debate	Relevance of technical questions	Out of 25 Points
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
Comments:						
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
Comments:						
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
Comments:						
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
Comments:						
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
Comments:						
Outstanding Statesman: You may not have one in your committee, but if a delegate possesses these criteria, please write their name in the space provided. > Superior knowledge of procedure > Superior speaking skills > Commanding presence > Active debater > Demonstrates good character				Name: Add any additional comments:		

Rubric

Descriptions of Categories:

1. Debate skills:
 - a. Grammar and organization:
 - i. Did the delegate order his or her points understandably and appropriately?
 - ii. Did the delegate avoid slang and use complete sentences?
 - iii. Did the delegate ensure his or her key message came across using strategies like repetition?
 - b. Quality of oral delivery:
 - i. Did the delegate stand up straight and make eye contact?
 - ii. Did the delegate project adequately but refrain from yelling?
 - iii. Did the delegate speak respectfully to other delegates asking challenging questions?
 - c. Quality of questions:
 - i. Did the delegate's questions to others meaningfully further debate?
 - ii. Was the delegate able to respond to other delegates' questions about his or her bill with confidence and accuracy?
 - iii. Did the delegate effectively answer questions from others in a manner that reinforced his or her points?
2. Relevance:
 - a. Relevance to debate:
 - i. Did the delegate only raise questions pertinent to the topic of discussion?
 - ii. Did the delegate actually answer other delegates' questions rather than providing a non-answer?
 - iii. Did the delegate make clear his or her perspective and unique framing of the issue?
 - b. Relevance of technical questions:
 - i. Did the delegate's technical questions meaningfully further debate? Delegates should NOT ask technical questions simply to talk more.

Please note that raising frequent points of order or non-relevant technical questions does NOT constitute quality performance.

Guidelines for (0-5) Scoring: The following represent general guidelines evaluators should apply to each category on the score sheet. It is strongly recommended that evaluators use "3" to indicate an average performance and adjust higher or lower for stronger or weaker performances.

3 — GOOD PERFORMANCE

- Acceptable but uninspired presentation
- Needs more creativity and persuasiveness

1 — POOR PERFORMANCE

- Poor presentation
- Inadequate knowledge of bill topic/parliamentary procedures

4 — EXCELLENT PERFORMANCE

- Well organized; demonstrates thorough preparation
- Smooth, engaging, creative presentation

2 — FAIR PERFORMANCE

- Awkward presentation
- Poise and delivery need more work

5 — SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE

- Demonstrates excellent preparation; well organized
- Presentation and ideas extraordinary and realistic, not overly rehearsed or memorized