



5th Thailand High-School National Debating Championship

การแข่งขันโต้วาทีภาษาอังกฤษระดับมัธยมศึกษาแห่งประเทศไทย ครั้งที่ ๕
ซึ่งถ้อยพระราชทานสมเด็จพระเทพรัตนราชสุดาฯ สยามบรมราชกุมารี



Debater Feedback Form

Round: _____ **Team:** _____ **Position:** Prop / Opp

Motion: _____

Result: Win / Lose _____ **Unanimous decision / split decision** _____ **Do you agree with the decision? :** Yes / No

Chair Name: _____ **Institution:** _____ **Ascend / Descend**

- 5: The adjudicator got the decision right. She/he identified the correct issues of the debate and prioritized them correctly. This adjudicator is capable of adjudicating the Grand Finals of this tournament.
- 4: The adjudicator got the decision right. She/he identified the key issues of the debate correctly, although it is possible that she/he may have misprioritized some of the issues and assessed certain issues with too much or too little weightage. This adjudicator should break into the octos or quarters of the tournament
- 3: The adjudicator got the decision marginally right or wrong. She/he identified some of the issues of the debate correctly although he or she may have misprioritized some of the tertiary issues of the debate. This adjudicator may marginally break or not break.
- 2: The adjudicator got the decision wrong or right on the wrong grounds. She/he seemed to see some issues but did not understand or prioritize the issues correctly. The adjudicator may have entered the debate. This adjudicator should not break or chair a round.
- 1: The adjudicator may have decided the debate purely on technical grounds like matter, manner regardless of relevance. The adjudicator has a fundamental misunderstanding of the rules of this style of debating. This adjudicator should be a trainee.

Panelist 1 Name: _____ **Trainee 1 Institution:** _____ **Ascend / Descend**

- 5: The adjudicator got the decision right. She/he identified the correct issues of the debate and prioritized them correctly. This adjudicator is capable of adjudicating the Grand Finals of this tournament.
- 4: The adjudicator got the decision right. She/he identified the key issues of the debate correctly, although it is possible that she/he may have misprioritized some of the issues and assessed certain issues with too much or too little weight. This adjudicator should break into the octos or quarters of the tournament
- 3: The adjudicator got the decision marginally right or wrong. She/he identified some of the issues of the debate correctly although he or she may have misprioritized some of the tertiary issues of the debate. This adjudicator may marginally break or not break.
- 2: The adjudicator got the decision wrong or right on the wrong grounds. She/he seemed to see some issues but did not understand or prioritize the issues correctly. The adjudicator may have entered the debate. This adjudicator should not break or chair a round.
- 1: The adjudicator may have decided the debate purely on technical grounds like matter, manner regardless of relevance. The adjudicator has a fundamental misunderstanding of the rules of this style of debating. This adjudicator should be a trainee.

Panelist 2 Name: _____ **Trainee 2 Institution:** _____ **Ascend / Descend**

- 5: The adjudicator got the decision right. She/he identified the correct issues of the debate and prioritized them correctly. This adjudicator is capable of adjudicating the Grand Finals of this tournament.
- 4: The adjudicator got the decision right. She/he identified the key issues of the debate correctly, although it is possible that she/he may have misprioritized some of the issues and assessed certain issues with too much or too little weightage. This adjudicator should break into the octos or quarters of the tournament
- 3: The adjudicator got the decision marginally right or wrong. She/he identified some of the issues of the debate correctly although he or she may have misprioritized some of the tertiary issues of the debate. This adjudicator may marginally break or not break.
- 2: The adjudicator got the decision wrong or right on the wrong grounds. She/he seemed to see some issues but did not understand or prioritize the issues correctly. The adjudicator may have entered the debate. This adjudicator should not break or chair a round.
- 1: The adjudicator may have decided the debate purely on technical grounds like matter, manner regardless of relevance. The adjudicator has a fundamental misunderstanding of the rules of this style of debating. This adjudicator should be a trainee.

Comments: _____

