

Round 1 Flt Room Q101 Judge Ebony Harrison

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code DDEL

Con Team code AASC

Speaker #	name:	Speaker points 0
Speaker #1	Pierr J. Earls	25
Speaker #3	Marc Lujan	26

Speaker #	name:	Speaker points 0
Speaker #2	Kateri Curlin	27
Speaker #4	Dominic Schnabel	28

Rate each speaker from 20 – 30 points: 20-23 Below average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above average 29-30 Outstanding

The winning team was the ☐ Pro ☒ Con Team code: AASC

Comments to debaters:

Speaker 1: Do not allow other side dominate CX.
• Good eye contact & volume
• In last speech, speaker stated that you're missing the mark but still won a CX
Spk 2: I need eye contact
• Thank you for roadmap. ←

Comments to debaters:

Speaker 1: I need eye contact
• Good volume & enunciation, very clear
• I need signposting, speech is all over the place.
• In last speech, speed is OK, but enunciate.
Spk 2: Good eye ant & volume

Reason for Decision: (please cite specific arguments that had a bearing on the outcome)

Aff did not attach Neg case at all.

Order/Time of Speeches	
Pro #1	4 min
Con #2	4 min
Crossfire	3 min
Pro #3	4 min
Con #4	4 min
Crossfire	3 min
Pro #1 summary	2 min
Con #2 summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire	3 min
Pro #3 final focus	2 min
Con #4 final focus	2 min
(2 min of Prep Time per side)	

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision Ebony S. Harrison Signature

School affiliation HHS

Round 1 Flt Room P-9 Judge Gabriel Gutierrez

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code AAJB

Con Team code DPBA

Speaker #	name:	Speaker points 0
Speaker #1	<u>Nancy Jung</u>	<u>28</u>
Speaker #3	<u>Clayton Becker</u>	<u>28</u>

Speaker #	name:	Speaker points 0
Speaker #2	<u>Michelle Barajas</u>	<u>28</u>
Speaker #4	<u>Katia Alvarez</u>	<u>26</u>

Rate each speaker from 20 - 30 points: 20-23 Below average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above average 29-30 Outstanding

The winning team was the ☒ Pro ☐ Con Team code: AAJB

Comments to debaters:

NS - SCOTUS - Fed Parameters
Cost/Benefit Analysis - corporations
Facts vs pop psychology
- careful w/ speed - more ppl to
make your point than just reading
a paper
- seminar ads - why bad
KFire - good discussion

CB - between - later turnout
Fast talker - but clear
good facts - use to explain
idea and back argument
- why decrease - though is
proof it was pro
S.C. said WBC could not say
whether

again good explanation -

Comments to debaters:

M.B. - no need for this much intro
go into argument - how does it hurt
set up how you win (good)
Freedom of speech - senator or
Justice Kennedy's
participation increase - how -
explain -
Outcome went against money side!

~~stare~~ posture - don't cross arms
don't let other side take control
- don't just ask for facts
give your own

K.A. - practice reading - it should
not just sound like you are reading
it the first time -
Argument - disorganized

Reason for Decision: (please cite specific arguments that had a bearing on the outcome)

Stronger Crossfire for affirm -
Held conversation and proved point -
arguments stronger and consistent
Between speakers stronger -

Order/Time of Speeches	
Pro #1	4 min
Con #2	4 min
Crossfire	3 min
Pro #3	4 min
Con #4	4 min
Crossfire	3 min
Pro #1 summary	2 min
Con #2 summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire	3 min
Pro #3 final focus	2 min
Con #4 final focus	2 min
(2 min of Prep Time per side)	

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision

Signature

School affiliation

CHS

Round

Flt

Room

P-7

Judge

Sean Gallagher

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code

CCRB

Con Team code

DDTS

Speaker #1

name:

Cesar Ryles

Speaker points 0

26

Speaker #3

name:

Tony Bonilla

27

Speaker #2

name:

Shanley Turcios

Speaker points 0

30

Speaker #4

name:

Malloy / Saldana

29

Rate each speaker from 20 – 30 points:

20-23 Below average

24-26 Average

27-28 Above average

29-30 Outstanding

The winning team was the

☐

Pro

☒

Con

Team code:

DDTS

Comments to debaters:

Please ~~use~~ make full use of the time allotted.

~~My~~ Plan to have ^{facts &} more statistics than needed for each key point. Work to memorize key points as much as possible. Contentions ~~were~~ quite good, just needed further development.

Comments to debaters:

Overall arguments were quite crisp. ~~Having~~ more facts/stats for each one of your points ~~would~~ provide an even more compelling argument. Made good use of allotted time.

Reason for Decision: (please cite specific arguments that had a bearing on the outcome)

The neg, DDTS, made convincing argument for all their contentions. In particular their use of facts and examples were excellent and the ~~neg~~ argument that the Supreme Court was doing its job was compelling.

Order/Time of Speeches

Pro #1	4 min
Con #2	4 min
Crossfire	3 min
Pro #3	4 min
Con #4	4 min
Crossfire	3 min
Pro #1 summary	2 min
Con #2 summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire	3 min
Pro #3 final focus	2 min
Con #4 final focus	2 min
(2 min of Prep Time per side)	

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision

Signature

School affiliation

Claremont High

Round 1 Flt Room P-6 Judge Rebeca Sanchez

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code AAKM

Con Team code CCSW

Speaker #1 name:	Daniel Knudsen	Speaker points: 8
Speaker #3 name:	Liz Maine	28

Speaker #2 name:	Shannon Slankard	Speaker points: 8
Speaker #4 name:	Lindsay Wuriz	27

Rate each speaker from 20 – 30 points: 20-23 Below average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above average 29-30 Outstanding

The winning team was the ☒ Pro ☐ Con Team code: AAKM

Comments to debaters:

#1. Clear speech, good eye contact, used allowed. Well prepared, clearly stated & defined contentions, words, etc. Stayed on topics and related them to Neg. Not a fan of the interruptions of Neg.
#3 clear speech, good eye contact, used all time and went over. Well prepared, clear explanation, called Neg out on lack of evidence, polite.

Comments to debaters:

#2. Clear speech, good eye contact, need to use all time allowed. Did not clearly hear/understand all three contentions at first. Kept calm under fire. Needed resources, evidence, facts, etc; none stated.
#4 clear speech, good eye contact. Restated contentions to clarify, thanks. Good effort with crossfire. Maybe research topic more? Needed evidence, facts, etc.

Reason for Decision: (please cite specific arguments that had a bearing on the outcome)

Aff. clearly stated contentions, seemed to be more prepared for crossfire, had several sources as evidence, stayed on topic.

Order/Time of Speeches
Pro #1 4 min
Con #2 4 min
Crossfire 3 min
Pro #3 4 min
Con #4 4 min
Crossfire 3 min
Pro #1 summary 2 min
Con #2 summary 2 min
Grand Crossfire 3 min
Pro #3 final focus 2 min
Con #4 final focus 2 min
(2 min of Prep Time per side)

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision

[Signature]
Signature

School affiliation YHS

Round 1 Flt 1 Room D-10 Judge Rose Hart

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code CCCS

Con Team code DDMB

Speaker #1 name:	<u>GISELLE CHAVEN</u>	Speaker points 0 <u>28</u>
Speaker #3 name:	<u>LORENA PACHEZ</u>	<u>27</u>

Speaker #2 name:	<u>ASHLEY MCGRAW</u>	Speaker points 0 <u>29</u>
Speaker #4 name:	<u>NATALIE BACA</u>	<u>29</u>

Rate each speaker from 20 – 30 points: 20-23 Below average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above average 29-30 Outstanding

The winning team was the ☐ Pro ☒ Con Team code: DDMB

Comments to debaters:
ALTHOUGH QUITE PREPARED,
THE "PRO" TEAM SEEMED
TO FALTER A BIT
DURING CROSSFIRE.
THEIR SUMMATION OF
PRESENTED FACTS
PROVED TO BE VERY
INFORMATIVE.

Comments to debaters:
VERY WELL PREPARED
VERY SELF-ASSURED
VERY CONVINCING
THE DEBATERS WERE
VERY FAMILIAR WITH
THEIR TOPIC AND SUBJECT
MATTER.

Reason for Decision: (please cite specific arguments that had a bearing on the outcome)
"CON" TEAM HAD BETTER USE OF DOCUMENTED
INFORMATION. PRESENTATION OF DATA WAS VERY
WELL DELIVERED. THE "CON" TEAM STAYED ON
TASK; NEVER LOSING FOCUS OR DEVIATING FROM
THE TOPIC

Order/Time of Speeches	
Pro #1	4 min
Con #2	4 min
Crossfire	3 min
Pro #3	4 min
Con #4	4 min
Crossfire	3 min
Pro #1 summary	2 min
Con #2 summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire	3 min
Pro #3 final focus	2 min
Con #4 final focus	2 min
(2 min of Prep Time per side)	

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision

Rose Hart
Signature

School affiliation M

Round 1 Flt Room P-8 Judge Martin Bustos

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code DDWR

Con Team code BBNK

Speaker #1 name: <u>Robert Rubio</u>	Speaker points: <u>24</u>
Speaker #3 name: <u>Darius Luitz</u>	<u>26</u>

Speaker #2 name: <u>Michelle Ko</u>	Speaker points: <u>25</u>
Speaker #4 name: <u>Nikki Nagdal</u>	<u>25</u>

Rate each speaker from 20 – 30 points: 20-23 Below average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above average 29-30 Outstanding

The winning team was the ☐ Pro ☒ Con

Team code: BBN 12

Comments to debaters:

- eye contact
- Do not stumble on a pre made speech
- speak clearly
- 2nd speaker has great control over cross fire
- it's a common knowledge

Comments to debaters:

- eye contact
- need more on case
- watch saying who should of won.
- great connections to off case to on case.
- less aggressive comes off well

Reason for Decision: (please cite specific arguments that had a bearing on the outcome)

I felt the neg was over zealous but they not only countered the one case and had a good off case. The neg made me feel natural about the res so it was not bad.

Order/Time of Speeches

Pro #1 4 min
Con #2 4 min
Crossfire 3 min
Pro #3 4 min
Con #4 4 min
Crossfire 3 min
Pro #1 summary 2 min
Con #2 summary 2 min
Grand Crossfire 3 min
Pro #3 final focus 2 min
Con #4 final focus 2 min
(2 min of Prep Time per side)

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision

Martin Bustos
Signature

School affiliation La Quinta