

Round 2 Flt _____ Room Q101 Judge Erica Shin

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code CCRB

Con Team code DDEL

Speaker #1 name:	Speaker points 0
<u>Tony B</u>	<u>25</u>
Speaker #3 name:	Speaker points 0
<u>Cesaer</u>	<u>25</u>

Speaker #2 name:	Speaker points 0
<u>Pierre E.</u>	<u>26</u>
Speaker #4 name:	Speaker points 0
<u>Marco L</u>	<u>28</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: DDEL

Comments to debaters:

- a bit unorganized
- a little difficult to follow
- more eye contact
- use more voice inflection
- good gestures

Comments to debaters:

- good eye contact
- unorganized
- was enthusiastic
- gave a constructive speech
- good speech delivery
- a bit more evidence to support arguments

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

~~more logical arguments~~
had more logical arguments
gave a more constructive speech

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 Erica Shin
Signature

School affiliation Claremont

Round 2 Flt _____Room P-8Judge Gabriel GutierrezSean GallagherCBSR **Public Forum** Debate BallotPro Team code DDMBCon Team code AAJB

Speaker #1 name:	Speaker points 0
<u>Ashley McLann</u>	<u>27</u>
Speaker #3 name:	
<u>Natalie Baca</u>	<u>28</u>

Speaker #2 name:	Speaker points 0
<u>Nancy Jung</u>	<u>29</u>
Speaker #4 name:	
<u>Clayton Becker</u>	<u>30</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 ☒ ConTeam code: AAJB

Comments to debaters:

Please watch time.
would benefit from
having more facts
and figures at their
fingertips

Very good use of opening
contentions, need
close just ~~was~~ as
strong

Comments to debaters:

Please watch time.
- work at not interrupting
as much.
- Excellent summary
argument

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

The con team provided a more varied
and detailed argument, and
specifically closed the final focus
with a strong and succinct set
of defensive arguments for their
contention.

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 2 Flt _____ Room P-10 Judge Elorise Bigsby

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code CCCS

Con Team code DDWR

Speaker #	name:	Speaker points
Speaker #1	<u>Gliselle Chavero</u>	<u>25</u>
Speaker #3	<u>Lorena Sanchez</u>	<u>26</u>

Speaker #	name:	Speaker points
Speaker #2	<u>Robert Darius</u>	<u>27</u>
Speaker #4	<u>Rubio White</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: DDWR

Comments to debaters:

Gliselle Chavero - probably nervous and speak low, could hardly hear.

Lorena Sanchez - she was very good, but need to be more organized. And did more of the cross fire response.

Comments to debaters:

Robert Darius - did very good, and in the crossfire, ask good questions.

Rubio White - did very well in presenting his case. Did well in crossfire.

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

DDWR - very well on their rebuttals, and made few other team agree with them.
(CCCS)

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 Elorise Bigsby

Signature

School affiliation Yucaipa

Round 2 Flt _____ Room P-7 Judge Rebecca Sanchez
Gabriel Gutierrez

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code BBNV

Con Team code AAKM

Speaker #	name:	Speaker points
1	<u>Michelle Ko</u>	<u>26</u>
3	<u>Nikhil Nayyar</u>	<u>28</u>

Speaker #	name:	Speaker points
2	<u>Daniel Kaudson</u>	<u>28</u>
4	<u>Liz Maine</u>	<u>27</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: AAKM

Comments to debaters: Intro too long - go straight into what you want - Good - get into parameters Define PACS and corps ^{good} Don't just read - looks better if you seem like you memorized

Be able to defend the aggression - Great stats - arguments - keep with 527 arguments

Careful with uhms good though you are not reading from paper - Good stats - now use them - no need to call me for honor

Comments to debaters: No need to chant! - Go against the Aff contentions immediately address your opponent Don't cite newswatch - cite facts Don't be side "common sense" just make your point

Good job with arguments careful with being too aggressive

Argument still lost - good - Good contentions against the other side - slow down a little - describe your argument? - speed each side contention said

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

Speakers for Con were generally stronger - attacked the other contentions stronger - Command of argument stronger for Con as well.

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 LQHS

Round 2 Flt _____ Room P-6 Judge Martin Bustos

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code DDTS

Con Team code AASC

Speaker #1 name:	<u>Guaraxe Lucios</u>	Speaker points 0	<u>26</u>
Speaker #3 name:	<u>Manny Valdañon</u>		<u>26</u>

Speaker #2 name:	<u>Kaveri Curtin</u>	Speaker points 0	<u>27</u>
Speaker #4 name:	<u>Dominic Schnabel</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: AASC

Comments to debaters:

- eye contact
- watch your team;
- local $\neq$ federal
- need examples of times super parts of local
- it is illegal

Comments to debaters:

- You did say they are people
- end stronger
- good catch on the local election catch.
- know the name of a law
- don't argue evidence. You can't win.

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

The Aff did not deal well with the aff case well. The Aff also contradicted it's self with it's definition. Correlation with causation. I did not feel the laws from the aff

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)	

The Judge decides when cross is over.

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision Martin Bustos

Signature

School affiliation La Quinta

Round 2 Flt _____ Room Q102 Judge Fred Curlin

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

CITIZENS UNITED HALL ELECTION PROPOS

Pro Team code CCSW

Con Team code PD3A

Speaker #	name:	Speaker points 0
Speaker #1	<u>SHANNON SUNZAM</u>	<u>24</u>
Speaker #3	<u>L. WURTZ</u>	<u>25</u>

Speaker #	name:	Speaker points 0
Speaker #2	<u>M. BALDWIN</u>	<u>25</u>
Speaker #4	<u>K. HAYES</u>	<u>24</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: CCSW

Comments to debaters:

- CLEAR EXPOSITION OF FRAMEWORK
- CLEAR LOGICAL SUPPORT
- GOOD ATTACK ON "NEG" CONTENTIONS
- A BIT WEIR - ON CLIPS
- SUPPORT CONT. #2
- NEED TO ATTACK NEG CONT. #2
- SPEECH - YOU DID NOT
- BUT) → EVIDENCE
- ON PAGE ON WEBSITE

Comments to debaters:

- EXCELLENT EVIDENCE
- SUPPORTING YOUR POSITION
- EXCELLENT ATTACK ON
- 2nd CONTENTION
- GOOD USE OF DATA TO REFUTE
- "PRO" CONTENTION #1/2
- (IT EFFECT OF ELECTION
- OWNERS → "PRO" DID NOT
- AGREE THERE ON #1)
- GOOD FRAMEWORK
- GOOD SUPPORT

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

- SPEAKER #3 REALLY
- DEFENDED CONTENTION #1/2
- ATTACKED "CON" CASE
- VIEW A NICE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK
- DEFEND AFF

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, CAL