

Round 4 Flt Room Q101 Judge Sean Gallagher

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code BBNV

Con Team code DDBA

Speaker #1 name:	<u>Michelle Ho</u>	Speaker points: <u>28</u>
Speaker #3 name:	<u>Nikhil Nagpal</u>	<u>30</u>

Speaker #2 name:	<u>Michelle Barnier</u>	Speaker points: <u>29</u>
Speaker #4 name:	<u>Katia Alvarez</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 LPN

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

Comments to debaters:

Excellent debate,
Try to apply a layered
approach to presenting
the facts - have more
related and supporting
data to ~~strengthen~~ strengthen
arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Excellent debate,
Try to be more crisp in
presenting facts - the graph
data was very useful
but could have been pre-
sented more effectively
and to the point

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

The neg presented a strong case to
support the lack of harm and the
rights to all, including corporations
and unions, to create political voice.

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 4 Flt _____ Room Q102 Judge Minh Deng

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code DDWR

Con Team code CCRB

Speaker #1 name:	<u>Rubio</u>	Speaker points 8 <u>26</u>
Speaker #3 name:	<u>White</u>	<u>26</u>

Speaker #2 name:	<u>Reyes</u>	Speaker points 8 <u>26</u>
Speaker #4 name:	<u>Barilla</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: _____

Comments to debaters:

Rubio: Well written opening but please know it better so you can present it better instead of reading it. Good summary but try to use all the time allowed to counterargue to be more convincing.
White: Good use of examples. However use it more to make case stronger for analysis.

Comments to debaters:

Reyes: well written opening but know it better so you can sell it instead of trying to read the script.
Good summary - ~~summary of your~~
~~time to make the case.~~

Barilla: Well argue - Practice time to finish/conclude in a more timely manner.

Remember that you have prep time ~~the~~
if needed. Don't wait for judge to ask.

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

Better job at supporting & defending their side.

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

GOMS

Round 1 Flt _____ Room PB Judge Charlie Atkins

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code AASC

Con Team code DDMB

Speaker #1 name:	<u>Kavari Corlin</u>	Speaker points: <u>29</u>
Speaker #3 name:	<u>Dominic Schaub</u>	<u>28</u>

Speaker #2 name:	<u>Ashley McGraw</u>	Speaker points: <u>28</u>
Speaker #4 name:	<u>Natalie Bacc</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: AASC

Comments to debaters:

ATF. Election
Unfair amount.
Cost Benefit any.
Political voices
Super PAC: TD. oath.
Billion in false vote
con - voice voice.
under mine vote
Less focus on corp.
all cost as benefit
Dare to cover.
Forqier, investor

Comments to debaters:

Neg. Harms the election.
Stop Uncons from using
harm Founding Fathers believes
Election Congress president
Founding Fathers intact
203 Bi partian - uncombin
Political
Tax: reason
changes - amend Const
States are against.

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

ATF: gave a better defense of their position
New Corporations are not people. Like the aff said
they are made up of people but have a set of laws that
they are judged by

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

Paul White
Signature

School affiliation Chambers

Round 4 Flt _____Room P7Judge Jeff Heftmann

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code

CCSW

Con Team code

DDTS

Speaker #1

name: SHANNON SLANKARDSpeaker
points28

Speaker #3

name: LINDSEY WURTZ27

Speaker #2

name: SHARALEE TURCIOSSpeaker
points25

Speaker #4

name: MALLORY SALDANA26

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:

SHANNON: GOOD JOB PROPOSING
YOUR CONTENTIONS, WELL SPOKEN.
GOOD RESPONSES ON CROSSFIRE.

LINDSEY: GOOD DATA AND
ARGUMENTS; WORK ON YOUR
ORGANIZATION AND FLOW
DURING PRESENTATION.

Comments to debaters:

SHARALEE: SLOW DOWN YOUR SPEECH
HARD TO UNDERSTAND. DID NOT
MAKE CLEAR CONTENTIONS. SLIGHTLY
RUDE DURING CROSS FIRE

MALLORY: LOTS OF CONFIDENCE
IN SPEAKING. GOOD CLARITY BUT
SHOULD SLOW DOWN SOME.
ASKED SOME UNANSWERABLE QUESTION
IN CROSS FIRE.

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

THE PRO TEAM DID A MUCH BETTER JOB DEPENDING
AND PRESENTING THEIR CONTENTIONS. THE CON'S
CROSSFIRE WAS BORDERLINE RUDE.

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

Jeff Heftmann
Signature

School affiliation

YUCAIPA

Round 4 Flt _____Room P6Judge Jeff Schiffman

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code

DDEL

Con Team code

CLS

Speaker #1 name:	<u>PIERRE E</u>	Speaker points 0	<u>27</u>
Speaker #3 name:	<u>MARCO L</u>		<u>26</u>

Speaker #2 name:	<u>GUSTAVE CHAURO</u>	Speaker points 0	<u>26</u>
Speaker #4 name:	<u>LUKEA SANCHEZ</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: DDEL

Comments to debaters:

MARCO → DON'T CHEAT COM
DURING THE DEBATE.

Comments to debaters:

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

THIS WAS A VERY CLOSE DEBATE. BOTH
SIDES WERE NOT OVERLY RESPONSIVE TO
THE OTHER'S POINTS.
IN THE END THE CON WAS NOT ABLE TO
REFUTE THE PRO'S POSITION, THUS THEIR VICTORY.

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

CLAREN

Round 4 Flt _____ Room P10

Judge ~~Diane Anderson~~

Eloise Bigwolf

CBSR Public Forum Debate Ballot

Pro Team code AA KM

Con Team code AAJR

Speaker #1 name: <u>Liz Maine</u>	Speaker points <u>26</u>
Speaker #3 name: <u>Daniel Knudsen</u>	<u>27</u>

Speaker #2 name: <u>Nancy Jung</u>	Speaker points <u>28</u>
Speaker #4 name: <u>Clayton Becker</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: AAJR

Comments to debaters:

① Liz Maine - Good job, well thought out presentation.

③ Daniel Knudsen - Did very good. Just seem to agree with his opponents, on some of the conventions.

Comments to debaters:

② Nancy Jung - Lot of information in her presentation. work well as a team.

④ Clayton Becker - Have very good arguments in his case. And did very well in the crossfire. As well of his questions.

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

Overall, I believe the Con team had a stronger case, and ~~the~~ in their cross-fire questions.

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

Eloise Bigwolf
Signature

School affiliation Yuba