

Round 1 Flt _____ Room Q205 Judge Scott Boydston

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition code E·BW

Opposition code A·NM

Prime Minister / 1st Pro
name: PILAR 28
Member of Government / 2nd Pro
name: SERINA 27

Leader of Opposition / 1st Opp
name: HANNAH MATHIESON 29
Member of Opposition / 2nd Opp
name: ANNIE NGUYEN 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 ☒ Prop ☐ Opp Code:

Comments to debaters:

THE DEBATE WAS LIFE IMITATES ART,
ART BEING VIOLENT VIDEO GAMES,
MOVIES OR BOOKS, GOOD CONNECTION
TO EXAMPLES AURORA COLO.
MERELY STATED GOV. SHOULD
COME UP WITH BILL TO
CENSOR, NECESSARY: PROPER
CLAUSE - THERE IS CRIME
IN U.K. JUST NOT GUN
CRIME - GOOD EYE CONTACT
CLEAR SPEAKING - A
LITTLE TOO FAST SPEAKING.

Comments to debaters:

VERY GOOD SPEAKER IN
HANNAH - GREAT EYE CONTACT
THE ISSUE OF LIFE IMITATING
ART - MAYBE NOT ADDRESSED TO
COMPLETELY - TURNED INTO A
GUN CONTROL ISSUE - DOES
NOT WANT GOV. TO CONTROL
1ST AMMEND. BUT OK WITH
CONTROLLING 2ND AMMEND

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

IN FAVOR FOR THE GOV. BECAUSE THEY MADE A GOOD
CONNECTION WITH A REAL CASE IN THE AURORA SHOOTING.
THAT GOV SHOULD STEP IN TO CENSOR VIOLENT ENTERTAINMENT.
OPP ONLY REAL ARGUMENT AGAINST WAS LACK OF
VIOLENCE IN THE U.K. BUT REBUTED BY GOV. IN THAT
U.K. DOES HAVE VIOLENT CRIME, JUST NOT GUN CRIME.

Order/Time of Speeches

Prop constructive 7 min
Opp constructive 7 min
Prop 7 min
Opp 7 min
Opp rebuttal 5 min
Prop rebuttal 5 min

(There is no prep time in Parli)

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision

J. Scott Boydston
Signature

School affiliation UCATPA

Round 1 Flt _____ Room Q201 Judge Sean Borndie
Shane

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition code E. BP

Opposition code C. VF

Prime Minister / 1st Pro
name: SOOTAAKII BIGWOLF 26
Member of Government / 2nd Pro
name: MADISON POLK 24

Leader of Opposition / 1st Opp
name: LIBERTY FELICIANO 27
Member of Opposition / 2nd Opp
name: IVONNE VERDUSCO 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 ☐ Prop ☒ Opp Code: C. VF

Comments to debaters:
SOOTAAKII
- good use of opening definitions
- good pace and flow of speech
- examples seemed too general
- needed to re-emphasized definition of art
MADISON
- some good use of examples
- needed to emphasize definition of art
- speech seemed too short

Comments to debaters:
LIBERTY
- excellent ~~pace~~ articulation
- good distinction between perception and creativity
- good specific examples
- best pace at certain moments
IVONNE
- excellent pace
- good examples
- good reinforcement of points

Reason for Decision: (please cite specific arguments that had a bearing on the outcome)
Opposition presented a case that was forceful, better organized with specific contentions, and more logical in handling the definitions of terms of the proposition

Order/Time of Speeches
Prop constructive 7 min
Opp constructive 7 min
Prop 7 min
Opp 7 min
Opp rebuttal 5 min
Prop rebuttal 5 min
(There is no prep time in Parli)

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision Will 1/1
Signature
School affiliation A - CHS

Round 1 Flt _____ Room Q202 Judge Rene Knudsen

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition code C-SM

Opposition code M-OS

Prime Minister / 1 st Pro	Speaker points
name: <u>Juan Sanchez</u>	<u>26</u>
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro	
name: <u>Marc Mansour</u>	<u>27</u>

Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp	Speaker points
name: <u>Tyler Ottoson</u>	<u>28</u>
Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp	
name: <u>Katie Schaeff</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 ☐ Prop ☒ Opp Code: M-OS

Comments to debaters: <u>Juan - good speaking voice.</u> <u>His first speech was</u> <u>well organized. His rebuttal</u> <u>was not so much.</u> <u>Marc - good speaker.</u> <u>Organized. Lot of poise</u> <u>under pressure.</u> <u>Both of the debaters show</u> <u>a great deal of potential.</u> <u>They had a hard time keeping</u> <u>up with the neg but they</u> <u>did put on a strong case.</u>	Comments to debaters: <u>Tyler - presented a good negation</u> <u>Organized with contentions</u> <u>and countering the aff.</u> <u>Katie was a dynamic</u> <u>speaker. Very poised.</u> <u>Tyler's rebuttal was well</u> <u>organized and easy</u> <u>to follow.</u>
--	--

Reason for Decision: (please cite specific arguments that had a bearing on the outcome) <u>While the aff presented a good but</u> <u>rather vague argument. The neg. was able</u> <u>to counter the aff quite well and presented strong</u> <u>contentions which the aff did not counter or</u> <u>did so weakly.</u>	Order/Time of Speeches Prop constructive 7 min Opp constructive 7 min Prop 7 min Opp 7 min Opp rebuttal 5 min Prop rebuttal 5 min (There is no prep time in Parli.)
--	--

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision

[Signature]
Signature

School affiliation Claremont

Round 1 Flt _____ Room Q207 Judge Kevin Reed

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition code	Opposition code
<u>A-MB</u>	<u>C-MD</u>

Prime Minister / 1 st Pro	Speaker points
name: <u>ANDREW BROWN</u>	<u>30</u>
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro	Speaker points
name: <u>SHARON MUSA</u>	<u>30</u>

Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp	Speaker points
name: <u>MATT MANSOUR</u>	<u>27</u>
Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp	Speaker points
name: <u>GIDEON ONDAP</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 ☒ Prop ☐ Opp Code: _____

Comments to debaters:	Comments to debaters:
A BROWN - VERY GOOD PRESENTATION OF FACTS. (TRUTHFUL FACTS) S MUSA - PROVIDED CONCISE AND CLEAR FACTS IN A TRUTHFUL MANNER. (EXCELLENT PRESENTER)	OPPOSITION - NEEDS TO STAY ON TRACK. THEY PRESENT CONFUSING FACTS

Reason for Decision: (please cite specific arguments that had a bearing on the outcome)	Order/Time of Speeches												
PROPOSITION - PROVIDED AN EXCELLENT PRESENTATION WITH CLEAR AND CONCISE FACTS. "SUPER JOB"	<table border="0"><tr><td>Prop constructive</td><td>7 min</td></tr><tr><td>Opp constructive</td><td>7 min</td></tr><tr><td>Prop rebuttal</td><td>7 min</td></tr><tr><td>Opp rebuttal</td><td>7 min</td></tr><tr><td>Prop rebuttal</td><td>5 min</td></tr><tr><td>Opp rebuttal</td><td>5 min</td></tr></table>	Prop constructive	7 min	Opp constructive	7 min	Prop rebuttal	7 min	Opp rebuttal	7 min	Prop rebuttal	5 min	Opp rebuttal	5 min
Prop constructive	7 min												
Opp constructive	7 min												
Prop rebuttal	7 min												
Opp rebuttal	7 min												
Prop rebuttal	5 min												
Opp rebuttal	5 min												
(There is no prep time in Parli)													

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision [Signature] Signature

School affiliation HERITAGE

Round 1 Flt _____ Room Q204 Judge Jonathan Posadas

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition
code

A.GL

Opposition
code

MJS

Speaker points	
8	
Prime Minister / 1 st Pro name: <u>Gavin Greene</u>	<u>28</u>
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro name: <u>Andrew Lopez</u>	<u>28</u>

Speaker points	
8	
Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp name: <u>Anthony Serrano</u>	<u>28</u>
Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp name: <u>Marlo Jimenez</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 ☒ Prop ☐ Opp Code: A.GL

Comments to debaters:

Gavin - Strong voice, very clear.
You show a lot emotion and
devotion when you speak. Well
done.

Andrew - Again, a good, strong, clear
voice that is easy to hear, and
understand.

Comments to debaters:

Anthony and Marlo - Both of you did
great, just make sure to keep
an eye on the clock, both of
you ran out of time before
finishing your cases. Great ability
with words, one that I envy, but
just keep an eye on the clock, again.

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

Prop won for they managed to defend their case
most effectively. Might of been an abusive argument, but the
Opp. failed to call topicality, and decided to follow through with
the debate without calling topicality.

Order/Time of Speeches

Prop constructive	7 min
Opp constructive	7 min
Prop rebuttal	7 min
Opp rebuttal	7 min
Opp rebuttal	5 min
Prop rebuttal	5 min

(There is no prep time in Parli)

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision

Signature

School affiliation

Carter

Round 1 Flt Room Q209 Judge Natalie Barajas

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot ~~X~~

Resolution:

Proposition code	<u>A.CS</u>	Opposition code	<u>M.O.L</u>
------------------	-------------	-----------------	--------------

	Speaker points 8		Speaker points 8
Prime Minister / 1 st Pro name: <u>Iain Scibethy</u>	<u>26</u>	Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp name: <u>Sarah Osuna</u>	<u>24</u>
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro name: <u>Alexis Carreras</u>	<u>26</u>	Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp name: <u>Alexis Lee</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 ☒ Prop ☐ Opp Code:

Comments to debaters:	Comments to debaters:
Good research skills. Try to understand the opp. better than you're own discussion. that way it is easier to speak. Gives you more confidence in what you are saying.	Think outside the box. You guys had been repeating a lot that was already stated. Seemed like the whole time you guys were giving "point of confirmation."

Reason for Decision: (please cite specific arguments that had a bearing on the outcome)	Order/Time of Speeches
The prop team had better points than the opp. team. They understood the pros and cons rather than just their own.	Prop constructive 7 min
	Opp constructive 7 min
	Prop 7 min
	Opp 7 min
	Opp rebuttal 5 min
	Prop rebuttal 5 min
(There is no prep time in Parli)	

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision Natalie Barajas Signature

School affiliation Carter High School

Round 1 Flt Room Q 204 Judge Charles Whims

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition code M. PB

Opposition code E. WS

Prime Minister / 1 st Pro	Speaker points
name: <u>Loren Bassil</u>	<u>29</u>
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro	
name: <u>Ayetzypressa</u>	<u>26</u>

Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp	Speaker points
name: <u>Cody Webb</u>	<u>28</u>
Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp	
name: <u>Williams Strong</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 ☐ Prop ☒ Opp Code:

Comments to debaters: <u>good job</u> <u>Aff. Education Electives will</u> <u>calc. Dept of Education</u> <u>Elective choices:</u> <u>creativity creates</u> <u>choose what they want.</u> <u>not homework = find out who</u> <u>they are.</u> <u>not just find out history</u> <u>ready for college.</u> <u>Tell college about their Quality</u> <u>of Life</u> <u>* Take in Life</u> <u>Explain the Electives</u>	Comments to debaters: <u>neg. not classes</u> <u>But Standards</u> <u>School is about learning</u> <u>Not Tangible</u> <u>* can't change how the system</u> <u>works</u> <u>Other countries are ahead of us.</u> <u>Sports is not education</u> <u>12 and classes in high school.</u> <u>Life can't intimidate art.</u> <u>Neg 2:</u> <u>School is not who they are</u> <u>what you know</u> <u>* competitive about employment</u>
---	--

Reason for Decision: (please cite specific arguments that had a bearing on the outcome)	Order/Time of Speeches
<u>I thought the argument was not believable for the</u> <u>Aff. Neg. argument on job in future better</u>	Prop constructive 7 min Opp constructive 7 min Prop 7 min Opp 7 min Opp rebuttal 5 min Prop rebuttal 5 min (There is no prep time in Parl)

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision Charles Whims Signature

School affiliation Claremont

Round 1 Flt _____ Room Q208 Judge Norma Perez

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition
code

E · AB

Opposition
code

A · KC

Prime Minister / 1 st Pro	Speaker points 8
name: <u>Emily Boydston</u>	<u>28</u> 28
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro	
name: <u>Amanda Hardy</u>	<u>26</u> 26

Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp	Speaker points 8
name: <u>Jannavi Curlin</u>	<u>28</u>
Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp	
name: <u>Madison Weigand</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 ☐ Prop ☒ Opp Code: A · KC

Comments to debaters:

- as are changes · ||||| ·
- people change
- less fillers · "umm"
- at times points were not well supported.

Comments to debaters:

- ||| · great start.
- very well informed.
- defined ~~you~~ extremely well.

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

- stood strong to their points.
- Prop. team was a bit scattered.
- convinced me to vote on their favor.

Order/Time of Speeches

Prop constructive	7 min
Opp constructive	7 min
Prop	7 min
Opp	7 min
Opp rebuttal	5 min
Prop rebuttal	5 min

(There is no prep time in Parli)

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision _____
Signature

School affiliation CARTER

Round 1 Flt _____ Room Q1015 Judge Jeff Heitmann

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution: THIS HOUSE BELIEVES LIFE IMITATES ART.

Proposition code M·WS

Opposition code B·VM

Prime Minister / 1 st Pro	Speaker points
name: <u>FAITH WINSTON</u>	<u>26</u>
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro	
name: <u>AMIR SHAHATIT</u>	<u>27</u>

Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp	Speaker points
name: <u>KEN MANN</u>	<u>27</u>
Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp	
name: <u>CLOVIS VINAM-TANG</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 ☐ Prop ☒ Opp Code: B·VM

Comments to debaters:

FAITH - DID NOT QUITE UNDERSTAND THE ORIGINAL ARGUMENT. FOCUS ON SPEAKING MORE FLUENTLY. RAISED P.O.I. EFFECTIVELY TO CHALLENGE THE OPP.

AMIR - RAISED P.O.I. ABOUT THE HOUSE AND OPP'S FAILURE TO NOTE ON POL ORIGINALLY. RAISED SOME GOOD POINTS ABOUT THE TOPICS AFTER P.O.I.'S. SPOKE PRETTY CLEAR AROUND THE 3 POINTS. GAVE GOOD EXAMPLES

Comments to debaters:

KEN - NOTED THAT THE HOUSE WAS DEFINED BUT ACTUALLY DID NOT HAVE IT. CHANGED HOUSE TO E.U. DID A GOOD JOB DEMONSTRATING POINTS. MADE STRONG POINTS DURING REBUTTAL

CLOVIS - ASKED GOOD P.O.C TO CLARIFY THE POINT OF THE ARGUMENT. DID A VERY GOOD JOB SPEAKING AND DEMONSTRATING THAT THE RESOLUTION WAS NOT TRULY DEBATABLE.

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

I DO NOT BELIEVE THE ORIGINAL RESOLUTION WAS DEBATABLE. THE OPPOSITION DID A GOOD JOB IN DEMONSTRATING THIS.

Order/Time of Speeches

Prop constructive	7 min
Opp constructive	7 min
Prop rebuttal	7 min
Opp rebuttal	7 min
Prop rebuttal	5 min
Opp rebuttal	5 min

(There is no prep time in Parli)

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision

Jeff Heitmann
Signature

School affiliation YUCAIPA

Round 1 Flt Room Q104 Judge Minh Dang

CBSR **Parliamentary** Debate Ballot

Resolution:

life without Art / 17 Hyman

Proposition code A-RH

Opposition code M-FS

Prime Minister / 1 st Pro name:	<u>Hin</u>	Speaker points 0 <u>27</u>
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro name:	<u>Reddy</u>	<u>26</u>

Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp name:	<u>Ross</u>	Speaker points 0 <u>28</u>
Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp name:	<u>Shahrest</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 ☐ Prop ☒ Opp Code:

Comments to debaters:

1. English / America → good conclusion
Steve Sobos

2. ⊖ Q

Seems? → didn't say why he
be successful just
that for now → our
1/2 said EU.

⊖ Q

Affirm did not get his way during
speech.

Comments to debaters:

1. good eye contact / lots of points
good conclusion.
good counterargument.

Q ⊖ (+)

2. American revolution

good eye contact.
good counterargument / definition.

Q ⊕.

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

Better arguments for opp clearly
stated - Better speakers.

Order/Time of Speeches

Prop constructive	7 min
Opp constructive	7 min
Prop rebuttal	7 min
Opp rebuttal	7 min
Prop rebuttal	5 min
Opp rebuttal	5 min

(There is no prep time in Parli)

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision Signature

School affiliation GOHS