

Round 3 Flt _____ Room Q105 Judge David John Pasada

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition
code

E-HB

Opposition
code

C-MO

Speaker
points
8

Prime Minister / 1st Pro

name:

Amanda Hardy

28

Member of Government / 2nd Pro

name:

Emily Brindston

29

Speaker
points
8

Leader of Opposition / 1st Opp

name:

Matt Mansour

28

Member of Opposition / 2nd Opp

name:

Gideon Onda

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 ☒ Prop ☐ Opp

Code: E-HB

Comments to debaters:

Amanda - You speak well, your well on your way. Just show a little more confidence. Speak like you mean it.

Emily - Very well done, you did very well and you showed that you stood by your argument.

Comments to debaters:

Matt - You performed well, but you kept repeating yourself. Remember your points and stick to them.

Gideon - Not much I can say, you did very well.

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

The Prop.'s def. of the topic was "we believe that the U.S. should judge countries by past similar circumstances." They did indeed argue and defended their argument by providing examples. The Opp. argued well, but did not manage to disprove the Prop.'s argument.

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 3 Flt _____ Room Q207 Judge Martin Justiz

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition code ACS

Opposition code BUM

Prime Minister / 1 st Pro	Speaker points
name: <u>Alan Sabety</u>	<u>26</u>
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro	
name: <u>Alli Cardenas</u>	<u>25</u>

Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp	Speaker points
name: <u>Ken Mann</u>	<u>26</u>
Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp	
name: <u>Clavis Vincent-Tony</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 ☐ Prop ☒ Opp Code: BUM

Comments to debaters:	Comments to debaters:
-try to avoid this topic -watch for protection -try to address all their points -it is a believe debate -questions in poi	-ask what in a poi, don't interrupt speech -religious roots is a dangerous argument -arguing american ideals as risky

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

I hate this topic but the aff contradicted it's self and both should and believe. The neg also made me feel it was less about rape and the aff did not talk about how it needs to be a woman's choice

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 Parl)

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision Martin Justiz Signature

School affiliation La Quinta

Round 3 Flt _____ Room Q202 Judge Jeff Hartmann

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution: THIS HOUSE BELIEVES YOU CAN JUDGE A BOOK BY ITS COVER

Proposition code AMB

Opposition code MOS

		Speaker points 0
Prime Minister / 1 st Pro		
name: <u>SHARON MUSA</u>		<u>26</u>
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro		
name: <u>ANDREW BROWN</u>		<u>27</u>

		Speaker points 0
MEMBER		
Prime Minister / 1 st Opp		
name: <u>KATIE SCHAAP</u>		<u>27</u>
Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp		
name: <u>TYLER OTTOSON</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 ☐ Prop ☒ Opp Code: MOS

Comments to debaters:	Comments to debaters:
<u>SHARON: SPEAK A LITTLE SLOWER.</u> <u>GOOD VOLUME AND CONFIDENCE.</u> <u>GOOD JOB ON REBUTTAL.</u>	<u>TYLER: GOOD JOB IN SUGGESTING</u> <u>RE-DEFINING THE HOUSE.</u> <u>SLOW DOWN A LITTLE WITH</u> <u>YOUR DELIVERY. PROVIDED GOOD</u> <u>REBUTTAL.</u>
<u>ANDREW: DID A GOOD JOB</u> <u>RESPONDING TO THE NEG'S</u> <u>WEIGHING MECHANISM. GOOD</u> <u>JOB W/ SUPPORTING THE 3</u> <u>CONTENTIONS</u>	<u>KATIE: SPEAKS WELL, WITH CONFIDENCE.</u> <u>DID A GOOD JOB RESPONDING</u> <u>TO P.O.C.'S</u>

Reason for Decision: (please cite specific arguments that had a bearing on the outcome)	Order/Time of Speeches
<u>THIS WAS VERY CLOSE, BUT ULTIMATELY, I HAD</u> <u>A TOUGH TIME UNDERSTANDING THE LINK FROM</u> <u>THE RESOLUTION TO THE ARGUMENT. NEG SUPPORTED</u> <u>THIS</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 Parli)

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision _____
Signature
School affiliation WCA/PA

Round 3 Flt _____ Room Q201 Judge Norma Perez

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition code AGL

Opposition code MOL

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

Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp	Speaker points
name: <u>Sarah Osuna</u>	<u>28</u>
Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp	Speaker points
name: <u>Alexis Lee</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: A-GL

Comments to debaters:

- very well done.
- great ground work!
- Really enjoyed this argument!

Comments to debaters:

- allow questions sometimes. (will help Judge favor your argument if you can stump the question.)

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

- very well grounded. stayed on topic supported their evidence, legit points, convinced me!

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 High School

Round 3 Flt _____ Room A208 Judge Ebony Harrison

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution: This house can ~~judge~~ judge a book by its cover.

Proposition code ARH

Opposition code EWS

Prime Minister / 1 st Pro	Speaker points 8
name: <u>Alex Han</u>	<u>27</u>
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro	
name: <u>Dwarak Reddy</u>	<u>26</u>

Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp	Speaker points 8
name: <u>Cody Webb</u>	<u>27</u>
Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp	
name: <u>William Strong</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: EWS

Comments to debaters:

Spk1 - Saying "um" too much
Thank you for roadmap.
Speech flowed much better in this
~~last~~ last speech.

Spk2 - I need eye contact.
Saying "um" too much.
Spending a lot of time repeating pts instead
of arguing them

Comments to debaters:

Spk1: Speech flowed very well.
No contentions?
Don't play w/ language.
Seems very comfortable

Spk2: Great volume & pace
Still no contentions
Seems very comfortable
Lost 2 min in last speech, utilize time
a little bit better?

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

App didn't really refute that sometimes info is leaked too late & if other factors were considered, it could have been helped, which was the Neg's whole argument. Instead defended own case w/o really attacking.

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 Parl)

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

Signature

School affiliation HHS

Round 3 Flt Room Q205 Judge Natalie Farajas

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition code	<u>ANM</u>	Opposition code	<u>MPB</u>
------------------	------------	-----------------	------------

		Speaker points 0			Speaker points 0
Prime Minister / 1 st Pro			Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp		
name:	<u>Hannah Mathieson</u>	<u>28</u>	name:	<u>Loren Bassil</u>	<u>26</u>
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro			Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp		
name:	<u>Annie Nguyen</u>	<u>27</u>	name:	<u>Ayetzky Resa</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 ☒ Prop ☐ Opp Code:

Comments to debaters: <u>Your speech ^{was} great.</u> <u>(both parties)</u>	Comments to debaters: <u>Expand your knowledge.</u> <u>Think outside the box.</u> <u>You made a great point.</u> <u>just come prepared.</u>
--	---

Reason for Decision: (please cite specific arguments that had a bearing on the outcome)	Order/Time of Speeches
<u>They made a great argument & most of their points were valid.</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 Parli)

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision

[Signature] Signature
School affiliation Carter H.S.

Round 3 Flt _____Room Q104Judge Fred Curlin

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition
codeM. WSOpposition
codeC. SMSpeaker
points
8Speaker
points
8Prime Minister / 1st Proname: F. WINSTON26Leader of Opposition / 1st Oppname: M. MANSUR26Member of Government / 2nd Proname: A. SHANATHIL27Member of Opposition / 2nd Oppname: JUAN SANCHEZ25

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 ☐ OppCode: M. WS

Comments to debaters:

Comments to debaters:

* FAITH EXC CLEAR STATEMENT & APP CASE

* AMIR EFFECTIVE DEFENSE OF APP & VERY EFFECTIVE DEFLECTION OF NEG TEAM TO REDEFINE THE QUESTION (GAD JOB)

FAITH & AMIR VERY EFFECTIVE AT RAISING QUESTION BACK TO US CORE → NOT DISTRACTED BY APP WON BASED ON DEFENSE OF REVOLUTION & WRITERS

WAC NICE ATTEMPT TO RE-DEFINE "P" TO SUIT HIS NEG & DEFLECTED BY AMIR!

SANCHEZ GOOD SPEAKER, ALM EXC DEFENSE OF OWN RESTATEMENT & ALMOST TALKED HIMSELF INTO AGREEMENT PRO (CAREFUL!)

YOU DEFENDED YOUR CHANGING DEFINITION WELL HOWEVER NOT RULE TW CAN REDEFINE THE QUESTION

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

"PRO" SIDE ESTABLISHED CLEAR FRAMEWORK RE QUESTION. CON SIDE WAS EFFECTIVE IN DEFENDING THEIR CHANGED QUESTION BUT NOT IN REDEFINING THE ORIGINAL P

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 Parl)

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision

WAC

Signature

School affiliation

CAREWAT

Round 3 Flt _____ Room Q206 Judge Charles Ahrens

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition
code

MJS

Opposition
code

EBP

Prime Minister / 1 st Pro	Speaker points
name: <u>Anthony Serrano</u>	<u>28</u>
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro	
name: <u>Mario Jimenez</u>	<u>27</u>

Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp	Speaker points
name: <u>Sotirakis Bagnall</u>	<u>26</u>
Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp	
name: <u>Madison Polk</u>	<u>26</u>

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

The winning team was the ☒ Prop ☐ Opp

Code: MJS

Comments to debaters:

well spoken
AFF Judge Book order
am. society
Book Charlie Sheen
cover what make them them
reality
actual
Drug Abuse.
MBA - admits he uses it
Promotes - Neg side of society
Cocky persona.
winning. Doing what he does.
Tiger Blood.
Disrespect Society
Domestic violence society
against this behavior

Comments to debaters:

Tell me what you are doing
to do
reality: Charlie Sheen!
Known as reality - actors 1/1 Real map.
Drink smoke Experience. woman
Disrespect society: Domestic
violence.
Cocky persona. superior.
Sets himself apart.
Drug abuse
Life coarse: all different.
Skater: not smart. in group
They are smart people.
own opinion: we counted that
way.

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

Neg team can give no reason for not judging
Prop presented a solid case for what judging and
what you see is the cover:

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 Parl)

Please sign your ballot to certify your decision

Charles Ahrens
Signature

School affiliation

Charmant H

Round 3 Flt _____ Room Q209 Judge Cabe Gutierrez

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition code EBW

Opposition code MFS

Prime Minister / 1 st Pro	Speaker points
name: <u>Pilar Burr</u>	<u>28</u>
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro	
name: <u>Serina Williams</u>	<u>29</u>

Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp	Speaker points
name: <u>Laura Flores</u>	<u>28</u>
Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp	
name: <u>Amin Shahit</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: EBW

Comments to debaters: <u>PHB</u> → Fed Govt - violence of <u>3 UN</u> <u>link #</u> <u>Possibilities</u> - <u>Good</u> <u>Discussion</u> <u>32 Q&A</u> <u>DOWN</u> <u>make sure your audience understands</u> <u>6eth</u> → <u>rec proper damage</u> <u>can not go against point</u> <u>Good speaker / Good poster</u> <u>Good content counter to</u> <u>Contentions - Knife / Guns</u> <u>"careful w/ 'ahms'"</u> <u>Good use of Question to stop</u> <u>rhythm of opp</u>	Comments to debaters: <u>Rebuttal - address careful with flow of argu</u> <u>speaking sets better when</u> <u>you move on - take a Q</u> <u>- make sure you address the</u> <u>affirmation and certain</u> <u>concede not concede</u> <u>- Good - m</u> <u>(no questions?)</u> <u>careful don't</u> <u>be circular -</u> <u>answer the Q at hand</u> <u>So basically 1 - No - Look up</u> <u>not at paper - Let it flow</u> <u>from memory - don't be</u> <u>too reliant on notes</u> <u>watch "ahms" - getting distract</u> <u>to argument - takes away</u> <u>Don't tell me what you are</u> <u>doing - Do it</u>
---	---

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

Stronger argument on part of pro.

Speaking overall better for pro

Rebuttal stronger for pro

VERY CLOSE! Though

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

LQ+15

Round 3 Flt _____ Room Q204 Judge Kevin Reid

CBSR Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Resolution:

Proposition code CVF

Opposition code AWC

Speaker points	
Prime Minister / 1 st Pro	
name: <u>LIBERTY FELIX</u>	<u>29</u>
Member of Government / 2 nd Pro	
name: <u>IVONNE VERDUZCO</u>	<u>30</u>

Speaker points	
Leader of Opposition / 1 st Opp	
name: <u>JAHNAVI COLIN</u>	<u>30</u>
Member of Opposition / 2 nd Opp	
name: <u>MADISON LEIGAND</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 ☐ Prop ☒ Opp Code:

Comments to debaters: <u>IVONNE VERDUZCO -</u> <u>GREAT SPEAKER AND</u> <u>PRESENTER.</u>	Comments to debaters: <u>J. COLIN - GREAT SPEAKER</u> <u>AND PRESENTER</u>
--	--

Reason for Decision: (please cite specific arguments that had a bearing on the outcome) <u>BOTH TEAMS WERE EXCELLENT.</u> <u>VERY HARD TO DETERMINE AS WINNER</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 HERSTAGE