Nilles Cameron

South ZB vs Westview LL
Room: 408 Flight A: Start 8am
CX -- Rd 1

AFA 4:45 3:52

Neg 4:40 3:30

Tires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

Round 1 Room 408 Time 8am Judge Cameron Nilles

Affirmative Code South ZB Negative Code Westview LL

First Aff. Athena Z Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	First Neg. Emily L Circle Rating: 30 29 28 (27) 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*
Second Aff. Daisy B Circle Rating: 30 29 28 (27) 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	Second Neg. Jordan L. Circle Rating: 30 29 28 (27) 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*

*If one of the debaters was rude, please report it to the ballot table. Otherwise, you may not rate below a 20.

The debate was won by South ZB (Team Code) representing Aff (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature Cameron Nilles Judge's School Barlow

Topic: _____

Constructives: 8 min; Cross-Examinations: 3 min; Rebuttals: 5 min; Prep Time: 5 min

WRITE *THOROUGH* COMMENTS TO EACH DEBATER. GIVE REASONS WHY YOU VOTED FOR ONE SIDE. PLEASE STATE WHAT THE LOSING DEBATER NEEDED TO DO TO WIN.

Oral critiques are *not* allowed.

1A - 6min left (used 2min) for 3 cards and (?), first card on econ adv. old. more clearly vary between cards; "Next". Consider the "royal" card over Bearden.

1N - You are less traditional in your presentation of the 1NC, makes it difficult. Focus your assault. Finish your DA! No internal link to credit down grade.

1NR - they DO NOT need to specify funding area, and in fact, they technically can't.

2A - Do a line-by-line. Apply your 2AC arguments directly. more coherent assault..

2N - You skimp on the warrants sometimes. Why do you continue w/ the Bio-D impact!? You skip your author a few times, delineate between cards better ~~You should~~ You should extend your partners 1NC case arguments rather than just make new ones, impact them; explain why they matter in the round.

2NR: Don't go for everything. Go for Econ case turn and defense on warming.

RFD: Theory "new in the two" was never responded to.

(To Be 14" in Length)

1AC-CX: Aff good responses you should elaborate a. building time through.

Neg: "we don't claim to (5) global warming" ~~don't~~ don't roll over.

"considerable wages"... Make a point w/ your CX.

2AC-CX: Aff: "General fund". Rather than be snarky about Fed (X) warrant respond preemptively and w/ confidence.

↖ I don't believe they asked about the time-frame...

2NC-CX: Aff Invasives is a new argument.. You don't need to ask it.

General issue: take control of your cross-x times

1AR: - You don't lose "ground"

- "Our dates are better"
- Cannot read evidence
- Double turn.

2AR: "no explanation"

1AR time skew:

Kuhn Matthew

South RK vs Sam Barlow GM
Room: 410 Flight A: Start 8am
CX -- Rd 1

res State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

Round 1 Room 410 Time _____ Judge Kuhn

Affirmative Code South Eugene (RK) Negative Code Sam Barlow (MG)

First Aff. Kate	First Neg. Keena
Circle Rating: 30 29 28 (27) 26 25 24 23 22 21 20	Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 (26) 25 24 23 22 21 20
Superior — Needs Improvement*	Superior — Needs Improvement*
Second Aff. Raina	**Second Neg. Cameron**
Circle Rating: 30 29 (28) 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20	Circle Rating: 30 29 (28) 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20
Superior — Needs Improvement*	Superior — Needs Improvement*

*If one of the debaters was rude, please report it to the ballot table. Otherwise, you may not rate below a 20.

The debate was won by RK (Team Code) representing Aff (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature [signature] Judge's School Lincoln

Topic: Transportation Infrastructure

Constructives: 8 min; Cross-Examinations: 3 min; Rebuttals: 5 min; Prep Time: 5 min

WRITE *THOROUGH* COMMENTS TO EACH DEBATER. GIVE REASONS WHY YOU VOTED FOR ONE SIDE. PLEASE STATE WHAT THE LOSING DEBATER NEEDED TO DO TO WIN.

Oral critiques are *not* allowed.

General comments to all four speakers:

1) Spend more time "mapping" your case ~~the~~ and the supportive arguments. How do the arguments relate to the overall case? How will the evidence support the arguments?
2) The volume of evidence is not as important as a clear, cogent explanation of its relevance.
3) Don't drift into laptop "babble". A ~~well~~ single well-enunciated piece of evidence is better than three rushed, mumbled pieces of evidence whose relevance in not clearly explained.
4) Avoid dismissive phrases: "and they know that" (Raina), "if you don't understand Keynesian" (Kate),
5) Don't tell the judge what to do: "You have to vote for the neg" (Cameron)
6) Avoid techno-jargon: "DAs" (Raina), "Perm" "Ass" "One AC" "Card" "neg" (Cameron), "analytics" (Keena)
7) Don't converse with your partner from podium

(To Be 14" in Length)

Over

The affirmative's case was stronger. stimulus argument and competitive advantage argument stood. The affirmative's argument on war was opaque. The affirmative's argument on global warming was topical and withstood negative's oblique arguments.

Negative gave excellent arguments but should directly counter all arguments of the affirmative

Delivery:

Kate: Very good, but slow down and look at judge occassionally. Give a stronger summary. Keep hands off of ~~comput~~ computer

Raina: Great gestures, but use hands less ~~energetic~~ energetically. Don't bob on your feet

Keana: Good delivery. Stand straight. Don't hunch over computer. Don't shuffle papers during rebuttal. Look at me occassionally.

Cameron: stand straight. Nice delivery. Don't lower voice while reading evidence.

McLain Susan

Sam Barlow VF vs Westview MZ
Room: 407 Flight A: Start 8am
CX -- Rd 1

Good Debate – Thank you

ires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

Round One Room 407 Time 8 AM Judge McLain

Affirmative Code Sam Barlow VF Negative Code Westview MZ

First Aff. George Ford — Better Rebuttal!	First Neg. Anthony Zheng — Best Computer shown!
Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 25 **24** 23 22 21 20	Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 25 **24** 23 22 21 20
Superior — Needs Improvement*	Superior — You cover your flow! Needs Improvement*
Second Aff. Jake Viales — Good CX!	Second Neg. Abhijit Mudigonda — Case-Side Better covered 2NR
Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 **26** 25 24 23 22 21 20	Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 **25½** 24 23 22 21 20
Superior — Needs Improvement*	Superior — Needs Improvement*

All Bunches

*If one of the debaters was rude, please report it to the ballot table. Otherwise, you may not rate below a 20.

The debate was won by Aff (Team Code) representing Sam Barlow VF (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature Susan McLain Judge's School Glencoe

Topic: Infra-structure / Roads / Rumble Strips

Aff Case — Constructives: 8 min; Cross-Examinations: 3 min; Rebuttals: 5 min; Prep Time: 5 min — Neg. Positions

WRITE *THOROUGH* COMMENTS TO EACH DEBATER. GIVE REASONS WHY YOU VOTED FOR ONE SIDE. PLEASE STATE WHAT THE LOSING DEBATER NEEDED TO DO TO WIN.

Oral critiques are *not* allowed.

#1. Basic – Case – Fine

#2. Presentation – NOT persuasive + Poorly given

#3. Solvency – Rumble Strips
Solving for Rural / Sleep
A + Q. = Accidents

Winners:
1) Aff. wins Topicality
2) D.A. Fiscal Disp. – Aff. Case meets: Rumble Strips $1.2 Million
D.A. Credit Downgrade
war link & no impact
3) K-1 / 1 2 – no link to Aff Case

Case Side: Solvency
Rumble Strips Save – money + lives

Aff Case – Real World

(To Be 14" in Length)

D.A.'s Conflict + Aff. Points out Topicality

#1. Topicality
40 Billion (T.I.S.)

#2. D.A. Credit Downgrade

D.A. Fiscal Disp.
Economic – ↓
Link News
Link Solution
INC
RNC

#3. K-1
Equity
K-2
Space + Time

2nd Neg: Links – poor + Aff took out with A Push.

You could have won Topicality – with more + better links to "Substantial" Term.

~~Wyle~~ **Justin**
Sam Barlow CT vs Clackamas PR
Room: 502 Flight A: Start 8am
CX -- Rd 1 Wiley

› Tires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

Round 1 Room 502 Time 8am Judge Justin Wiley

Affirmative Code Sam Barlow Negative Code Clackamas

First Aff. ~~Sam Barlow CT~~ Haley Circle Rating: 30 29 (28) 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	First Neg. ~~Clackamas PR~~ Alan Circle Rating: 30 29 28 (27) 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*
Second Aff. Katie Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 (25) 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	Second Neg. Alex Circle Rating: 30 29 (28) 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*

*If one of the debaters was rude, please report it to the ballot table. Otherwise, you may not rate below a 20.

The debate was won by Clackamas (Team Code) representing Neg (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature _____ Judge's School Gresham

Topic: _____

Constructives: 8 min; Cross-Examinations: 3 min; Rebuttals: 5 min; Prep Time: 5 min

WRITE *THOROUGH* COMMENTS TO EACH DEBATER. GIVE REASONS WHY YOU VOTED FOR ONE SIDE. PLEASE STATE WHAT THE LOSING DEBATER NEEDED TO DO TO WIN.

Oral critiques are *not* allowed.

- Great balance between speed and clarity! Thanks for NOT spreading!
- Great Job for your first debate! They were a very daunting team to face as an introductory debate.
- Great Dead puppies turn in last rebuttal! = almost voted on this!
- Great composure ladies!

self-dehumanization? * use all your time though.

-Neg- Great Job overall. You guys are seasoned and good to go. However, Topicality was unnecessary. Even the defense of your "T" in CX was ridiculous since the AFF has the right to Fiat that their plan will pass. The arguments that your "T" was defending- politics DAs- attempt to undercut Fiat which is more abusive than AFF's plan.

Thanks for saving puppies!

(To Be 14" in Length)

~~Vemuri Ram~~ STEVEN TAYLOR CLACKAMAS

South DS vs Glencoe IP
Room: 406 Flight A: Start 8am
CX -- Rd 1

Tires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

Round _____ Room _____ Time _____ Judge _____

Affirmative Code South DS Negative Code GLENCOE IP

First Aff. CARSON	First Neg. KARISSA
Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 **(26)** 25 24 23 22 21 20	Circle Rating: 30 29 28 **(27)** 26 25 24 23 22 21 20
Superior ... Needs Improvement*	Superior ... Needs Improvement*
Second Aff. JESSICA	Second Neg. HALEY
Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 **(25)** 24 23 22 21 20	Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 **(26)** 25 24 23 22 21 20
Superior ... Needs Improvement*	Superior ... Needs Improvement*

*If one of the debaters was rude, please report it to the ballot table. Otherwise, you may not rate below a 20.

The debate was won by GLENCOE IP (Team Code) representing NEG (Aff or (Neg)). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature SIA Judge's School CLACKAMAS

Topic: TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

E/I = EVEN IF?

Constructives: 8 min; Cross-Examinations: 3 min; Rebuttals: 5 min; Prep Time: 5 min

WRITE *THOROUGH* COMMENTS TO EACH DEBATER. GIVE REASONS WHY YOU VOTED FOR ONE SIDE. PLEASE STATE WHAT THE LOSING DEBATER NEEDED TO DO TO WIN.

CARSON – RECOMMEND USING A HIGHER READING PLATFORM INSTEAD OF LOW DESK. IT WILL HELP W/ YOU BREATHING
- TRY TO USE ANOTHER TRANSITIONS BESIDES "NEXT CARD"
- SOME OF YOUR IAC ECON CARDS COULD BE CUT MORE TO ALL
- WORK ON TIMING YOU DID NOT REALLY GET ME ANY SOLVENCY ARGUMENTS DURING IAC
- WOULD HAVE LIKED SOME ANALYSIS BESIDES JUST
- CLEAR

Oral critiques are *not* allowed.

NEG CASE PRESENTATION SOUNDED MORE LIKE LD EVIDENCE PRESENTATION INSTEAD OF POLICY INFO WAS THERE BUT

KARISSA – [redacted] I NEED AUTHOR/YEAR/QUALIFICATIONS FOR EACH SOURCE SOURCE
- [redacted] TRY TO SIGN POST WHICH SPECIFIC ARGUMENT OR CARD YOU ARE COUNTERING WITH YOUR EVIDENCE
- GOOD OVERALL ANALYSIS
- IN CX I WANT TO HEAR THE "EVIDENCE" YOU ARE BUILDING YOUR CASE UPON, NOT JUST THE ANALYSIS IT WAS HARD TO TELL SIGNPOSTING HELPS
- CLEAR, EASY TO UNDERSTAND
- GOOD CX QUESTIONS BUILDING ON YOUR CASE

JESSICA – CARSON ALREADY READ ME A WARMING → EXTINCTION CARD YOUR CARD WAS NOT NEEDED
- RECOMMEND USING A PODIUM TO HOLD YOUR LAPTOP
- CLEAR DURING READING BUT MUMBLED DURING CX
- STILL NO REAL SOLVENCY CARDS READ DURING 2AC IAR IS TOO LATE TO BRING IN NEW ARGUMENTS

HALEY – JUST BECAUSE AIR MAY BE BETTER DOES THIS MEAN HSR SHOULD NOT BE ADDRESSED? UNLESS YOU GIVE ME A COUNTERPLAN I CAN STILL WEIGH HSR VS. STATUS QUO INSTEAD OF HSR VS AIR
- IT IS "OUR" CASE, NOT MY CASE. YOU ARE PART OF A TEAM
- CLEAR, EASY TO UNDERSTAND
- TRY TO WATCH NONVERBALS WHILE SPEAKING "WASHING HANDS"
- GOOD EYE CONTACT DURING FINAL SPEECH

BOTH TEAMS: RECOMMEND WATCHING A FINAL ROUND OF CX TO SEE EXAMPLES OF WHAT I MEAN ABOUT SIGNPOSTING AND ROADMAPS

AFF: E/I HSR DOES NOT DIRECTLY USE OIL, HOW IS THE ELECTRICITY GENERATED. DOESN'T THIS (IN MANY CASES) USE PETROLEUM PRODUCTS?. E/I THERE IS A ↓ IN CO_2 EMMISIONS DUE TO HSR WILL THIS SOLVE FOR GLOBAL WARMING. I HEARD CARD THAT GW CAN BE SOLVED BUT NO LINK (DIRECT) FOR THE SOLUTION

NEG: TRY TO PUT SOME "LINGO" INTO YOUR ANALYSIS. YOUR CASE REVOLVED AROUND NON-UNIQUE ASPECTS OF PLAN, NO SOLVENCY LINKS AND POTENTIAL ↑ HARMS

BOTH: BUILD ME A CASE X IS A HARM. [redacted] X HARM SHOULD BE SOLVED. PLAN CAN SOLVE FOR HARM (INHERENCY) GIVE ME SPECIFIC LINKS OR BREAK OPPONENT LINKS

(To Be 14" in Length)

Updated: 9/17/2012

RFD: NO SOLVENCY EVIDENCE FOR HSR SOLVING ECON. ONLY SOLVENCY CARD ON GLOBAL WARMING WAS ↓ EMMISIONS W/ NO ACTUAL LINK TO SOLVING GLOBAL WARMING ⇒ PLAN DOES NOT SOLVE + NEG POINTED OUT OTHER POTENTIAL HARMS W/ HSR THAT WERE NOT COUNTERED BY AFF: ⇒ SQ WINS

Pavlik John

Sam Barlow TG vs South KR
Room: 409 Flight A: Start 8am
CX – Rd 1

Tires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

Round _____ Room _____ Time _____ Judge _____

Affirmative Code _____ Negative Code _____

First Aff. _____ Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	First Neg. _____ Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*
Second Aff. _____ Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	Second Neg. _____ Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*

*If one of the debaters was rude, please report it to the ballot table. Otherwise, you may not rate below a 20.

The debate was won by _____ (Team Code) representing _____ (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature _____ Judge's School _____

Topic: _____

Constructives: 8 min; Cross-Examinations: 3 min; Rebuttals: 5 min; Prep Time: 5 min

WRITE *THOROUGH* COMMENTS TO EACH DEBATER. GIVE REASONS WHY YOU VOTED FOR ONE SIDE. PLEASE STATE WHAT THE LOSING DEBATER NEEDED TO DO TO WIN.

Oral critiques are *not* allowed.

aff win
neg loses

(To Be 14" in Length)