

Tires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

AX-Westview BL vs AX-Westview WS
 Room: 27 Start: 4pm
 Novice CX -- Rd 3

Time Judge Samaica Jones

<p>Affirmative Code <u>AX - Westview BL</u></p> <p>First Aff. <u>Sim Lo</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Circle Rating:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Superior Needs Improvement*</p>	<p>Negative Code <u>AX - Westview WS</u></p> <p>First Neg. <u>Pranay</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Circle Rating:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Superior Needs Improvement*</p>
<p>Second Aff. <u>Maya</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Circle Rating:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Superior Needs Improvement*</p>	<p>Second Neg. <u>Austin</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Circle Rating:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Superior Needs Improvement*</p>

*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 APP (Team Code) representing Westview BL (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win.

Judge's Signature [Signature] Judge's School [Signature]

Topic: [Signature]

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

You guys are awesome and CX is awesome - stick with it!

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.

- 1AC: Instead of saying "next" - signpost - so I know where to flow your args; label. I.e. Solvency 1, 2, 3, etc.
- 1NC: Get some pre-prepped strats so you don't have to use prep time. Umm... signpost. Where is the signposting? I didn't even get a roadmap. 2 minutes in, and I don't even know what kind of offense this is. Make on case arguments! Don't drop case. When you run T, tell me why a violation of the resolution is abusive. Voters!
- 2AC: Good job going straight for the line by line. But please for the love of God, signpost. When you say "their args go for our case" - they are turns - impact turns! You need more args on the DA. Good job extending args. Yay
- 2NC: Roadmap? Extend your DA arguments; they are pretty much dropped. Signpost - for example - where am I flowing these econ arguments?
- 1NR: Roadmap? You don't need to reread the definitions. Do a line by line refutation - otherwise there is no clash. weigh mpx? Signpost - please please
- 1AR: when you say "their definition goes with us" - ~~we~~ you mean "we meet" signpost? Roadmap? Good job extending args - more of that! Impact calculus! All the concurrences are turns!
- 2NR: No new definitions/cards in the last speech - I won't flow it. ~~From~~ Voters! **(To Be 14" in Length)** Good job saying they dropped args - but tell me why that wins the debate.
- 2AR: Yay - roadmap! You win T - you don't need to spend more than 30 seconds on it. Mpx!

AX-Westview SZ vs AX-Westview KB
 Room: 28 Start: 4pm
 Novice CX -- Rd 3

High School State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

Time 4pm Judge Marlaine Isbell

Affirmative Code Westview SZ

Negative Code Westview KB

<p>First Aff. <u>Arushi Singhal</u></p> <p>Circle Rating:</p> <p>30 29 <u>28</u> 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p>Superior Needs Improvement*</p>	<p>First Neg. <u>Vha Vya Vikshi</u></p> <p>Circle Rating:</p> <p>30 29 28 27 <u>26</u> 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p>Superior Needs Improvement*</p>
<p>Second Aff. <u>Elaine Zheng</u></p> <p>Circle Rating:</p> <p>30 <u>29</u> 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p>Superior Needs Improvement*</p>	<p>Second Neg. <u>Emory Kim</u></p> <p>Circle Rating:</p> <p>30 29 28 27 26 <u>25</u> 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p>Superior Needs Improvement*</p>

*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 Westview SZ (Team Code) representing AFF (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win.

Judge's Signature Marlaine Isbell Judge's School Lincoln

Topic: USFG should require warrants for drone surveillance.

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.

The argument about legal resources to obtain warrants should be addressed sooner.

Arushi - Good job! Keep working on your case, your arguments are strong on the uniqueness level but lack an explanation of impacts. You ran out of time on Advantage 2. Good use repeating that "eye and the sky" phrase through round.


Vha Vya - Good speech. The DA needs to be built up more, especially without a counter plan. Make sure that your arguments fit your opponents case, case did not address the "surveillance" ^{newse}. Round summary was good but ^{arguments} were made too late.

Elaine - Great job, try to avoid coaching your partner during her speeches because it is distracting. Great questions during CX. Structural racism argument was well made ^{work on speech organization}.

Emory - During the first CX you make an argument about surveillance of police, there was no "CP" so their evidence of how they are presently used outweighs. Make sure you are familiar with your cards, know how to pronounce the words & what they mean. ^{Very good overall!}

RFD - This debate came down to rather or not there was any chance of the AFF solving because there was no CP presented. The terrorism PA doesn't interact with the AFF case but just drone use in general. AFF was targeted surveillance with warrants prevents gov. oppression/protects privacy.

(To Be 14" in Length)



Room: 133 Start: 4pm
Open CX -- Rd 3

Time _____

Judge Julie Siewert

Affirmative Code

Negative Code

First Aff. <u>Quinn Samouilidis</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 <u>(27)</u> 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	First Neg. <u>Jon Meinhardt</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 <u>(26)</u> 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*
Second Aff. <u>Mathias Knight</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 <u>(27)</u> 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	Second Neg. <u>Jadon Schmitt</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 <u>(26)</u> 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 AE (Team Code) representing Aff (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win.

Judge's Signature Julie Siewert Judge's School Westview

Topic: the U.S. Federal Government should substantially curtail its domestic surveillance.

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.

Quinn-You need to benchmark better. Since your 1st Aff was not benchmarked the rest of the debate was disorganized and hard to flow. Good eye contact. Thank you for listening to my request to speak slowly enough that I could flow. In fact all four of you listened!


Mathias-You need to better explain your ideas. You would make a statement but not explain it. An example would be "safety of people-capital 13." I know you're referring to a card but I don't remember every card read. You did cover all of the 1st Neg attacks.

Jon-You had good ideas to explain why the aff plan wouldn't work but lacked evidence. You need evidence to show data mining keeps us safe. You had some very logical arguments but need to support those with evidence. You started your rebuttal with "so-um" and never looked at me during the rebuttal. Debate is communication!

Jadon-You started your 2nd neg speech with "First I'm going to read evidence." You need to benchmark for me and tell me where to apply your evidence. You also need to have eye contact with the judge. You summarized the debate well in your rebuttal.

Reason For Decision - The Aff wins the debate since the negative had no evidence to show that data mining keeps us safe. the reduced risks of war also flowed to the affirmative. This was a very close debate!

(To Be 14" in Length)



AM-Lake Oswego SG vs AD-Clackamas LI Tires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

Room: 29 Start: 4pm
Open CX -- Rd 3

Time _____

Judge Travis Root

Affirmative Code Lake Oswego SG

Negative Code Clackamas LL

First Aff. <u>Radwika S.</u> Circle Rating: Superior 30 29 28 27 <u>26</u> 25 24 23 22 21 20 Needs Improvement*	First Neg. <u>Kacie L.</u> Circle Rating: Superior 30 29 28 27 26 25 24 <u>23</u> 22 21 20 Needs Improvement*
Second Aff. <u>Sarah Jane G.</u> Circle Rating: Superior 30 29 28 27 <u>26</u> 25 24 23 22 21 20 Needs Improvement*	Second Neg. <u>Johnathan L.</u> Circle Rating: Superior <u>30</u> 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 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 LL (Team Code) representing 4 Neg (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win.

Judge's Signature J. Root

Judge's School La Salle Prep

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 Overall well done. I like the ease you made. It might behoove you to slow down slightly. Clear means speak clear. Not speak clear and then speed again.

1N Good use of witherson. I think that you need to speak up more and not let your partner speak for you. That all comes with experience.

2A Work on extending the important Aff arguments and try and cover Neg as much as possible via line by line so you don't miss anything. But nice speed and good analysis.

2N Very strong. I think you make good refutations and know the right arguments to make. Keep explanations during cross brief, cuz things got fairly repetitive.

(To Be 14" in Length)

3:30 left Ngp → 2:40 left → 2:30 left
12:22 left AH → 1:30 left

Tires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

Time _____ Judge Lowe

Affirmative Code GL

Negative Code LJ

First Aff. Cal

Circle Rating:

30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20

Superior Needs Improvement*

First Neg. Alex

Circle Rating:

30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20

Superior Needs Improvement*

Second Aff. Gabriel

Circle Rating:

30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20

Superior Needs Improvement*

Second Neg. Laura

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 LJ (Team Code) representing Neg (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win.

Judge's Signature Eric Lowe

Judge's School Wilson

Topic: Heg- \$

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.

RFD: I don't know who neg is!

Lol.

all kidding aside, Aff needs to read a solvency arg. against the presidential XO CP. Also, 3/4 DA's like to the CP too.

(To Be 14" in Length)

