~~Smith Jeff~~ ANU KHAIRA

Glencoe DR vs Westview PC
Room: 405 Flight A: Start 10am
Open Parli -- Rd 2

OSAA/U.S. Bank/Les Schwab Tires State Championships: I

Round _____ Room _____ Time _____ Judge _____

Proposition Code Glencoe DR Opposition Code Western PC

First Prop. Gauri Gupta Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 **(28)** 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior — Needs Improvement*	First Opp. Junha Park Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 27 **(26)** 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior — Needs Improvement*
Second Prop. Anisha Kumar Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 **(28)** 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior — Needs Improvement*	Second Opp. Akash Chikkamane Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 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 Glencoe (Team Code) representing Prop (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature Ann N Khaira Judge's School Sunset High School

Topic: Resolved: Computers are more beneficial to education than books.

15 min. prep before debate begins.
1st Prop: 7 min; 1st Opp: 8 min; 2nd Prop: 8 min; 2nd Opp: 8 min; 1st Opp Rebuttal: 4 min; 1st Prop Rebuttal: 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.

Glencoe:
Gauri - Your contentions were clear and well thought out. The rebuttal was very well done. The only recommendation I have is that you perhaps slow down in the actual delivery of the speech a little since you had time left over.
Anisha :- I thought your speech was very well done as well, clear points, articulate, good examples. However, I would encourage you as well to speak a little slower with emphasis on certain points I think it would make you a powerful speaker.
Westview:
Junha - I liked your style of speaking - calm, sure of your points. You even brought some humor in your rebuttal at the end.
Akash : I thought you had great points and a well thought out argument. I think you spoke well but would recommend ~~practicing~~ putting in some passion, emphasis

(To Be 14" in Length)

Radon-Kimbal

Sherwood TB vs Sandy MK
Room: 210 Flight A: Start 10am
~~Open Parli -- Rd 2~~ 02

OSAA/U.S. Bank/Les Schwab Tires State Championships: Pa

Round 2 Room 210 Time 10:30 Judge Molly R-K

Proposition Code Sherwood TB Opposition Code Sandy MK

First Prop. Hao T.	First Opp. Olivia K.
Circle Rating (Ties allowed):	Circle Rating (Ties allowed):
30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20	30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20
Superior — Needs Improvement*	Superior — Needs Improvement*
Second Prop. Simon B.	Second Opp. James M.
Circle Rating (Ties allowed):	Circle Rating (Ties allowed):
30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20	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 Sherwood TB (Team Code) representing Aff (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature Molly Kimball Judge's School Cleveland

Topic: Resolved: computers > books 9 education

15 min. prep before debate begins.
1st Prop: 7 min; 1st Opp: 8 min; 2nd Prop: 8 min; 2nd Opp: 8 min; 1st Opp Rebuttal: 4 min; 1st Prop Rebuttal: 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 - great questioning you cut straight to the core, concisely. good organization; roadmap, etc. Careful with rhetorical questions. When you ask me something, make sure you answer it! "~~Rod~~ Does it matter?" "NO!" Great line-by line refutations! No drops on my flow. Don't be a dick in questions... You're smart, I get it, but let him speak!!! Some new points in last speech... urgh.

Neg: careful, you did not really debate the resolution. question them! Questions are a great way to plant a seed for an argument later. Don't get hung up on the details! 2nd: great job with their questions... Sorry! I know how debate works, but thanks ☺ Bring up voters. Reasons! Conclusions! Thank you!

RFD: Aff had a more organized, simple, logical, funny, and well-articulated case.

(To Be 14" in Length)

ctrl + F, Bongs, bombs, 69, Electronix.

Tan Peter

South SW vs Westview HB
Room: 214 Flight A: Start 10am
Open Parli – Rd 2

ıwab Tires State Championships: Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Round 2 Room 214 Time 11:39 Judge Peter Tan

Proposition Code South SW Opposition Code Westview HB

First Prop.	First Opp.
Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 **27** 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 (Superior … Needs Improvement*)	Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 27 **26** 25 24 23 22 21 20 (Superior … Needs Improvement*)
Second Prop.	**Second Opp.**
Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 27 **26** 25 24 23 22 21 20 (Superior … Needs Improvement*)	Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 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 SW (Team Code) representing prop (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature Peter Tan Judge's School Sherwood High School

Topic: This House would ban the promotion of diets

15 min. prep before debate begins.
1st Prop: 7 min; 1st Opp: 8 min; 2nd Prop: 8 min; 2nd Opp: 8 min; 1st Opp Rebuttal: 4 min; 1st Prop Rebuttal: 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.

prop# 1: speak clearly. well organized. I liked the idea to establish the definition of "diet" in the beginning; excellent job of rebuttal. effectively counter opposite argument

opp #1. good volume and clear speaking. eye contact. arguments were well organized some arguments used in the opposition constructive phase may be better used later in the rebuttal phase.

prop# 2: good jobs to extend the partner's augument. reaffirmed the "diet" definition.

opp# 2: excellant jobs to add more evidence to support partner's argument

Both team did excellent jobs. thank you!

I like the prop team ~~better~~ slightly better because they did better in the rebuttal to counter opposition arguments.

(To Be 14" in Length)

Amy Meade

Khaira Anu
Westview AS vs Cleveland SW
Room: 404 Flight A: Start 10am
Open Parli -- Rd 2

OSAA/U.S. Bank/Les Schwab Tires State Championships: Parli

Round 2 Room 404 Time _____ Judge _____

Proposition Code _____ Opposition Code _____

First Prop. WESTVIEW	First Opp. CLEVELAND
Circle Rating (Ties allowed):	Circle Rating (Ties allowed):
30 29 28 27 26 **(25)** 24 23 22 21 20	30 **(29)** 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20
Superior — Needs Improvement*	Superior — Needs Improvement*
Second Prop. WESTVIEW	**Second Opp.** CLEVELAND
Circle Rating (Ties allowed):	Circle Rating (Ties allowed):
30 29 28 27 **(26)** 25 24 23 22 21 20	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 Cleveland SW (Team Code) representing (Prop or **(Opp)**). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature Amy Meade Judge's School Wilson

Topic: US should ignore N Korean provocation

15 min. prep before debate begins.
1st Prop: 7 min; 1st Opp: 8 min; 2nd Prop: 8 min; 2nd Opp: 8 min; 1st Opp Rebuttal: 4 min; 1st Prop Rebuttal: 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.

Both teams had effective + substantive content + style – skillful thinkers + speakers! Neg. did a very impressive job marshalling analysis and evidence, tweaking definitions to their advantage ("ignore") and employing highly effective speaking skills. Both sides could have used questions for greater results, but all were fluid, articulate + clear – nice job! Neg wins because they presented compelling arguments based on logic, history + backed them up w/ specific, concrete support. Style tips: 1st aff needs to speak softer + slower (don't let yourself sound agitated or you lose some of your persuasiveness). Second aff. had great eye contact but struggled w/ pronouncing [prah vō kay shun] while 1st aff. said "new kyu lur" instead of "new klee er." Both neg speakers were cool + collected – well-done. Neg could consider emphasizing a needy conversational tone: "we have clearly shown that the US cannot and does not ignore N Korean provocation. Rather, we utilize their provocation to our own advantage ..." (tell the story)

Great debate, guys – very sophisticated work!

(To Be 14" in Length)

Sun Sam

Sandy WM vs Lincoln AS
Room: 212 Flight A: Start 10am
Open Parli -- Rd 2

res State Championships: Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Round 2 Room 212 Time 10:00 Judge Sam Sun

Proposition Code Sandy WM Opposition Code Lincoln AS

First Prop. Aidan Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 27 **(26)** 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior … Needs Improvement*	First Opp. Lukas Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 27 26 **(25)** 24 23 22 21 20 Superior … Needs Improvement*
Second Prop. Kaden Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 27 **(26)** 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior … Needs Improvement*	Second Opp. Carmen Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 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 Lincoln AS (Team Code) representing Opp (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature [signature] Judge's School Sunset HS

Topic: TH would ignore North Korean provocations

15 min. prep before debate begins.
1st Prop: 7 min; 1st Opp: 8 min; 2nd Prop: 8 min; 2nd Opp: 8 min; 1st Opp Rebuttal: 4 min; 1st Prop Rebuttal: 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.

GOV

Key: + = good point, − = weak point

General thoughts: You guys made some great points but there was also plenty of missed opportunities. For example, in the 1st speech you outlined a cost benefit analysis that would be judged based on the well being of North Korean citizens that was never mentioned again. Good catch on Neg's assertion that North Korea had bombed S.K. multiple times – expound on why N.K. is not a threat!

PM (1st spkr)
+ time use
try to avoid repeating yourself and avoid awkward pauses

MG (2nd spkr)
+ time use
UN is part of your plan so it's fair game

OPP

General thoughts: I wasn't quite convinced that there would be a slippery slope where either North Korea would cause nuclear war or that it would encourage other nations to pursue destabilizing programs of their own. When you go for such a dramatic criteria such as extinction, you need to clearly walk the judge step-by-step through your reasoning. There were holes in your argument such as why North Korea would reach a tipping point through US inaction. What is that point?

LO (1st spkr)
− time use: you had ~2 min after your 1st speech and 1:20 after your 2nd, since you speak faster than usual I thought you would speak more than you did.

MO (2nd spkr)
+ good clash, work on eye contact a bit. I liked that you took the prop's questions

(To Be 14pt in Length)

Final thoughts: Although global nuclear war may not happen, Neg demonstrated that a weak UN did not have the capability to contain North Korea under Prop's plan.

(Westview Judge) Susan Oh

Miller Thurma

Sam Barlow GH vs Wilson MM
Room: 206 Flight A: Start 10am
Open Parli -- Rd 2

OSAA/U.S. Bank/Les Schwab Tires State Championships: Parlia

Round _____ Room _____ Time _____ Judge _____

Proposition Code San Barlow Opposition Code Wilson

First Prop. Joshua Hevmans Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 (28) 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	First Opp. Chris Meake basterre Kea Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 (29) 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*
Second Prop. Niah Garfield Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 (28) 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	Second Opp. Libby Morgan-Stahus Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 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 Wilson MM (Team Code) representing Opposition (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature _____ Judge's School Westview

Topic: Computers are more beneficial to education than books.

15 min. prep before debate begins.
1st Prop: 7 min; 1st Opp: 8 min; 2nd Prop: 8 min; 2nd Opp: 8 min; 1st Opp Rebuttal: 4 min; 1st Prop Rebuttal: 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.

1st
1. books are tedious / hard to navigate
vocabulary difficult
2. computers → better for environment
books easily ruined / burned
3. way of the future
- biased.
- internet more accessible

Good presentation & good arguments
Clearly stated contentions

1st
1. reliability, computers are not regulated
hackable
shifting through more to get to scholarly articles
- information in books are lasting

2. health / environment
a. climate change affected by internet / electricity.
b. health
3. Apocalypse.
computers are not benevolent

Good point 1 & 2, but #3 a little shaky.
Good voice & stance.

(To Be 14" in Length)

2nd

- weighing mechanism.
- rebuttal of Neg's points valid

familiarity with computers necessary in the work force.

2nd

* Restates negation case - well done

Worldwide - access to books vs. internet

Environment impact = paper, tree planting

Good arguments

Good voice. don't stand behind the chair, stand beside or in front of chair

Good, convincing arguments

* Personal experiences backup argument.

1st speaker

- Refutes negation #3
- rebuttal of negation

Need to emphasize why computers are more beneficial absorbing new information

1st speaker.

* What helps education most, globally?
* countries limited access to internet, computer, electricity
* Good explanation of the burden of proof on affirmative.

Affirmation "threw away" the argument when allowing the debate to shift into the global education scene. Arguments on the negation side there on out became more convincing. (Although the Mayan contention was not sufficiently convincing.) The fact that a large population of the world have limited access to electricity, thus the internet, solidified the negation case.

the computer and

~~Lesterman Adal~~ Rahul

Sunset BB vs Westview VW
Room: 402 Flight A: Start 10am
Open Parli -- Rd 2

vab Tires State Championships: Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Round 2 Room 402 Time _____ Judge Rachel Wilczewski

Proposition Code Sunset BB Opposition Code Westview VW

First Prop. Rahul Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 27 **(26)** 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior … Needs Improvement*	First Opp. Reuben Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 **(27)** 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior … Needs Improvement*
Second Prop. Ryan Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 27 26 **(25)** 24 23 22 21 20 Superior … Needs Improvement*	Second Opp. Avi Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 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~~ Opposition (Team Code) representing Westview VW (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature Rachel K Wilczewski Judge's School Sam Barlow H.S.

Topic: _____

15 min. prep before debate begins.
1st Prop: 7 min; 1st Opp: 8 min; 2nd Prop: 8 min; 2nd Opp: 8 min; 1st Opp Rebuttal: 4 min; 1st Prop Rebuttal: 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.

Opposition:- Identify fact that Prop did not touch any of your opposition case. Supersize Me is not an advertisement promoting a diet program.

Proposition:- In 2AC, you did an admirable job w/ clarifying definitions and backing up your position. However, you didn't touch the Opposition's case. ~~You do this at the very end of the 2AC~~. → 1/AR: Very poised presentation. However, the way you [redacted] frame your voters, they come across as new arguments.

Opposition:- Clarification: [redacted] The prop. is [redacted] banning diet promotion, so they are not defending the status quo.

Proposition:- Lots of new arguments in 1AR. You do a great job clarifying your position.

RFD: I agree with the proposition's position; however, on the flow, the opposition clearly dominated the debate.

(To Be 14" in Length)

Meabe, Amy

Gresham KE vs Westview SG
Room: 208 Flight A: Start 10am
Open Parli -- Rd 2

OSAA/U.S. Bank/Les Schwab Tires State Championships: Pa

Round 2 Room 208 Time 10:30 Judge Elsie Praeger

Proposition Code Gresham KE Opposition Code Westview SG

First Prop. K	First Opp. Utsav Ghosh
Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 (Superior … Needs Improvement*)	Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 (Superior … Needs Improvement*)
Second Prop. E	**Second Opp.** Ian Shipper
Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 (Superior … Needs Improvement*)	Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 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 Westview SG (Team Code) representing Opp (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature Elsie Praeger Judge's School Unaffiliated

Topic: This house would ignore N.K. provocation

15 min. prep before debate begins.
1st Prop: 7 min; 1st Opp: 8 min; 2nd Prop: 8 min; 2nd Opp: 8 min; 1st Opp Rebuttal: 4 min; 1st Prop Rebuttal: 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.

opp had much better case
not much clash
Prop dropped all contentions
as if they were not here

Gresham forfeit

(To Be 14" in Length)

Watkins, John ~~Ellis Curry So~~

South BS vs Lincoln HP
Room: 204 Flight A: Start 10am
Open Parli -- Rd 2

OSAA/U.S. Bank/Les Schwab Tires State Championships:

Round 2 Room ~~[illegible]~~ 204 Time 10:00 Judge John Watkins

Proposition Code South BS Opposition Code Lincoln HP

First Prop. Alec B.	First Opp. Emma H.
Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 (28) 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 — Superior … Needs Improvement*	Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 (28) 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 — Superior … Needs Improvement*
Second Prop. Danielle S.	Second Opp. Alejandra P.
Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 (27) 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 — Superior … Needs Improvement*	Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 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 Lincoln HP (Team Code) representing (Prop or (Opp)) Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature John Watkins Judge's School Glencoe

Topic: Computers vs Books

15 min. prep before debate begins.
1st Prop: 7 min; 1st Opp: 8 min; 2nd Prop: 8 min; 2nd Opp: 8 min; 1st Opp Rebuttal: 4 min; 1st Prop Rebuttal: 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.

- A Plan text was so unnecessary for this topic, you could claim a lot of the benefits without all the burdens of a plan.
- Who are these people who don't have access to classical literature?
- Your definition of computers was a little out-dated.
- I don't know if you can be for education and want to throw out classical literature.
- It matters a little what the government spends money on.
- Benefits do count but the Prop plan has to relate to the topic or explain why it doesn't, or the Opp has to agree to talk about the props choices.

RFD: Prop dropped a lot of points and also seemed one sided in their analysis. Opp just did a better job covering the flow and persuading me working Aff would not be beneficial.

(To Be 14" in Length)

Caswell, Eliza

Lincoln LS vs Sandy HR
Room: 107 Flight A: Start 10 am
Novice Parli -- Rd 2

Schwab Tires State Championships: Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Round 2 Room 107 Time 10 am Judge Elizabeth Caswell

Proposition Code Lincoln SL Opposition Code SH-HR

First Prop. Miles Stepleton	First Opp. Kylie Hoang
Circle Rating (Ties allowed):	Circle Rating (Ties allowed):
30 29 **28** 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20	30 29 28 27 26 25 **24** 23 22 21 20
Superior — Needs Improvement*	Superior — Needs Improvement*
Second Prop. Daniel Cavenaugh	**Second Opp. Grace Ramstad**
Circle Rating (Ties allowed):	Circle Rating (Ties allowed):
30 29 **28** 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20	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 Lincoln SL (Team Code) representing Prop (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature William A Caswell Judge's School Westview

Topic: Computers are more beneficial to education than books

15 min. prep before debate begins.
1st Prop: 7 min; 1st Opp: 8 min; 2nd Prop: 8 min; 2nd Opp: 8 min; 1st Opp Rebuttal: 4 min; 1st Prop Rebuttal: 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.

Prop 1

Good -
Clear definitions
Recency
Explains importance - how cover
3rd will test scores
Good use of time

Needs work - unsubstantiated
Price does not influence education
Children will know unreliable sources
History of Rome - not good example

Prop 2 -

Good
Good refutation on hardcover cost
Good refutation on hacking websites reliable websites
Good use of time
Unsubstantiated
After people don't need new info?
Easy to teach computers Not always.

Opp 1

Good - Can set off to SL
Inappropriate Content argument - good

Needs work -
You left too much time unused
Not take home a laptop?
Cost of books inaccurate

Opp 2

Good - Library use
Quadratic formula stays same
Cost of computer maintenance
Listing of fiction books

Needs work
Left too much time unused
Did not refute on cost of books

(To Be 14" in Length)

Van Baalen Jac

Lincoln KW vs Wilson SC
Room: 105 Flight A: Start 10 am
Novice Parli -- Rd 2

ichwab Tires State Championships: Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Round _____ Room _____ Time _____ Judge _____

Proposition Code Lincoln KW Opposition Code Wilson SC

First Prop. Leo Wilson	First Opp. Ed Edward
Circle Rating (Ties allowed):	Circle Rating (Ties allowed):
30 29 28 27 26 **(25)** 24 23 22 21 20	30 29 28 27 **(26)** 25 24 23 22 21 20
Superior ... Needs Improvement*	Superior ... Needs Improvement*
Second Prop. Kimberly	**Second Opp.** DeVan
Circle Rating (Ties allowed):	Circle Rating (Ties allowed):
30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 **(22)** 21 20	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 Wilson SC (Team Code) representing Opp (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature _____ Judge's School Sandy

Topic: Ignore North Korea

15 min. prep before debate begins.
1st Prop: 7 min; 1st Opp: 8 min; 2nd Prop: 8 min; 2nd Opp: 8 min; 1st Opp Rebuttal: 4 min; 1st Prop Rebuttal: 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.

I ended up giving this debate to the Neg because I heard more substantive evidence about reason why NK was a threat than why they aren't. Also, I didn't have any reason to believe that China would fall on their sword and launch nukes on behalf of NK. It really came down to why was NK a threat and Aff failed to uphold their burden of proving NK was a threat — more evidence ~~could~~ may have tipped the scale

(To Be 14" in Length)

Habecker, Trac

Lincoln ZH vs Clackams EB
Room: 109 Flight A: Start 10 am
Novice Parli -- Rd 2

chwab Tires State Championships: Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Round _____ Room _____ Time _____ Judge _____

Proposition Code Lincoln ZH Opposition Code Clackamas EB

First Prop. Zahra Hannan - don't ever admit you made a mistake	First Opp. Vicky Bachinsky - good demeanor + hand gestures
Circle Rating (Ties allowed):	Circle Rating (Ties allowed):
30 29 28 27 26 (25) 24 23 22 21 20	30 29 28 27 (26) 25 24 23 22 21 20
Superior Needs Improvement*	Superior Needs Improvement*
Second Prop. Danielle Zusman - work on eye contact	**Second Opp.** Edwin Fletcher - stay focused; avoid excessive anecdotes
Circle Rating (Ties allowed):	Circle Rating (Ties allowed):
30 29 28 27 26 (25) 24 23 22 21 20	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 Clackamas EB (Team Code) representing Opp. (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature Tracy M Habecker Judge's School South Eugene High School

Topic: _____

15 min. prep before debate begins.
1st Prop: 7 min; 1st Opp: 8 min; 2nd Prop: 8 min; 2nd Opp: 8 min; 1st Opp Rebuttal: 4 min; 1st Prop Rebuttal: 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.

Zahra and Danielle: ultimately it was your failure to clearly define "diets" or "harmful diets" that caused me to vote for the opp. Because I did not know what sort of diet was being promoted, I could not clearly identify a causal link between the idea of diets being promoted and the harmful image effects you identified. your strongest point invalidating the opp. was when you stated that diet promotion is not currently banned but we still have not solved for obesity. If you had articulated what you meant by harmful diets you would have strengthened your case.

Vicky and Edwin: you quickly capitalized on the aff's failure to define "diets." Then, you proposed your own definition and stressed the role of exercise as part of your definition. Diet and exercise are really 2 separate things, but I accepted your definition because the aff. did not supply their own definition or challenge yours. As the aff. pointed out, you did bring up some irrelevant points, but your argument about the potential helpfulness of PSA's in reducing obesity was compelling.

(To Be 14" in Length)