Mills, Greg

Sunset PL vs Westview CP
Room: 505 Flight A: Start 12:30
Open PF -- Rd 3

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

Round 3 Room 505 Time 12:45 Judge _____

TEAMS: _____

Judges: Mark team codes as Proposition and Opposition on ballot after flip for sides.

Proposition Code Sunset PL Opposition Code Westview CP

First Prop. Gauton Pacanjape	First Opp. Rushil Patel
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. Jared Lin	Second Opp. Cheng Chen
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 W CP (Team Code) representing Opposition (Prop or (Opp)) Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature G Mills Judge's School U of O

Topic: _____ NASA 1.58

Prop 1st Speaker: 4 min	Prop 2nd Speaker: 4 min	Prop Summary: 2 min	Prop Final Focus: 2 min
Opp 1st Speaker: 4 min	Opp 2nd Speaker: 4 min	Opp Summary: 2 min	Opp Final Focus: 2 min
Crossfire: 3 min	Crossfire: 3 min	Grand Crossfire: 3 min	PREP TIME: 2 min per team

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.

~~28~~ 57

I agree that we can make military spending cuts and that the resolution does not have to pertain to the Ryan Plan. I like the negs points on wasteful spending (4th biggest spender on education, but terrible at educating, or wasteful healthcare spending).

AFF should have talked more about the damages and fallacies surrounding tax cuts, and less time defending spending. Gov. is notorious at wasteful spending (i.e. bridge to nowhere) so I wouldn't defend that as much. Personally, I agree with the Resolutions, however, this round I side with the opposition.

(To Be 14" in Length)

Chikarmane Vi

Glencoe LH vs Cleveland CS
Room: 510 Flight A: Start 12:30
Open PF -- Rd 3

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

Round 3 Room 203 Time 12:30 Judge _____

TEAMS: GLENCOE LH VS CLEVELAND CS

Judges: Mark team codes as Proposition and Opposition on ballot after flip for sides.

Proposition Code GLENCOE LH Opposition Code CLEVELAND CS

First Prop.	First Opp.
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.	**Second Opp.**
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 CS (Team Code) representing Opp (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature Uniaj Chkarmane Judge's School WESTVIEW HS

Topic: RESOLVED THE US SHOULD PRIORITIZE TAX INCREASES OVER SPENDING CUTS

Prop 1st Speaker: 4 min ✓ Prop 2nd Speaker: 4 min ✓ Prop Summary: 2 min ✓ Prop Final Focus: 2 min ✓
Opp 1st Speaker: 4 min ✓ Opp 2nd Speaker: 4 min ✓ Opp Summary: 2 min ✓ Opp Final Focus: 2 min ✓
Crossfire: 3 min ✓ Crossfire: 3 min ✓ Grand Crossfire: 3 min ✓ PREP TIME: 2 min per team

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 1st spkr presentation was read verbatim from written text. Always better to have the written text but speak fluently while looking only part of the time at the text. also did not give clear examples of how tax increases benefits the economy. Could have refuted the ~~[illegible]~~ argument to cut defense

Opp 1st spkr was clear about wasteful spending (22% of the fed. spending) gave the example of defence – huge spending even though we don't have a direct threats. Should or could have given more examples

Prop 2nd spkr was not clear in delivering argument that tax increases were needed – why? could have mentioned that spending on infrastructure (roads, prks, bridges etc) are important. Again did not supply any examples or why or rather where the revenue is spent. Did not provide a ceiling on tax increases – how much taxes is enough?

Opp 2nd spkr was assertive, made eye contact with the opponents & judge. Fluent & spoke with conviction. Reiterated that the Prop has not given any examples of where tax are not spent. Gave examples of defence, wasteful Medicare spending etc.

(To Be 14" in Length)

OSAA/U.S. Bank/Les Schwab Tires State Championships: Public Forum Debate Ballot

Round _____ Room _____ Time 1:30 PM Judge Santosh Bhatt

TEAMS: Glencoe & Sunset.

Judges: Mark team codes as Proposition and Opposition on ballot after flip for sides.

Proposition Code Glencoe PA Opposition Code Sunset HL

First Prop. Glencoe	First Opp. Sunset.
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. Glencoe	**Second Opp.** Sunset.
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 Glencoe (Team Code) representing Prop. (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature SBhatt Judge's School West View.

Topic: Increase ~~tax~~ tax rate over Spending Cut.

Prop 1st Speaker: 4 min	Prop 2nd Speaker: 4 min	Prop Summary: 2 min	Prop Final Focus: 2 min
Opp 1st Speaker: 4 min	Opp 2nd Speaker: 4 min	Opp Summary: 2 min	Opp Final Focus: 2 min
Crossfire: 3 min	Crossfire: 3 min	Grand Crossfire: 3 min	PREP TIME: 2 min per team

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 did perform well during debate

→ However, Glencoe team's ~~or~~ crossfire skills were much better. They were able to argue their case much better.

→ My advice to Sunset team is to speak confidently and don't deviate from your original point.

(To Be 14" in Length)

Habecker, Trac

Sunset SS vs Ridgefield QH
Room: 107 Flight A: Start 12:30
Novice Public Forum -- Rd 3

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

Round _____ Room _____ Time _____ Judge _____

TEAMS: Sunset Ridgefield

Judges: Mark team codes as Proposition and Opposition on ballot after flip for sides.

Proposition Code SS Opposition Code QH

First Prop. Tara Sengupta	First Opp. Isaac Quim
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. Lori Sun	Second Opp. Christian Harrington
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 SS (Team Code) representing _____ (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature [signature] Judge's School South Eugene High School.

Topic: _____

Prop 1st Speaker: 4 min	Prop 2nd Speaker: 4 min	Prop Summary: 2 min	Prop Final Focus: 2 min
Opp 1st Speaker: 4 min	Opp 2nd Speaker: 4 min	Opp Summary: 2 min	Opp Final Focus: 2 min
Crossfire: 3 min	Crossfire: 3 min	Grand Crossfire: 3 min	PREP TIME: 2 min per team

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.

Tara and Lori, I voted for your side for the following reasons. (1) you demonstrated that the need for government programs that assist the poor, sick and elderly is increasing. (2.) you argued that seniors who have paid into programs have earned their benefits. (3) you refuted the other team's point that spending cuts would prevent the U.S. from "falling" into an economic situation resembling Greece's (because Greece did implement austerity measures and they made things worse). (4) you challenged the other team's logic around efficiency.

Christian and Isaac, this round was very close. However, you contradicted a few of your own contentions, which the other team pointed out. you argued that a great deal could be cut from programs like Medicare and social security, but repeated the statement that the office of Budget + Management has said they won't allow cuts to these vital programs. you did not provide any examples of how to prevent fraud, thus ascertaining benefits would remain unchanged. To win, you need some examples to back up your statistics + statements.

(To Be 14" in Length)

Garcia, Gus

~~Van Baalen Jac~~

Sunset LC vs Ridgefield AT
Room: 111 Flight A: Start 12:30
Novice Public Forum -- Rd 3

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

Round 3 Room 111 Time _____ Judge Gus Garcia

TEAMS: _____

Judges: Mark team codes as Proposition and Opposition on ballot after flip for sides.

Proposition Code Sunset LC Opposition Code Ridgefield AT

First Prop. Dominique L.	First Opp. Jackson T.
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. ~~Elise~~ Elise C.	Second Opp. Jacob A.
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 Sunset LC (Team Code) representing Aff. (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win ☐

Judge's Signature Judges Andrea Judge's School Clarkland H.S.

Topic: Tax increases v. Spending cuts

Prop 1st Speaker: 4 min	Prop 2nd Speaker: 4 min	Prop Summary: 2 min	Prop Final Focus: 2 min
Opp 1st Speaker: 4 min	Opp 2nd Speaker: 4 min	Opp Summary: 2 min	Opp Final Focus: 2 min
Crossfire: 3 min	Crossfire: 3 min	Grand Crossfire: 3 min	PREP TIME: 2 min per team

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.

Neg.

Jackson • Make sure to explain why the fiscal cliff is a bigger problem than Aff. • Don't cite about econ, cite the economists name • Rudeness does not really matter as a voting issue. I also disagree that Aff won rude, but I see your point.

Jacob • Most of your time in the refutation speech should be on your opponents case, instead of extending your own. Rebuilding my is fine, if you are speaking second.

Aff.

Dominique • Contentions 2 & 3 could be collapsed into one contention (social services) • Why are education, unemployment, etc. the sectors that will be cut • Don't refute during summary.

Elise • definitions are generally rebutted in the constructive, to ensure clarity. • Make sure to rebuild your own case after your opponents' refutations.

(To Be 14" in Length)

RFD →

Finding effective sources:

Google [site:.gov <your query>]

Gov't sources are generally better than about.com

Both teams:

* Both sides assume exactly how/where tax increases and/or spending cuts will be made but do not give warrant for why that is how/where these penalties will occur actions
* ~~No~~ Both teams would benefit from examples beyond the Clinton era.
* Neither side really talked about the efficacy of tax increases vs. spending cuts. This is a large issue

---

RFD: Aff.'s case was the only case that discussed the efficacy of tax cuts v. spending cuts. Aff gave empirical evidence that tax cuts have been effective, which was only really discussed by neg during refutation.

Additionally, neg's case was confusing. The point on the fiscal cliff was never really explained, which meant that neg had little context to vote on.

Gus Garcia

~~Van Baalen Jac~~

Sunset LP vs Sunset CC
Room: 111 Flight B: Start
Novice Public Forum -- Rd 3

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

Round 3 Room 111 Time _____ Judge Gus Garcia

TEAMS: _____

Judges: Mark team codes as Proposition and Opposition on ballot after flip for sides.

Proposition Code Sunset CC Opposition Code Sunset LP

First Prop. Ayush C.	First Opp. Freddie N.
Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 27 (26) 25 24 23 22 21 20	Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 (28) 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20
Superior ... Needs Improvement*	Superior ... Needs Improvement*
Second Prop. Gavin K.	Second Opp. Aden L.
Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 (27) 26 25 24 23 22 21 20	Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 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 Sunset LP (Team Code) representing NEG (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature [signature] Judge's School Cleveland H.S.

Topic: Tax increases (cuts) v. Spending

Prop 1st Speaker: 4 min	Prop 2nd Speaker: 4 min	Prop Summary: 2 min	Prop Final Focus: 2 min
Opp 1st Speaker: 4 min	Opp 2nd Speaker: 4 min	Opp Summary: 2 min	Opp Final Focus: 2 min
Crossfire: 3 min	Crossfire: 3 min	Grand Crossfire: 3 min	PREP TIME: 2 min per team

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.

NEG

Freddie
- please give definitions at the start of your constructive.
- What are the useless programs?

AFF

Ayush
- "Classes of 30 students" is not a great impact. chose a more effective example

Aden
That is not quite what the Fiscal Cliff is...

Gavin
- Good Final focus speech, you actually give good analysis, instead of just repeating key lines

(To Be 14" in Length)

See reverse

Both Teams

* Refutation speeches should be more thorough.

The following contentions were dropped:

Aff

* Taxes as main revenue source (cont. 1)

Neg

* Rewarding hard work (Contention #02)
* Affordable healthcare (Contention #03)

* Neither side really discussed the eff. cost of tax increases vs. spending cuts.

* Summary speeches and final focus speeches should analyse instead of simply reiterating contentions

Good voting issues:

- Burden of proof
- Dropped contentions
- Topicality
- Historical precedent
- Cost-benefit analysis
- No links

Bad voting issues

- Repeating the same taglines used in the constructives

RFD: ~~Neg won this round for two reasons.~~

Neither side convinced me that one method of helping the U.S. economy was ~~better~~ more effective than the other. However, neg convinced me that spending cuts would be a more fair solution via cutting defense spending.

Rangel Heidi

Sunset KK vs Westview CO
Room: 506 Flight A: Start 12:30
Open PF -- Rd 3

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

Round 3 Room 506 Time _____ Judge Heidi
TEAMS: Heidi Rangel

Judges: Mark team codes as Proposition and Opposition on ballot after flip for sides.

Proposition Code Sunset KK Opposition Code Westview CO

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

Judge's Signature Heidi Rangel Judge's School Sam Barlow

Topic: Tax ↑ > Spending Cuts

Prop 1st Speaker: 4 min	Prop 2nd Speaker: 4 min	Prop Summary: 2 min	Prop Final Focus: 2 min
Opp 1st Speaker: 4 min	Opp 2nd Speaker: 4 min	Opp Summary: 2 min	Opp Final Focus: 2 min
Crossfire: 3 min	Crossfire: 3 min	Grand Crossfire: 3 min	PREP TIME: 2 min per team

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.

Neg states in second cotention that efficiency is their important emphasis in considering recovering the economy as the aff states the round should be weighed on a consideration of the best method to reduce U.S. debt.

- Aff notes - tax cuts move quickly passed in Congress
  - that cuts alone (especially in regards to excess spending) is simply not enough to be considered efficient
    - Should have extrapolated throughout every speech how spending cuts actually worsen the economy, but the ev was in fact lightly moved ~~theross~~ the flow without real rebuttal

(Especially in voter)

Neg is making a lot of general claims in this debate, arguments that falter under the weight of some kind of evidence based analysis put forth by the Aff.

(To Be 14" in Length)

Rangel Heidi

Ridgefield H.S. TP vs Westview AA
Room: 506 Flight B: Start
Open PF -- Rd 3

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

Round 3 Room 506 Time _____ Judge _____

TEAMS: _____ Heidi Rangel

Judges: Mark team codes as Proposition and Opposition on ballot after flip for sides.

Proposition Code Westview AA Opposition Code Ridgefield H.S. TP

First Prop. Vineet	First Opp. Zach
Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 (29) 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20	Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 (29) 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20
Superior ... Needs Improvement*	Superior ... Needs Improvement*
Second Prop. Shyan	Second Opp. Robert
Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 (29) 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20	Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 (29) 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20
Superior ... Needs Improvement*	Superior ... Needs Improvement*

29.5 29.5 1:00 29.5

*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 Ridgefield H.S. TP (Team Code) representing Opp (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win ☐

Judge's Signature [signature] Judge's School Sam Barlow

Topic: Tax ↑ > Spending Cuts

Prop 1st Speaker: 4 min	Prop 2nd Speaker: 4 min	Prop Summary: 2 min	Prop Final Focus: 2 min
Opp 1st Speaker: 4 min	Opp 2nd Speaker: 4 min	Opp Summary: 2 min	Opp Final Focus: 2 min
Crossfire: 3 min	Crossfire: 3 min	Grand Crossfire: 3 min	PREP TIME: 2 min per team

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 am admittedly initially torn on the tactic of the Aff to narrow the definition of what constitutes the perameters of a tax increase in the round. Ultimately, I acknowledge the lack of footing Aff is provided in the generic wording of the res.; Neg met this challenge admirably. Neg cites evidence that states it is unreasonable to increase taxes on the 1% because of historically noted ramifications of decreased investment as well as jobs, extending by noting longer recessions have resulted from such an implementation, but aff really outlines spending cuts slowing economic effect in loss of public sector jobs, consequently harming the private sector occupation sustainability as well. The tax evasion debate ~~was~~ was pursued by Neg in offense, stating billion(s) dollar losses, linking this also to ~~[illegible]~~ lack of real revenue garnered, ~~the~~ and the aff's response seems inadequate ~~as~~ a "brushing-off" of the argument noting cap retainer ~~ph~~ phenomenon allegedly rendering the tax evasion/off shore account arg invalid... I don't buy it. I think neg puts the best offense on the flow, protects the minimal loss of cutting spending, and most completely won their advocacy in light of the res. interpretation, on both sides.

(To Be 14" in Length)

[redacted]

Tan Peter
Glencoe HC vs Westview KB
Room: 504 Flight A: Start 12:30
Open PF -- Rd 3

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

Round _____ Room _____ Time _____ Judge [redacted]

TEAMS: _____

Judges: Mark team codes as Proposition and Opposition on ballot after flip for sides.

Proposition Code Glencoe HC Opposition Code Westview KB

First Prop. Hampus Hammarlund Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 **(27)** 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior … Needs Improvement*	First Opp. Nimisha Kapur Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 27 **(26)** 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior … Needs Improvement*
Second Prop. Lorena Colcer Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 **(27)** 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior … Needs Improvement*	Second Opp. Sai Bandi 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 HC (Team Code) representing Prop (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

Judge's Signature [redacted] Judge's School Sherwood High School

Topic: United States should prioritize tax over spending cut

Prop 1st Speaker: 4 min
Opp 1st Speaker: 4 min
Crossfire: 3 min

Prop 2nd Speaker: 4 min
Opp 2nd Speaker: 4 min
Crossfire: 3 min

Prop Summary: 2 min
Opp Summary: 2 min
Grand Crossfire: 3 min

Prop Final Focus: 2 min
Opp Final Focus: 2 min
PREP TIME: 2 min per team

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: Well written case. speak clearly

Prop#2: extended partner's argumet well. good conclusion with "aggregated" demand

opp#1: well written case. could be better if made more effective crossfire.

opp#2: well organized. used a good analogy.

Both team well prepared. Prop team was siglitly better during the crossfire and emphasized the "proritize" point.

(To Be 14" in Length)

Tan Peter
Westview LL vs Ione DH
Room: 504 Flight B: Start
Open PF -- Rd 3

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

Round _____ Room _____ Time _____ Judge _____

TEAMS: _____

Judges: Mark team codes as Proposition and Opposition on ballot after flip for sides.

Proposition Code Westview LL Opposition Code Ione DH

First Prop. Candace La Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 **(27)** 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior … Needs Improvement*	First Opp. Joe Doherty Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 27 26 **(25)** 24 23 22 21 20 Superior … Needs Improvement*
Second Prop. Janet Lee Circle Rating (Ties allowed): 30 29 28 **(27)** 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior … Needs Improvement*	Second Opp. Daniel Holtz 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 LL (Team Code) representing Prop (Prop or Opp). Check if Low Point win. ☐

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

Topic: United States Shuld Prioritize Spending Cut over Tax

Prop 1st Speaker: 4 min
Opp 1st Speaker: 4 min
Crossfire: 3 min

Prop 2nd Speaker: 4 min
Opp 2nd Speaker: 4 min
Crossfire: 3 min

Prop Summary: 2 min
Opp Summary: 2 min
Grand Crossfire: 3 min

Prop Final Focus: 2 min
Opp Final Focus: 2 min
PREP TIME: 2 min per team

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: well written case, speak clearly. good jobs in crossfire questioning. would be better if provided stronger argument in summary.

prop#2: good eye contact, effectively counter-opposition arguments. against good crossfire questioning.

opp#1: well organization. would be better to have eye contact. could add more argument/evidences as there was >2 min time left.

opp#2: speak clearly ~~—~~ effectively eye contact. had good questions in crossfire.

Both teams did good jobs. I like prop team better because it provided more evidences and better crossfire questions.

(To Be 14" in Length)