

BDC REGIONAL  
CHAMPIONSHIP

ROUND III

(BALLOTS)

MARCH 12, 2022

# Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date: 3/12/2022		Tournament Location: Patterson Hall, UofK	
Round/Flight: 3	Room: 129	Division:	Judge Name: Sahil Tendolkar
Resolution/Topic: On balance, GMO foods can be desirable			Affiliation/Occupation: STUDENT

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: (Round 2)	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: (Round 3)	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: Benjamin		29	Speaker 2 Name: Sophia		28.5
Speaker 3 Name: Morgan		27.5	Speaker 4 Name: Alyssa		28

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code:
--	------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

### Comments to debaters: PRO

- Good questions
- Clear speaking
- Clear answers
- Confident
- Morgan try to research more questions, since you didn't ask any.

### Comments to debaters: CON

- Good points
- Clear voice
- Confident
- Clear questions
- Good answers
- Alyssa try to avoid saying um.

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Pro team won because they stated more evidence and facts, and were able to ask more questions. Con team needed a bit more evidence.

3rd COPY

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

Tournament Date:	March 12 2022			Tournament Location:	Patterson Hall	
Round/Flight:	3	Room:	129	Division:	Judge Name:	Dhruv Gandhi
Resolution/Topic:						

**EVERY** round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

**AFTER** the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team				
Code:	Round 2	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code:	Round 3	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name:	Ben		29	Speaker 2 Name:	Alyssa		27.5
Speaker 3 Name:	Morgan		28.5	Speaker 4 Name:	Sophia		28

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code:
--	------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e. jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters: **Pro For GMO**

- Good questions
- Good speaking
- Ben / not looking at opponent while answering or talking
- Good sources
- Ben / good use of saying "my opponent"

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

- Morgan / needs more research

- Ben ~~he~~ did good not nervous, ~~not nervous~~

Comments to debaters: **Con Against Gmo**

- Good questions
- Good speaking
- Sophia / using numbers, statistics and good sources.
- Nervous / Alyssa
- Sophia / saying some speech
- Alyssa / saying "um" and doubting herself.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

R-3

Tournament Date:		Tournament Location:	
Round/Flight: 3	Room: 129	Division:	Judge Name:
Resolution/Topic:		Affiliation/Occupation:	

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: Round 2	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: Round 3	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: ben		29	Speaker 2 Name: Alyssa		27.5
Speaker 3 Name: Morgan		27.5	Speaker 4 Name: Sophia		28.5

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code:
--	------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

ben was very outspoken and clear.

Morgan needs to just speak more

Comments to debaters:

Sophia was doing really well with pacing

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

R.3

# Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:		Tournament Location:		
Round/ Flight:	Room: 128	Division:	Judge Name:	Affiliation/ Occupation:
Resolution/ Topic:				

**EVERY** round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

**AFTER** the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code:	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code:	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: <i>Croster Miller</i>		27.3	Speaker 2 Name: <i>Maren Hoffman</i>		28
Speaker 3 Name: <i>Satvik</i>		27.0	Speaker 4 Name: <i>Michelle Zhan</i>		28.7

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior    20-23 Below Average    24-26 Average    27-28 Above Average    29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code:
---	------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e. jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Comments to debaters:

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1.....	4 min.
Speaker 2.....	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*.....	3 min.
Speaker 3.....	4 min.
Speaker 4.....	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*.....	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary.....	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary.....	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all).....	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus.....	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus.....	2 min.
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

Group: 131-101

R-3

Julia Marine

Room: 128

con-GMO\*

Pro-GMO<sup>1st</sup>

(2min) Speech Michel: 28

Maren: 26.5

Team A, then B, then A, B  
5min break  
Rebuttals: good eye contact with opponent. Nice strong tone & visible confidence. Try memorizing some of your speech

Nice job referenking their speech when you asked a question. Nice introduction  
Good eye contact and non-reliant use of

(2min) address their argument so you can make more eye contact and have a stronger argument.

your tablet. Work on your responses - they are strong however sometimes they don't directly answer the given question.

Crossfire: Practice phrasing your questions a clear manner before you speak.

Work on common curtisies - though I know it can't always be prevented try to avoid leaving room during speech! Work on memorizing your points beforehand - this will eliminate nervousness & losing your train of thought.

26-30

Satvik: 27.5

Carter: 27

try to be less reliant on your paper, use it more as notes, memorize it somewhat - this will make you appear more confident & help your argument to come across. Practice speaking more clearly & slowly - I recommend reading through difficult parts of your speech multiple times to establish more comfort with your speech. Work on posture! As simple as it sounds a tall stance over a slouched one can improve your argument

take a min to get aligned before you begin its better to take your time and begin more confidently! Nice pauses - allowed the infomul sink in. Good eye contact with opponent Watch your "ums" - I know its tricky! Very strong passion and involvement in discussion. Though I know it can't always be avoided try to avoid leaving room during round. Good job establishing credibility of sources.

Final Scores:

# Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:		Tournament Location:	
Round/ Flight: 3	Room: 105	Division:	Judge Name: Athena
Resolution/ Topic: GMO		Affiliation/ Occupation:	

**EVERY** round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

**AFTER** the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code:	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: Stephanie		29	Speaker 2 Name: Aarav		30
Speaker 3 Name: Pinky		28.5	Speaker 4 Name: Aaron		29

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code:
--	------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Comments to debaters:

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

# Round 3 Room 105

Athens

Pinky

Aaron George - 28.5

~~Anna~~ ~~██████~~ - 29.5

- 1600 points
- Listening to partner during speech

- Writing something down
- Looks untintive
- Looking down while take work

- Looking at both ~~part~~ of partner doing all the team and judges

- Own pre paired
- Speech with good points
- little/no hesitaion in speech

- Very well put and collected
- Moving hands a little, cant tell if fitting or explaining with hands
- good conclusion

- Good stance
- Quick answer after question

A Ray T. - 29.5 30

~~A Ray T.~~ ~~RAND~~ - 29

- Good Point
- only one Point
- Looks at other person
- ~~Look at judge more~~
- Looking at us and not on script
- Great conclusion and speech, good points every thing was clean

- more dicton hard to completely understand
- Good points
- see if you can find another thing other than Don't you think
- hesitating
- more to needs to be more confident

PRO

CON



# Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:		Tournament Location:	
Round/ Flight: 3	Room: 105	Division:	Judge Name: Logan
Resolution/ Topic:		Affiliation/ Occupation:	

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code:	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name:	STEPHANIE	24	Speaker 2 Name:	KARAU	30
Speaker 3 Name:	PINKIE	28.5	Speaker 4 Name:	DARON	29

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code:
--	------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Comments to debaters:

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1.....	4 min.
Speaker 2.....	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*.....	3 min.
Speaker 3.....	4 min.
Speaker 4.....	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*.....	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary.....	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary.....	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all).....	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus.....	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus.....	2 min.
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

(3)

# Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date: 3/12/22		Tournament Location: Patterson Hall	
Round/Flight: 3	Room: 228	Division: FLD	Judge Name: Bhumika
Affiliation/Occupation: Student		Resolution/Topic: GMD	

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: A009	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: ADH	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: Kumail		28	Speaker 2 Name: Anoushka		28.5
Speaker 3 Name: Abhiram		26.5	Speaker 4 Name: Nandhini		27

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code: A011
--	-----------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters: CON

Good questions and credible evidence strong comebacks some pauses

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

Comments to debaters: PRO

Little unclear and repetitive strong answers and defense for claim

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

# Round 3

Bhramika

Abhiram  
Abirahm  
Kumil

LON

Anoushka  
Nandhini

26-30

- Abhiram  
Starts uses good evidence  
~~good~~  
good points and reasons  
- little repetitive  
using more than one point in crossfire

Anoushka  
Good question  
~~Q~~  
Defends against opponents  
question nicely  
Uses a new point and refutes opponent

- Kumil  
Good evidence  
good comeback and use all time

Nandhini -  
To the point  
Credible sources  
nice and good evidence relates ~~to~~ to argument

1. Nandhini, Anoushka
2. Kumil
3. Nandhini
4. Abhiram

# Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date: <b>03/12/2022</b>		Tournament Location: <b>PATILSON HALL</b>	
Round/Flight:	Room: <b>228</b>	Division:	Judge Name: <b>NEELANJANA GUHA</b>
Resolution/Topic: <b>Crimo Poor</b>		Affiliation/Occupation: <b>MANAGER</b>	

**EVERY** round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

**AFTER** the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: <b>A009</b>	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: <b>A011</b>	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: <b>KUMAIL M.</b>		<b>27.5</b>	Speaker 2 Name: <b>ANUSHKA</b>		<b>28.5</b>
Speaker 3 Name: <b>ABHIRAM</b>		<b>26.5</b>	Speaker 4 Name: <b>NANDINI</b>		<b>28</b>

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code: <b>A011</b>
--	------------------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

**Comments to debaters:**

KUMAIL & ABHIRAM

1. PROS → GOOD POINTS  
→ CONFIDENT

CONS → RESISTANT  
→ MORE CREDIBLE SOURCES  
→ MORE CLEAR

**Comments to debaters:**

ANUSHKA & NANDINI

PROS → CREDIBLE SOURCES

CONS → NOT VERB & CLEAR & SPECIFIC.

**Reasons for Decision** (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

BETTER THAN OTHER TEAM

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1.....	4 min.
Speaker 2.....	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*.....	3 min.
Speaker 3.....	4 min.
Speaker 4.....	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*.....	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary.....	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary.....	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all).....	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus.....	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus.....	2 min.
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

TEAM

228

TEAM

-0.5

AO09 - PRO

AO11. - CON.

KUMAIL

ANUSHKA

ABHIRAM

NANDINA

~~ANUSHKA~~

KUMAIL. -

29

NANDINI

~~ANUSHKA~~

28

PRO →

PRO -

CON. → HESITANT - 0.5  
→ COUNTERED UNIT + 0.5

CON - NOT SOLD - 0.5  
EVIDENCE.

TOTAL

27.5

NOT SOLD + 0.5  
EVIDENCE

TOTAL

27

ABHIRAM

29

ANUSHKA

29.5

PRO →

PRO →

+0.5

+0.5

CON.

CON →

-0.5

26.5 ↓ 2

28.5

Tournament Date: 3/12/22		Tournament Location: Patterson Hall, U of K	
Round/Fight: 3	Room: 229	Division:	Judge Name: Sahil Tendolkar
Resolution/Topic: On balance, genetically modified (GMO) food is desirable		Affiliation/Occupation: STUDENT	

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: A012	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: A008	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: Jinghan		27	Speaker 2 Name: Havi		30
Speaker 3 Name: Keerthi		26	Speaker 4 Name: Aarika		29

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code: A008
--	-----------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e. jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Keerthi- Try to think of questions throughout your opp. case

Jinghan- Try to better understand and your opp. thoughts, and why they are wrong

Comments to debaters:

Aarika- Good job with your case and presentation skills.

Havi- Great job! You did great in your presentation, and really seemed to understand the topic.

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Both teams presented well evidence with clear facts. Team A008 won because they asked multiple questions overall, and presented their facts neatly.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

Tournament Date:		Tournament Location: Patterson Hall	
Round/Fight: 03	Room: 229	Division:	Judge Name: Moini Paki
Resolution/Topic: on balance Genetically Modified (GMO) food is desirable.		Affiliation/Occupation: Student	

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: A12	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: A08	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: Jingham		27	Speaker 2 Name: AarKa		29.5
Speaker 3 Name: Keerthi		28	Speaker 4 Name: Havi		29

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code: A08
--	----------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters: A08

- as a group they had strong evidence and reasons
- struggled during cross fire
- were lacking to ask question
- strong intros

Keerthi  
 pro - good evidence  
 con - lack of questions

Jingham  
 pro - question  
 con - confidence/proving

Comments to debaters:

- strong reasoning
- good team work
- strong articulation
- struggled with why evidence supported rebuttle

AarKa  
 pro - evidence  
 con - intro statement

Havi  
 pro - being on elements  
 con - very on sided

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Team A08 won because they worked better as a team and were more clearly able to prove their point with confidence.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

RB

# Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date: <u>March 12 2022</u>		Tournament Location: <u>Patterson Hall</u>	
Round/Flight:	Room: <u>106</u>	Division:	Judge Name: <u>Suvidhi</u>
Resolution/Topic:		Affiliation/Occupation:	

**EVERY** round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

**AFTER** the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code:	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: <u>Aryan</u>		<u>29.5</u>	Speaker 2 Name: <u>Ben</u>		<u>28</u>
Speaker 3 Name: <u>Anika</u>		<u>29</u>	Speaker 4 Name: <u>Morgan</u>		<u>27.5</u>

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code:
--	------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

**Comments to debaters:**

- Very efficient and confident
- Easygoing
- Patient
- Respectful
- to the point
- Good rebutting

**Comments to debaters:**

- Efficient
- Easygoing
- Patient
- Wasn't really paying attention...

**Reasons for Decision** (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

- Ben kind of agreed to the point
- He used the info but not correctly
- very good but kind of gave in.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1 .....	4 min.
Speaker 2 .....	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)* .....	3 min.
Speaker 3 .....	4 min.
Speaker 4 .....	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)* .....	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary .....	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary .....	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all) .....	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus .....	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus .....	2 min.
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	



# Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:	March 12 <sup>th</sup> 2022		Tournament Location:	Patterson Hall	
Round/Flight:	Room: 106	Division:	Judge Name: <u>Drury Anandhi</u>	Affiliation/Occupation:	
Resolution/Topic:					

**EVERY** round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

**AFTER** the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code:	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: Aryan		29	Speaker 2 Name: Ben		28
Speaker 3 Name: Anika		29	Speaker 4 Name: Morgan		28

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior    20-23 Below Average    24-26 Average    27-28 Above Average    29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code:
--	------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e. jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters: Con

- Nervous / Aryan, but good
- Not confident / Anika, but good
- Patient
- kind
- respectful

Comments to debaters: Pro

- kind
- Nervous
- efficient
- respectful

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Ben went against his own point, the Cons were very convincing. Also Ben and Morgan kept using their point not the evidences.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	