

BDC REGIONAL  
CHAMPIONSHIP

ROUND IV  
(BALLOTS)

MARCH 12, 2022

4

Tournament Date: 3/12/22		Tournament Location:	
Round/Flight: 4	Room: 10	Division: EFL	Judge Name: Bhulmika
Resolution/Topic: GMD		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):

26-30

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: Alyssa		27.5	Speaker 2 Name: Stephanie		27
Speaker 3 Name: Sophia		29	Speaker 4 Name: Pinky		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

Alyssa - confident and strong point, be more precise

Sophia - good comebacks, but a little more precise

Comments to debaters: PRO

Pinky - really good rebutting, good and strong evidence, use more sources

Stephanie - good responses talk louder, use more sources or state them

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

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.	

4

Tournament Date:		Tournament Location:		
Round/Flight: 4	Room: 105	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 type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code:	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: Alyssa		28.5	Speaker 2 Name: Stephanie		27.5
Speaker 3 Name: Sophia		29	Speaker 4 Name: Pinkie		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 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:**

Sophia good pacing and is very clear

Alyssa needs to be a lot more clear

**Comments to debaters:**

Stephanie needs to be louder

Pinkie needs to speak more

**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.	

# Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date: <b>March 12<sup>th</sup> 2022</b>		Tournament Location: <b>Patterson Hall</b>	
Round/Flight:	Room: <b>129</b>	Division:	Judge Name: <b>Dhrv Cudhi</b>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: <b>Jing han</b>		<b>26.5</b>	Speaker 2 Name: <b>Carter</b>		<b>28</b>
Speaker 3 Name: <b>Keerti</b>		<b>27</b>	Speaker 4 Name: <b>Maren</b>		<b>27.5</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:
--	------------

- ❖ 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 speaking
- Not good use of time
- good questions
- Maren / using "I" and being doubtful

Comments to debaters:

PRO

- Good speaking
- Not good use of time
- good questions
- Keerti / using "Um" a lot
- Good teamwork

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

The CONS are saying "I" a lot which is not ok in a debate to not say your thought and basing off the source. The pros are good, but they are not confident, also not a lot of research done because of them stutturny and breaking up sentences.

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.	

128

(u)

Tournament Date:		Tournament Location:		
Round/ Flight:	Room:	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: <i>Con</i>	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: <i>Cherter</i>		<i>27.6</i>	Speaker 2 Name: <i>Momen</i>		<i>27</i>
Speaker 3 Name: <i>Jinghan</i>	<i>pro</i>	<i>26.7</i>	Speaker 4 Name: <i>Keerthi</i>	<i>pro</i>	<i>28.3</i>

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.	

Tournament Date: <u>March 12 2022</u>		Tournament Location: <u>Patterson Hall</u>	
Round/Flight: <u>4</u>	Room: <u>106</u>	Division:	Judge Name: <u>Suvidhi Mutha</u>
Resolution/Topic: <u>GMO foods are desirable</u>		Affiliation/Occupation: <u>Judge</u>	

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>Kumail</u>		<u>27.5</u>	Speaker 2 Name: <u>Nandini</u>		<u>28</u>
Speaker 3 Name: <u>Abiram</u>		<u>28.5</u>	Speaker 4 Name: <u>Anoushka</u>		<u>29</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code: <u>Anoushka and Nandini</u>
--	--

- ❖ 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:**

- Questions are not that broad and are not easy to understand.
- Little too eager
- Good talking quality
- Abiram is good at rebutting opponent
- Didn't really know what to say

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

I thought that Anoushka and Nandini's speech was a little better than the boy's speech. they rebutted questions a little better than the boys.

**Comments to debaters:**

- Nandini is rebutting questions very nicely
- Anoushka's speech is great
- Good talking quality
- Nandini went blank in the middle but then recovered
- Efficiency is good
- Love how they are rebutting

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.	