

BDC REGIONAL
CHAMPIONSHIP
SEMI FINALS
(BALLOTS)

MARCH 12, 2022

Tournament Date: GMO FOODS.		Tournament Location: UK.		03/12/2022	
Round/ Flight: 4	Room: 229	Division:	Judge Name: KAI2AR	Affiliation/ Occupation:	
Resolution/ Topic: GMO FOODS.					

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: A007	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: A008	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: ANIKA		85	Speaker 2 Name: HAVI		85
Speaker 3 Name: ARYAN		83	Speaker 4 Name: AARKO		84

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: 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:

Speech - ~~HAVI~~ ARYAN - 28
ANIKA - 29

Rebutles - ARYAN - 28
ANIKA - 28

Crossfire - ARYAN - 27
ANIKA - 28

Comments to debaters:

Speech - HAVI - 29
- AARKO - 29 -

Rebutles - HAVI - 28 -
AARKO - 27 - few mistakes.

CrossFire - HAVI - 28
AARKO - 28

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

HAVI - Confident, clear voice,

AARKO - maintains eye contact,

ARYAN - structured speech,

ANIKA - confident, gave good answers.

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: Round 4		Tournament Location:	
Round/ Flight:	Room: 229	Division:	Judge Name: Anna Marino
Resolution/ Topic: GMO Foods		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: A007	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: A008	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: Anika		28.5	Speaker 2 Name: Havi		29.5
Speaker 3 Name: Aryan		28	Speaker 4 Name: Aarko		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: 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: **Recommend to memorize the speech, eye contact when answering qns.**

Speaker 1: **Information is good and confidence is the strong side. 28.5**

~~Enjoyed your answer~~ **Answering qns is great. 29**

Strong crossfire → 29

Speech is well prepared, but 28.0 would need improvement in presentation. Answering questions include good research (data). Need to speak more, read cbs.

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

Comments to debaters: **Strong presenters, eye contact. 29.5**

Speech is well organized - introduction, Research examples are great - with dates and names. Conclusion - is strong. Answering q-n with respect. 2nd q

Great start - organized presentation research. Towards the end answer questions. Crossfire - great points. 29

Team A008 were strong at very well organized presentation, they handled qns calmly & had good structured answers.

Team A007 - great info and arguments, can improve on the presenting skills.

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.	



A007 + A008

Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:		Tournament Location:	
Round/ Flight:	Room: 229	Division:	Judge Name:
Resolution/ Topic: GMO Foods		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: A007	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: A008	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: Anika		28	Speaker 2 Name: Hawi		29
Speaker 3 Name: Aryan		27.5	Speaker 4 Name: Aarkov		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 type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" 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.

PRO

Comments to debaters:

- nice job directly refuting their viewpoints
- nice, strong tones
-

CON

Comments to debaters:

- good job citing sources & explaining them
- nice job quoting your partner & opponent
- effective transition when your argument could go no further
- hypothetical situation was a good concept but was hard to follow

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

Speaker 1	2 min.
Speaker 2	2 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	2 min.
Speaker 4	2 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.

note for EVERYONE: good posture is key! It gives you a stronger presence, and captivates the listener.

Anika:

Interesting data citing gmo-food examples. Good, energetic, well-paced tone. Nice volume. I found your statistics and evidence very interesting & well-tied into your speech.

Your good presence and posture allowed your passion for your topic to effectively shine through.

Nice emphasis on important words - this gave a clear accent for the listener.

Havi:

good introduction, hand motions (not too much not too little) very good pacing, easily understandable. Good transitions in between points. Effective use of pathos. Not many credible sources in your speech - this would have strengthened your argument. Very good answers to question - effectively redefined your point. Nice job taking a moment to gather thoughts before answer to provide an answer. nice eye contact with your opponent.

Aryan:

Slow down your pace to carry across your points - rushing through your speech even if it holds effective information, diminishes your arguments. Your speech holds many strong sources - you need to provide more of an explanation around them so the listener can better understand. With your pace - you had plenty of time remaining so you have much room to slow down. Give your partner her due time to speak, while your effort to assist is nice, she also has good points that should be given the chance to be heard.

try not to fidget while you speak - this detracts from your speech and distract the listener. Practice memorizing your speech so that you don't have to speak down into your paper.

Aarkov:

"The horrors..." - effectively hooks in the listener. You had a good, strong tone while holding eye contact. This shows your dedication to your speech and strengthens your argument. You held a very confident tone - however when it comes to your opponents speaking you seem to lose focus, remember; considering your opponents viewpoint and giving attention is respectful practice for debaters.

Nice vocabulary - helped add sophistication to your argument.

Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:		Tournament Location:		
Round/ Flight:	Room: 228	Division:	Judge Name: Parita Patel	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: A004	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: A001	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: AAARAV		30	Speaker 2 Name: Benjamin		28
Speaker 3 Name: ARON		30	Speaker 4 Name: Morgan		26

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: A004
--	------------------------

- ❖ 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.

A004
Comments to debaters: Clear Communicator
 - Constructive Arguments. & resources. presented very well.
 - Cost Effectiveness. Presented very well.
 - Pesticides Usages. minimal to zero.
 - Solving World Hunger. Very interesting arguments.
 - **Speaker was able to challenge & answer.**
Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

A001
Comments to debaters: Clear Communicator
 gene mutation - Very Impressive.
 Very confident - & knowledgeable
 Answered very well & resources.
 Toxic effect from crop elaborated.
 - Herbicide vs Pesticide.
 Cost vs Benefits. (Tried. However unable to stand arguments.)
 - Presented cost effectiveness questions with good arguments.

Team was able to present with very well arguments & answered questions appropriately:
 constructive arguments with facts & research/study.
 Solid logic & reasoning to arguments.
 Clear & strong evidence to prove to point & reasoning to support a position of advocacy.
 Extraordinary Presentation.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 14 min.
Speaker 24 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*3 min.
Speaker 34 min.
Speaker 44 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus2 min.
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date: 3/10/12 GMFO Foods		Tournament Location: Paterson Hall, Uof K	
Round/ Flight: 4	Room: 228	Division:	Judge Name: Sahil Tendolkar
Resolution/ Topic: GMFO Foods			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: A004	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: A001	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: AARAV		29	Speaker 2 Name: Benjamin		28
Speaker 3 Name: AARON		29	Speaker 4 Name: Morgan		27.5

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: A004

- Very clear questions
- Really good case
- Aarav is very confident
- Clear case

Comments to debaters: A001

- speech - Good speaking
- Lots of evidence
 - Strong answers
 - Morgan - Try to think about other questions when you realize that your partner has already asked the question.

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

The pro side had lots of evidence, and didn't hesitate when speaking.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 14 min.
Speaker 24 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*3 min.
Speaker 34 min.
Speaker 44 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date: 03/02/22		Tournament Location: Patterson Hall	
Round/ Flight: 04	Room: 228	Division:	Judge Name: Marti
Affiliation/ Occupation: Student		Resolution/ Topic: GMO FOODS	

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: A004	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: A001	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: Benjamin		28	Speaker 2 Name: Aarav		30
Speaker 3 Name: Morgan		20	Speaker 4 Name: Aaron		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: A001
--	-----------------

- ❖ 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: A004

Aarav - fast questions, strong back to back, uses economical examples, tons of evidence, very confident

Aaron - effective questions, evidence in all of the parts, uses multiple examples, clear sources.

Comments to debaters:

Benjamin - strong background information strong explanations, weaker rebuttal.

Morgan - talk about both sides in intro, although not evidence to support own side, lack confidence.

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

My decision was made because team A001 because they were well rounded and had all the information with confidence that the other group lacked.

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.	

BDC REGIONAL
CHAMPIONSHIP

FINALS
(BALLOTS)

MARCH 12, 2022

Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:		Tournament Location:	
Round/ Flight:	Room:	Division:	Judge Name: <u>Aash Garg</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>Aarav</u>		<u>29</u>	Speaker 2 Name: <u>Aarav</u>		<u>29.5</u>
Speaker 3 Name: <u>Aaron</u>	<u>Winner</u>	<u>29</u>	Speaker Name: <u>Havi</u>		<u>29.5</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 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:

Aaron: desirable: world hunger
Eye contact, articulation, hand movement, energetic, confident body lang.

Aarav clear thought process.
as copied from top.

Comments to debaters:

Havi: Awesome speech.
confident body lang. in answering the question, detail explanation!

Aro: all qualities except playing with medal

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

Better Rebuttal
Confident

Better Rebuttal points but
not confident

Lovely crossfire, difficult to judge individually but as a team, Aarav Aaron won.

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: <u>March 12 2022</u>		Tournament Location: <u>Patterson Hall U of K</u>	
Round/ Flight: <u>Finals</u>	Room: <u>Main Hall</u>	Division:	Judge Name: <u>Suvridhi Muthen</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code:	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: <u>Aaron George *</u>			Speaker 2 Name: <u>Havisheth</u>		
Speaker 3 Name: <u>Aarav Tibrewal *</u>			Speaker 4 Name: <u>Aarko Guha</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:
--	------------

- ❖ 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: - Persuasive

- makes eye contact
- Good impacts and points
- Aaron has a good rebuttal
- Aarav has a good speech
- Aarav is asking good questions
- Both have nice efficiency
- Loud and good talking quality.

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

- Credible resources (Harvard, etc)
- was very persuasive and any question asked against them was refuted.
- Good points and nice efficiency
- Strong claims
- Good usage of evidence and speech

Comments to debaters: - Nervous evident

- Aarko has good questions and Havi
- Havi makes eye contact and is talking to the judges.
- Aarko asks good questions
- Havi has a nice speech
- Both could work a little on talking quality.
- Went blank in the middle.
- Aarko has good rebuttal and nice answers in store

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: 3/12/21		Tournament Location:	
Round/Flight: Final	Room:	Division: ELA	Judge Name: Brunika Dama
Resolution/Topic:		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:	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: Aaron			Speaker 2 Name: Havi		
Speaker 3 Name: Aarav		30	Speaker 4 Name: Aarko		
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:

talking directly to judges

- Aarav: eye contact, good questions, sounds very confident, credible sources, persuasive

- Aaron: good points, sounds very confident, strong evidence, strong speech

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

- has strong evidence, credible sources such as Harvard

= Very Persuasive and confident

- Strong claims

- refutes opponent well

Comments to debaters:

- Aarko: good responses, stuttering a little, try sounding more confident - very strong rebuttal, seemed nervous a little later in debate

- Havi: uses evidence to refute opponent speech

- good response, talking little

- was a little hard to hear during rebuttal

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: 3/12/2022		Tournament Location: Patterson Hall UofK	
Round/ Flight: 5	Room: Main hall	Division:	Judge Name: SAHIL TENDOLKAR
Affiliation/ Occupation: STUDENT		Resolution/ Topic: GMO food will be desirable	

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: Aaron		30	Speaker 2 Name: Havi		29
Speaker 3 Name: Aarav		30	Speaker 4 Name: AarKa		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 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:

- Good points
- Good answers
- Confident
- Good questions
- Aaron very loud and clear about his points
- Aarav is very precise and clear

Comments to debaters:

- Good questions
- Clear voice
- Havi clearly understands the problem & solution
- AarKa understood the topic REALLY well, but hesitated and muttered a little bit.

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

Both teams had great sportsmanship, understood the topic, presented evidence, and had great facts. The pro team was chosen because they presented more clearly and had good reasoning behind their evidence.

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: 3/12/2022		Tournament Location:	
Round/Flight: Finals	Room: Hall	Division:	Judge Name: Logan
Resolution/Topic: GMO will 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:	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: Aaron George		30	Speaker 2 Name: Havi		29
Speaker 3 Name: Aarav		30	Speaker 4 Name: Aarka		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 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:

Aaron gets straight to his points
Aarav is very good at crossfiring
Aaron did really good in the rebuttal.

Comments to debaters:

Havi is very clean with his points
Aarka struggles to get his point out
Havi did not talk that much, I just wanted to see him talk more

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

Team 1 was very impressive
and team 2 just didn't hit the mark

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.	