ROUND: 4   LOCATION: 3

JUDGE'S NAME: PEACOCK

****Judges- Please rank debaters on a scale of 1-30 points.****

Very Good Ballot: The first thing on this ballot is a clear reason for why the judge voted for the winning team. Also, this ballot tells each team what they did to either lose or win the round. This judge went on to give feedback to teams as a whole, as well as suggestions to individual debaters about things they should work on.

IN MY OPINION, THE TEAM THAT WON THE DEBATE WAS THE (CIRCLE ONE) **PROP** / OPP.

SIGNATURE: Rebecca A Peacock   AFFILIATION: CMC

PLEASE USE THE SPACE BELOW TO INDICATE YOUR **REASON FOR DECISION** AND TO PROVIDE HELPFUL COMMENTS TO THE DEBATERS.

I voted for the proposition today because they were able to tell me why the status quo had health care problems that their resolution would begin to solve for, while the opposition did not fully explain why the current health care system was good enough and why government funding to other programs was more important. Both teams need to work on explaining their points more, then they would speak for a longer period of time, and countering the other team's points.

Prop#1: Good volume and clear speaking, you need to explain your points more - why is the current health care system bad?

Opp#1: Good clear speaking and off-case points. You need to counter the proposition's arguments!

Prop#2: Good extensions, however don't let points of information dominate your speech and address the proposition opposition's arguments

Opp#2: Good explanations and extensions of your team's points,

18

but why are they better than universal health ~~care~~ an insurance
the problems that universal health insurance bring worse?

Opp#3: Good summary of points and eye contact. You need
to emphasize why what you represent is better.

Prop#3: Good summary ~~maga~~ and good job beginning
to counter ~~your tea~~ the opp's arguments. You also need
to tell me why your side is better.

Prop 74 - pro or con?

Judge: **Tom Sprankling**

Room: 409

Ro~~und:~~

Debate #: 214

Very Good Ballot: This ballot comments on each speech made during the round. Not only does this judge provide a concrete reason for decision, but the judge also tells each debater about something they did well. Additionally, each debater received some advice about things to work on in the future.

↗ for decision
on back

Signature: ~~Thomas J. Sprankling~~   Affiliation: Claremont

Please use the space below to indicate your **reason for decision** and to provide helpful comments to the debaters.

1st prop: work on your speaking style. You obviously know a lot about prop 74, just work on trying to communicate that knowledge more effectedly. USE ALL YOUR TIME!

1st opp: good speech w/ good content. I liked your POIs a lot. Try to use all of your time.

2nd prop: excellent speaking style ~~that~~ I would have liked it if you could have brought up some ~~new~~ new arguments in your speech. For the record, please don't call me judge and please don't ask me what I think during a POI - just state a fact or comment. Try to use all of your time

2nd opp: good content in speech but somewhat repetitive. Watch out for "ands" and when you look up at me try to look at me, not to the side. Try to use all your time

3rd opp: excellent rebuttal. I would have liked a little more organization though. Congratulations — you were the only person to use all of their time.

3rd prop: Way, way too short. Its obvious that you just got nervous. It's okay, w/ more experience will come more practice

Proposition's strongest (and really only major offensive point) was that in the SQ, teachers have an automatic job for life after their brief probation period is over. Empirically I know that this is not true (I went to a public high school where several very senior teachers were fired when I was in 12th grade) and the opp did a very able job of proving that that was not true. W/ the proposition's strongest argument neutralized, I look to a strong Opp argument that went unanswered (prop 74 gives students too much power over their teachers) that, in my mind outweighs what is left of the prop's case. Thus, I cast my vote for the Opp.

PLEASE USE THE SPACE BELOW TO INDICATE YOUR REASON FOR
DECISION AND TO PROVIDE HELPFUL COMMENTS TO THE DEBATERS.

This is a low-point victory:

The prop won 3 uncontested points:

1. 60% of those executed are innocent
2. blacks are executed disproportionately to whites
3. The U.S. should set an example for other nations

The opp won 2 points, though not strictly:

1. The death penalty will deter crime
   (though now much life imprisoned will deter lessens this)
2. The guilty that are executed get what they deserve
   (example of westerfield was used)

* For the record the opp came out on the favorable end of two
other issues:

1. The biblical debate on an "eye for an eye"
2. Tax $ issue though it was never really quantified

The 3 uncontested points, on balance, outweigh the points
won by opp. Nothing the opposition said justifies the
deliberate execution of innocent people by the government.

Good Ballot: This judge points to specific arguments made by each team and goes on to explain which points were won by each side. This ballot allows debaters to understand which of their arguments prevailed in the debate. The judge also explains the criteria used for deciding which team won and explains the reason for decision. However, the judge does not give individual feedback to each debater. Comments directed toward debaters are very helpful.

PLEASE USE THE SPACE BELOW TO INDICATE YOUR REASON FOR
DECISION AND TO PROVIDE HELPFUL COMMENTS TO THE DEBATERS.

Proposition had 3 clear ideas that were reinforced by
other team members and that is why they won. I was
unclear with the opposition's idea to vote no for reasons
other than damage education.
All students gave an impression of not understanding
the topic

Taylor - made some eye contact, work on confidence of voice

Akita - table talk is not well done and try not to play with
hair (it shows you are nervous)

Elizabeth - started off talking softly, but voice gained in
strength

Shawn - nervous, appeared unsure of topic and stand on topic

Cassie - nice voice, appeared confused

Willie - great eye contact, work on long pauses

Good Ballot: Although this ballot gives a reason for decision, the judge never refers to
specific arguments that helped the proposition win. Debaters need to understand which
points in the round were the deciding factors for the judge's decision. The judge does
give suggestion to individual debaters about things they could do to improve.

PLEASE USE THE SPACE BELOW TO INDICATE YOUR REASON FOR
DECISION AND TO PROVIDE HELPFUL COMMENTS TO THE DEBATERS.

Kabrina = nice introductory speech, need more organization
for arguments

Giovanni = I liked your new arguments and how you organized
your speech. Good at refuting the other side

Khallid = Nice speaking style. Be sure to tell me why
you won

Nancy = nice organization, be sure to use evidence.

Ashlei = nice refutation. Use A-R-E to make clearer
arguments

Christine = your arguments were clear, but tell me why you
win.

Good Start, Needs Improvement: Debaters love it when you give them individual,
specific feedback on their speaking style; however, they do not enjoy it when you give
them no reason for decision. This ballot tells the teams what they are doing well
individually, but gives no analysis on their arguments.

PLEASE USE THE SPACE BELOW TO INDICATE YOUR REASON FOR DECISION AND TO PROVIDE HELPFUL COMMENTS TO THE DEBATERS.

The opposition won because their arguments went uncontested during the round.

PROP

www.middleschooldebate.com
this site will help you with research for the topics

refute/answer arguments made by the other side

OPP

focus your arguments in order to prove you win
(i.e. FEMA messed up; that's inappropriate)
Good job numbering your arguments. Try to go in order though.
Good preparation

Both Teams

Good luck & keep debating!

Good Start, Needs Improvement: This ballot gives general suggestions and comments to each team, but does not provide individual debaters with feedback. It would be helpful for the judge to evaluate the specifics in the round. Also, it is always good to tell both teams they did a good job, however in order for them to get better, debaters need specific comments about what they could do differently.

PLEASE USE THE SPACE BELOW TO INDICATE YOUR REASON FOR
DECISION AND TO PROVIDE HELPFUL COMMENTS TO THE DEBATERS.

Proposition

- 70,000 cures in rain forest
- feed 5 times as many people
- cruel animal treatment
- not saying can't eat meat, just that it is unethical

Opposition

- people need meat to survive
- natural part of diet
- historically been good
- B12 defficiency

Overall

- great public speaking skills
- don't accept all points of information
- good use of points of information to fluster speaker

* make sure to not bring up new arguments in final (rebuttal) speeches

---

Bad Ballot: This ballot outlines the important arguments made by both teams, but does not give a reason for decision. The debaters need to know what they did well and what they need to improve upon. General comments about the round, without addressing them to a specific team or debater, are not very helpful. Be sure to be specific and thoroughly explain yourself. Debaters spend a lot of time preparing for tournaments and they look forward to judge's suggestions.

PLEASE USE THE SPACE BELOW TO INDICATE YOUR REASON FOR
DECISION AND TO PROVIDE HELPFUL COMMENTS TO THE DEBATERS.

PROP: Allison - great refuting skills, definition & should be closed
    1. POI - Illegal land from Cuba, we didn't say land would be used
       for jails
    2. POI - Torture → great rebuttal, great skill at answering questions.
    3. POI - Prisoners could escape to Cuba, U.S. has no authority in Cuba, it
       will weaken the U.S. image - 4 1/2 minutes

OPP: 1. POI - It's difficult to bring prisoners to trial (Trevor: poor transitions &
                                                   organization)
    2. POI - No more attacks on the U.S., they are "enemy combats"

PROP: 1. POI - Abuse of detainees (Crystal: gave many sources of information
       about abuse and no trials)
    2. POI - Held without trials - 3 minutes

OPP: September 11, 2001 - visit to the prisoners
    POI - some prisoners have been released
    Nicki - should allow more questions from prop team
    POI - If send them elsewhere they could destroy military camps
    Refuted all of prop's points - 3 1/2 minutes

PROP: U.S. has released 30 prisoners, costly to release prisoners

OPP: Rebuttal : 10% of prisoners (Marisa: too short, not prepared)
    1 1/2 minutes

PROP: Refute (to prove wrong) - prisoners are hard to catch in cuba
    Prisoners should have 3 essentials per day
    Ruins U.S. reputation, prisoners should be on U.S. grounds

Bad Ballot: Although it is clear that this judge was paying specific attention to each
team's arguments, the judge never gives a reason for decision. Additionally, although
writing down all the arguments made during a round (flowing) is encouraged, it is not
necessary and discouraged for judges to flow on the ballot. The ballot is intended to
provide students with useful comments, not to recap all arguments made during a round.
The purpose of a ballot is to give debaters a reason for decision by explaining which
arguments prevailed and why. Additionally, no comments were given to individual
debaters.

PLEASE USE THE SPACE BELOW TO INDICATE YOUR REASON FOR
DECISION AND TO PROVIDE HELPFUL COMMENTS TO THE DEBATERS.

Good performance by both sides
Opp's rebuttalist brought it home!

Very Bad Ballot: It is always good to tell both teams they did a good job. However, if you want to help these teams get better, tell them what they have done well specifically, and give the something to work on for the next tournament. Without constructive criticism these teams will never get better.

PLEASE USE THE SPACE BELOW TO INDICATE YOUR REASON FOR
DECISION AND TO PROVIDE HELPFUL COMMENTS TO THE DEBATERS.

Very Bad Ballot: This ballot has no reason for decision and does not give debaters any
feedback. It is very important for students to understand why the judge voted for the
winning team. Additionally, receiving constructive criticism is important for students to
improve in the future.