

Round One: Parliamentary Debate

	Proposition	Opposition	Judge
CO 101	DVC - DV	LMC - GH	Steele
CO 102	DVC - CCW	LMC - KP	Harrison
CO 103	DVC - BT	LMC - CL	Ban
CC2 221	CCSF - EM	LMC - ES	Barber
CC2 222	CCSF - BS	LMC - JS	Leahy
CC2 223	CCSF - CR	LMC - BG	Pourkhalkelhali
CC2 212	COL - KM	SJSU - NS	Saito
CC2 213	CCC - SW	SJSU - LS	Zimny
CC2 214	CCC - RS	BCC - BT	Adams
CC2 225	OHL - BM OHL - CC	BCC - MN BYE	Elizondo

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC fdlProposition: DVC-DUOpposition: LMC-GHLeader: AlexPoints (1-30) 28Leader: Candace Points (1-30) 28Member: NickiPoints (1-30) 28Member: Vanessa Points (1-30) 28Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial MS

Comments for Improvement:

No criteria offered to evaluate args. (access? Competition? Exposure to new ideas? Completion of degree). Define "superior education". I vote GOV on the value of remediation (recognize strengths/weaknesses) and greater opportunities for growth.

- provide more examples
- remember you're comparing CC + Pub. 4 year (don't make args about 1, → comparative analysis)
- cite sources
- signpost + provide roadmap to keep org. clear

LL2-221

APR 2011
(2:45)

Barber

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC fdl

Proposition: CSF-EM

Opposition: LMC-ES

Leader: Points (1-30) 25

Leader: Points (1-30) 20

Member: Points (1-30) 20

Member: Points (1-30) 23

45

43

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial CS

Comments for Improvement:

788 45 ALL - VERY STRONG DEBATE, ESP. FOR NOVICE! THANKS!
OPP DON'T BE TENTATIVE. WATCH "SEEM LIKE" U
 GIVE SUPPORT, DON'T UNDERCUT YOUR CASE BY
 SAYING IT / THERE WASN'T EVIDENCE. (FOR YOURS OR
 OTHERS.) OWN IT. NICE TEAM WORK TOGETHER.
GOO CLEAR DEFS, CLEAR STRUCTURE
 YOU WON WITH THE IDEA OF INFO FROM CCS
ALMOST = TO CSU/US, CLEAR, CLEAR 1. QUALITY
 2. NAME 3 PATHS COMPLETE
ALL - CLEAR STRUCTURE. YAG! U WAS TO GO,
 ESP FOR NOVICE DEBATERS. CLEAR SIGNPOSTS
GOOD EXAMPLES. (CRANKING, GAS, ET C.
 (GAS COSTS)
 SORRY ABOUT TIME SIGNALS, OWN IT.
 SO MUCH FOR 2 BRAND NEW STOP WATCH!

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC Rd1

Proposition: CLSF - CR

Opposition: LMC - BG

Leader:
Rose, Amber

27

OPP
Points (1-30) 27

Leader:

Gordon

GOV
Points (1-30) 29

Member:
Cornali, Charley

27.5

OPP 25
Points (1-30) ~~24.5~~
Left questions for later
& entered protected
time w/o talking
them.

Member:

Dumenthal

GOV
Points (1-30) 27.5

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial CR

Comments for Improvement:

- Try to clash more on impacts.
- Be ready to debate the value criteria if you don't go for Net benefits as Gov. Keep your eyes on the criteria if it's not net-benefits for impacts.
- Be on the watch for new arguments in ~~rebuttals~~ and ready to raise a P of O (Point of Order) and say it's a ^{rebuttals} new argument.

CC2-222

Leahy

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

Rd 1

Proposition CLSF - BS

Opposition: LMC - JS

Leader: Sergio Scheit Points (1-30) 28 Leader: Feloro Smith Points (1-30) 28

Member: Nick Barlow Points (1-30) 28 Member: Tanner Johnson Points (1-30) 27

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial DL

Comments for Improvement:

As I mentioned in the round ~~we~~ needed more impacts and analysis as to why those arguments matter.

Great work on all things - great Narze round.

In rebuttals - go for the argument that your side needs to win.

CO-103

Ben

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

Rd 1

MASON
ASHLEY

Proposition: ~~DUC - BT~~

Opposition: LMC - CL

Leader: ~~VAIOS~~

Points (1-30) 25

Leader: MASON

Points (1-30) 26.5

Member: ~~CECILY~~

Points (1-30) 25

Member: ~~ASHLEY~~

Points (1-30) 26

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial

ZB

Comments for Improvement:

RES: A C.C. Edu is superior to the first 2 yrs of a public Univ.

Verbal, but:

DUC: Need criteria & weighing mech.

LMC: need structure in your offense.

Both sides: • Use all of your time.

• Thank you's needed.

• Excellent job Flawing

CC2-225

Elizondo

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

R1

Proposition: ^{acc/} OHL-Bm

Opposition: BCL-MM

Leader: Andy Points (1-30) 25

Leader: Dawn Points (1-30) 22

Member: James Points (1-30) 19

Member: Rebeccah Points (1-30) 21

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial

OPP

Comments for Improvement:

This debate was a close run due to the brief nature of some of the remarks.

Coin Flip = Opp = more coherent

acc

CO-102

Harrison

Rd. 1 **A Comm. College Education is Superior to the 1st 2 yrs. of a public Univ.**
Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

Proposition: **DUC - CCW**

Opposition: **LMC - KP (21)**

Leader: **Angela A Choy** Points (1-30) 20

Leader: **T. J. Patterson** Points (1-30) 25

Member: **Erica Winkler** Points (1-30) 21

Member: **Denzel King** Points (1-30) 23

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial KH

Key Harrison, Orlone College

Time 3:36
Comments for Improvement:

PM Angela A. Choy
 Identify - value debate?
 Slow down on definitions
 Why is it valuable?
 Expand each reason

Rein your hair back - distracting

Rebuttal: 2:00

UG Erica Winkler Time 4:05

nice job of reiterating
 your partner's points -
 expand examples
 while

All of you need to strengthen claims - why

Time 5:46
T. J. Patterson

nice voice - good
 connection w/ audience
 Organization is
 clear - need to
 expand.

Rebuttal 2:30

MO Denzel King Time 4:16

Try to explain your
 points more completely -
 if you have "no clue" -
 don't bring it up.

Good 1st, debate of year.

work on a should I "vote" for ... resolution?

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

RJ

Proposition: CC-SCW

Opposition: STSU-CS

Leader: Alfredo

Points (1-30) 23

Leader: Ashley

Points (1-30) 27

Member: Jonathan

Points (1-30) 27

Member: AVESTA

Points (1-30) 24

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial RJZ

Comments for Improvement:

- Close debate, excellent clash. Vote turned on long-term vs. short-term cost/benefit of CC vs. CSU

Alfredo (PM) - better use of time needed. BE CLEAR AND emphatic as to organization of case.

Jonathan (MG) - excellent articulation, but try not to jump around on the flow. Take points in case order. When you raise new ads in 2 prop constructive, label them as such

Ashley (LO) - Good use of time. BE CAREFUL about labeling you disads as "ads". Disads are "off case."

AVESTA (MO) - when you concede a point, tell the judge why in detail. You scored well when you noted that they dropped the "lower transfer rate in CCs" disad. Along with the long-term cost-benefit ratio, this weighed heavily in my vote.

Both teams: state the case framework clearly and explicitly and restate it again in each speech. Make it easy on the judge!

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

pdf

Proposition: CCC-2S

Opposition: BCC-BT

Leader: Ariel Silva Points (1-30) 20

Leader: Foxie Brown Points (1-30) 24

Member: Robert Rees Points (1-30) ~~20~~ 22

Member: Tina Tamori Points (1-30) 24

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial AR

Comments for Improvement:

All: -ack of impact in most points. opp had better constructive speeches. it not pulled through in rebuttals. PMR most impact

PM very disorganized but strong, clear speaker
 very passionate

MO hoping around on floor, needs speak leader
 some good arguments but unclear where on floor

LO Clear speak, off-case well organized, on-case loses organization

MO Smart, Good ideas but unsituated and no impact on university definition so I don't know what to do w/ it

Rebuttals:
 LO drops own off-case (bad)
 PM many new arguments (bad) but they don't call you on it

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC R1

Proposition: COL-KM

Opposition: STSU-NS

Leader: Savannah
Mulderig

Points (1-30) 25

Leader: Amy
Kimbro

Points (1-30) 24

Member: Megan
Swartzwelder

Points (1-30) 23

Member: Niko
Neueauer

Points (1-30) 24

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial AS

Comments for Improvement:

The government chose a creative & clever tactic of invoking Social Justice as their primary criterion of excellence in education. While they could have done a better job of defining this & illustrating specifically how community colleges promote this, the Opposition almost entirely failed to challenge or address this criterion & this is why I ultimately ruled in favor of the government.

That said, the opposition did forward some compelling arguments according to their own definition of "excellence". Their point about the social scene & teacher qualifications were very strong. Likewise their mentioning the very low transfer rates of CC students was effective.

Neither side did a strong job with providing evidence to back their assertions. Sure, statistics could have helped, but given that they are all college students they could at least →

have offered examples from their own experience.

A few specific comments.

Savannah: great organization. Your opening comments were powerful & well presented.

Megan: You have great passion. Be careful not to get your ego too wrapped up in the clash.

Amy: Work on organization. You did a nice job countering the Opposition's points, but it was a bit scattered. Also - STAND when you speak.

Niko: Great presence & an ~~of~~ authoritative tone. You were the best at citing examples. Work on creating arguments more.

For everyone: Good job on the 1st debate.

Learn the rules of parli. Lots of confusion about points of order / information, constructive speech rules etc ...

Round Two: Parliamentary Debate

	Proposition	Opposition	Judge
CO 101	LMC – GH	OHL – CC	Arcidiacono
CO 102	LMC – KP	CCSF – CR	Ban
CO 103	LMC – CL	COL – KM	Steele
CC2 221	LMC – ES	CCC – SW	Adams
CC2 222	LMC – JS	CCC – RS	Barber
CC2 223	LMC – BG	OHL – BM	Matt Zweier
CC2 212	SJSU – NS	CCSF – BS	Campbell
CC2 213	SJSU – LS	DVC – BT	Saito
CC2 214	BCC – BT	DVC – CCW	Zimny
CC2 225	BCC – MN CCSF - EM	DVC – DV BYE	Sandoval

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC PL2

Proposition:

SJSU-MS

Opposition:

CLSF-BS

Leader:

Megan

Points (1-30) _____

Leader: Nicholas

Points (1-30) _____

Member:

Nino

Points (1-30) _____

Member: Sergio

Points (1-30) _____

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial NE

Comments for Improvement:

- PM - Be sure to subpoint your Harms and advantages. clarify what the net benefits are. when introducing harms be sure to back them up thru advantages. Great organization
- MG - Be sure to back up the plan using the same format. Be ~~st~~ in sync with your partner plan. Great flow and tone. good job on the argument.
- LOL - Make sure you don't concede too much without a strong counter argument. good tone on your speaking. -
- M/O - Great job on laying out the uniqueness and times and backing up your partner. good arguments.

10-103

Steele

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC Rd 2

Proposition: LMC-LL

Opposition: COL-KM

Leader: Ashley Points (1-30) 29

Leader: Savanagh Points (1-30) 27

Member: Mason Points (1-30) 28

Member: Amy Points (1-30) 27

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial MS

Comments for Improvement:

Re: Rd 2: The U.S should abolish the death penalty.

- Gov should make all those great responses to opp's disad earlier in rd. so opp can respond.
- Opps disad would be better labeled as "creating divide" as opposed to vaguely attacking republicans (tell me more specifically the "all kinds of things" they'd take away)
- Gov's innocents killed arg is initially responded to with: "it doesn't matter" drop it if it doesn't; of course it does + the response in the next speech is better

I vote Gov. on Econ Adv. + protecting human rights. ~~Opp respon~~

CC2-221

Adams

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

Rd 2

Proposition: LMC-ES

Opposition: LLL-SW

Leader: Cynthia Shepard

Points (1-30) 24

Leader: Alfred Points (1-30) 22

Member: Stephan Elstand

Points (1-30) 21

Member: John Points (1-30) 23

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial _____

Comments for Improvement:

MG hops around on flow alot (bad)

MO follows MG's hops → bad
go back to LO organization

Opp make fallacious arguments (appeal to ignorance)
on # of innocent ppl killed, claim's can't know numbers or cost therefore they should win point

PM Good first speech, separate & impact voters more

LO Impact, off-case better, also you dropped your own (vague) counter-plan → bring it back in the rebuttal as a counter to cost of killing people

Gov wins b/c saves innocent lives & \$, not enough impact on opp side for why ~~save~~ giving closure to family is important or accountability important

Dropping all speaker its for rivalizing ignoring humanity fppl rprishn speshally hose ho ave. committ rime

CC2 214

Zimny

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

212

Proposition: BCC-BT

Opposition: DUC-CCW

Leader: FOXIE Points (1-30) 23

Leader: ERIKA Points (1-30) 22

Member: TINA Points (1-30) 24

Member: ANGELA Points (1-30) 20

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial DFZ

Comments for Improvement:

To both teams - clearly & explicitly establish your case structure & follow it consistently

Govt.: FEWER ads, better supported by links & EVIDENCE

Opp: Use all your time efficiently. Deal with each govt. advantage, but not in equal time. REMEMBER: the status quo is not a counterplan.

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC Rd 2

Proposition: LMC-KP

Opposition: CCSF-CR

Leader: Denzel Points (1-30) 27

Leader: ~~Charley~~ Points (1-30) 25.5
Charley

Member: T.J. Points (1-30) 26

Member: Ambu Points (1-30) 25.5

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial

SB

Comments for Improvement:

The U.S. should abolish the Death Penalty. ~~3/20~~

LMC: Need Criteria & weighing mech to start. (Good job defining "abolish" & "death penalty" though.)

T.J.: You did just enough work on the D/A to beat it. But with the amount of time you left unused, you need to make sure you respond & refute that D/A better.

CCSF: need to practice LMC & Internal LMC args of D/A.

Ambu: Dont take 3 POI's back to back to back. All your opponents are doing is sucking your time.

- Both:
- Use all of your speaking time.
 - Good structure on both sides & excellent job of extending your args.
 - Well done! Fun debate!

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC R2

Proposition: LMC-36

Opposition: CHL-36

Leader: Ryan Points (1-30) 27

Leader: Andy Points (1-30) 28

Member: Luis Points (1-30) 25

Member: Jim Points (1-30) 26

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial OPP

Comments for Improvement:

gov: make sure you have all parts of plan. Label advantages and make sure to emphasize impacts. At the end I would like to hear a weighing of the impacts on net benefits.

opp: Make sure to flush out Solvency press and give re voters on it. Try to use all your time. Coordinate with partner on what the disadvantages are.

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC R2Z

Proposition: LMC-64

Opposition: OHL-LL

Leader: Vanessa Garcia Points (1-30) 26

Leader: Eric Points (1-30) 28

Member: Candace Helix Points (1-30) 25

Member: Allen Points (1-30) 27

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial MA

Comments for Improvement:

Very well done both teams. Keep up the good work and stick with it.

30V: Work on your structure, you are all over the place, especially in the MOC, you've got me trying to guess where you are and you jump between ONCASE & OFFCASE. MOC, be a little more vocally confident, you want to own it. Don't stress when OPP questions your stat, remember, common knowledge.

RFID unit: and prove that the plan causes no significant changes to the SQ. Rest of RFID in round.

OPP: LOC, nice awareness, very well articulated, but you also need to work on structure, you need to work on structure and signposting, it gets messy. MOC, make sure you quote GW correctly, you call their H&A's Advis' when that's not what they are.

2.F.D: I vote for the OPP on the fact that they argue effectively that GW interprets res as fact when it's a policy, and they run a "plan" that has no specifics. I also vote OPP on NIB unholding and the fact that they turn all GW Adv's

CC2-225
What are the stats on crimes w/ & w/o the D.P.?
Is there a benefit for the community?

How would the U.S. abolish the D.P. if the D.P. is a state by state issue?
Sendou, R2Z

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

Think Critically

Proposition: BCC-MM Opposition: DUC-DU

Rachael & Damien B/C the opp is not abolishing the system but "creating a new humane system" you could argue that the opp is offi

Leader: Rachael Points (1-30) 25 Leader: Alex Points (1-30) 21

Member: Damien Points (1-30) 23 Member: Niki Points (1-30) 20

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial N.S.

Comments for Improvement: I think its hard to come up & speak especially since alex didnt set up any arguements for your case. The only area you are speaking on is your C.P. & gov case. But never establish yours.

Don't ve releasing criminals on the street.

Rachael - Define the resolution. - provide a plan. What about folks who arent innocent? folks. Should they be put to death?

Alex - your C.P. is completely opposite from your own definition of abolish (completely end). To say you wont end or abolish, but will create a more humane system is not "completely end". Alex it's your job to create the opps case - what are your dis ads? You didnt give any arguements for your side. You simply said you agreed w/ the govs harms.

Damien - good job bringing in counter arguements on the opps plan.

Folks: The D.P. is done on a state by state basis. Thus the P.P. in Calif. & the reasons for the D.P. in Calif is different than the D.P. in Texas.

CC2-~~213~~
213

Saito

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC Rd 2

Proposition: SJSU-LS

Opposition: DUC-BT

Leader: Avesta Sabetian

Points (1-30) 24

Leader: Vaivos Bozikis

Points (1-30) 22

Member: Ashley Love

Points (1-30) 25

Member: Cecily Trowbridge


Points (1-30) 23

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial KK

Comments for Improvement:

The opposition made a fatal mistake of arguing the case they'd prepared (States' rights) versus the case the government forwarded (abolishing the D.P. in the Federal prison system). While the opp. made some great points they entirely ignored all arguments the govt. made. Perhaps they could have argued that the govt. incorrectly interpreted terms, but they didn't & this is why I ruled in the government's favor.

The MG should have pointed out this error in her speech. Then she ~~could~~ could have nevertheless tried to demonstrate why states shouldn't be given the right to ~~decide~~ decide such an important civil rights issue like this one. There are many arguments against a states' rights approach to this topic, & just in case the judge rules to accept the opposition's ~~argument~~ definition they'd still be covered.



The USA should abolish the death penalty.

3:20
PM

It was a devastating point of information when the opposition asked the govt. to provide one single example of an innocent person put to death & the govt. could not. They should have been prepared with copious examples.

CC2-222

"US SHOULD ABOLISH THE DEATH PENALTY" 3:20

Barber

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

Pd 2

Proposition: LMC-JS

Opposition: CLL-RS

Leader: Points (1-30) 35
PM - TAMER JOHNSON

Leader: Points (1-30) 20
ROBERT REED

Member: Points (1-30) 23
MG - PELERO SITU (40)

Member: Points (1-30) 24
Aeric Silva (44)

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial GOVT - CS

Comments for Improvement:

GOVT - BE MORE SUCCINCT. WHEN YOU GET TO IT (WITHOUT TOO MUCH FLUFF) IT'S STRONGER, MORE CRISP AND EFFECTIVE. "SPEEDING UP A BROKEN PROCESS ISN'T FIXING IT." GREAT POINT. NICE MG CLOSE OF # OF DEATHS NOT WITHHOLDING ON EYE FOR EYE PATH. Jump on THEIR C.P. counterp. # your POINTS. HAVE MORE STRUCTURE & BE MORE DIRECT. GET THEM ON CLAIM FROM DNA EVIDENCE & PROVER. (NOT SURE ~~WHY~~ YOU BRING UP CASE ANTHONY CASE?) GREAT RECORD WITH PM LATER

OPP- # your POINTS. LIKE GOVT, BE MORE DIRECT, STRUCTURED. FINISH ALL YOUR THOUGHTS, IDEAS. YOU HAVE TO COUNTER THEIR EYE FOR EYE ARGUMENT MORE COMPLETELY. GREAT USE OF PATHOS. NEED MORE SUPPORT, LOGOS. ; counter plan WAS A BIT HAZY, VAGUE (AND BROAD)

TANNER-

DON'T SAY GIVE YU ATTN GETTER. JUST GIVE IT. ;
COST\$. morally "NOT SURE" - DON'T BE TENTATIVE.

3rd Sp.
Sous Counter +
To Closure. ;

So sorry about y phone! WHAT A DOOFUS! ;
Admin Justice more \$ to have it.

Good Humane
Argument.

"money-murder machine" ; + GREAT. THE IS NOW.

+ Good/best

WHAT IS YOUR PLAN TEXT? / YU CONFUSED YOURSELF "SHOULD NOT
VOTE THIS IN" (HUH?) - NEED TO JUMP ON IDEA OF CLOSURE FOR
VICTIMS FAMILIES.

REAG
ESQU
A!

FELERE

+ GOOD SNOWBALL ANALOGY, YOU SET ^{IT} UP WELL. FOLLOW IT SWAY

GOVT = THUGS. HUND DEAD. CONFUSING "NO FEELING TO WHAT I HAVE
DONE" (AS FATHER) THU WAS A LITTLE CONVOLUTED. ATTACK THEIR
CONTENTIONS MORE DIRECTLY. EXPLAIN/TEAR APART THE IDEA THE SPEEDING
UP PROCESS - THAT'S WRONG IS STILL WRONG. BE CRISPER, MORE DIRECT, EXPLICIT
YOUR MURDER/MURDER EX GOT CONFUSING... KILL MORE IS CLEAR, SUCCINCT,
ETC. + GOOD!

NO SPEECH
WITHOUT REGARD...

OPP

ROBERT - BE MORE SUCCINCT - WORK ON
SHORTER, CRISPER SENTENCES, EASIER TO FOLLOW.

ROBERT

✓ AGREE DEFS.

+ CRITERIA - WHAT SAVES MORE LIVES? WHAT ABOUT TAKEN LIVES?
? YOUR SEPT 11 EX WAS A LITTLE FROM LEFT FIELD. YU SAID "HE"
BUT HUH?
+ GOOD POINT, SAVING/PREVENTING FUTURE MURDERS.
+ APPER PROCESS. GIVE YOUR SUBJ A ROAD MAP TO
FOLLOW. GOOD RESPONSE TO TANNER'S Q.

DISPO 1 - CLOSURE? DISPO 2? GOOD TO LOOK AT COST# + COUNTER PLAN
GOOD! ; \$

AERIEL

+ GREAT PASSION, CONVICTION & CONFIDENCE, ESP. FOR A
NOVICE DEBATER. NEED EVIDENCE TO SHOW THE
CLOSURE FOR FAMILY. VIOLENCE, UPRISING IN JAIL IS
INCREASES.

ON ONE HAND YU SAY PRISONERS ARE ANIMALS IN CAGES
BUT ON OTHER THAT D.P. IS HUMANE. CONTRADICTION.
BIG STRETCH TO ANIMALS IN CAGES AND 5 STAR HOTELS. HAV
FINISH THOUGHT - IF THEY WERE TO BE 1... YU TRAIL
OFF FINISH STRONG.

Round Three: Parliamentary Debate

	Proposition	Opposition	Judge
CO 101	BCC - BT	OHL - BM	Arcidianacono
CO 102	LMC - ES	SJSU - NS	Steele
CO 103	CCC - SW	LMC - BG	Opsata
CC2 221	LMC - GH	DVC - BT	Sandoval
CC2 222	OHL - CC	LMC - JS	Pourkhalhali
CC2 223	CCSF - BS	DVC - DV	Saito
CC2 212	LMC - CL	CCSF - CR	Lim
CC2 213	SJSU - LS	COL - KM	Campbell
CC2 214	LMC - KP	CCC - RS	Whalen
CC2 225	BCC - MN DVC - CCW	CCSF - EM BYE	Zimny

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

Proposition: GHL-CC

Opposition: LMC-TS

Leader: ALLEN CHAN

Points (1-30) 27

Leader: Felero Smith

Points (1-30) 27

Member: ERIC KAMACHO

Points (1-30) 30
Hit the other team's points dead on and got in a solid overview

Member: Tanner Johnson

Points (1-30) 27

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial CC

Comments for Improvement:

~~PMCo~~: Don't define "immediately" as "in six months". If you start right now and it takes 6 months, cool, but starting in 6 months is not really topical.

- Don't do more than resolution (UN)
- Don't fiat US and UN as agents of action

For the opp:

- I guess learn some procedurals to nail that if it happens again (Topicality, Extra-Topicality, Multiple Actor Fiat abusive)
- Get strong disadvantages so you can prove they lose the debate in doing plan action.
- Nail them on their advantages and make a good case for why they don't work.
- Paint a picture of why a world where their plan passes is a bad world that shouldn't happen so I should vote Opp.

Generic Procedural shell (rules are what you make them):

- Standard (what you say is the rule)
- Violation (How they don't follow it.)
- Vote (why the judge should vote against them for it.) then you debate

CC2-214

Whalen

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

lots of unused speech time

Proposition: LMC-KP

Opposition: CCC-RS

Leader: Denzel 1 Points (1-30) 27

Leader: Aeviel ⁴ ^{great confidence} Points (1-30) 26

Member: T.J 3 Points (1-30) 27

Member: Rob Points (1-30) 27

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial KW

Comments for Improvement: Both teams were late to the round.

Aeviel: don't agree with the def of immediate = gradual.

Denzel: Make sure you ask a question not make a statement

Rob: Don't take back to back P.O.T.s. Other team is dominating your speech time.

clearly label this Starabia arg as a disad and use structure

Neg does not have a consistent DA and drops the Time frame Assadar arg - Key to round

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

Proposition: CCC-SW

Opposition: LMC-BG

Leader: Alfredo Serono Points (1-30) _____

Leader: Luis Gordon Points (1-30) _____

Member: Jonathan Wheat Points (1-30) _____

Member: Ryan Blumenthal Points (1-30) _____

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial CR

Comments for Improvement: 788845 Questions of topicality and relevancy are args to be made in the debate. Don't ask the judge to intervene.

PROV

• Use a weighing mechanism that allows for comparisons to be made. Advantages (sentiment, troop pull-out) are distinct from weighing. Body count, utilitarianism, ethics, moral responsibility those are all "weighing mechanisms" or "how we value what we value."

• Be careful of saying things like "Iraq is a lost cause" w/out providing warrants

"What do you call it?" "You know" cut out filler

OPP

• Provide support for your counter advocacy. So we should wait... why?

• 1st Opp does an excellent job of making defensive args against gov. (mitigating gov impacts) but try to think of disadvantages, not cause specific harms as a result of their plan

I vote opp b/c they did a good job of mitigating the gov's impacts while providing unique reasons (terrorist attacks) why leaving troops is better.

CC2-221

Sandouel

folks
Be sure to give me voters
so I know what to vote on.

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

Proposition: LMC-64

Opposition: DUC-BT

Leader: Vanessa Points (1-30) 25

Leader: Vaios. Points (1-30) 23

Member: Candace Points (1-30) 24

Member: Cecily Points (1-30) 23

where would the \$ be better spent?

How will we maintain or ensure security for our folks if we withdraw.

If there are more than 4,000 military deaths then shouldn't we withdraw to prevent more? Haven't we been in this war long enough?

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial N.S.

Comments for Improvement:

Vanessa - Be sure to define the resolution. What does immediately & unconditionally mean? Also you dont have a plan. - How would you as the gov do this? Tell us.

Candace - good point about getting Binladen

Vaios - you dropped all of the gov's Harms. You did well trying to reestablish the opps case, But never opposed the gov's case, also when reestablishing your case be sure to have more than one argument - which was if we withdraw the iraqis insurgents will take control, know where you find your info. what are your sources? How are you going to affirm the resolution? what is your plan? Dont keep clearing your throat - just pause - you dont have to talk the entire time.

I like your House foundation metaphor. Nice explanation. The New Jackals - Careful of biased info.

CC2-225

Zimny

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

Proposition: BCC-MM

Opposition:

CCSF - Eum

Leader: Damon

Points (1-30) 25

Leader: Andrew

Points (1-30) 27

Member: Rachel

Points (1-30) 20

Member: Mike

Points (1-30) 23

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial

JFZ

Comments for Improvement:

Reason for vote: Opp. presented counterplan not sufficiently distinct from status quo. Govt. didn't call them on it and were unable to use their 2nd constructive effectively. Several solid points made only in Govt. rebuttal.

Strengths: Smooth, articulate presentations, good clash on some points.

o improve on: clear presentation of case structure, better time management.

Both teams have excellent potential!

CO-101

Leahy

~~Academic~~
~~Opposite/El...~~

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

Proposition: B CC-BT

Opposition: O HL-BM

Leader: Forie

Points (1-30) 28

Leader: Andy B

Points (1-30) 29

Member: Tina

Points (1-30) 26

Member: James

Points (1-30) 27

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial DC

Comments for Improvement:

Keep working on structure and line by line refutation.

Look Neg on plan vagueness and dropped DB Ads.

Good job

CC2-223

Sa.to

The US Military should withdraw from Iraq immediately & unconditionally. 440.

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

Proposition: CCSF-BS

Opposition: DUC-DU

Leader: Nicholas Barlow

Points (1-30) 24

Leader: Alex Vuskovic

Points (1-30) 24

Member: Sergio Suchett

Points (1-30) 23

Member: Niki Dukellis

Points (1-30) 22

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial AS.

Comments for Improvement:

While the government forwarded some good arguments about why leaving Iraq is a good idea, they never forwarded a plan about how this would occur even when prompted by the opposition. Moreover, they didn't address the very strong counterarguments about anarchy & the necessity of war for the US economy. Therefore I ruled in the opposition's favor.

~~The stat~~ I encourage all the speakers to have used history more to enforce their points. There have been occasions when the US has occupied a country & democracy has flourished. At the same time democracy has also come to countries without US intervention. Without specific examples, both teams were reduced to broad generalizations.

Finally, while I commend the passion of the MO when describing the anarchy that could occur with immediate withdrawal, she got carried away down that slippery slope. The Govt. should have pointed out the weakness of her argument.

CC2-213

Campbell

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMC

Proposition:

SJSU-LS

Opposition:

COL-KM

Leader:

Ashley

Points (1-30)

28

Leader: Savannah

Points (1-30)

29

Member:

Avesta

Points (1-30)

25

Member: Amy

Points (1-30)

28

Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial

he

Comments for Improvement:

PM / Great Structure, slow down just a bit. Put good layout and

Debate Ballot - 2011 Debate Camp at LMCProposition: LMC-ESOpposition: SJSU-MSLeader: Stephan Points (1-30) 28Leader: Niko Points (1-30) 27Member: Cynthia Points (1-30) 28Member: Megan Points (1-30) 27Please circle the team that you thought won the debate. Initial MS**Comments for Improvement:**

The US military should withdrawal from Iraq immediately + unconditionally

- Gov, try to keep more of the debate on your side of the flow; don't let opp push you off
- Both sides, ensure you're connecting examples to specific harms/benefits.
- Highlight dropped args + emphasize why it matters.

I vote Gov as their advantage on saved \$ for healthcare/infrastructure is relatively untouched.
Opp calling 3 trillion insignificant is non responsive