Public Forum Debate Ballot

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

Tournament Date:	11/7 - 11/8		Tournament Location:	Ripon HS	
Round/Flight: 1A	Room: 322	Division: V	Judge Name: Scott Wunn		Affiliation/Occupation: Ripon HS

Resolution/Topic: *Resolved: On balance, the benefits of genetically modified foods outweigh the harms.*

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			
Code: Millard West RJ	Side: ☐ Pro ☑ Con		Points
Speaker 1 Name: Jennifer Jerome			28.5
Speaker 3 Name: Fred Robertson			28

Second Team			
Code: Montgomery Academy RR	Side: ☑ Pro ☐ Con		Points
Speaker 2 Name: Jay Rye			27
Speaker 4 Name: Goo Rye			30

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

Winning Team: ☑ Pro ☐ Con	Team/Code:	Montgomery Academy RR

❖ 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:

· The chemistry of the team was good.

· The summary did an effective job of highlighting the key issues in the round.

· The final focus discussed a couple arguments that the summary did not focus on.

· The argument about the developmental harms was persuasive but not developed in the later parts of the round.

Comments to debaters:

· The first speaker's confidence is strong in the first speech but lacks in the summary

· The rebuttal was impressive with the turns placed on the con case.

· The summary speech dropped a couple arguments.

· The final focus did an effective job comparing arguments and crystallizing.

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

This was an interesting debate. While the con team was more balanced, the pro did end up winning the round. The most important argument at the end of the round was the pro's second contention. Within that contention, the con did not effectively refute the various parts of the argument. While they rejected the overall claim, they failed to address the specific justifications that established the validity of the claim.

The key elements of the argument that led to me voting pro was the Harvard University study on GMOs and the economic impacts that are created. The defense that was put on the side effects helped mitigate the offense of the con. So I voted pro.

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.

SAMPLE

08/21/2014