**Sample PF Ballot**

Ballots do not all look alike, but they all contain certain essential information.

Judge Name \_\_\_\_\_\_Jackson Weber\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Pro Speaker #1 Name: Pro Speaker 1 Speaker Points \_\_\_\_29\_\_\_\_

Pro Speaker #2 Name Pro Speaker 2 Speaker Points \_\_\_27.5\_\_\_

Con Speaker #1 Name Con Speaker 1 Speaker Points \_\_\_28.5\_\_\_

Con Speaker #2 Name Con Speaker 2 Speaker Points \_\_\_\_28\_\_\_\_

School You are Voting For: Princeton

Please Verify the Side You Voted For – Underline One – **Pro** or Con

Comments for the Pro Speakers:

The Pro extended their arguments throughout the round much better than the Con did. They were also *much* better organized in their speeches.

Speaker 1: Well articulated. Good clean cross at the beginning, but it quickly devolved into an argument match in which no progress was being made towards answering the question. However, that little bit ended up being set aside for the rest of cross, so + points for that.

Speaker 2: Calm down. Tone comes off as unnecessarily aggressive. Hand motions are good, just not like that. Every action, from asking questions in cross to walking up to speak, was done in a hostile manner. Rebuttal and FF were well-organized and easy to follow. Cross was a little bit speech-y with not enough questions and too many arguments.

Comments for the Con Speakers

Both speakers lacked the confidence that the pro had. While Pro Speaker #2 was entirely too aggressive, the con was much too quiet. It’s important to be passionate without appearing angry.

Speaker 1: Nothing much for speeches, well spoken. If anything, try to make eye contact with the judges more rather than staring at the paper.

Speaker 2: Tends to speak at a faster pace. Though completely understandable, it comes across as panic. Rebuttal is a *little* card-heavy. That isn’t necessarily a problem, but when it becomes noticeable, when it comes to a point where a judge notices it, it needs to be toned down. Cross was a mess, full of interrupting and talking over the opponent, mostly (if not entirely) by fault of the con side.

Reasons for Your Decision

I agreed with the pro that the con’s evidence was nebulous and barely quantifiable. The pro’s links were well-extended throughout the arguments. Ultimately I voted off the argument that poverty cannot be solved for without industrialization, and by reducing borders more jobs open up.