CROSS-EXAMINATION OFFICIAL JUDGING BALLOT

☐ Round Robin ☐ Elimination Rounds Round: _____ Time: _____

Affirmative: *Total Team Score* _____

Leader: Galilea Martinez

Presentation:

Verbal 1 3 (5)

Non-Verbal 1 3 (5)

Content *What you say*:

Use of Value Criterion 2 (4) 6

CX Responses (2) 4 6

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 (8) 10

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 (5)

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Leader vs Leader)

Section A (score stronger argument here) (6) 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 5

Total (max. 45 points) 35

Member: Daniela Saucedo

Presentation:

Verbal 1 3 (5)

Non-Verbal 1 3 (5)

Content *What you say*:

Use of Inquiry 2 (4) 6

Rebuttal/Rejoinder 2 (4) 6

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 (8) 10

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 (5)

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Member vs Member)

Section A (score stronger argument here) (6) 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 5

Total (max. 45 points) 37

Opposition: *Total Team Score*

Leader: Dalinda Hernandez

Presentation:

Verbal 1 3 (5)

Non-Verbal 1 3 (5)

Content *What you say*:

Use of Value Criterion (2) 4 6

CX Responses (2) 4 6

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 (8) 10

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 (5)

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Leader vs Leader)

Section A (score stronger argument here) 6 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 (5)

Total (max. 45 points) 32

Member: Natalia Yanez

Presentation:

Verbal 1 (3) 5

Non-Verbal 1 3 (5)

Content *What you say*:

Use of Inquiry 2 (4) 6

Analysis of Opponent's Argument 2 (4) 6

Reasoning and conceptualization (6) 8 10

Decorum, Rules, and Time: (1) 3 5

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Member vs Member)

Section A (score stronger argument here) 6 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 (5)

Total (max. 45 points) 28

In the judge's opinion, the team with the highest combined points was made by (circle one): **(AFFIRMATIVE)** **OPPOSITION**
(In the event of a tie, the judge may choose the more effective and persuasive team.)

COMMENTS

Galilea: Strong opening, horrible responses.

Daniela: never said only, just prioritization, really strong rebuttal.

Dalinda: cannot answer questions
Didn't respond well to the value or harm. mentioned it once and said I don't agree.
Did not disprove well. ~~Didn't like the response of independent~~

Natalia: started really strong. needs to fill time. Didn't give enough reasons to disprove.

Judge Name: [redacted] Signature: [redacted]

5.27.25

CROSS-EXAMINATION OFFICIAL JUDGING BALLOT

☐ Round Robin ☐ Elimination Rounds Round: Finals Time: 2:07

Affirmative: *Total Team Score* _____

Leader: Galilea Martinez

Presentation:

Verbal 1 3 5

Non-Verbal 1 3 5

Content *What you say*:

Use of Value Criterion 2 4 6

CX Responses 2 4 6

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 8 10

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 5

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Leader vs Leader)

Section A (score stronger argument here) 6 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 5

Total (max. 45 points) [ ]

Member: Daniela Saucedo

Presentation:

Verbal 1 3 5

Non-Verbal 1 3 5

Content *What you say*:

Use of Inquiry 2 4 6

Rebuttal/Rejoinder 2 4 6

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 8 10

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 5

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Member vs Member)

Section A (score stronger argument here) 6 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 5

Total (max. 45 points) [ ]

Opposition: *Total Team Score*

Leader: Dalinda Hernandez

Presentation:

Verbal 1 3 5

Non-Verbal 1 3 5

Content *What you say*:

Use of Value Criterion 2 4 6

CX Responses 2 4 6

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 8 10

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 5

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Leader vs Leader)

Section A (score stronger argument here) 6 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 5

Total (max. 45 points) [ ]

Member: Natalia Yañez

Presentation:

Verbal 1 3 5

Non-Verbal 1 3 5

Content *What you say*:

Use of Inquiry 2 4 6

Analysis of Opponent's Argument 2 4 6

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 8 10

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 5

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Member vs Member)

Section A (score stronger argument here) 6 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 5

Total (max. 45 points) [ ]

In the judge's opinion, the team with the highest combined points was made by (circle one): **AFFIRMATIVE** **OPPOSITION**
(In the event of a tie, the judge may choose the more effective and persuasive team.)

COMMENTS

affirmative
Galilea
- good responding, but I would've recommended that through ~~text~~ IBL + CBL and practice, ~~by~~ the time participants are leaders, they can make quick decision
Daniela
good question
good tone in rebuttal
could've more work defending your stance. tell me the need for change?

Dalinda
good tone
good passion
good handling

opposition
Natalia:
- oxford dic. isn't strong arg. in closing statement
- good bringing up harm

Judge Name: [redacted]

Signature: [redacted]

5.27.25

CROSS-EXAMINATION OFFICIAL JUDGING BALLOT

☐ Round Robin ☐ Elimination Rounds Round: _____ Time: _____

Affirmative: *Total Team Score* _____

Leader: Galilea Martinez

Member: Darilla Saucedo

Presentation:		**Presentation:**	
Verbal	1 3 (5)	Verbal	1 3 (5)
Non-Verbal	1 (3) 5	Non-Verbal	1 (3) 5
Content *What you say*:		**Content** *What you say*:	
Use of Value Criterion	2 4 (6)	Use of Inquiry	2 4 (6)
CX Responses	2 (4) 6	Rebuttal/Rejoinder	2 4 (6)
Reasoning and conceptualization	6 (8) 10	Reasoning and conceptualization	6 (8) 10
Decorum, Rules, and Time:	1 3 (5)	**Decorum, Rules, and Time:**	1 3 (5)
Argument *How you defend what you say*: (Leader vs Leader)		**Argument** *How you defend what you say*: (Member vs Member)	
Section A (score stronger argument here)	6 8	Section A (score stronger argument here)	6 (8)
Section B (score lesser argument here)	3 (5)	Section B (score lesser argument here)	3 5
Total (max. 45 points)	36	Total (max. 45 points)	41

Opposition: *Total Team Score* _____

Leader: Dalinda Hernandez

Member: Natalia Yanez

Presentation:		**Presentation:**	
Verbal	1 3 (5)	Verbal	1 3 (5)
Non-Verbal	1 3 (5)	Non-Verbal	1 (3) 5
Content *What you say*:		**Content** *What you say*:	
Use of Value Criterion	2 (4) 6	Use of Inquiry	2 (4) 6
CX Responses	2 (4) 6	Analysis of Opponent's Argument	2 (4) 6
Reasoning and conceptualization	6 (8) 10	Reasoning and conceptualization	6 (8) 10
Decorum, Rules, and Time:	1 3 (5)	**Decorum, Rules, and Time:**	1 (3) 5
Argument *How you defend what you say*: (Leader vs Leader)		**Argument** *How you defend what you say*: (Member vs Member)	
Section A (score stronger argument here)	6 8	Section A (score stronger argument here)	6 8
Section B (score lesser argument here)	3 (5)	Section B (score lesser argument here)	3 (5)
Total (max. 45 points)	36	Total (max. 45 points)	32

In the judge's opinion, the team with the highest combined points was made by (circle one): **(AFFIRMATIVE)** **OPPOSITION**

(In the event of a tie, the judge may choose the more effective and persuasive team.)

COMMENTS

Gali: Good strong voice.

Dari: More confidence, passion, and emphasis. Good rebuttle questions & knowledge. Use stronger

Dalinda: Good passion, but don't present the your mad. Use stronger rebuttal: responses.

Natalia: Good strong voice. STAY DOWN!!! keep confidence at all times!!!

Judge Name: [redacted]

Signature: [redacted]

3.27.25

CROSS-EXAMINATION OFFICIAL JUDGING BALLOT

☐ Round Robin ☐ Elimination Rounds Round: Finals Time: _____

***Affirmative:** Total Team Score* _____

Leader: Galilea Martinez

Presentation:

Verbal 1 3 (5)

Non-Verbal 1 (3) 5

Content *What you say*:

Use of Value Criterion 2 4 (6)

CX Responses (2) 4 6

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 (8) 10

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 (5)

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Leader vs Leader)

Section A (score stronger argument here) (6) 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 (5)

Total (max. 45 points) 35

Member: Daniela Saucedo

Presentation:

Verbal 1 3 (5)

Non-Verbal ~~1 (3) 5~~ 3

Content *What you say*:

Use of Inquiry 2 4 (6)

Rebuttal/Rejoinder 2 4 (6)

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 8 (10)

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 (5)

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Member vs Member)

Section A (score stronger argument here) 6 (8)

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 5

Total (max. 45 points) 43

***Opposition:** Total Team Score*

Leader: Dalinda Hernandez

Presentation:

Verbal 1 (3) 5

Non-Verbal 1 (3) 5

Content *What you say*:

Use of Value Criterion (2) 4 6

CX Responses (2) 4 6

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 (8) 10

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 (5)

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Leader vs Leader)

Section A (score stronger argument here) 6 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 (5)

Total (max. 45 points) 29

Member: Natalia Yañez

Presentation:

Verbal 1 3 (5)

Non-Verbal 1 3 (5)

Content *What you say*:

Use of Inquiry 2 4 (6)

Analysis of Opponent's Argument 2 4 (6)

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 8 (10)

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 (5)

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Member vs Member)

Section A (score stronger argument here) 6 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 (5)

Total (max. 45 points) 42

In the judge's opinion, the team with the highest combined points was made by (circle one): **AFFIRMATIVE** **OPPOSITION**
(In the event of a tie, the judge may choose the more effective and persuasive team.)

COMMENTS

- prioritize inq. based and collab. learning – change is abs. necessary
- standardised adaptive mindset
- Galilea: verbal presentation was rily good, but you have to look up! also, state your harm more directly.
- Daniela: great CX! I think the 2nd time you bring up the definition needs to be clearer, look up when talking Loved your opening quote,

Natalia: great closing question
Dalinda: you started off screaming, slow down, great job addressing the contradiction, loved you mentioning the website example, you look
Natalia closing: slow down, great job clarifying what your leader meant.

Judge Name: [redacted] Signature: [redacted] 5.27.25

great job emphasizing that you're not ONLY using those learning methods, great closing.

CROSS-EXAMINATION OFFICIAL JUDGING BALLOT

☐ Round Robin ☐ Elimination Rounds Round: _____ Time: _____

***Affirmative:** Total Team Score* _____

Leader: GALILEA MARTINEZ

Presentation:

Verbal 1 3 (5)

Non-Verbal 1 3 (5) 10

Content *What you say*:

Use of Value Criterion 2 4 (6)

CX Responses (2) 4 6 21

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 (8) 10

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 (5)

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Leader vs Leader)

Section A (score stronger argument here) (6) 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 5

Total (max. 45 points) 37

Member: DANIELA SAUCEDO

Presentation:

Verbal 1 3 5

Non-Verbal 1 3 5

Content *What you say*:

Use of Inquiry 2 (4) 6

Rebuttal/Rejoinder 2 4 6

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 (8) 10

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 (5)

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Member vs Member)

Section A (score stronger argument here) 6 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 5

Total (max. 45 points) _____

***Opposition:** Total Team Score*

Leader: DAHNDA HERNANDEZ

Presentation:

Verbal 1 3 (5)

Non-Verbal 1 3 (5) 10

Content *What you say*:

Use of Value Criterion (2) 4 6

CX Responses (2) 4 6

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 (8) 10 16

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 (5)

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Leader vs Leader)

Section A (score stronger argument here) 6 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) (3) 5

Total (max. 45 points) 30

Member: NATALIA YANEZ

Presentation:

Verbal 1 (3) 5

Non-Verbal 1 (3) 5

Content *What you say*:

Use of Inquiry 2 (4) 6

Analysis of Opponent's Argument 2 4 6

Reasoning and conceptualization 6 8 10

Decorum, Rules, and Time: 1 3 5

Argument *How you defend what you say*:
(Member vs Member)

Section A (score stronger argument here) 6 8

Section B (score lesser argument here) 3 5

Total (max. 45 points) _____

In the judge's opinion, the team with the highest combined points was made by (circle one): **(AFFIRMATIVE)** **OPPOSITION**
(In the event of a tie, the judge may choose the more effective and persuasive team.)

COMMENTS:

AFF

STANDARDIZED
ADAPTED
MINDSET

FIXING → PREVENTING

VC: SYSTEMS OF INQUIRY
COLLABORATION

OPP

NOT A CONTRADICTION

VALUE + HARM CONN

GREAT POINT ON "ONLY"
↳ WOULD ELABORATE MORE

Judge Name: [redacted]

Signature: [redacted] 5.27.25

BURDEN OF PROOF, [redacted] NOT TRUTH