

Matthew Brothers

### Big Questions Debate ballot

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

Round 1 Sect. A - Room 501 - Judge Y5 **Mindy Glazer** (Miami Beach Senior High)

Debaters: Maria Garzon (McArthur High GA - AA) vs. Spencer Grosso (Nova High Scho GR - Z)

Affirmative Code: **McArthur High GA**

Name(s): **Maria Garzon** Points: 25 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_

Negative Code: **Nova High Scho GR**

Name(s): **Spencer Grosso** Points: 28 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Pts: Points: \_\_\_\_\_

The Negative side, code Z won this debate. Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Judge signature [Signature] School Krop

#### COMMENTS

##### AFFIRMATIVE

##### NEGATIVE

Spoke Very Fast  
Moments of clarity and good points  
but JIFF: c-lt + follow. Good conclusion  
but not tied together ideally  
Conclusion

- Needs to relax and deliver  
- Good points but not well  
tied together  
→ strong close/Rebuttal  
Better cross/very good  
cleaner rebuttals

#### Reasons for decision

The negative side won not necessarily because his arguments were better but because he was able to present better.

# Big Questions Debate ballot

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

Round 1 Sect. D - Room 506 - Judge AA7 **Carolina Valenzuela** (McArthur High School)

Debaters: Michael Moy (Nova High Scho MO - Z) vs. Sophia Thobani (Deerfield Beac TH - G)

Affirmative Code: **Nova High Scho MO**

Name(s): **Michael Moy** Points: \_\_\_\_\_ -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: 28

Negative Code: **Deerfield Beac TH**

Name(s): **Sophia Thobani** Points: \_\_\_\_\_ -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Pts: Points: 28

The aff side, code Nova M.O won this debate. Low point win?

Judge signature Carolina Valenzuela School McArthur High

### COMMENTS

#### AFFIRMATIVE

#### NEGATIVE

You literally dropped your entire ~~MC~~ MC, which was really interesting so make sure you extend!

Very clear and concise but you're letting him boil down this round to parenting point, be more assertive!

Parenting turn was great, but shouldn't have been the focal point of the round,

Athnism was strong but parenting leak was weak, I would've turned his capitalisms point to include ethnic professions such as doctor, lawyer, social worker which include sewing OTHERS completely unrelated to each other.

- Very clear and articulate

Both: Need to ask your coaches to explain voters ~~response~~ & sign posting, you guys were good to follow, but it

- You were great! 😊

could've been more organized, but this didn't affect my vote today.

#### Reasons for decision

More participants in capitalism than parenting

Greed  
- Athnism  
feelings

# Big Questions Debate ballot

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

Round 1 Sect. C - Room 505 - Judge Y5 **Mindy Glazer** (Miami Beach Senior High)

Debaters: Jason Alvarez (Nova High Scho AL - **Z**) vs. Christian Campbell (McArthur High CA - **AA**)

Affirmative Code: **Nova High Scho AL**

Name(s): **Jason Alvarez** Points: 27 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_

Negative Code: **McArthur High CA**

Name(s): **Christian Campbell** Points: 30 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ **Pts:** Points: \_\_\_\_\_

The Negative side, code AA won this debate. Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Judge signature Mindy Glazer School Miami Beach Sr. High

Jason Alvarez

### COMMENTS

Christian Campbell

#### AFFIRMATIVE

state your name before you begin  
good points raised in <sup>first</sup> argument  
but it was too short (first argument)  
made good eye contact  
Good response to question  
Asked a good question  
Try not to use word "like" so much  
and ~~to~~ use "um" so much.

#### NEGATIVE

state your name before you begin  
excellent argument - clear and reasoned  
set forth contentions clearly  
Good eye contact  
Asked good questions  
Need to answer question - ~~just~~ <sup>Don't just say</sup> ~~points~~  
his question was refuted in my contention  
Excellent 3rd argument - coherent & succinct  
argument supported by facts  
Good demeanor & gave coherent response to question

#### Reasons for decision

conveyed Argument well  
- humans primarily driven by self interest

Mr. Alvarez made good arguments but needed more facts to support his argument.

Mr. Campbell did an outstanding job making succinct and rational arguments. I liked that he referred back to statements made in his earlier contentions.

# Big Questions Debate ballot

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

Round 2 Sect. B - Room 504 - Judge L11 **Sheryl Tracey** (Ft Lauderdale)

Debaters: Christian Campbell (McArthur High CA - AA) vs. Michael Moy (Nova High Scho MO - Z)

Affirmative Code: **McArthur High CA**

Name(s): **Christian Campbell** Points: 28 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_

Negative Code: **Nova High Scho MO**

Name(s): **Michael Moy** Points: 21 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Pts: Points: \_\_\_\_\_

The aff side, code \_\_\_\_\_ won this debate. Low point win? NO

Judge signature Sheryl Tracey School Ft Lauderdale

### COMMENTS

#### AFFIRMATIVE

#### NEGATIVE

Christian's case was overall ~~convincing~~ <sup>well</sup> constructed and he extended on the emotional & spiritual aspects of his case. Overall he was able to present a fully constructed case.

Michael extended his argument regard mother/child bond but overall ~~as~~ his case was ~~not extended~~ well presented but overall focused on one factor.

### Reasons for decision

The aff was able to present his case ~~and p~~ in an organized and easy to follow format.

**Big Questions Debate ballot**

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

Round 2 Sect. A - Room 501 - Judge J1 **Minette Perez Poole** (Our Lady of Lourdes Academy)Debaters: Kleibers Perez (McArthur High PE - **AA**) vs. Jason Alvarez (Nova High Scho AL - **Z**)Affirmative Code: **McArthur High PE**Name(s): **Kleibers Perez** Points: 28 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_Negative Code: **Nova High Scho AL**Name(s): **Jason Alvarez** Points: 27 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ **Pts:** Points: \_\_\_\_\_The affirmative side, code \_\_\_\_\_ won this debate. Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_Judge signature Minette Perez Poole School Our Lady of Lourdes**COMMENTS****AFFIRMATIVE**

Good use of vocal & non-verbal techniques to help strengthen your statements.  
 Try to work on avoiding the use of verbal fillers, especially during the rebuttal.

**NEGATIVE**

Good posture & use of gesture.  
 Clear voice...  
 Try to practice your vocal delivery, specifically for those items which you have the opportunity to prep ahead.

**Reasons for decision**

Mr. Perez was more efficacious both in constructing the argument & successfully rebutting to competitor's line of questioning. Additionally, Mr. Perez's rationale was more clear & strongly supported.

# Big Questions Debate ballot

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

Round 2 Sect. C - Room 505 - Judge Z12 **Richard Grosso** (Nova High School)

Debaters: Sophia Thobani (Deerfield Beac TH - G) vs. Maria Garzon (McArthur High GA - AA)

Affirmative Code: **Deerfield Beac TH**

Name(s): **Sophia Thobani** Points: 29 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_

Negative Code: **McArthur High GA**

Name(s): **Maria Garzon** Points: 29 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Pts: Points: \_\_\_\_\_

The Aff side, code Deerfield Beac TH won this debate. Low point win? No!

Judge signature [Signature] School Nova High

### COMMENTS

#### AFFIRMATIVE Thobani

#### NEGATIVE Garzon

- Definitions good
- ego-ism - persuasive + logical <sup>much better 2nd time around</sup>
- pretty good eye contact - need more always better to speak to your audience defined "primarily" - strong point
- Useful stories: good examples
- sometimes swallowed your words - couldn't understand them always
- Good speaking voice - loud enough & well-paced
- Excellent cross - "Isn't it..." just like a lawyer
- Very good - kept "on message" - you

- Good eye contact + natural gestures ✓
- Slow down a little
- Self-interest vs primary desire - Sounds like you are saying we aren't making conscious decisions. Would be more effective + persuasive to make that clear
- Good sources
- I didn't come away from first argument having been persuaded
- You did set to that on answering cross
- Good point
- Quick answers to cross

#### Reasons for decision

- Kept coming back to your theme
- Avoid "instinct" - detracts & contradicts your conclusion STRONG FINISH
- Good job broadly defining self-interest
- Point about biology was unclear
- "inclusive fitness" needed more explanation
- Strong: plain - spoken well would point about saving yourself over a stranger
- Look at the judge more when questioning

- ~~Avoid instinct~~ - it contradicts your main conclusion <sup>95-5%</sup>
- STRONG FINISH <sup>to reflex & think</sup>
- Neg had the harder arg to make I think
- Desire v. Self Interest - Not ~~good~~ Altruism versus Self-Intent
- STRONG POINT!!!
- Examples to help me "feel" your point would have helped

Very strong & close round. Very hard to choose a winner - BRAVO TO BOTH

# Big Questions Debate ballot

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

Round 3 Sect. A - Room 501 - Judge F16 Jim Longstreth (Western High School)

Debaters: Maria Garzon (McArthur High GA - AA) vs. Jason Alvarez (Nova High Scho AL - Z)

Affirmative Code: **McArthur High GA**

Name(s): **Maria Garzon** Points: 28 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_

Negative Code: **Nova High Scho AL**

Name(s): **Jason Alvarez** Points: 27 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Pts: Points: \_\_\_\_\_

The Affirmative side, code \_\_\_\_\_ won this debate. Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Judge signature James Longstreth School WESTERN

### COMMENTS

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
DATA - ✓✓✓ PRESENTATION - ✓✓ CLARITY - ✓✓✓ EVIDENCE/THEORY - ✓ CROSSFIRE - ✓ REBUTTAL - ✓✓ AFFIRMATIVE - ✓✓ CONSOLIDATION - ✓✓	DATA - ✓✓✓ PRESENTATION - ✓✓ CLARITY - ✓✓ EVIDENCE/THEORY - ✓✓ CROSSFIRE - ✓✓ REBUTTAL - ✓ AFFIRMATIVE - ✓✓ CONSOLIDATION - ✓✓
CONVICTION - ✓✓✓	CONVICTION - ✓✓✓

### Reasons for decision

~~MARIA~~ AFFIRMATIVE WAS AT THE END OF THE DAY MORE CONVINCING IN HER ARGUMENT. SHE MAY MORE EXPERIENCE IN THE TOPIC OR DEBATE. THIS WAS A VERY GOOD ARGUMENT FROM BOTH SIDES

### Big Questions Debate ballot

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

Round 3 Sect. C - Room 505 - Judge J4 Esther Gonzalez (Our Lady of Lourdes Academy)

Debaters: Michael Moy (Nova High Scho MO - Z) vs. Kleibers Perez (McArthur High PE - AA)

Affirmative Code: **Nova High Scho MO**

Name(s): **Michael Moy** Points: \_\_\_\_\_ -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: 29.5

Negative Code: **McArthur High PE**

Name(s): **Kleibers Perez** Points: \_\_\_\_\_ -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Pts: Points: 29

The Affirmative side, code \_\_\_\_\_ won this debate. Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Judge signature [Signature] School OLLA

#### COMMENTS

##### AFFIRMATIVE

Pros - • Good contentions  
• Good examples used to support your point  
• tying self interest and desire

Cons: use dates for research used to support your argument

##### NEGATIVE

Pros - • Good references used  
The use of Maslow's hierarchy  
• Your examples to support your debate that altruism comes 1st then self interest were also good.

Cons: use dates for research used  
Make sure your key concepts are well defined to you in order to support them more persuasively

#### Reasons for decision

My decision for Michael Moy winning the debate is because at the end his persuasion won at the end. Both boys were very good at debating their sides.



# Big Questions Debate ballot

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

## Round 3 Sect. B - Room 504 - Judge J1 Minette Perez Poole (Our Lady of Lourdes Academy)

Debaters: Spencer Grosso (Nova High Scho GR - Z) vs. Christian Campbell (McArthur High CA - AA)

Affirmative Code: **Nova High Scho GR**

Name(s): **Spencer Grosso** Points: 29 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_

Negative Code: **McArthur High CA**

Name(s): **Christian Campbell** Points: 28 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Pts: Points: \_\_\_\_\_

The aff. side, code Nova High Scho GR won this debate. Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Judge signature Minette Poole School Our Lady of Lourdes

### COMMENTS

#### AFFIRMATIVE

Excellent vocal delivery/clarity/speaking rate. Work on minimizing the "inhale" sound as it can make you seem desperate (at worst) or out of breath. Work on making specific choices in your use of gesture. There were a few points throughout when you used gesture to great effect; however, during the const. when you (in theory) had time to prep, your movements seemed unmotivated. You really got to the heart of the debate, directly addressing the issue of competing definitions. You also constructed the rebuttal & cons. very effectively.

#### NEGATIVE

Very unmeasured vocal delivery. Good use of inflection to help draw attention to the important aspects of each statement/piece of evidence. Excellent use of eye contact. Work on finding more effective/efficient ways to clarify your position. Use the ability to take time to prep to your advantage. It seemed you spent quite a while re-stating your points but not enough time directly addressing the points brought up by the opponent.

### Reasons for decision

Mr. Grosso most effectively constructed his argument & continued to handle each subsequent line of questioning & speech effectively supporting his position, and directly addressing comments/points from his opponent.

# Big Questions Debate ballot

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

Round 4 Sect. A - Room 501 - Judge Z15 **Alex Dunn** (Nova High School)

Debaters: Kleibers Perez (McArthur High PE - **AA**) vs. Sophia Thobani (Deerfield Beac TH - **G**)

Affirmative Code: **McArthur High PE**

Name(s): **Kleibers Perez** Points: \_\_\_\_\_ -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: 29

Negative Code: **Deerfield Beac TH**

Name(s): **Sophia Thobani** Points: \_\_\_\_\_ -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Pts: Points: 28

The AFFIRMATIVE side, code AA won this debate. Low point win? NO

Judge signature A. Dunn School NOVA HIGH

## COMMENTS

### AFFIRMATIVE

- Great use of sources
- Great rebuttal and affirmation
- Improve presentation:
  - mindful of "uhms"
  - practice constructive more and ensure emphasis on your affirmation

### NEGATIVE

- Great examples
- Articulate and clear presentation
- Improve:
  - be mindful of conclusionary statements
  - look into anticipatory rebuttal questions

## Reasons for decision

- Good use of sources
- Affirmative rebuttal and affirmation were clearly presented, and not conclusionary.
- (Main) \* Using the question to link to point of biological make up v. learned behaviors
- Negative side used more conclusionary statements and needed more supporting evidence or improved supporting argument.

# Big Questions Debate ballot

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

Round 4 Sect. C - Room 505 - Judge Y8 **Cindy Jacobs** (Miami Beach Senior High)

Debaters: Christian Campbell (McArthur High CA - AA) vs. Maria Garzon (McArthur High GA - AA)

Affirmative Code: **McArthur High CA**

Name(s): **Christian Campbell** Points: 29.5 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_

Negative Code: **McArthur High GA**

Name(s): **Maria Garzon** Points: 29 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Pts: Points: \_\_\_\_\_

The Aff side, code AA won this debate. Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Judge signature Cindy Jacobs School Miami Beach Senior High

### COMMENTS

#### AFFIRMATIVE

Christian Campbell  
Great eye contact  
well organized  
Very clear arguments  
with good support evidence

#### NEGATIVE

Maria Garzon  
Very well organized  
very clear concise  
arguments  
well organized  
read less & speak slower

### Reasons for decision

- Arguments were very convincing
- Very clear arguments
- very well-spoken
- both opponents well-organized
- rebuttals very good,
- hard to decide who is winner

### Big Questions Debate ballot

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

Round 4 Sect. B - Room 504 - Judge D1 **Kim Adams** (J.P. Taravella High School)

Debaters: Spencer Grosso (Nova High Scho GR - Z) vs. Michael Moy (Nova High Scho MO - Z)

Affirmative Code: **Nova High Scho GR**

Name(s): **Spencer Grosso** Points: 29 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_

Negative Code: **Nova High Scho MO**

Name(s): **Michael Moy** Points: 29 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Pts: Points: \_\_\_\_\_

The Affirmative side, code Nova High GR won this debate. Low point win? NO - even

Judge signature [Signature] School J.P. Taravella

#### COMMENTS

##### AFFIRMATIVE

Spencer - clear, good pace, good inflection; well-versed on topic

##### NEGATIVE

Michael - great eye contact; clear voice, passionate; polite; also, well-versed on topic

#### Reasons for decision

Both did a great job. Enjoyable round to watch. I gave the win to the Aff side b/c 1) His 1st contention on Greed supported by evidence & was not convincingly negated by NEG side; 2) He effectively negated the NEG's contention on Economic Productivity & the NEG did not have any real supporting evidence on that - donation for taxes, not strong enough. The NEG speaker did prevail on Contention 2 - Biological (Aff) & Parental Instinct (NEG) - Parental instinct argument much stronger.

# Big Questions Debate ballot

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

Round 5 Sect. A - Room 501 - Judge Y5 **Mindy Glazer** (Miami Beach Senior High)

Debaters: Michael Moy (Nova High Scho MO - Z) vs. Maria Garzon (McArthur High GA - AA)

Affirmative Code: **Nova High Scho MO**

Name(s): **Michael Moy** Points: 29 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_

Negative Code: **McArthur High GA**

Name(s): **Maria Garzon** Points: 28 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Pts: Points: \_\_\_\_\_

The Affirmative side, code Z won this debate. Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Judge signature Mindy A. Glazer School Miami Beach Sr. High

Michael Moy (Pro) COMMENTS Maria Garzon (Con)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Argued- Humans Driven by self interest  
Great argument- logical and good analysis  
I liked hand gestures  
spoke slowly enough so that I could understand argument.  
Don't interrupt opponent while she is finishing answer.

**NEGATIVE**

Argued  
Altruism prevail over self interest  
Good argument and analysis  
Used evidence effectively  
Be sure to communicate your contentions clearly. I was a little confused about your position during the rebuttal and ~~rebuttal~~ question segment.

**Reasons for decision**

Michael Moy

spoke clearly and made logical arguments.  
Asked good questions  
Presented argument well.

Maria Garzon

Asked good questions  
Responded to opponents argument well.  
Answered questions well.

# Big Questions Debate ballot

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

Round 5 Sect. C - Room 505 - Judge Y8 **Cindy Jacobs** (Miami Beach Senior High)

Debaters: Sophia Thobani (Deerfield Beac TH - G) vs. Jason Alvarez (Nova High Scho AL - Z)

Affirmative Code: **Deerfield Beac TH**

Name(s): **Sophia Thobani** Points: 20 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_

Negative Code: **Nova High Scho AL**

Name(s): **Jason Alvarez** Points: 20 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Pts: Points: \_\_\_\_\_

The Aff Sophia side, code THG won this debate. Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Judge signature Cindy Jacobs School Miami Beach Senior High

### COMMENTS

#### AFFIRMATIVE

#### NEGATIVE

- Sophia
- very well organized
  - very sound arguments
  - less reading
  - good pace
  - add evidence based arguments

- Jason
- very unconvincing argument
  - not organized
  - clear arguments & well developed
  - good evidence
  - less reading

### Reasons for decision

- Sophia - Aff, THG
- excellent rebuttals; super clear.
  - very good communicator - makes statements + then waits to see if other side understands her statement.
  - improve evidence/facts to support arguments

# Big Questions Debate ballot

SFCFL 1: West Broward - Oct. 20, 2018

Round 5 Sect. B - Room 504 - Judge D4 **Cathyanne Mathis** (J.P. Taravella High School)

Debaters: Spencer Grosso (Nova High Scho GR - Z) vs. Kleibers Perez (McArthur High PE - AA)

Affirmative Code: **Nova High Scho GR**

Name(s): **Spencer Grosso** Points: 29 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_

Negative Code: **McArthur High PE**

Name(s): **Kleibers Perez** Points: 28 -and- \_\_\_\_\_ Pts: Points: \_\_\_\_\_

The AFF side, code GR - Z won this debate. Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Judge signature Cathyanne Mathis School J.P. Taravella

### COMMENTS

#### AFFIRMATIVE

- greed
- ① -self-interest corrupts
- ② - our brains (fight or flight) are programmed by instinct for self preservation
- ✓ 2N, can you measure how often people think altruistically before acting out of self-interest
- ✓ 2N, what is good for the race (altruism) happens to be good for self-interest
- ✓ 2N, every act in self-interest is an affirmation even if a person thought altruistically about things first
- ✓ 2N, natural desires following basic instincts is an example of self-interest

[Very organized and strong presenter.]

#### NEGATIVE

- ① natural desire (as opposed to defining w/use of the word "interest")
- ② altruism is a more powerful desire than self-interest, it is considered a primary motivator
- genetic success is based on altruism (helping the race over itself)
- ✓ 2A, basic instinct <sup>does</sup> not equate to self-interest, eating and drinking are done to live, self-interest comes after basic necessity is met.
- X 2A, humans have evolved and basic instincts isn't needed in the same manner as before (to live in nature)

[Creative approach; good delivery.]

### Reasons for decision

NEG attempted to separate base instinct from self-interest, stating that self-interest is a conscious and deliberate act. However, the NEG did not provide any examples of humans not acting out of self-interest and instead presented actions as being altruistic and for the good of all. AFF successfully rebutted both NEG contentions and furthermore, stated clearly that our natural instincts are by definition, acts of self-interest as humans remain biologically programmed for self-preservation.