Novice Parli Debate

Preliminary Round Results

Asher Lanzone 4A Bentley School Jeremy Hubinger	13C W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	17C L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	8B W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	2 - 1 0
Stephen Giverts 4B Bentley School Dylan Han	8B W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	17A L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	17C L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	1 - 2 0
Pranav Anand 5A Dougherty Valley HS Arnav Gupta	15A W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	17B L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	14H L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	1 - 2 0
Tanya Agarwal 5B Dougherty Valley HS Divija Maitra	14F W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	15E W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	15A W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	3 - 0 0
Ingrid Hsu 5C Dougherty Valley HS Divya Sharma	14E L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	15A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	15E W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	1 - 2 0
Faris Bokhari 5D Dougherty Valley HS Naval Patel	8D W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	15D W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	17B L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	2 - 1 0
Humza Khan 5E Dougherty Valley HS Hemakshat Sharma	14D W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	15B W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	17A W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	3 - 0 0
Ansuman Bardalai 5F Dougherty Valley HS Mohsin Rangwala	8A W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	14H W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	14G W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	3 - 0 0
Naya Murdock 6A John Swett HS Briana Bazile	14A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	8B W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	14F L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	1 - 2 0
Peter Santana 6B John Swett HS Dale Jones	14G L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	8E L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	15D L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	0 - 3 0
Marviona Green 6C John Swett HS Raezhelle Madison	17B L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	8A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	15B L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	0 - 3 0
Alexia Ainsworth 8A Maria Carrillo HS Joseph Cusenza	5F L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	6C W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	13B W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	2 - 1 0
Marcus Navarra 8B Maria Carrillo HS Trenton Nguyen	4B L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	6A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	4A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	0 - 3 0
William Schoeffler 8C Maria Carrillo HS Trevor Nguyen	15C L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	14E L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	14D W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	1 - 2 0
Claire Yin 8D Maria Carrillo HS Hannah Tan	5D L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	14C L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	14B L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	0 - 3 0
Mara Albers 8E Maria Carrillo HS Katie Pell	13A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	6B W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	13C L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	1 - 2 0
Brian Burrous 13A San Marin HS Max Von Blankenburg	8E W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	14G L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	14A L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	1 - 2 0
Ryan Blanchard 13B San Marin HS Mackenzie Elmhirst	15E W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	14F L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	8A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	1 - 2 0
Ashok Sundararaman 13C San Marin HS Matthew Baetkey	4A L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	14B W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	8E W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	2 - 1 0
Emily Ibanez Arroyo 14A Sonoma Academy Gracie Mendoza	6A W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	16A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	13A W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 0.0/0	2 - 1 0

Novice Parli Debate

Preliminary Round Results

Gibran Hassan 14B Sonoma Academy Alyssa Goody	17A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	13C L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	8D W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 **1 - 2** 0.0/0 0
Claire Stephens 14C Sonoma Academy Lola Flanagan	15B W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	8D W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	15C W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 **3 - 0** 0.0/0 0
Owen Clark 14D Sonoma Academy Allan Farfan Canales	5E L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	15C L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	8C L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 **0 - 3** 0.0/0 0
Elias Keen 14E Sonoma Academy Jacob Kowalick-Allen	5C W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	8C W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	16A W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 **3 - 0** 0.0/0 0
Reece Stromberg 14F Sonoma Academy Anna Miller	5B L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	13B W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	6A W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 **2 - 1** 0.0/0 0
Nina von Raesfeld 14G Sonoma Academy Hugo Sappington	6B W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	13A W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	5F L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 **2 - 1** 0.0/0 0
Lana Green 14H Sonoma Academy Maya Nichols	17C W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	5F L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	5A W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 **2 - 1** 0.0/0 0
Draper Dayton 15A Sonoma Country Day School Ben Alexander	5A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	5C W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	5B L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 **1 - 2** 0.0/0 0
Bruno Coelho 15B Sonoma Country Day School Cyrus Siegel	14C L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	5E L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	6C W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 **1 - 2** 0.0/0 0
Ellie Ramos 15C Sonoma Country Day School Natalie DiCicco	8C W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	14D W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	14C L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 **2 - 1** 0.0/0 0
Hannah Farkas 15D Sonoma Country Day School Paige Cabral	16A L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	5D L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	6B W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 **1 - 2** 0.0/0 0
Jordan Hendrickson 15E Sonoma Country Day School Sean O'Connor	13B L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	5B L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	5C L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 **0 - 3** 0.0/0 0
Richard Reid 16A St. Joseph Notre Dame Chris Gerlach	15D W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	14A W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	14E L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 **2 - 1** 0.0/0 0
Chase Cohen 17A Windsor HS Nikolas Lemenager	14B W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	4B W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	5E L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 **2 - 1** 0.0/0 0
Tyler Campanella 17B Windsor HS Trae Petruska	6C W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	5A W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	5D W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 **3 - 0** 0.0/0 0
Abby Little 17C Windsor HS Noah Wagner	14H L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	4A W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	4B W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 **2 - 1** 0.0/0 0

PARLI Debate

Hergenrather, Starr (*1)
Round 1 9:00am Room 1
Gov: 17 Cohen - Lemenager
Opp: 14 Hassan - Goody
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Starr Hergenrather

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 17		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Chase Cohen	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Alyssa Goody	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Nicholas Lemenager	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Gibran Hassan	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Very polite, clear, good eye contact, but got flustered by the "rules" that were pointed out by the opp.s. Initial points well spoken. Brought in statistics Clearly laid out points of information,
Prop 2: Also very polite,

Opp 1: Very polite, passionate speaker, organized "contentions" set up. Information was general, good eye contact. Kept bringing up "rules" which broke the Prop.s train of thought.
Opp 2: (Forgot to check if I was ready) Polite, good eye contact, good points. Rebuttaled P.O.I. well.

TEAM CODE #: #17 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Felt that Prop. team #17, even though they apparently broke some rule, had a stronger stance and points in the debate.

PARLI Debate

Thomas, Jackson (*1)
Round 1 9:00am East13
Gov: 15 Farkas - Cabral
Opp: 16 Reid - Gerlach
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name:_____

Judge's School Affiliation:_____

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 15		Team Code #: 16	
Prop Speaker #1_____	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1_____	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2_____	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2_____	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Good structure
confident speaking

Prop 2: Points were very clear and actually the best arguments of the round. Don't be afraid to elaborate on the other points of contention

Opp 1: ~~Aff~~ Bf Aff doesn't define the round, it's your job to offer counter definitions, so define the round in your favor (This goes for all debaters)

->Clear
-Eye contact

Opp 2: Good responses to ~~Aff~~ rebuttal

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Hard decision w/o dfns. In the future, offer some definitions no matter when, it is better than none at all. Opp wins b/c the value criterion, as hinted at in the Aff closing, was future impact. Aff did nothing to aff future impact of FB, only past and present.

PARLI Debate

Meshulam, Phyllos (*1)
Round 1 9:00am Annex1
Gov: 13 Sundararaman - Baetkey
Opp: 4 Lanzone - Hubinger
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Phyllis Meshulam

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy, Rus.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	13	Team Code #:	4
Prop Speaker #1	Baetkey pts____	Opp Speaker #1	Lanzone pts____
Prop Speaker #2	Sundararaman pts____	Opp Speaker #2	Hubinger pts____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: 27
Very professional. Eye contact could have been a bit better, and refutations of opp. a bit stronger. Don't concede on issues

Prop 2: 27
Also very professional. Be aware of blinking - a bit distracting. Good refutations NASH ≠ Musk.

Opp 1: 29
Very strong & organized. Good job of hitting all points hard & addressing all issues.

Opp 2: 28
Convincing! Be aware of nervous habit of touching nose. Good refutations on border-ied issues, innovations vs. donations

TEAM CODE #: 4 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Strong arguments, detailed refutations. Took advantage of using P.O.I.

PARLI Debate

Scholten, Lynn (*1)
Round 1 9:00am East15
Gov: 15 Coelho - Siegel
Opp: 14 Stephens - Flanagan
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Lynn Scholten

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	Sonoma Country Day	Team Code #:	Sonoma Academy
Prop Speaker #1	Bruno Coelho pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Claire Stephens pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Cyrus Siegel pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Lola Flanagan pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: good presentation of facts and closing - better confidence in closing
work on word pronunciation

Prop 2: good preparation in such a short time
practice keeping on track after being questioned by other team

Opp 1: good enthusiasm and speaking with confidence; good hand movements
wear your shoes at all times! distracting & unprofessional

Opp 2: nice job on bringing back opp 1's points and continuing on by furthering on with your own points
best speaker in room

TEAM CODE #: Sonoma Academy 14 **in the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Stronger speaking confidence & presented stronger facts

PARLI Debate

Porter, Wendy (*1)
Round 1 9:00am East14
Gov: 15 Hendrickson - O'Connor
Opp: 13 Blanchard - Elmhirst Ryan / McKenzie
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Wendy Porter

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 15	Team Code #: 13
Prop Speaker #1 Jordan Hendrickson pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Ryan Blanchard pts 28 (28 WP)
Prop Speaker #2 Sean O'Connor pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 McKenzie Elmhirst pts 29 (29 WP)

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Define topic more clearly Brought thoughtful analysis but Expand your contentions to provide challenge to your opponents More formal presentation would be appreciated

Prop 2: Provide more support for your position - more development Would like more volume and eye contact. Good poise under pressure

Opp 1: Clearly stated or restated topic under discussion. Brought logical reasoning and support. There was time for you to speak more slowly and give eye contact even with notes. discussion between team members very distracting

Opp 2: Strongest speaker in development of issues surrounding topic - appreciated logical development. Good rate of speech and eye contact. turn off cell! Extremely Confident

TEAM CODE #: 13 **on the** Opposition **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Much clearer defined arguments and statement of topic, better developed support for your opposition position.

PARLI Debate

Olzman, Bill (*1)
Round 1 9:00am East18
Gov: 17 Little - Wagner
Opp: 14 Green - Nichols
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Bill Olzman

Judge's School Affiliation: El Molino H.S.

Elon M who has greater impact on planet Earth

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: Windsor		Team Code #: Sonoma Valley	
Prop Speaker #1 Abby Little more influential	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Nichols Space Exp. Less	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 focused on charity	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Green	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Fantastic — a bit too quickly spoken — facts on why Facebook itself influences humanity. Had me voting for you in beginning but I was off the subject as I was thinking of humanity. Identified keys to counter space x arguments and is a strong speaker — Excellent marshalling of evidence!!

Opp 1: Countering arguments makes for a tough job initially. Way to breathe, think — then repond with specific credible arguments.

Prop 2:

Opp 2: Passionate advocacy of space exploration being the key to saving Earth and how that is happening now rocks! Also very strong speaker with engaging passion!!

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** Opp (Prop or Opp) **wins this debate.**

REASON FOR DECISION: The impact on the planet Earth was not clear initially — I thought it was most influential on humanity — until after all speakes it was clear most influential on planet Earth. The five year period is clear and the focused refutation →

My opp. speaker #2 and her ability to impress about spare exploration being indispensable to saving our planet and if not may allow for an escape to another planet was not refuted nor even attempted. That's the single biggest ~~to~~ opponents won debate.

PARLI Debate

Young, Wendy (*17)
Round 1 9:00am Room 3
Gov: 14 Clark - Canales
Opp: 5 Khan - Sharma
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Wendy Young

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 5	
Prop Speaker #1 Canales	pts 25	Opp Speaker #1 Khan	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Clark	pts 24	Opp Speaker #2 Sharma	pts 25.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: CANALES
+ good eye contact
- need to define terms in beginning
+ good arguments

Prop 2: CLARK
- work on eye contact
- a bit more work on organizing thoughts

Opp 1:
+ good definitions
+ good evidence
+ good eye contact

Opp 2:
+ good delivery
- define society would have helped

TEAM CODE #: 5 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
- good delivery and organization of information, very courteous

PARLI Debate

Tom, Joyce (*7)
Round 1 9:00am Room 2
Gov: 14 Arroyo - Mendoza
Opp: 6 Murdock - Bazile
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: JOYCE TOM

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 6	
Prop Speaker #1 Mendoza	pts 26.5	Opp Speaker #1 Bazile	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Arroyo	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Murdock	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: You made your points clearly and with a nice voice/pace. Try using language that helps listener know you are transitioning to a new pt. Also, take time to develop your ideas by using examples. Nice job!

Prop 2: Your passion really comes thru. I like that..., but you can slow down a little to emphasize your ideas. Experiment w pace. Good counter arguments - and you did a good job of reinforcing your position

Opp 1: Very nice pace & strong voice. As opp, I liked how you explicitly talked about your goals. Take the time to think about what you want to say. I'm listening to your ideas. Also, in your opening segment - BE SURE to address the PROPs arguments. Nice job! Keep up the great work!

Opp 2: I like your calm and clear delivery. You responded effectively to prop's arguments. Nevertheless, I was more persuaded by the Props points - ~~they points were~~ I had a hard time understanding how fb promotes AI. ~~How it works~~

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opposition's position was effective but ultimately outweighed by PROP's position. Opps counter to PROP's points could be stronger. PROP did a good job of presenting points & counting OPP's points.

PARLI Debate

Malachowski, George (*1)
Round 1 9:00am East12
Gov: 14 Stromberg - Miller
Opp: 5 Agarwal - Maitra
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: George Malachowski

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 5	
Prop Speaker #1 Miller	pts 24	Opp Speaker #1 Aggarwal	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Stromberg	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Maitra	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Excellent job for 1st time! Practice will help w/ nerves. Things to work on are eye contact, tone, posture, and hand gestures.

Prop 2: Well spoken & argued. Excellent use of tone & variation in speeches. Could have been better connecting refutations of opp in rebuttal.

Opp 1: Overall good job flowing arguements. Sometimes the organization of the rebuttals was disjointed. One thing to work on is more impactful hand gestures.

Opp 2: Good job organizing arguements, good eye contact use of hands. Could use more variation in tone and could be better addressing specific points of opposition in varied ways.

TEAM CODE #: 5 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
This was very close and came down to the opp being slightly better organized, particularly in their closing argument.

~~Fehr, Rick ('11)~~ Nick Mizin

Round 1 9:00am Room 103
Gov: 5 Anand - Gupta
Opp: 15 Dayton - Alexander
Novice Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Nicholas Mizin

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 15	
Prop Speaker #1 [redacted] 27	pts ____	Opp Speaker #1 [redacted] 26	pts ____
Prop Speaker #2 [redacted] 26	pts ____	Opp Speaker #2 24	pts ____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
gave them verbally

Opp 1:
gave them verbally

Prop 2:
gave them verbally

Opp 2:
gave them verbally

TEAM CODE #: 5 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
I think the ~~better~~ clearer presented arguments in a more structured way, and negate the Opp side better.

PARLI Debate

~~Kenyon, Karen (-13)~~ Sierra Belden
Round 1 9:00am Room 107
Gov: 5 Bardalai - Rangwala
Opp: 8 Ainsworth - Cusenza
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Sierra Belden

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 8	
Prop Speaker #1 Bardalai	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Cusenza	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Rangwala	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Ainsworth	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Great intro speech, good analysis/eg Sumary of debate on last speech. In first Speech remember to road map where you are going and summarize points/end. Good job of being curteous and refuting opponents points!

Prop 2: Great Refutations and analysis of opponents' arguments! way to link them back to your own Remember to summarize your points at end of Speech. Great Job!

Opp 1: Great Presence + vivid examples used. Remember to road map, Refute opponents then clearly lay out your own points and give a quick summary. Take POI's from other team if you have time. Great enthusiasm! Good gestures/ use of space thands.

Opp 2: The 2nd Neg Speech is the hardest, you did great! Caught and clearly refuted many points in the round, good job catching the "will" part of topic, and Strengthening your contentions.

TEAM CODE #: 5 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
The Prop effectively refuted the neg's points while still holding up their own points with good analysis + refutation

PARLI Debate

Siegel, Mike (*15)
Round 1 9:00am Room 109
Gov: 13 Burrous - Blankenburg
Opp: 8 Albers - Pell
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Mike Siegel

Judge's School Affiliation: SCDS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 13		Team Code #: 8	
Prop Speaker #1 Burrous	pts 28½	Opp Speaker #1 Albers	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Blankenburg	pts 26½	Opp Speaker #2 Pell	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: good eye contact
organized well thought out delivery. good conclusion
not sure if your suppose to tell the judge why you won?
wiggles are a little distracting

Prop 2:
very clear in stating goals of presentation.
delivery was a little choppy
Don't admit what you don't know

Opp 1: Very poised, clear speaking good argument but somewhat anecdotal not supported by referencable facts

Opp 2: Very clear communication, nice poise
Stated source for facts very effective
other arguements were anecdotal/opinion based.

TEAM CODE #: 13 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop Speaker #1 made a more organized and supported argument to slightly edge the argument in their favor

Noah, Maciah
~~Burnes, Mica~~ (*1)
Round 1 9:00am East10
Gov: 5 Hsu - Sharma
Opp: 14 Keen - Kowalick-Allen
Novice Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Mariah Noah

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Sharma	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Keen	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Hsu	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Kowalick-Allen	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Opp is allowed to bring up new arguments in any Constructive speeches including the second one

Prop 2: Make sure to respond to all of their arguments with unique arguments, not just repeating your original argument.

Opp 1: good job both of you, don't call out your own b.s. lol. Let your opponents do that for you. Also, don't say "I don't have evidence on this." Just make the argument

Opp 2:

You two should have talked about Zuck. just dropped all his charity.

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: The ~~Aff~~ Dropped too many big impacts from the neg. Ultimately, neg proves to me that Musk is Δing the world through more than just Teslas.

PARLI Debate

Lustig, Robert (*7)
Round 1 9:00am Annex2
Gov: 6 Santana - Jones John Swett
Opp: 14 Raesfeld - Sappington Sonoma Academy
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: LUSTIG

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	6	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Santana pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	[redacted] pts 27.
Prop Speaker #2	Jones pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	[redacted] Sappington pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Tobs opening spt.
Flow of ideas supt.
New Market to supt.
But did not tie that to it/ nagar economy, or the future.

Prop 2:
Good challenging of opposition to start.
But elaboration of points late
"who will pay for new devices" was weak.

Opp 1: Good points about "just be lucky".
Also good point about non-profit LLC.
A little too forceful on the "planet dying aspect" - we're not in a position to change other planets.

Opp 2:
Good point about batteries
Also that there is no other developer competing with Musk
But very redundant - gave speech twice

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Ultimately the resolution was "who WILL impact society" not "who HAS impacted society". Musk's efforts have more potential in the future - The Aff team did not address this.

PARLI Debate

Stephan, Susan (*9)
Round 1 9:00am Room 108
Gov: 8 Navarra - Nguyen
Opp: 4 Giverts - Han
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: S. Stephan

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	8	Team Code #:	4
Prop Speaker #1	Trenton Nguyen pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Stephen Giverts pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Marcus Navarra pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Dylan Han pts 28.4

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Really close debate and debators close also

Prop 1: Very nice job all
more eye contact
a voice projection
speech speech
keep

Opp 1: was great
up the good work
a little more practice
d you will all be fantastic debators!

Prop 2: -don't mention positive for the other side. At first they didn't mention Space X - if they forget it, don't help opponet.

Opp 2: good mentioning negatives of FB
good adding E Musk's achievements/ companies.

TEAM CODE #: 4 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Refuted #8 (brought up) the negatives of Facebook - bullying, suicides.

PARLI Debate

Wang, Qian (Jessie) (*5)
Round 1 9:00am Room 102
Gov: 8 Schoeffler - Nguyen
Opp: 15 Ramos - DiCicco
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: PRANAV SHAHI

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: Maria Carrillo		Team Code #: Sonoma Country Day School	
Prop Speaker #1 Trevor Nguyen	pts 25	Opp Speaker #1 Natalie DiCicco	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Will Schoeffler	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Did not show	pts NA

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
~~+ve~~ You have good ideas, but seemed nervous. Work with your partner before the round, so that he does not have to give you pointers when you are speaking.

Prop 2:
+ve : sounded confident, presented case really well, countered opp. points

Opp 1:
+ve : sounded confident, presented ideas clearly, good rebuttals

Opp 2:

TEAM CODE #: Sonoma Country Day School **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp team laid a long term impact which was not effectively countered by the Pro team.

PARLI Debate

Blackmer, Susan (*1)
Round 1 9:00am East16
Gov: 8 Yin - Tan
Opp: 5 Bokhari - Patel
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Susan Blackmer

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 8		Team Code #: 5	
Prop Speaker #1 ~~Yin~~ Tan	pts ____	Opp Speaker #1 ~~Tan Bokhari~~ Patel	pts ____
Prop Speaker #2 ~~Tan~~ Yin	pts ____	Opp Speaker #2 ~~Patel~~ Bokhari	pts ____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: 25
good opener
didn't mention Musk

Opp 1: 28
clear examples, transitions

Prop 2: 27
Clear org., use of trans.

Opp 2: 26 some good arg.

TEAM CODE #: 5 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Ainsworth, ~~Doug~~ Brett (*8)
Round 1 9:00am Room 111
Gov: 6 Green - Madison
Opp: 17 Campanella - Petruska
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Brett Ainsworth

Judge's School Affiliation: Maria Carrillo

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 6		Team Code #: 17	
Prop Speaker #1 Green	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Campanella	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Madison ~~Campanella~~	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Petruska	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Speak louder Please. You talk very softly. Try and use more of your speaking time. It possible take a few moments to think. You set up Fact debate but you need to tell me how to weigh it. You need to take time to address each argument, 2nd speech

Opp 1: Good Opp counter case. Good Arguments about music and eco + space. Good 2nd speech summarizing points. You knew you will have time so slow down and take your time.

Prop 2: Good response to the Opp, Take time to think about what they say. They are talking about Global vs US impact.

Opp 2: Good refutation, great responses to Prop arguments. Great use taking time to talk about each idea.

TEAM CODE #: 17 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The Opposition made better clear arguments that were not refuted.

Champaign

Peoria

Madison

PARLI Debate

Tamminen, Paul (*1)
Round 2A 11:00am Room 111
Gov: 5 Agarwal - Maitra
Opp: 15 Hendrickson - O'Connor
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Paul Tamminen

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	5	Team Code #:	15
Prop Speaker #1	Tanya Agarwal pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Jordan Hendrickson pts 28 24
Prop Speaker #2	Divija Maitra pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Sharon O'connor pts 29 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Good, clear argumentation and strong final summary.

Opp 1: Load up all your sides arguments here to allow better back & forth in the remaining time.

Prop 2: Good arguments and addressing of neg's counter-arguments.

Opp 2: Nice lay out of 5 arguments to support your counter position.

TEAM CODE #: 5 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

(Better focused arguments, better defended, with more focused responses to Opp's main points.

PARLI Debate

Tamminen, Paul (*1)
Round 2B 11:00am Room 111
Gov: 16 Reid - Gerlach
Opp: 14 Arroyo - Mendoza
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Paul Tamminen

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	16	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Richard Reid pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Emily Ivane Arroyo pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Chris Gerlach pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Gracie Mendoza pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Lots of coherent argumentation and detail. And good summary response.

Prop 2: Good flow-through, especially Rebuttal of NEGs arguments

Opp 1: Good, passionate argumentation. And slowing down a bit would focus argumentation a bit better. Nice handling of Questioning.

Opp 2: Nice addition of arguments. Could have gone after AFF's arguments with more specific rebuttals.

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Narrow definition of proposition a little questionable but within bounds (and accepted by NEG anyway). Kept arguments supported pretty well and did a better job rebutting NEG points.

Media refrain from terror attacks.

PARLI Debate

Fogarty, Matthew (*9)
Round 2A 11:00am Room 102
Gov: 6 Murdock - Bazile
Opp: 8 Navarra - Nguyen
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: MAT FOGARTY

Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 6. BAZILE		Team Code #: 8.	
Prop Speaker #1 ~~NAVARRA~~	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 NAVARRA	pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 ~~NGUYEN~~ MURDOCK.	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 NGUYEN.	pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
Very clear, 3 strong points
Did not set up the topic, definitions etc.
Only used 3/7 minutes

Prop 2:
well organized, good points.

Opp 1:
Add an intro + summary
take your time (only used 2 mins)
address their points ⇒ add your own points

Opp 2:
same.

TEAM CODE #: 6 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp failed to make strong points or fully address props points

Dev. econ > environmental protection.

PARLI Debate

Fogarty, Matthew (*9)
Round 2B 11:00am Room 102
Gov: 14 Hassan - Goody
Opp: 13 Sundararaman - Baetkey
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: MAT FOGARTY

Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	13
Prop Speaker #1	Goody pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	BAETKEY pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Hassan pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	SUNDARARAMAN pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
- Good passion + confidence
- Make points cleaner - very overlapping
- Did not offer a clear plan (how to implement plan)

Prop 2:
- Started strong & organized
- Allowed partner to control near end (you need to control points & own podium)

Opp 1:
Good to redefine as developing, not 3rd world.
Good points on China
need better summary at end

Opp 2:
Good structure
More summary needed

TEAM CODE #: 13 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Topicality around "3rd world" or "developing" was a red herring. 3rd world actually is from Cold War times and means not allied with Soviets or US. Both teams need to learn about environment ⇒ meteors & ozone are not #1 issues facing env (no discussion of CO2 or global warming)

Jackie Hallerberg

~~Sutton, Jim (*7)~~
Round 2A 11:00am Room 103
Gov: 14 Raesfeld - Sappington
Opp: 13 Burrous - Blankenburg
Novice Parli Debate Media Images

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Jackie Hallerberg

Judge's School Affiliation: Andy

PROP

Team Code #: 14

Prop Speaker #1 Hugo pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Nina pts 28

OPP

Team Code #: 13

Opp Speaker #1 Max pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Brian pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
- easy to follow
- laid out contentions and continued to refer to them

Prop 2:
- very concise points, easy to follow
- organized

Opp 1:
- So glad Max worked through some of his nervousness → keep debating

Opp 2:
- good restatement of arguments; helped to continue to lay road map as debate progressed
- used understandable language

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
- always cycled back to the topic: media images
- addressed points logically

Jackie Hallerberg

~~Sutton, Jim (*7)~~
Round 2B 11:00am Room 103
Gov: 14 Stephens - Flanagan
Opp: 8 Yin - Tan
Novice Parli Debate Economic Growth Over Environment

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Jackie Hallerberg

Judge's School Affiliation: Amity

PROP

Team Code #: 14

Prop Speaker #1 Lola pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Claire pts 28

OPP

Team Code #: 8

Opp Speaker #1 Claire pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Hannah pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
- took great care to be organized
- articulate
- good closing arguments

Prop 2:
- passionate about topic
- articulate
- helped bolster team's position

Opp 1:
- organized
- liked stats & specific examples

Opp 2:
- organized

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
- easy to follow contentions/rebuttals
- always brought comments back to the topic of debate
- gave credence to opposing side's contentions but maintained strong point of view
- good use of statistics

DON

Shifs, ~~Maaba~~ (*13)
Round 2A 11:00am Room 107
Gov: 14 Green - Nichols
Opp: 5 Bardalai - Rangwala
Novice Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: DON SHIFS

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	5
Prop Speaker #1	GREEN pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	BARDALAI pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	NICHOLS pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	RANGWALA pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
MS. GREEN HAD SOME GOOD THOUGHTS BUT A BIT FLUSTERED

Opp 1:
VERY SOLID SPEAKER- WELL THOUGHT OUT-

Prop 2:
HAD GOOD THOUGHTS BUT GOT A BIT FLUSTERED WHEN PARTNER KEPT GIVING HER NOTES

Opp 2:
NICE CADENCE TO SPEAKING

TEAM CODE #: 5 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: THE NEGATIVE PRESENTED MUCH SENSIBLE CASE & SHOWED EXCELLENT EXAMPLES I) RWANDA GENOCIDE WITH MEDIA NOT SHOWING PLUS ARGUMENT FOR FREEDOM OF PRESS

DON
Shifs, ~~Masha~~ (*13)
Round 2B 11:00am Room 107
Gov: 17 Campanella - Petruska
Opp: 5 Anand - Gupta
Novice Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: DON SHIFS

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 17		Team Code #: 5	
Prop Speaker #1 CAMPANELLA	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 ANAND	pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 PETRUSKA	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 GUPTA	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
~~HE~~ IN FIRST ROUND HIS THOUGHTS WERE GOOD BUT SPEAK LASTED ONLY 4 MINUTES - COULD [illegible]

Prop 2: EXCELLENT
→ WELL THOUGHT OUT

Opp 1: → EVEN THOUGH IN 4TH PLACE STILL SICK WELL BUT THOUGHTS JUST A BIT FRAGMENTED

Opp 2: → MADE VALID POINTS. [illegible] SHOW A BIT MORE PASSION

TEAM CODE #: 17 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

VERY CLOSE BUT PROP WON BASED ON THEIR ARGUMENT THAT WITHOUT BUILDING STRONG ECONOMY CAN'T PAY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL NEEDS

PARLI Debate

Macpherson, Michele (*3)
Round 2A 11:00am Room 108
Gov: 14 Keen - Kowalick-Allen
Opp: 8 Schoeffler - Nguyen
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Michele Macpherson

Judge's School Affiliation: Belmont

PROP	OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Kowalick pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Nguyen pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 Keen pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Schoeffler pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: + good signposting
+ good terminal impacts
+ Clear arguments, nicely delivered
- Be careful communicating clearly with partner when speaking

Prop 2:
+ Good response to POI
+ good explanation of terminal impacts → e.g. wealth
+ Good job focusing → knew Child Addictive was topic

Opp 1: → Good job mentioning values to Syrian.
→ work to deliver the whole list of contentions in first speech

Opp 2: + Excellent job covering all the points
+ Good argument that the media already does reform
– Dropped point on children

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Clear case made with higher Net Benefits

PARLI Debate

Macpherson, Michele (*3)
Round 2B 11:00am Room 108
Gov: 15 Dayton - Alexander
Opp: 5 Hsu - Sharma
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Michele Macpherson

Judge's School Affiliation: Belmont

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 15		Team Code #: 5	
Prop Speaker #1 Dayton	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Hsu.	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Alexander	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Sharma	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
* Effective argument that the scope is different in developing nations
* talk to judge in final speech
* Work on partner communication to make it smoother

Prop 2:
- Good point clarify role of developing nation in policy
- Good stats

Opp 1:
- Excellent point on the fact that environment is gone, cannot be reclaimed
- Go

Opp 2:
- Good job elaborating on the contentions
- You indicated that PROP didn't address your first 2 contentions but I had notes that they had done so
- Good job pointing picture of human life vs $

TEAM CODE #: 15 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Final Aff speech outlined the differences for developing nations vs. whole world = effectively

Low pt win.

PARLI Debate

Bhargava, Piyush (*5)
Round 2A 11:00am Room 2
Gov: 15 Ramos - DiCicco
Opp: 14 Clark - Canales
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: PIYUSH BHARGAVA

Judge's School Affiliation: DUHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 15		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 DICICCO	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Owen Clark	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 DICICCO	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Allan Canales	pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Articulate speaker. Show more confidence. Strong analysis and excellent rebuttal. Should have addressed Opp. constitution argument.

Prop 2:

Opp 1: Should have built more on constitution argument. Didn't address aff core argument on images creating "Terror"

Opp 2: Deviated from the topic and actually agreed with Aff on Boston marathon topic. Need to connect back to core argument

TEAM CODE #: 15 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

clarity of argument

PARLI Debate

Bhargava, Piyush (*5)
Round 2B 11:00am Room 2
Gov: 13 Blanchard - Elmhirst
Opp: 14 Stromberg - Miller
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Piyush Bhargava.

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 13		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Blanchard	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Ana Miller	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Elmhirst	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Stromberg	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Opening was weak but did an excellent job with closing argument

Prop 2: Excellent debator. I felt you veered off topic a bit but overall very confident & articulate

Opp 1: Stromberg.
Very persuasive and ~~moving~~ expressive articulate speaker. Good use of hands and gestures.

Opp 2:
Confident speaker. Need to work on flow

TEAM CODE #: ~~13~~ 14 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
This was a very close debate. The argument that economy may not matter if health (environment) is lost won it. Teams could have done better job of differentiating as Aff supported env as well.

PARLI Debate

Griffin, Nona (*1)
Round 2A 11:00am Room 1
Gov: 4 Giverts - Han
Opp: 17 Cohen - Lemenager
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Nona Griffin

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	17
Prop Speaker #1	Giverts pts 24	Opp Speaker #1	Cohen pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Han pts 23	Opp Speaker #2	Lemenager pts ~~28~~ 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Didn't state argument upfront
- Would love more evidence + ref. to current events
- more confident delivery; use full time to speak
- directly address opp. arguments

Prop 2: "

Opp 1: courtesy: Not esh other team if it's their 1st time or say I'm sorry to them because you clearly won!
Analysis + evidence - very strong ++ on point
Argumentation: liked use of emotional examples

Opp 2: courtesy: same as above
Delivery: fidgeting was distracting
Analysis: very strong, somewhat repetative + evidence

TEAM CODE #: 17 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
The opposition did a very good job of fleshing out all of the evidence to support their ~~op~~ argument and used emotional narrative to persuade you to vote for them.

PARLI Debate

Griffin, Nona (*1)
Round 2B 11:00am Room 1
Gov: 5 Bokhari - Patel
Opp: 15 Farkas - Cabral
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: GRIFFIN

Judge's School Affiliation: ANALY/WASHINGTON HIGH, SF

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	5	Team Code #:	15
Prop Speaker #1	BOKHARI pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	FARHAS pts 24
Prop Speaker #2	PATEL pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	CABRAL pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: could work on clearer delivery, but argument was strong.

Prop 2: good delivery, clear points + strong argument

Opp 1: Delivery: more confident delivery needed
- points of argument were strong, just needed stronger delivery
- more concrete evidence needed

Opp 2: strong delivery, clearly ~~started~~ stated

TEAM CODE #: 5 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Argument directly addressed the reasons why economic growth is more important than envt. & protection and why envt. protection can't happen without economic growth.

PARLI Debate

Ernst, Debra (*17)
Round 2A 11:00am Room 3
Gov: 5 Khan - Sharma
Opp: 15 Coelho - Siegel
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Debra Ernst

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 15	
Prop Speaker #1 Khan	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Siegel	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Sharma	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Coelho	pts 28+

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Well thought-out argumentation. Good Final speech. Best refutation of Neg's case.

Prop 2: Needed to have a little more ammunition in speech, but neatly addressed each point that Neg had made.

Opp 1: Great speaking style logically laid-out argument.

Opp 2: Really Good ~~points~~ evidence to back up your points. Great speaking style.

TEAM CODE #: 5 **on the** Aff **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Neg. had very well-spoken speakers and they gave a valiant effort. However I am giving win to Aff. because they backed up their case so well in final speech.

PARLI Debate

Ernst, Debra (*17)
Round 2B 11:00am Room 3
Gov: 8 Albers - Pell
Opp: 6 Santana - Jones
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Debra Ernst

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	8	Team Code #:	6
Prop Speaker #1	Albers	Opp Speaker #1	Santana
pts	28	pts	27
Prop Speaker #2	Pell	Opp Speaker #2	Jones
pts	28.5	pts	27.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Albers. Succint definition of resolution. Maybe should have spoken longer?

Prop 2: Pell. Good job backing up your case.

Opp 1: Santana. Good speaking style, a bit raw. Good points, just didn't spend enough time backing them up. Use more facts/evidence when crafting your case.

Opp 2: Jones speak a little more slowly and annunciate. A few good points but not enough to overcome your opposition.

TEAM CODE #: 8 **on the** Aff **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Aff had a bit more facts and good logic by speaker #2

Sierra Belden

~~Raesfeld, Kathleen von (*14)~~
Round 2A 11:00am Room 109
Gov: 4 Lanzone - Hubinger
Opp: 17 Little - Wagner
Novice Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Sierra Belden

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 4		Team Code #: 17	
Prop Speaker #1 Hubinger	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Little	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Lanzone	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Wagner	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Great delivery of arguments, and analysis, good roadmapping

Opp 1: Great enthusiasm + evidence + examples good Summary + refutations

Prop 2: Great analysis & refutations good clear progress of arguments. Try to hit all of their points if you can, otherwise great speaking!

Opp 2: This is the hardest speech and you did great! way to turn their points to yours and clearly hold up your own contentions.

TEAM CODE #: 17 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**

(Prop or (Opp))

REASON FOR DECISION:

The speakers were all very good and well matched! Ultimately the Opp had more contentions standing at the end of the round. Good job everyone!

~~Sierra Bolden~~

~~Raesfeld, Kathleen von (*14)~~
Round 2B 11:00am Room 109
Gov: 8 Ainsworth - Cusenza
Opp: 6 Green - Madison
Novice Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Kathleen vonRaesfeld

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 8		Team Code #: 6	
Prop Speaker #1 Ainsworth	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Madison	pts 27.25
Prop Speaker #2 Cusenza	pts 27.25	Opp Speaker #2 Green	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: + clear presentation, well organized
+ excellent citing of sources

Prop 2: + love enthusiasm & passion
- try to make a bit of eye contact with judge
+ followed argument well & excellent partner support

Opp 1: Way to Be Brave !!
+ excellent sources connected to topic
+ ~~Stronger start to both speeches~~ your conviction became stronger as you spoke more - Yay!
+ great work on a tricky topic

Opp 2:
+ very Brave to get up there
+ professional look, clean & polished, stood up straight :)
- need a bit more eye contact & try not to read notes the whole time

TEAM CODE #: 8 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

(1) 2 arguments were dropped and supported again in final speech - good argumentation
(2) more net benefits

Challenging subject - Excellent job staying with it to BOTH TEAMS!

PARLI Debate

Ainsworth, Laura Ainsworth (*8)
Round 3 1:30pm Room 102
Gov: 5 Anand - Gupta
Opp: 14 Green - Nichols
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Laura Ainsworth

Judge's School Affiliation: Marin Catholic

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	5	Team Code #:	14
4:39 Prop Speaker #1	Anand pts 27.5	7:00 Opp Speaker #1	Nichols pts 29.5
5:37 Prop Speaker #2	Gupta pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Green 5:12 pts 30
4:21			5:00

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Needed to mount a counter-argument to it's "dangerous to be wildly unreasonable" She discusses murderers and the Rule of Law in OPP 1 - where is the response?

You have a solid understanding of this and good arguments EXTEND and EXTRAPOLATE them - use your full time though.

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

1. * I vote on the implosion argument: "letting go" has no link to Alcohol/Drugs. Green made this clear in her speech - a Constructive
2. * There are no Prop. Impacts
3. * (T) does matter.

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Case was interesting. The Defs were different. I would be willing to accept that, but tell me why I should, or argue where yours came from not against a counter Cambridge Dictionary definition.

Opp 1: So, this was tricky, but your inclinations were strong. You established several on case arguments that were logical. You also had a reasonable (T) argument which you explained well.

Prop 2:

Opp 2: I am not sure how rounds would normally unfold for your team. You may want to consider switching places. Your "links" and "implosion" arguments were really good. You had time to develop these further. Your thinking is sharp.

Can have more argumentation specific to (T) since it becomes a voter. Why/What makes it abusive? Why are your definitions/framework superior?

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: "Abusive" in and of itself is not an argument. The PROP/AFF started this and then the OPP/NEG caved a little. Ask them-OPP to justify or explain why something is abusive. NEG, you did a great job identifying where ground is and what the burdens are. Stick with those arguments. In this case, Topicality really mattered. Why were their definitions better? They never said.

Dear Family

Love,

PARLI Debate

Masters, Claudette (*13)
Round 3 1:30pm Room 3
Gov: 5 Agarwal - Maitra San Ramon
Opp: 15 Dayton - Alexander Sonoma
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Claudette

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 15	
Prop Speaker #1 Tanya Agarwal	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Draper Dayton	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Divija Maitra	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Ben Alexander	pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Both teams Good volume and posture.

Prop - Professional demeanor.

Prop 1: Good jobs defining terms and presenting clear arguments. Slow down and pronounce words clearly. Add small pauses - you had time. Good jobs using Stanford Study to back up stress control.

Prop 2: Good work rebuilding arguments. Great speaking clear points.

Opp 1: Don't use Dr. Draper as source. Good job of addressing prop arguments. No need to tell corny jokes - by saying they are funny does not make them funny. Pay attention to other team.

Opp 2: You talked too much during their time. Be respectful, listen, and be discreet when communicating with partner. Too many corny jokes and personal opinions, not enough solid arguments.

TEAM CODE #: 5 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop presented good definitions and arguments for silly sounding topic. Opp did not use enough evidence - too much personal opinion

PARLI Debate

Catterton, Chris (*1)
Round 3 1:30pm East14
Gov: 8 Ainsworth - Cusenza
Opp: 13 Blanchard - Elmhirst
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Chris Catterton

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	8	Team Code #:	13
Prop Speaker #1	Ainsworth pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Blanchard pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Cusenza pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Elmhirst pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: All of y'all are smart. All need to speak longer, clash more, and compare args more. Here is some useful info, some of which we discussed.

Prop 1:
Theory/Topicality
A. Interp - your rule or def
B. Violation - they don't (consistent) } remember the "we meet" as a refutation here
C. Standards - why should we prefer your interp
1. Predictability
- pre-round, Prop 2: context of resolution
- in-round - unclear and allows shifts
2. Ground
- quality - "we have to say insanity=good"
- quantity - only a couple ideas
D. Impacts/Voting issues
1. reject the arg (so maybe their case becomes irrelevant
2. fairness - skewed debate

Opp 1:
offense - "we save the world, everyone dies if you vote for our opponents" vs.
defense - "Putin isn't that crazy"
→ new offense in 2nd gov speech will put opp off balance, so preemp opp args and prep responses

Opp 2: IMPORTANT: a good rebuttal speech basically writes the Reason for Decision for the judge. Do this by: 1. Comparing/weighing conflicting args, not just asserting you're right 2. give contingencies, "even if they're winning contention 2, XYZ is more important"

TEAM CODE #: 8 on the Prop (Prop or Opp) wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: Neg eventually agrees to Aff's defn and introduces new points. Unfortunately, "they're equal" or "we can't tell" is defense, so since the Aff wins some chance that anti-jokes are funnier (shock, delivery, translatable) and that anti-jokes are def better with a skilled joke teller, it's a clear vote aff.

Types of offense:
1. Link turn - "they say they led to X, but actually we do, so vote for us to get X"
2. Impact turn - "they say they led to Y, but Y is bad so vote for us to avoid Y"
Don't do a double turn ☺

Have the 2nd opp prep new pts during the 1st prop - via wakeupdebate.blogspot.com

PARLI Debate

Wells, Brendan (*1)
Round 3 1:30pm East10
Gov: 15 Ramos - DiCicco
Opp: 14 Stephens - Flanagan
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Brendan Wells

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

~~PROP~~ Opp
Team Code #: 14

~~OPP~~ Prop
Team Code #: 15

Opp ~~Prop~~ Speaker #1 Stephens pts 25

Prop ~~Opp~~ Speaker #1 DiCicco pts 27

Opp ~~Prop~~ Speaker #2 Flanagan pts 27

~~Opp~~ Speaker #2 No Show pts ___

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Opp ~~Prop~~ 1: Your delivery was a little erratic — while reading your notes you stuttered and lost your place. While speaking without notes, you were loud, clear, and eloquent.

Opp ~~Prop~~ 2: Even it out? You have a nice, clear speaking style. Keep going! Find ways to add more interesting and relevant points to your subtopics

Prop ~~Opp~~ 1: Again, I thought you were really brave for finishing out the round. For next time, really focus on your organization — make each topic and subtopic have talking points and examples

Opp 2:

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
I think the definition debate got a little wild on both sides, with examples like Hitler and human sacrifice being thrown around. Ultimately the neg showed that harm could come from crazy fun, and the aff did not sufficiently counter.

~~Raymond, Bill~~ (*1) Lucas Tammiren

PARLI Debate

Round 3 1:30pm Annex1
Gov: 5 Khan - Sharma
Opp: 17 Cohen - Lemenager
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: _____

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 17	
Prop Speaker #1 Sharma	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Cohen	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Khan	pts 25	Opp Speaker #2 Lemenager	pts 25

all ok, basically, but be more confident

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: • clear + concise

for both arguments were unoriginal for such a topic, esp. since you were advocating the benefits of "going bananas".

Prop 2:

Opp 1: • don't complain so much about the topic
• good use of physical humor
• make your voters more concise - the whole point is to summarize in your favor
•

Opp 2:

TEAM CODE #: 5 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: The technical victory goes to the Proposition, but the moral victory is awarded to the opposition. The opposition presented a case that was far more subtle and original, even if they could not always articulate it with precision. That, however, as the final Prop speaker pointed out, makes a strong case for the superiority of "going bananas." In the end, a muddled but highly amusing debate.

McNamara, Lana (*1)
Round 3 1:30pm East16
Gov: 13 Burrous - Blankenburg
Opp: 14 Arroyo - Mendoza
Novice Parli Debate

Coming Banana vs Berry Corning

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: LANA McNAMARA.

Judge's School Affiliation: EMHS.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	13	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1 Burrous	pts 27.5	Opp Speaker #1 Arroyo	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Blankenburg	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Mendoza	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Burrous
- clear, to the point, laid out argument neatly.

Prop 2: Blankenburg
- tried something different
- daring
- (needed more substance)

Opp 1: Arroyo
- stand straighter - leaning in gives sense of desperation
- clear, knows order, well argued, "professional"

Opp 2: Mendoza
- good support / reiteration
- tougher job given opponents destruction.

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Stronger, clearer, well planned argument, boys intro'd argument and then abandoned it.

Going Bananas
going crazy
challenging status quo
vs
Being Barrows

Barrows
words / phrases
Corn + bad for health
- high fructose syrup
- butter / salt

Bananas + healthy
→ long curved fruit
- staple
- vitamins
- potassium
- rec activity
+ own container
+ endangered fruit (support)
+ superior / name of debate

??

Arroyo
road map
fruit vs def of def
violation
saying
contextual definitions
Value realism
utilitarianism → most good for most people
- mental health (crazy) vs corniness (Cliched)
vs Happy (impact)

{ suicide
depression
youth
shootings

corn - cereal plant
OED - est ref

> stand straight

Being Barrows
↳ melodramatic
magnified on stood on desk
hat box
distracting

Blankenburg
"
- bananas
- definition challenge
- challenging status quo

Rebuting negations
- mental instability
- creates change (going bananas)
- crazy seek + thru time becomes accepted

PARLI Debate

Young, Kathy (*1)
Round 3 1:30pm Room 1
Gov: 14 Keen - Kowalick-Allen
Opp: 16 Reid - Gerlach
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Kathy Young

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy H.S.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	16
Prop Speaker #1	Kowalick-Allen pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Reid pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Keen pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Gerlach pts 27.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
Seemed a bit nervous at first, but improved later

Prop 2:
Spoke with authority

Opp 1:
Good eye contact. Clear arguments against a difficult/random idea to argue

Opp 2:
Great speaking voice & mannerisms.

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Team 14 gave clear arguments in favor of their position. Team 16's ideas were too abstract for their position.

PARLI Debate

Little, Sharon (*17)
Round 3 1:30pm Room 2
Gov: 14 Clark - Canales
Opp: 8 Schoeffler - Nguyen
Novice Parli Debate

aff

Judge's Name: Little

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	8
Prop Speaker #1	Canales pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Schoeffler pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Clark pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Nguyen pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
+ polite
– need to offer roadmap
+ good pace
ending better than beginning

Prop 2:
+ courteous
+ good pace
– organization

Opp 1:
+ tried to give some organization to argument
+ courteous
+ good pace

Opp 2:
+ good pace
– organization
– be respectful of the classroom

TEAM CODE #: 8 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
aff did not offer a clear plan

PARLI Debate

Sharma, Kashyp (*5)
Round 3 1:30pm Annex2
Gov: 8 Yin - Tan
Opp: 14 Hassan - Goody
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Kashyap Sharma

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 8		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Tan	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Goody	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Yin	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Hassan	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Courteous, Good in debate except
- Could not provide source of defenition
- Not clear evidence
- Finished 1st Round very quickly (Spend Time in preparation next Time)

Prop 2: Courteous, Good in delivery, Good in debate but
Same thing as in prop #1
not able to provide enough evidence

Opp 1: Very Good in debate
- Utilized full time
- provided source of defenition

Opp 2: Very Good debator & partner.
- good in delivery

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

As I said (Aff) Team could not provide clear defenition & evidences, I would vote for opp Team.

Bonanas v. Corny

Sutton, Jim (*7)
Round 3 1:30pm East12
Gov: 5 Bokhari - Patel
Opp: 17 Campanella - Petruska
Novice Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP
Team Code #: 5

Prop Speaker #1 Patel pts 25

Prop Speaker #2 Bokhari pts 25

OPP
Team Code #: 17

Opp Speaker #1 Campanella pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Petruska pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Patel – Don't read from your notes – make eye contact with judge. Two minutes is too short.

Prop 2: Bokhari – Don't read from notes. You need to come up with more arguments. Watch "Uh" and "um's."

Opp 1: Campanella – You're going to be a great debater! Great speaking style and good organization. You need a conclusion to all your speeches.

Opp 2: Petruska – Wear a tie and don't chew gum. Great explanations of your arguments given that you didn't have much to work with.

TEAM CODE #: 17 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp won because they refuted all Prop's arguments and made good arguments which Prop did not refute. For this level of topic, all of you should have SMILED more – have fun!!

PARLI Debate

Raesfeld, Kathleen von (*14)
Round 3 1:30pm East13
Gov: 5 Hsu - Sharma
Opp: 15 Hendrickson - O'Connor
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Kathleen von Raesfeld

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	5	Team Code #:	15
Prop Speaker #1	Hsu pts 27.75	Opp Speaker #1	O'Conner pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Sharma pts 28.5	Opp Speaker #2	Hendrickson pts 27.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
+ cordial, good smile & definitions
+ excellent examples & support
- status quo point was not well linked to argument
- remember to look up from notes
+ great job supporting partner

Prop 2:
+ excellent eye contact
+ passion and connection to the real world were persuasive
+ Smooth transitions and good job restating argument #3

Opp 1: + business-like start - GREAT!!
+ in first speech you really "chased down" the topic and points with support - yay!
- remember to stay engaged and try not to look out the window
+ theatrical manner and "cool" points persuasive

Opp 2:
+ strong passion and empathy for the making friends point - well done!
+ excellent example of corny vs crazy and drawing out how you can't make a comeback
- remember to smile, take a deep breath & pause for effect!!

TEAM CODE #: 5 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Dropped argument that corny do not grow society - just needed a refute!
- Prop kept definition "alive"

Excellent job on a "tricky" topic!!

PARLI Debate

Fishlow, Dan (*9)
Round 3 1:30pm Room 107
Gov: 14 Raesfeld - Sappington
Opp: 5 Bardalai - Rangwala
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Fishlow

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	5
Prop Speaker #1	Sappington pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Bardalai pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Raesfeld pts 24	Opp Speaker #2	Rangwala pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Sappington
Good opening; good framework
eye contact, comfortable, personable

Opp 1: Bardalai
Strong speaker; able to turn argument in their favor
Good command of the room

Prop 2: Raesfeld
Had some good points but seemed nervous
* not quite proper attire

Opp 2: Rangwala
Solid speaker; good voice.

TEAM CODE #: 5 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Did a better job of showing that not all innovation is bad and stuck more closely to the topic. Hard topic to debate.

PARLI Debate

Vejby, Mara (*1)
Round 3 1:30pm East15
Gov: 4 Lanzone - Hubinger
Opp: 8 Navarra - Nguyen
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Mara Vejby

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 4		Team Code #: 8	
Prop Speaker #1 Hubinger	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Navarra	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Lanzone	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Nguyen	pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

~~Prop~~ 1: Prop

Consider defining the debate metaphorically rather than literally next time. It will make your case much easier to outline

~~Prop~~ 2: & manage.

~~Opp~~ 1: Opp Be careful not to drop points made by the Prop. These arguments need to be addressed & countered in addition to making your own case.

Opp 2:

Both

Very funny and amicable debate. Well done and best luck to all.

TEAM CODE #: 4 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp did not address Prop's arguments and left their comments too abstract to apply in their favor.

PARLI Debate

Noah, Harrison (*1)
Round 3 1:30pm Room 109
Gov: 6 Murdock - Bazile
Opp: 14 Stromberg - Miller
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Harrison Noah

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 6		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Bazile	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Miller	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Murdock	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Stromberg	pts 30

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
Very eloquent and exhibited a quiet confidence.

Work on adding evidence, that will make your speeches longer

Prop 2:
Great job handling a tough debate. Try and add more refutations on opponent's points

Opp 1: You did a great job laying out your case. Try and add voting implications to topicality arguments.

Opp 2:
Clearly you have a bright future as a speaker. Next step is to work on judge adaptation; since I debated before you don't have to rely on emotional appeal, focus on analytics.

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Hitler is worse than snuggies.

PARLI Debate

Noah, Mariah (*1)
Round 3 1:30pm East18
Gov: 6 Green - Madison
Opp: 15 Coelho - Siegel
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Marian Noah

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 6		Team Code #: 15	
Prop Speaker #1 Madison	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Siegel	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Green	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Coelho	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: You defined the resolution as a tautology. If your def. it reads "It is better to be fun than to be unpleasant!" How is neg supposed to argue that it is better to be unpleasant?

Prop 2: You also can't win off of "dropped" definitions or judging criteria alone. It doesn't matter if they dropped that you made this a fact or if you said what the criteria was b/c these weren't conflicting arguments.

Opp 1: Dispute definitions that don't make sense. Try to fill your time. Good job responding to most of their arguments

Opp 2:

Your judging criteria is word for word our judging criteria is a beneficial. This makes no sense. You are both very good + confident speakers, polish up your case.

TEAM CODE #: 15 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The aff's definitions made no sense and their case was ineffective. They didn't respond to neg's arguments so neg wins.

GOING BANANAS IS BETTER THAN BEING CORNY

PARLI Debate

Macpherson, Michele (*3)
Round 3 1:30pm Room 111
Gov: 4 Giverts - Han
Opp: 17 Little - Wagner
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ERIK VONBLANKENBURG

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN H.S.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	17
Prop Speaker #1	STEPHEN GIVERTS pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	ABBY LITTLE pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	DYLAN HAN pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	NOAH WAGNER pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: STEPHEN
GOOD CALM DELIVERY. COULD USE MORE FACTS AND EXAMPLES GOOD EYE CONTACT.

Opp 1: ABBY
CALM DIRECT DEMEANOR GOOD USE OF FACTS BUT NEED TO FURTHER EXPLAIN YOUR ARGUMENT

Prop 2: DYLAN
GOOD DELIVERY. WORK ON SPEAKING FOR A LONGER PERIOD OF TIME. USE MORE SPECIFIC EXAMPLES TO PROVE POINT

Opp 2: NOAH
BEST SPEAKER IN GROUP. CALM CLEAR PRESENTATION. USED MANY EXAMPLES.

TEAM CODE #: 17 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or (Opp))

REASON FOR DECISION:
GOOD JOB BY BOTH SIDES BUT NOT MANY FACTS AS THIS WAS JUST A FUN OPINION DEBATE. PROPONENTS MADE THE MISTAKE OF USING A "CORNY" JOKE AS AN ARGUMENT FOR GOING "BANANAS" OPPOSITION USED DICTIONARY DEFINITION OF CORNY TO ARGUE THEIR SIDE AND EFFECTIVELY REBUTTED PROPOSITIONS ARGUMENT

PARLI Debate

Chen, Ming (*5)
Round 3 1:30pm Room 103
Gov: 15 Farkas - Cabral
Opp: 6 Santana - Jones
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ming Chen

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 15		Team Code #: 6	
Prop Speaker #1 ~~Cabral~~ Farkas	pts 24	Opp Speaker #1 Jones	pts 24
Prop Speaker #2 Cabral	pts 23	Opp Speaker #2 Santana	pts 24

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Suggestions to both teams: Please provide better evidence to support for your argument. Both sides arguments are pretty weak.

Prop 1: It's a hard topic and I think you did a good job analyzing the topic & came up w/ a good framework. However, there was very little evidence to support your arguments.

Prop 2: You ~~did not~~ had a good start in your counter-argument but didn't finish your speech.

Opp 1: You were not able to establish your argument. Rather, just some general counter-arguments. Please use specific evidence & example in your speech.

Opp 2: Your argument that ~~people~~ having different opinions leads to segration doesn't seeem to be supported by empirical evidence. Please consider using your time to lay out the arguments better.

TEAM CODE #: 15 **on the** Prop **wins this debate!**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
The opposing team failed to provide any counter argument that having new ideas is bad. Rather the arguments are quite weak & lack evidence.

PARLI Debate

Lake, Abby (*15)
Round 3 1:30pm Room 108
Gov: 8 Albers - Pell
Opp: 13 Sundararaman - Baetkey
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Abby Lake

Judge's School Affiliation: SCDS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	8	Team Code #:	13
Prop Speaker #1	Albers pts 25	Opp Speaker #1	Baetkey pts 25
Prop Speaker #2	Albers pts /	Opp Speaker #1	Sundararaman pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
* good & rebuttal of neg's points
* watch "ums" (11)
* stay strong until the very end — the last speech seemed very rushed and informal

Prop 2:
N/A

Opp 1:
* good rebuttal of aff's points
* good "road map" + organization
* watch "ums" and "likes" (11)
* stand strong until the very end — some of your points trailed off during the last speech.

Opp 2:
* good point about Hawaiian language and culture.
* some explanations were a bit unclear
* watch "ums" (11)

TEAM CODE #: 13 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp had more reasonable points and a slightly stronger rebuttal than the affirmation.