

Open Parli Debate

Preliminary Round Results

Victoria Castro-Chavez 2A Bear Creek H.S.	7D L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	9D L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	17I L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 0 - 3 0
Michael Barber				
Scott Macpherson 3A Belmont	7A W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	17G L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	17H W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Cameron Humphreys				
Katie Stamm-Kirk 4A Bentley School	13F W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	5C W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	17G W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 3 - 0 0
Gabby Burshteyn				
Ryan Booth 4B Bentley School	17C L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	7C L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	17E W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Devin Pracar				
Michael Rubsamen 4C Bentley School	17G L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	5F W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	17A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Irene Partzuf				
Davis Cohen 4D Bentley School	10C W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	14A L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	17F L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Olive Brogan				
Lucy Holt 4E Bentley School	17I W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	5B W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	17D L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Katerina Mizin				
Paul Furer 4F Bentley School	9E L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	5E L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	14A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 0 - 3 0
Jacob Skepner				
Nikhil Sawhney 5A Dougherty Valley HS	13E L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	17B W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	13F L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Larry (Shuchen) Liang				
Arman Sawhney 5B Dougherty Valley HS	7C L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	4E L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	13D W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Annie Jeong				
Vishruth Mattegunta 5C Dougherty Valley HS	9A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	4A L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	13C L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 0 - 3 0
Srinath Nandakumar				
Amanda Su 5D Dougherty Valley HS	17J W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	BYE 0*	17C L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Emily Her				
Ryan Giang 5E Dougherty Valley HS	14C L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	4F W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	10C L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Yolanda Shen				
Indu Gaddamadugu 5F Dougherty Valley HS	7H L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	4C L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	10B W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Ritika Pudota				
Andrew Wilcox 7A Lowell HS	3A L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	9F W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	10A W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Frances Sutton				
Thomas White 7B Lowell HS	BYE 0*	17J W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	17B W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 3 - 0 0
Emily Hall				
Matthew Chin 7C Lowell HS	5B W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	4B W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	14C W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 3 - 0 0
Raul Rosenfeld				
Fontanna Yee 7D Lowell HS	2A W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	9E L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	14B L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Iris Alison Morrell				
James Pritchard Sutton 7E Lowell HS	17H L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	13A L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	9G L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 0 - 3 0
Emily Moon				
Miriam Lustig 7F Lowell HS	17A W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	13F L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	9F L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Irene Gerenrot				

Open Parli Debate

Preliminary Round Results

Jaden Jarmel-Schneider 7G Lowell HS	17F L 0* Opp 0*	9C L 0* Gov 0*	9B W 0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Daniela Bernstein	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0
Daniel Shin 7H Lowell HS	5F W 0* Opp 0*	9A W 0* Gov 0*	9D L 0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
David Miller Shevelev	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0
Eric Banisadr 9A Miramonte HS	5C W 0* Gov 0*	7H L 0* Opp 0*	13A W 0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Zachary Weiner	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0
Adam Aguilera 9B Miramonte HS	14B L 0* Gov 0*	17D L 0* Opp 0*	7G L 0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 0 - 3 0
James Zhou	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0
Hannah Fishlow 9C Miramonte HS	13C W 0* Gov 0*	7G W 0* Opp 0*	13B W 0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 3 - 0 0
Olivia Fishlow	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0
Rusheel Kapoor 9D Miramonte HS	10B W 0* Gov 0*	2A W 0* Opp 0*	7H W 0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 3 - 0 0
Graham Berger	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0
Alexander Steven Casendino 9E Miramonte HS	4F W 0* Opp 0*	7D W 0* Gov 0*	13E W 0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 3 - 0 0
Shawn Essy Honaryar	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0
Jordan Hardwick 9F Miramonte HS	17E W 0* Opp 0*	7A L 0* Gov 0*	7F W 0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Jasmine Alina Der	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0
Jules Fogarty 9G Miramonte HS	13B L 0* Opp 0*	17C L 0* Gov 0*	7E W 0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Thor McAvenia	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0
Sakura Nash 10A Montgomery HS	13A L 0* Opp 0*	17H L 0* Gov 0*	7A L 0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 0 - 3 0
Clifton Thrasher	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0
Jonathan Day 10B Montgomery HS	9D L 0* Opp 0*	17E W 0* Gov 0*	5F L 0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Devon Siebels	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0
Arianna Fischer 10C Montgomery HS	4D L 0* Gov 0*	17A L 0* Opp 0*	5E W 0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Ann Jicha	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0
Bill Cao 13A San Marin HS	10A W 0* Gov 0*	7E W 0* Opp 0*	9A L 0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
James Gunn	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0
Eric Cheng 13B San Marin HS	9G W 0* Gov 0*	17I W 0* Opp 0*	9C L 0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Spencer Shifts	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0
Aditya Katewa 13C San Marin HS	9C L 0* Opp 0*	17F W 0* Gov 0*	5C W 0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Tyler Colenbrander	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0
Carina Masters 13D San Marin HS	17B L 0* Gov 0*	14B L 0* Opp 0*	5B L 0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 0 - 3 0
Cole Fehring	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0
Bilal Mubarack 13E San Marin HS	5A W 0* Opp 0*	14C W 0* Gov 0*	9E L 0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Nathaniel Troup	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0
Erik Cervantes 13F San Marin HS	4A L 0* Opp 0*	7F W 0* Gov 0*	5A W 0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Manny LaCarrubba	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0
Jack Greenberg 14A Sonoma Academy	17D L 0* Gov 0*	4D W 0* Opp 0*	4F W 0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Liam Kolling	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0
Caleb Kornfein 14B Sonoma Academy	9B W 0* Opp 0*	13D W 0* Gov 0*	7D W 0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 3 - 0 0
Audrey von Raesfeld	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0* Gov 0*	0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0

Open Parli Debate

Preliminary Round Results

Aris Saxena 14C Sonoma Academy	5E W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	13E L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	7C L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Connor Duncan				
Shane Rosenthal 17A Windsor HS	7F L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	10C W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	4C W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Dante Dondero				
Ben Chu 17B Windsor HS	13D W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	5A L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	7B L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Luke Fraga				
Will Hatcher 17C Windsor HS	4B W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	9G W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	5D W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 3 - 0 0
Cyrus Butler				
Autumn Inman 17D Windsor HS	14A W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	9B W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	4E W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 3 - 0 0
Aly Young				
Morgan Streeter 17E Windsor HS	9F L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	10B L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	4B L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 0 - 3 0
Erika Stewart				
Mary Lavell 17F Windsor HS	7G W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	13C L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	4D W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Angelique Hall				
Anna Skarr 17G Windsor HS	4C W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	3A W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	4A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
JP Escarcega				
Claire Ernst 17H Windsor HS	7E W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	10A W 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	3A L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Christophe Davis				
Sean Manni 17I Windsor HS	4E L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	13B L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	2A W 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Riley Brown				
Vanessa Ramirez 17J Windsor HS	5D L 0* 0.0* Opp 0*	7B L 0* 0.0* Gov 0*	BYE 0* 0.0/0	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Brandon Castenada				

PARLI Debate

Sutton, Emma (*6)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 208

Gov: 7 Wilcox - Sutton

Opp: 3 Macpherson - Humphreys

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Emma Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett

Team Code #: PROP 7

Team Code #: OPP 3

Prop Speaker #1 Sutton pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Macpherson pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 W. Cox pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Humphreys 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: Nice plan! Definite, so less grey area. Good delivery & pacing. Excellent summary (got you 1st speaker in round)

Prop 2: I had doubts about your counterplan, but you made compelling arguments & still had a great debate

Prop 2: Good job covering a lot of territory. Good refutation. Careful about telling judge to force all, how to vote. Five line between asking for my vote & demanding it. Good summary at voting issue - carry to follow.

Opp 2: Nice job rebutting all arguments. Easy to follow, smooth delivery.

TEAM CODE #: 3 on the Neg. wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: Great round! Overall neg carried impact on poor ppl (who do have laws, btw). Enforcement issue was good, but in the end neg argument that it is already in use carried. AAA arguments on defined law size were very good, but overall neg carried.

Sorry I messed up of my comments!

Prop 1
Opp 2

PARLI Debate

Sharma, Kashyp (*5)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 202

Gov: 17 Lavell - Hall

Opp: 7 Jarmel-Schneider - Bernstein

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Kashyap Sharma

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS, San Ramon

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	<u>17</u>	Team Code #:	<u>7</u>
Prop Speaker #1	<u>Hall</u> pts <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #1	<u>Jarmel</u> pts <u>28</u>
Prop Speaker #2	<u>Lavell</u> pts <u>27</u>	Opp Speaker #2	<u>Bernstein</u> pts <u>28</u>

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: Nicely started & explained definition & facts

Opp 1: Missed to greet everyone & introduce & Thank everyone. But corrected at the time of summarizing & good in argument.

Prop 2: Please work on fluency & material. As a #2 speaker you get more time to prepare

Opp 2: Greatly Argued.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Based on contention with numbers and opponents team not able to provide alternative.
But opp team argued well.

PARLI Debate

Sharma, Kashyp (*5)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 202
Gov: 14 Greenberg - Kolling
Opp: 17 Inman - Young
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: KASHYAP SHARMA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS, San Ramon

PROP
Team Code #: 14

OPP
Team Code #: 17

Prop Speaker #1 Kolling pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Inman pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Greenberg pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Young 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 presenter
Missed 2 companies of Musk

Opp 1: well argued

Prop 2: Good presenter

Opp 2: well argued

TEAM CODE #: ~~14~~ 17 on the opp wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Having Did good homework with numbers ^{4 arguments}. It was tough as opponent team also put solid facts and argued well. ~~Prop~~
Negation Teams presented good facts ~~but not~~

WITH THE EXCEPTION OF PUBLIC PARKS AND SCHOOLS
LAWNS SHOULD BE BANNED PARLI Debate
IN CA

Blankenburg, Erik Von (*13)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 206
Gov: 4 Furer - Skepner
Opp: 9 Casendino - Honaryar
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ERIK VONBLANKENBURG

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

Team Code #: PROP 4

Team Code #: OPP 9

Prop Speaker #1 PAUL FURER pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 SEAN HONARYAR pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 JACOB SKEPNER pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 ALEXANDER CASEDINO 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: PAUL

GREAT RELAXED PRESENTATION. GOOD JOB OF ANSWERING POINT OF INFO (QUESTION) GOOD QUOTING OF SOURCES IN PRESENTING FACTS.

Prop 2: JACOB

GREAT PRESENTATION. USED A GREAT TECHNIQUE OF USING OPPOSITION TO PROVE YOUR POINT AND THEN REFUSED TO ANSWER OTHER P.O.I.'S WHEN IT MAY HAVE BEEN A DISADVANTAGE TO YOU.

Opp 1: SEAN

GREAT POISE & PRESENTATION. GOOD JOB QUOTING SOURCES WHEN PRESENTING FACTS - IMPORTANT. GOOD JOB OF SUMMARIZING SPEECH AT THE END. MADE ARGUMENT VERY CLEAR WITH THIS CONCLUSION GREAT TECHNIQUE

Opp 2: ALEXANDER

GREAT PRESENTATION. CALM & CONTROLLED DELIVERY! GOOD EXPLANATION OF ALTERNATE PLAN. PAID CLOSE ATTENTION TO PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT AND REBUTTED IT WELL.

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the OPP wins this debate.

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

THIS WAS A VERY TOUGH DECISION. BOTH TEAMS WERE EXCELLENT. JACOBS TECHNIQUE OF ASKING QUESTIONS OF THE OPPOSITION TO MAKE HIS CASE AND THEN NOT RESPONDING TO THEIR P.O.I.'S WAS EFFECTIVE, BUT USE OF SARCASM WAS NOT. SEAN'S USE OF SUMMARIZING HIS ARGUMENTS WAS VERY EFFECTIVE. ALSO PROPOSITION

→ OVER

MISTAKENLY QUOTED DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE WHEN OPPOSITION USED THE 5TH AMMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION TO MAKE THEIR "PROPERTY" DEFENCE ARGUMENT. HOWEVER OPPOSITION COULD ALSO ARGUE RAISING WATER RATES AS A WAY OF REDUCING WATER USE.

GREAT JOB BY BOTH SIDES OVERALL. THIS WAS A REALLY TOUGH DECISION.

THANK YOU

Blankenburg, Erik Von (*13)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 206

Gov: 17 Skarr - Escarcega - PROPOSITION

Opp: 4 Rubsamen - Partzuf - OPPOSITION

Open Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

" MARK ZUCKERBERG WILL HAVE A GREATER IMPACT ON SOCIETY THAN ELON MUSK
Judge's Name: ERIK VONBLANKENBURG

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

PROP

OPP

Team Code #: 17

Team Code #: 4

Prop Speaker #1 J.P. ESCARCEGA pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 IRENE PARTZUF pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 ANA SKARR pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 MICHAEL RUBSAMEN 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: J.P.

QUOTE MORE SOURCES WHEN STATING FACTS, SLOW SPEECH A LITTLE. GOOD POISE & PRESENTATION. GOOD EYE CONTACT. CALM DOWN AND RELAX. YOU HAVE A GOOD COMMAND OF THE FACTS. PRESENT THEM SLOWLY & CLEARLY

Prop 2: ANA

GREAT PRESENTATION & POISE. EMPATHIC WITHOUT TALKING TOO FAST. GOOD JOB OF QUOTING SOURCES. BE CAREFUL CLAIMING RACISM IN INCOME INEQUALITY

TEAM CODE #: 17 on the PROP

Opp 1: IRENE

SLOW DOWN A LITTLE BIT. GOOD ENUNCIATION. EASY TO UNDERSTAND. GOOD JOB OF ADDRESSING PROponents ARGUMENTS AND HANDLING POINTS OF INFORMATION

Opp 2: MICHAEL

EXCELLENT PRESENTATION. VERY PERSUASIVE. GOOD EYE CONTACT. LEFT OUT JOB CREATION AS HELPING THE POOR. ACCIDENTALLY GAVE PROponents EXAMPLE OF NEGATIVE IMPACT ON SOCIETY

BUT THEY FAILED TO PICK UP ON IT

REASON FOR DECISION: SEE BACK

MAKE SURE TO QUOTE SOURCED FACTS

(Prop or Opp)



THE TOPIC WAS WHO WILL HAVE THE "GREATEST" IMPACT ON SOCIETY. PROPOSITION USED A LOT OF OPINION AS WELL AS FACT. OPPOSITION FAILED TO USE "JOB CREATION" AS AN ARGUMENT AGAINST CLAIMS OF INCOME INEQUALITY BY ZUCKERBERG'S PROPONENTS. * OPPONENTS ALSO INADVERTANTLY HELPED PROPOSITION WITH CYBERBULLYING CLAIMS AGAINST FACEBOOK. A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON SOCIETY IS STILL AN IMPACT. HOWEVER PROPOSITION FAILED TO PICKUP ON THAT AND INCLUDE IT IN THEIR ARGUMENT.

OVERALL EXCELLENT JOB BY BOTH SIDES, THIS WAS A VERY TOUGH DECISION.

OPPOSITION PROVED THAT ELON MUSK WILL HAVE A "MORE POSITIVE" IMPACT ON SOCIETY BUT THE TOPIC WAS "GREATER" IMPACT AND PROPOSITION PROVED IT (WITH OPPOSITIONS HELP)

* ELON MUSK'S MANUFACTURING OF "LUXURY PRODUCTS" CREATES JOBS FOR LOWER INCOME PEOPLE.

Renee Murakami

PARLI Debate

Walji, Inara (#12)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 207
Gov: 14 Saxena - Duncan
Opp: 5 Giang - Shen
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Renee Murakami
Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 Aris Saxena pts 28.5

Opp Speaker #1 Ryan Giang pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Connor Duncon pts 29.5

Opp Speaker #2 Yolanda Shen 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 organization
 - very good use of sources/evidence
 - organized & well-executed "road map"
 - clear, easy to follow points
 - good use of time, and good time awareness
 - could ~~to~~ slow down speech a bit

Prop 2:
 - very good organization
 - clearly refuted opponent's arguments
 - excellent eye contact
 - enthusiastic

Opp 1: good organization
 - good job discussing the Prop's points
 - ~~to~~ good job using sources/evidence
 - could use a bit more eye contact

Opp 2: very good organization and use of "road map"
 - good use of sources
 - did good job of summation

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
overall, prop (Team 14) presented stronger, organized arguments for their case / plans (all debaters were respectful of each other - very pleasant young lady and men!)

PARLI Debate

Rosenthal, Alan (*17)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 204
Gov: 13 Cao - Gunn
Opp: 10 Nash - Thrasher
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ALAN ROSENTHAL

Judge's School Affiliation: WINDSOR HS

Team Code #: PROP 13

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 CAO pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 NASH pts 24

Prop Speaker #2 GUNN pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 THRASHER 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: GRAB, CLEAR SPEECH
WELL SPOKEN

IMPACTS MORE PEOPLE

GREATER IMPACT DOES NOT
MEAN BETTER OR WORSE!
EXCELLENT

Prop 2:

MORE DONATIONS \$ +
MORE ONLY CARES TO WEALTH +
THE BENEFIT

Opp 1: BREATHE! SLOW DOWN
FB IS ONLY 1 PLATFORM GOOD
ENV. IMPACT GOOD +
NEW IMPACT BUT STILL IMPACT,
PAY ATTENTION TO THE TOPIC!
TECHNOLOGY AFFECTS LIFE +

Opp 2: NUMBERS CAN'T BE COMPARED
SPACE X HUGE POTENTIAL +
NUMBERS MAY BE SKEWED +
NEW IMPACT -

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

DATA WAS MORE CLEARLY GIVEN
GOOD REBUTALS
BETTER INTERPRETATION OF TOPIC

PARLI Debate

Rosenthal, Alan (*17)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 204
Gov: 9 Aguilera - Zhou
Opp: 14 Kornfein - Raesfeld
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ALAN ROSENTHAL

Judge's School Affiliation: WINDSOR HS

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: <u>9</u>	Team Code #: <u>14</u>
Prop Speaker #1 <u>ZHOU</u> pts <u>27.5</u>	Opp Speaker #1 <u>KORNFEIN</u> pts <u>25</u>
Prop Speaker #2 <u>AGUILERA</u> pts <u>26</u>	Opp Speaker #2 <u>RAESFELD</u> pts <u>26</u>

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:

VERY CLOSE!

Prop 1: GREAT DELIVERY
 BANNING VS. INCENTIVES -
 STATED THERE SHOULD BE A CHANCE -
 PESTICIDE ARGUMENTS +
 NO GUARANTEE OF EL NIÑO +
 NATIVE SPECIES +

Prop 2: GOOD DELIVERY
 OPP SAID ALL BANNED +
 LESS PESTICIDES +
 OPP. PROVIDED NO SPECIFIC
 \$ SAVINGS +

Opp 1: CLEAR DELIVERY BUT SLOW DOWN!
 ENV. BENEFITS +
 INCENTIVES VS BANNING +
 GRASS DOESN'T REQ MUCH PEST +

GOOD DELIVERY
 Opp 2: NOT ENOUGH GRASS LEFT +
 ↑ ASTHMA
 EL NIÑO HAS BEEN PROVEN
 ↓ DROXON +

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

EFFECTIVE REBUTALS
STRONG EVIDENCE

PARLI Debate

Day, Chris (*10)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 210

Gov: 7 Yee - Morrell

Opp: 2 Castro-Chavez - Barber

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: DAY

Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomery

Team Code #: PROP 7

Team Code #: OPP 2

Prop Speaker #1 Morrell pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Castro-Chavez pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Yee pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Barber 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: Somewhat hard to follow opening statement - didn't hear definition of net benefits criteria or other criteria to judge. Could have talked about severity of problem on a rainy day

Prop 2: Extremely strong negation; covered their points well with good analysis + counters

Opp 1: Good private property rights argument. Good enforcement challenges issue.

Could have defeated their case with El Nino predictions - why not?

Opp 2: Good "greater needs" counter Good enforcement / Stockton police example

TEAM CODE #: 7 on the PROP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: ... just barely; came down to very good Prop 2 counter of Opp points. Both sides could have talked about severity of problems + defined judging criteria to their liking

PARLI Debate

Day, Chris (*10)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 210

Gov: 9 Banisadr - Weiner

Opp: 5 Mattegunta - Nandakumar

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: DAY

Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomery

Team Code #: ~~9~~ **PROP** 9

Team Code #: 5 **OPP**

Prop Speaker #1 ~~Weiner~~ Banisadr pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Nandakumar pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Weiner pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Mattegunta 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 data on Zuck; good definition of impact as "probable" Good 1st point, 2nd point could have been clearer

Opp 1: 2 Good presentation, could have debated "probable" more. Needed to use facts to support why Musk can be successful. He has larger vision than Zuck - but why should I believe he can do it

~~Opp 2:~~

Prop 2: Very good command of points - but could deliver them more convincably by slowing down

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the PROP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Better support why Zuck, even with lesser potential, will have greater impact than Musk. Didn't learn enough about Musk to believe he could succeed

PARLI Debate

Sutton, Emma (*6)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 208

Gov: 5 Sawhney - Liang

Opp: 13 Mubarak - Troup

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Emma Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Sawhney pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Mubarak pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Liang pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Troup 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: Excellent smooth delivery easy to follow, well organized

Opp 1: Beautiful speech! Smooth delivery, well organized, good refutation.

Prop 2: Great refutation! Outstanding job covering all points, both yes and no.

Opp 2: Good job covering a ton of ground.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Great debate, tough decision! Both teams had persuasive arguments, but in the end the opp. won on long-term impact, doubts about Zuckerberg's charitable donation, and Facebook not being unique or innovative.

Sutton, Jim (*7)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 113
Gov: 17 Streater - Stewart
Opp: 9 Hardwick - Der
Open Parli Debate

Zuckerberg

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

Team Code #: PROP 17

Team Code #: OPP 9

Prop Speaker #1 Stewart pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Der pts 26

Prop Speaker #2 Streater pts 25

Opp Speaker #2 Hardwick 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:

STEWART. Very good conversational style. Very well-organized speeches—very important. Didn't need to call opponents "unfair," and shouldn't have mocked opponent's personal story.

Prop 2: STREETER Very nice speaking style, but your substance was lacking. Not enough specifics about what FB does.

DER. Too many "ums," interruptions and fiddling with papers. Need to "signpost" speeches-- need to give headings and tell me where you're going. Don't just list out stray, unrelated points. Good summation at end of rebuttal-- nice wrap-up of three best arguments. Apple???

Opp 2: HARDWICK. Great speaker. Very intelligent points. You should be 1st speaker. "Action more important than words" and "personal wealth does not mean he's doing anything for society" -- best points in debate.

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the OPP (Prop or Opp) wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: OPP won because AFF did not make the point that Musk's "action" -- building solar cells, electric cars, and PayPal -- are more influential than Zuckerberg's "words." AFF had easier case, but did not give specific words in which FB/social media are helping products.

Sutton, Jim (*7)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 113
Gov: 4 Holt - Mizin
Opp: 17 Manni - Brown
Open Parli Debate

Banning laws

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

Team Code #: PROP 4

Team Code #: OPP 17

Prop Speaker #1 Holt pts 30

Opp Speaker #1 Manni pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 Mizin pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Brown 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:

HOLT. Phenomenal style and
Prop 1: phenomenal substance.
Your 2nd AFF knocked it out of park -
then looks in counterplan. Style is
great - quick but articulate

MIZIN. Good eye contact and
Prop 2: good wording. Watch
your "uns." Good job at least
try to respond to all NEG's
points. There are a lot of reasons
to play sports besides getting into top.

MANNI. Great speaker, Great eye contact.
Opp 1: say "we" not "I." Your notes were
cute but weak - you're too good a
speaker to rely on canned conclusions.
Needed to think through where it
would come from for a p.

BROWN. Speaking style too slow and
halting. Good arguments (57 Minus twA)
but need to make them more fleshly.
Shouldn't have said you were responding
to request for numbers when you didn't
have answers.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very intriguing counter-plan, but AFF won because NEG were
explained where money for education and infrastructure would come
from. NEG needed to think through specifics of its counterplan more -
2nd AFF speech was solid.

Zuck > Musk.
PARLI Debate

Fogarty, Matthew (*9)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 209
Gov: 10 Fischer - Jicha
Opp: 4 Cohen - Brogan
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: MAT FOGARTY

Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 4

Prop Speaker #1 JICHA pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 BROGAN pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 FISCHER pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 COHEN 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:

+ve clear voice + passion

-ve try to use all your time (speech was 2 mins)
(did not mention Musk)

try to look @ judge not paper

Prop 2:

try to be more continuous (less gaps)
do not concede too early "Zuck did not bring new ideas"

Opp 1:

+ well organized, clear nice closing summaries

- too many points (overview of Musk companies was complicated)

Opp 2:

Nice to point out that prop did not address CO2 issue
good to pull it all together

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop's points on Zuck were weak and on Musk were missing.
prop did not address importance (or not) of carbon issue.

Lawn Labeled (copied from schools + parents)
PARLI Debate

Fogarty, Matthew (*9)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 209
Gov: 7 Chin - Rosenfeld
Opp: 5 Sawhney - Jeong
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: MAT FOGARTY
Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

Team Code #: PROP 7

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 ROSENFELD pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 SAWHNEY pts 27 *diverting vally.*

Prop Speaker #2 CHIN pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 JEONG 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 voice + posture
Needs points better organized
Good handling of POI at end
Good use of [→] starts
Don't add new points in final speech

Prop 2:
Good summary
Was thrown off by topic switch

Opp 1:

→ did not debate the main point, agreed with all props points. Made the debate about the debate, not about the topic.

Opp 2:

The way you debated was good, but the strategy around the topic lost it for me.

TEAM CODE #: 7 on the PROP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Extra topicality / N+1 . We did not get a debate about lemons, rather about the side point of schools.

PARLI Debate

Raesfeld, Kathleen von (*14)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 203
Gov: 9 Fishlow - Fishlow
Opp: 13 Katewa - Colenbrander
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Kathleen von Raesfeld

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

Team Code #: PROP 9

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Fishlow, O pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Katewa pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Fishlow, H pts 27.5

Opp Speaker #2 Colenbrander 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:

- + excellent eye contact
- + smooth style
- have phone/timer ready

- + liked overview approach
- Opp 1: + polite
- + spoke w/ conviction
- + good permanent solution argument
- need sources on hyperloop plan
- taking "has colonized planet" a bit too far

- Prop 2: - have phone/timer ready
- + good points / effective pauses
 - + nice transitions
 - + + gracious to allow ~~is~~ question but stayed back on topic

- Opp 2: + excellent presence & effective pauses
- + "Legacy" excellent response and word choice
 - + spoke w/ conviction

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

- + most clear arguments, stayed on track with defined topicality
- + refuted all points and ~~stated~~ presented strongest, consistent argument

* Both teams were EXCELLENT! You are going to go far!!

PARLI Debate

Raesfeld, Kathleen von (*14)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 203
Gov: 7 Lustig - Gerenrot
Opp: 17 Rosenthal - Dondero
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Kathleen von Raesfeld

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

Team Code #: PROP 7

Team Code #: OPP 17

Prop Speaker #1 Lustig pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Dondero pts 28.5

Prop Speaker #2 Gerenrot pts 28.25

Opp Speaker #2 Rosenthal 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: - Slow down a bit, pause, smile
+ excellent vocabulary "aesthetic pleasures"
+ summary back to criterion well done
+ question of enforcement eliminated argument for both sides at least you had a plan - well Done ☺

Prop 2:
+ That never give up attitude will get you places!
+ love drama & voicetone
- ignored question a bit too long

Opp 1: + smooth, polished and professional -
+ excellent & persuasive
+ nice save on "congregation" vs "conjugation" used by partner - kept it all positive

Opp 2: + smile at intro was full of confidence and made me want to believe you now! ☺
+ excellent review and smooth transitions
+ your "spark" and eye contact were spot on
- "conjugation" is not what you meant... "congregation" was

TEAM CODE #: 7 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

- Prop made strong case for over 25 square foot spaces only, difficulty of access to parks for ALL. Most benefits because ^{water} awareness, + maintenance + cost to manage "non-native" that exist, + still teaching about plants while providing healthy environment but realistic and ~~acceptable~~ ^{acceptable} limitations for CA

Macpherson, Michele (*3)
 Round 1A 9:00am Room 201
 Gov: 13 Cheng - Shifts
 Opp: 9 Fogarty - Pister
 Open Parli Debate

Pister - 1
 Fogarty - 2
 Shifts - 1 ✓
 Cheng - 2

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Michele Macpherson
 Judge's School Affiliation: Belmont

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: <u>13</u>	Team Code #: <u>9</u>
Prop Speaker #1 <u>Shifts</u> pts <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #1 <u>Pister</u> pts <u>27.5</u>
Prop Speaker #2 <u>Cheng</u> pts <u>27</u>	Opp Speaker #2 <u>Fogarty</u> pts <u>28</u>

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:

* Should have ~~challenged~~ ^{challenged} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~criteria~~ ^{criteria} ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~be~~ ^{be} ~~redefined~~ ^{redefined} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~criteria~~ ^{criteria}.

Prop 1: Excellent final speech
 → good POI re relative donations
 → You should be calling
 → good POI when new topics were introduced in Opp closing speech
 → e.g. open source code

* Be more confident on calling POI

Prop 2:
 → Excellent job organizing responses point by point
 → nothing was dropped
 → good thinking on POI answer
 * Do not let POI throw off your flow → fit in when

Opp 1: Very strong speeches
 → Needed more ~~terminator~~ ^{terminator} impacts to make case → keep asking 'so what'
 → redefinition of criteria was not justified enough to warrant changing Alt & definition.

Opp 2: > Strong speaker
 > Good job arguing point by point and not dropping any points
 > Strong arguments on value of ideas
 > Strong arguments on FIB
 > not helping people struggle or dying but lacked linkage to show make impact on standards + duty

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

> Shifts final speech showed greater impact effectively
 → successfully argued the ~~the~~ value of FIB ~~and~~ impact of Zuchungy Christie Giving

Gen
Terms

Macpherson, Michele (*3)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 201
Gov: 5 Su - Her
Opp: 17 Ramirez - Castañada
Open Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

- 1. Su
- 2. Her

- 1. Castañada
- 2. Ramirez

Judge's Name: Michele Macpherson

Judge's School Affiliation: Belmont

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 17

Prop Speaker #1 Su pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Castañada pts 27.5

Prop Speaker #2 Her pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Ramirez pts 26.5

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: Clear contentions, well delivered

Strong point on double harms and ability to tie to humanized impact

You didn't call for a new concept of drought resistant plants

Prop 2: Good points argued against CP

good coverage of the key points of the case

Strong delivery
Be sure stats match partner

TEAM CODE #: 5

Opp 1: Strong idea with plan inclusive counter plan -> very good set up

Spends a little more time on each of their points acknowledged benefits

You introduced new concept of drought resistant plants in first speech which could have been in first speech

Opp 2: Good job going through each point thoroughly

All the time you argued against their PROP plan, you were also arguing against your own plan. Work on partner communication

on the PROP wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Closing speech for Aff successfully argued that benefits greater because of doubling harms if the middle ground being better than the extreme.

5 or 5 allms
9.2B

Walji, Inaara (12)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 207
Gov: 13 Masters - Fehring
Opp: 17 Chu - Fraga
Open Parli Debate

Ming Chen

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Ming chen

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

Team Code #: PROP 13

Team Code #: OPP 17

Prop Speaker #1 Fehring pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Fraga pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Masters pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Chu 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: speak a little slower.
clearly laid out the arguments which made it easy to follow.
The closing argument addressed the opponents points, nicely done.

Opp 1: nicely paced ^{clear} speaking while speaking with a lot of passion, it did seem a little overpowering at times.

Prop 2: Good job in rebuttal. Try to speak with more confidence.

Opp 2: Good job in rebuttal. Some statements sounded over-reaching based on your evidence.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The argument that the ~~quest~~ topic is about ^{the} future of how Musk's innovations will have a bigger impact in the future wins the debate.

PARLI Debate

Cowsert, Lynnette (*1)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 112
Gov: 5 Gaddamadugu - Pudota
Opp: 7 Shin - Shevelev
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Lynnette Cowsert

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy H.S.

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 7

Prop Speaker #1 Gaddamadugu pts 27.5

Opp Speaker #1 Miller shevelev pts 28.5

Prop Speaker #2 Pudota pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Daniel Shin 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: *Seemed nervous and sometimes breathless... breathe! Many "um"s in speech good eye contact and gestures*

Opp-1: *Animated, good eye contact. Many times touching glasses, just a nervous gesture I'm sure*

Prop 2: *Seemed to have trouble with eye contact; great points made, entirety of plan hard to follow*

Opp 2: *Excellent eye contact, very passionate in speech. noticeable rushing.*

TEAM CODE # 5/7 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Their points regarding the Federal government running a state based program ~~was~~ were made to seem wrong. State problems corrected by state means. The Prop's plan wasn't well presented

PARLI Debate

Minick, Karen (*2)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 205
Gov: 17 Hatcher - Butler
Opp: 4 Booth - Pracar
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Karen Minick
Judge's School Affiliation: Bear Creek H.S.

Team Code #: PROP 17

Team Code #: OPP 4

Prop Speaker #1 Butler pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Booth pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Hatcher pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Pracar 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

* Don't argue Rules "I see we win!"

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

Prop 1: great eye contact
swap a little
good voice - clear points

Opp 1: good, strong voice, excellent
pathos - beautiful rhetoric
even when off topic

Prop 2: nervous
nervous - good analysis, good
counter points, concise used more
specifics to support good ans.

Opp 2: slow down! - speaks very
quickly tend to mumble

Bited sources

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg dropped \$ donation/philanthropy pt from Aff and
changed def. in 2nd speech (*I caught it before Aff
addressed in last speech)

PARLI Debate

Minick, Karen (*2)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 205
Gov: 9 Kapoor - Berger
Opp: 10 Day - Siebels
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Karen Minick
Judge's School Affiliation: Bear Creek H.S.

Team Code #: PROP 9 Team Code #: OPP 10
Prop Speaker #1 Kapoor pts _____ Opp Speaker #1 Siebels pts _____
Prop Speaker #2 Berger pts _____ Opp Speaker #2 Day 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: well spoken, confident Opp 1: great voice - looks around a lot
good questions ↑ eye contact

Prop 2: strong Opp 2: Very clear & easy to understand
↑ more eye contact

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the Pro wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Policy of water regulation does not counter resolution
If had addressed exceptions at all might have won.
* Neither team addressed "the exception" in resolution?!

* Both Teams Very Confident!!

Single flight only Varsity

PARLI Debate

Arias, Christina (#16)

Claudette Windsor Masters

Round 1A 9:00am Room 211
Gov: 17 Ernst - Davis
Opp: 7 Sutton - Moon
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: _____

Judge's School Affiliation: San Maria HS

Team Code #: PROP Windsor 17

Team Code #: OPP Lowell SF 7

Prop Speaker #1 Claire Ernst pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 James Sutton pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Christophe Davis pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Emily Moon 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:

<p>Prop 1: <u>Const. - Good case in favor of m/z over EM impact - their life-time vs future? Good posture, eye contact, volume. Rebuttal - need to support Paypal cost</u></p> <p>Prop 2: <u>Good answer to rebuild case and address Paypal argument + "non green" materials used</u></p>	<p>Opp 1: <u>Const. - Great job of pointing out future impact of Green energy. Good speaking, eye contact, volume - need to slow down, sometimes hard to understand. Needed Paypal argument support - free vs. cost Rebuttal. Dig. eye FB emotional</u></p> <p>Opp 2: <u>argument dropped. Eviron Sustanability. Nice comfortable start - good support of Paypal w/ Etsy, Amazon</u></p>
---	--

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Hard decision - both were strong cases. Props cited evidence, defined society in EM + m/z lifetime. Speakers were more relaxed and easier to understand. Both did Good Job!

PARLI Debate

Cowsert, Lynnette (*1)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 112
Gov: 4 Stamm-Kirk - Burshteyn
Opp: 13 Cervantes - LaCarrubba
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Lynnette Cowsert
Judge's School Affiliation: Analy HS

Team Code #: PROP 4

Team Code #: OPP

Prop Speaker #1 Gabriela Burshteyn pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Erik Cervantes pts 28.5

Prop Speaker #2 Ratie Stamm-Kirk pts 28.5

Opp Speaker #2 Munny LaCarrubba 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 eye contact, convincing touches timer/phone during speech, distracting Excellent presentation

Opp 1: Great presenter, maybe nervous, but a lot of "um's" during speech

Prop 2: Excellent eye contact, focused Very confident presentation

Opp 2: Great at body language many good points. fidgety during opponents time is noticeable

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

They made a point of societal impact being the importance, the economic war as well made

Mara Vejby

PARLI Debate

Day, Chris (*10)

Round 2 11:00am Annex6
Gov: 3 Macpherson - Humphreys
Opp: 17 Skarr - Escarcega
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Mara Vejby
Judge's School Affiliation: Amaly

Team Code #: PROP 3

Team Code #: OPP 17

Prop Speaker #1 Macpherson pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Skarr pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 ~~Macpherson~~ Humphreys pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Escarcega 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: Prop.
Focus on more specifically defining/containing the scope of the debate. When opp. tries to shift scope of def. it Prop 2: will be easier to defend.
Slow down delivery to make for stronger points.
Good developing nations argument.

Opp 1: Opp.
Don't shy away from challenging def. Good approach to bring up lives as standard.

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Well Done Everyone

PARLI Debate

Raymond, Bill (*1)

Round 2 11:00am Room 209

Gov: 17 Chu - Fraga

Opp: 5 Sawhney - Liang

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Bill Raymond

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PROP

OPP

Team Code #: _____

Team Code #: _____

Prop Speaker #1 Fraga pts 27.5 Opp Speaker #1 Sawhney pts 28.5

Prop Speaker #2 Chu pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 Liang 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: All speakers were strong and expanded points effectively!

Prop 1: clear presentation of Prop case, well organized. Rebuttle not quite as clear, focus on delivery of key points, complete sentences + enumerated "values"

Opp 1: Just a bit clearer with organization & delivery than other speakers. Effective use of gestures to emphasize points,

Prop 2: Good organization and delivery. Great job expanding Prop case & rebutting Opp issues.

Opp 2: A well organized reiteration of key arguments.

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the OPP wins this debate.

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Excellent debate & a very tough decision. Prop successfully argues value + Maslow. Opp wins Time Limits. Tie breaker is Opp's many examples where economic growth & improved focus on environment. A more precise definition of "Developing" could have been used by either side.

to strengthen its arguments.

Developing nations should prioritize economic growth over environmental protection.

PARLI Debate

Malcolm, Laura (*1)
Round 2 11:00am East12
Gov: 7 Sutton - Moon
Opp: 13 Cao - Gunn
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Laura Malcolm
Judge's School Affiliation: El Molino H.S.

Team Code #: 7 **PROP**

Team Code #: 13 **OPP**

Moon
Sutton
Prop Speaker #1 Moon pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Sutton pts 27

Prop Speaker #1 Cao pts 29
Opp Speaker #2 Gunn 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: Clear roadmap of contentions
Strongest contention for stability & jobs needed more supports/examples
Prop 2: some excellent examples and refutation, but missed opportunities - ~~POWER~~

Opp 1: Logical, passionate and sometimes funny. Thanks!
Concern about opposing team opening unfair door w/ new evidence was warranted - you handled that gracefully
Opp 2: Best examples. You really hammered it home and the UDHRs stuff was very convincing.

Reports Judge too much

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Cao & Gunn seemed more well prepared & confident. Opposing team's assertions were less convincing (despite that) it was not
There was more evidence and specific examples of support for making environment equally important in dev. nations

You could have added
NEW ~~DEAL~~ ideas to
support econ.
growth & environment

CATTERTON, CHRIS

PARLI Debate

~~Marakani, Renee (*1)~~

Round 2 11:00am East14
Gov: 9 Fogarty - McAvenia
Opp: 17 Hatcher - Butler
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Chris Catterton

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

Team Code #: PROP 9

Team Code #: OPP 17

Prop Speaker #1 McAvenia pts 26

Opp Speaker #1 Butler pts 26.5

Prop Speaker #2 Fogarty pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Hatcher 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:

Everyone has a lot of potential. Here are ways to improve. Keep it up, you're all doing well!

Prop 1:

- give a standard of criteria for judge to evaluate
- more structure/ subpoints would help case
- need structure/strategies in PMR

Opp 1: When you get nervous and start to fidget, try breathing deeper and having awareness of your belly moving

BOTH: make impacts tangible - ~~general~~ broad appeals which assume why growth is good or GW = bad don't help me decide

BOTH: weigh impacts and give case scenarios so you win on multiple levels. it's like writing the ballot for the judge

Opp 2: More structure would help, let your partner go big picture, the MO is the speech to cover everything in detail (multiple, numbered answers) to make it difficult for the PMR

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp persuades me that there's no reason to sacrifice the enviro for the sake of growth, so Quality of Life is highest when we respect workers and natural resources. I see prop's "not mutually-exclusive" point as partially true: eventually, foreign investment provides resources for protection, but there are still short term harms via poisoning the land. The defin of growth being "sustainable for years" doesn't counter this b/c US, China, etc can all keep developing while polluting. Yin-Yangs have a dot on either side: so I choose the side w/ lots of protection and some econ growth.

Brendan Wells

PARLI Debate

~~Pierce, Lisa (*1)~~

Round 2 11:00am Annex4
Gov: 5 Mattegunta - Nandakumar
Opp: 4 Stamm-Kirk - Burshteyn
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Brendan Wells

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 4

Prop Speaker #1 Nandakumar pts 25

Opp Speaker #1 Stamm Kirk pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Mattegunta pts 24

Opp Speaker #2 Burshteyn 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: Attacking the neg in rebuttal wasn't helping you, POO's or not. If societal good is your value, you need to make a link between the topic and that. Point II, Economy → Env. Wasn't relevant.

Prop 2: You seemed to get lost in the economy → schools → environment argument, and needed more. Even when presenting, be sure to have clear organization.

Opp 1: Very clear statement of the balance premise and clear wrap-up with voting issues. Perhaps a touch more courtesy with the POI's and POO's — the first one helped, but the rest seemed a bit impatient.

Opp 2: You have a very clear way of making your points, and you did well attacking the aff's examples and dragging them into an unproductive economy vs. envs debate.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The aff allowed themselves to get dragged into the economy versus environment debate, but it was not their burden to show the economy is better. It was their burden to show that prioritizing the economy leads to better growth societal welfare.

than balance would. That issue was only briefly mentioned in terms of education. On the other hand, the neg clearly linked balance to societal good in multiple ways, and ~~returned to~~ were able to raise doubt in the aff's case.

PARLI Debate

Mays, Jane (*1)

Round 2 11:00am East15
Gov: 13 Katewa - Colenbrander
Opp: 17 Lavell - Hall
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: JANE Mays

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

Team Code #: PROP Gov 13

Team Code #: OPP opp 17

Prop Speaker #1 Colenbrander pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Hall pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Katewa pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Lavell 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:

- voice control
- succinct / clear
- well presented arguments
- very courteous + respectful.

Prop 2:

idea of colonizing Mars is unsupported by facts given.

- good pt. about minimalists can't advance or sustain themselves.

- respectful + courteous

Opp 1: - Good argument - Environment is why we can feed ourselves.
- Only one earth only one life - harms are too great.
- happiness factor is unsupported
Respectful, courteous speaker
can use more data

Opp 2:

needed more evidence to support position.
- Good pt. extinction is irreversible
Courteous + Respectful

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop was strong on evidence supporting claims

PARLI Debate

Humphrey, Ann (*1)

Round 2 11:00am East10

Gov: 13 Cervantes - LaCarrubba

Opp: 7 Lustig - Gerenrot

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ANN Humphrey

Judge's School Affiliation: ANALY

Team Code #: PROP Gov 13

Team Code #: OPP OP 7

Prop Speaker #1 Eric Cervantes pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Miriam Lustig pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Mary LaCarubba pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Irene Gerenrot 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:

all were courteous!

28
Prop 1: Eric framed debate about values, references were well done & earned, thoughtful well founded - good control of material - worked well w/ rebuttal points

Opp 1: Miriam - Good introduction that delineated & set up the points you then made a difficult case to make to persuade econ development for "green policies" nations "don't care" - unsupportable

Prop 2: Mary well spoken - clear, focused - smooth w/ questions from other side

Opp 2: Irene passionate, clear - again - could use more examples w/ nations that "don't care" - could use more support for that contention

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Diff. for opp. to substantiate some of their claims
Prop - strong pts about need to have a dev. economy for the problems

DEVELOPING NATIONS SHOULD PRIORITIZE ECONOMIC GROWTH OVER ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

PARLI Debate

Arias, Christina (*16)

Round 2 11:00am Annex3
Gov: 5 Giang - Shen
Opp: 4 Furer - Skepner
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ERIK VONBLANKENBURG

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

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 4

Prop Speaker #1 GIANG pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 PAUL FURER pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 SHEN pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 JACOB SKEPNER 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: GIANG

NEED TO RELAX AND SLOW DOWN. ORGANIZE FACT PRESENTATION BEFORE DELIVERY. GOOD END SUMMARY TO CONFIRM ARGUMENT.

Prop 2: SHEN

EXCELLENT PRESENTATION AND ANSWERING P.O.I. QUESTIONS REJECTED PREMISE OF QUESTIONS AND GAVE AN ANSWER THAT HELPED HER CASE. GREAT TECHNIQUE!

Opp 1: PAUL

VERY CONFIDENT AND KNOWLEGABLE PRESENTATION, GOOD JOB OF DEFINING DEBATE AND CLEARLY PRESENTING POINTS OF ARGUMENT.

Opp 2: JACOB

GREAT SPEAKING AND LEASE OF PRESENTING ARGUMENT. QUOTE MORE SOURCES WITH FACTS. GOOD TECHNIQUE OF GETTING PROPOSITION TO AGREE WITH YOU BY ASKING QUESTIONS

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

THIS WAS A POOR SUBJECT FOR DEBATE AS IT WAS NOT SPECIFIC ENOUGH. NEITHER TEAM WAS ABLE TO CITE SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF THE ENVIRONMENT CAN BE PROTECTED FROM INDUSTRIAL PRACTICES. INSTEAD THE ARGUED OVER A "PIZZA" OVER

KITCHEN" ANALAGY THAT DID NOT APPLY TO THE TOPIC. IT WAS GOOD TO SEE OPPOSITION QUOTE ADAM SMITH'S LAW OF DIMINISHING RETURNS RELATED TO FIXED COSTS BUT AGAIN FAILED TO EXPLAIN HOW THAT LAW PREVENTED DEVELOPING NATIONS FROM GROWING THEIR ECONOMY AND PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT.

AS A SIDE NOTE, AND NOT A FACTOR IN MY DECISION, HENRY FORD DISPROVED ADAM SMITH'S LAW OF DIMINISHING RETURNS BY REDUCING THE COST OF PRODUCING THE MODEL T EVERY YEAR FOR 20 YEARS. AND CONSEQUENTLY HE WAS ABLE TO LOWER THE SALE PRICE EVERY YEAR.

THE PROPOSITION TEAM WAS ABLE TO AT LEAST COME UP WITH A PLAUSIBLE ARGUMENT FOR GROWING THE ECONOMY FIRST AND PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT SECOND. THE OPPOSITION ADDRESS ALL THE PROP'S ARGUMENTS BUT FAILED TO PRESENT THEIR OWN PLAN OF HOW TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT 1ST. CLOSE DEBATE, GOOD JOB TO BOTH!

PARLI Debate

Taylor, Ann and Henry (*1)

Round 2 11:00am Annex1
Gov: 17 Inman - Young
Opp: 9 Aguilera - Zhou
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Anna + Henry Taylor

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

Team Code #: PROP 17

Team Code #: OPP 9

Prop Speaker #1 Inman pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Zhou pts 21

Prop Speaker #2 Young pts 27.5

Opp Speaker #2 Aguilera 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: All could slow down a bit.

Prop 1: Good use of pyramid - basic needs argument
Stats well presented, 10 second moment great tactic

Opp 1: Presented opp. arguments well but needed examples.
Using China as qual. of life comparison today good.

Prop 2: Well organized point by point

However:
Both: Arguments very general - what protection would be needed? How would they help econ.?

Opp 2: Good energy for position - showed his real concerns for future well
Global warming concerns well presented

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Convinced us that starvation + basic needs must be met first.

Nick Mizin

PARLI Debate

Fehr, Rick (*11)

Round 2 11:00am Room 205
Gov: 7 Jarmel-Schneider - Bernstein
Opp: 9 Fishlow - Fishlow
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Nicholas Mizin
Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	_____	Team Code #:	_____
Prop Speaker #1	<u>Jarmel Schneider</u> pts <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #1	<u>Fishlow</u> pts <u>26</u>
Prop Speaker #2	<u>Bernstein</u> pts <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #2	<u>Fishlow</u> pts <u>28</u>

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: I love that you incorporated the other teams thoughts in your opening statement. I love that you said them. Great eye contact.

Prop 2: You had a clear structure to your debate

Opp 1: I love that you mentioned that long term is more important than short term

Opp 2: make good refuting statements

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the Opp wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The aff team didn't really address the point of long term vs. short term problems well, but evas. matched overall

PARLI Debate

Masters, Claudette (*13)

Round 2 11:00am Room 113
Gov: 17 Rosenthal - Dondero
Opp: 10 Fischer - Jicha
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Susan Lundy, Ph.D.

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin HS

Team Code #: PROP Gov 17

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 Rosenthal pts _____

Opp Speaker #1 Fischer pts _____

Prop Speaker #2 Dondero pts _____

Opp Speaker #2 Jicha 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:

29 Prop 1: Rosenthal - Slowdown!!
 "Nice to have 3 clear, you defined contentions.
 Also interesting that you baited the opponent with the GND example. They took the bait and did, as you summarized, missed the refutation of your actual point.
 Good summary
 28 Prop 2: Fischer Excellent strategy to move the argument toward "short term vs long term"; also good point that \$ needed to create solvency."

27 Opp 1: Fischer - Thank you for slowing down and allowing time to speak normally. I appreciate that very much. You needed to focus upon proving your contention that building sustainable from the first is better than switching 180. This was an incredibly important argument; would prove your choice of priority.
 29 Opp 2: Jicha - Wow - you have a killer ability to get to the heart of the most salient points - Time/money to restart process; focusing on economy instead of sustainability builds more problems/Backlash. Your proof of your contention/substantal was a bit weak, though.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop refuted the 3rd of 3 Prop contentions (Hypocritical) but did not overcome the most important of the opp points relating to short/long term economy.

PARLI Debate

Sappington, John (*14)

Round 2 11:00am Room 208
Gov: 7 Shin - Shevelev
Opp: 9 Banisadr - Weiner
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: JOHN SAPPINGTON

Judge's School Affiliation: SONOMA ACADEMY

Team Code #: PROP 7 AFF

Team Code #: OPP 9 NEG

Prop Speaker #1 Shevelev pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Banisadr pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Shin pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Weiner 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: commendable as a technical strategist although at times your technique overwhelmed the content of your arguments

Opp 1: Good presentation very clear calm and well presented - needed a little more substance less insistence on disagreement

Prop 2: Nicely done need to focus arguments to specific points w/ clarity as objective less drama.

Opp 2: Well delivered although the other teams interjections seemed to distract and destabilize you.

TEAM CODE #: 7 on the PROP/AFF wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

I declare this a tie - neither team substantially influenced my decision as both needed to provide more content w/ a little less reliance on strategy ->

However, since there cannot be a tie, Alf takes it based on tactical ability.

theatricality on the one hand and a heavy reliance on moral imperatives on the other - score split evenly.

PARLI Debate

Pifer, Patti (*1)

Round 2 11:00am Room 112
Gov: 9 Casendino - Honaryar
Opp: 7 Yee - Morrell
Open Parli Debate

- They time
- + can knock.
- brief oral feedback from me @ end

Judge's Name: Patty Pifer
Judge's School Affiliation: Wash HS

PROP 9
Team Code #: 9

OPP 7
Team Code #: 7

Prop Speaker #1 Casendino pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Yee pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Honaryar pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Morrell pts 28

favor

oppose

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

Developing nations should prioritize economic growth over environmental protection.

- 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

nice work on both teams supporting their position and countered their opposing team

All great eye contact, engaging.

All very! courteous!

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

S. Korea, us, Haiti, Rwanda, Sudan, prior countries, more human suffering, good return to established country dem. w/ GDP, good definitions to establish evidence, what 3 main contentions, provide later

Prop 1: Casendino 7 mins 9 sec
good organization, points delivered easy to understand, pleasant, committed

Opp 1: Yee 7 mins
not as organized, scattered, second negation, good job to tie to partner, feathered their position, consequences!! viable plbse to survive cont. to suffer

Affirmation focus on econ. GDP doesn't help poor, spoiled of 3 contentions, tragedy of the commons, crim mins, good example! took question! good answers, negation 2 main pts + tied back to partner's

Prop 2: Honaryar 6 mins 23 sec
address two main cont. from other side, dev. nation thru out history, can't wait, deal w/ deeper enviro. issues, must have capital.

Opp 2: Morrell 10 seconds
affirmation not @ trade off, mutually impact no healthy enviro no humans, all competing w/ long term effects, can not prioritize econ over enviro.

Ther GDP a positive economy net benefits to dev. countries, their spec. pts, prior enviro otherwise no resources to tap into, survival of humanity, quality of life - joblessness, food

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the Prop wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: only due to stronger facts and evidence otherwise it would have been a DRAW!

good delivery, good pts of information, continued to tie back to partners earlier pts

fast delivery but very passionate, organized, good questions, good evidence, & fundamental agric. & life style

Negation

- Tragedy of commons to solve must ackn. ↑
- Quality of life
H₂O must be alive first to even deal w/ it.
- GDP not enough!
still goes to top 1%

5 mins

Affirmation

- ↳ fantasy failed to ackn. Bourgeois
- ↳ opp. no specific evidence
- ↳ refute envir. does not impact 3rd world as they cont. to starve
- ↳ need economy
- Ind. Rev. Britain as So. Korea
- must focus on economy = greater good
food, safety

PARLI Debate

Ainsworth, Laura Ainsworth (*8)

Round 2 11:00am Room 204

Gov: 4 Cohen - Brogan

Opp: 14 Greenberg - Kolling

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Laura Ainsworth

Judge's School Affiliation: Mania Carrillo High School

Team Code #: PROP 4

Team Code #: OPP 14

Prop Speaker #1 no speaks pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 no speaks given pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 given for this tournament pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 You were both phenomenal pts 30/29.5

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

I don't normally see teams do well with K; you are one of the few to truly understand

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

Excellent work Nice save #1 to #2 on the "K turns" case

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

Prop 1: Tried to be preemptive on the unfolding "which comes first?" situation of ENVY or ECON. Ultimately, one case

Opp 1: Very strong DBads, well-explained links, audience adaptation, and judge awareness. Clear that you will still explain, if needed - able to crystallize and be point-for-point

DISADS Prop 2: Point for Point can be stronger - you're making sound arguments but need a clarity

Opp 2: One of the best debaters I've seen. Could have had more pull-across, just in case, as well as, blowing up non-wiffle arguments (mentioned by partner and could have become larger). You still had time, so even when it feels certain, I would give it another once over. Good summary of overall impacts.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Voted on DBads First Too strong, Links not addressed.

Second, lack of substantiation and direct response on case. Affirm is for OPP K is for OPP

Each of you had almost a full 1:30-2:00 for additional arguments use it

James H. ...

James H. ...

H

30

the ...

30/4/72

for ...

I don't ...
as well ...
for ...

plant
...
...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

H

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

PARLI Debate

Lake, Abby (*15)

Round 2 11:00am Room 206

Gov: 4 Booth - Pracar

Opp: 7 Chin - Rosenfeld

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Abby Lake

Judge's School Affiliation: SCDS

Team Code #: 4 **PROP**

Team Code #: 7 **OPP**

Prop Speaker #1 Ryan Booth pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Matthew Chin pts 27.5

Prop Speaker #2 Devin Pracar pts 27.5

Opp Speaker #2 Raul Rosenfeld 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:

*captivating speaker with great articulation
 *very clear "road map" and explanations provided in final summary.

Prop 2:

*good cause & effect chain brought up relating to the economy
 *good connection & explanation of evidence via Algeria example

Opp 1:

*excellent opening hooks
 *asked a great question about the investing intentions of struggling nations.
 *responses to aff. evidence could have been a bit stronger at times

Opp 2:

*provided a lot of clarity re: how round should be judged.
 *bringing up the idea of putting basic regulations in place rather than investing \$ was a positive turning-point for me

TEAM CODE #: 7 on the Opp wins this debate.

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Both teams presented exceptionally compelling arguments that caused my thoughts to shift back & forth more than usual. I almost want to vote impartial because the debate seemed so close, but if I have to vote one way, I would go with the opp because their argument seemed to support the judging criteria of "net benefits" slightly more than aff.~~ Both teams presented exceptionally compelling arguments that caused my thoughts to shift back & forth more than usual. I almost want to vote impartial because the debate seemed so close, but if I have to vote one way, I would go with the opp because their argument seemed to support the judging criteria of "net benefits" slightly more than aff.

PARLI Debate

Fishlow, Dan (*9)

Round 2 11:00am Room 203
Gov: 13 Mubarak - Troup
Opp: 14 Saxena - Duncan
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Fishlow

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

Team Code #: ~~#~~ PROP 13

Team Code #: ~~#~~ OPP 14

Prop Speaker #1 Mubarak pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Duncan pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Troup pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Saxena 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: Mubarak:

- good speaker, good eye contact
- Good use to define the argument up front.

Prop 2: Troup

- very solid
- Excellent point to focus on definition.

Opp 1: Duncan:

- Very good speaker, with excellent eye contact.
- Slightly over-dramatic in "everyone will die"
- Needed to drive the point, of its everyone problem, how can rich nations help?

Opp 2:

Saxena:

- Good relaxed style, slight fast as a speaker
- Good try to tie current developments as not working

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

A good discussion that went back and forth on what the definition of "developing" meant. At the end, the argument that developing countries need to feed their people and that developed countries were the main cause of pollution, tipped the scale to economic growth. Also → the point on dependency didn't really →

developing nations should prioritize economic development over environment

PARLI Debate

Little, Sharon (*17)

Round 2 11:00am Room 202
Gov: 5 Sawhney - Jeong
Opp: 4 Holt - Mizin
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Little

Judge's School Affiliation: WAS

PROP 5

OPP 4

Team Code #: 5

Team Code #: 4

Prop Speaker #1 Sawhney pts 26

Opp Speaker #1 ~~Miz~~ Holt pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Jeong pts 25

Opp Speaker #2 Mizin 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:

Sawhney
Prop 1: + poise
- fast pace
- choose more precise vocab ("stuff" "things like that")
+ organization

Holt
Opp 1: + confidence
- fast pace
+ nice closing

Jeong
Prop 2: + courteous
- super fast, hard to keep up, confusing

Mizin
Opp 2: + poise + confidence
+ organization

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

the deep ecology point, points & counterpoints were more specific from opp

PARLI Debate

Chen, Ming (*5)

Round 2 11:00am Room 201
Gov: 17 Ramirez - Castenada
Opp: 7 White - Hall
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ming Chen

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

Team Code #: PROP 17

Team Code #: OPP 7

Prop Speaker #1 Castenada pts 26

Opp Speaker #1 White pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Ramirez pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Hall 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 in the argument. Some specific examples may help you make the argument stronger.

Opp 1: Good job laying out the road map. Good argument on the livelihood. Good analogy of boat vs. sail.

Prop 2: Good job countering the opponents' points. The resource argument is a good one, however, the example (S. Africa & Nigeria) doesn't work very well because both countries are resource rich countries.

Opp 2: Passionate & clear speaker. Argument about ag. & environment. WNK is weak.

TEAM CODE #: 7 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The opp. side laid out good arguments to counter the arguments offered by prop. side: without the environment, the economy wouldn't matter is convincing.

PARLI Debate

Peter.m
Walt, Inara (*12)
Round 2 11:00am Annex2
Gov: 2 Castro-Chavez - Barber
Opp: 9 Kapoor - Berger
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Peter.m.

Judge's School Affiliation: Quarry Lane

PROP
Team Code #: roy:2

OPP
Team Code #: opp: 9

Prop Speaker #1 Castro-chavez pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Kapoor pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Barber pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Berger 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:

- organized
- followed process properly.

Opp 1:

- Confident
- organized

Prop 2:

- followed the process properly
- Address each point of the opp.

Opp 2:

- Passionate
- Crisp to the point

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

- Better contentions & evidences
- Ability to address other side points.
- Focused and factual.

PARLI Debate

Noah, Harrison

~~Tom, Joyce (*7)~~

Round 2 11:00am Room 207

Gov: 4 Rubsamen - Partzuf

Opp: 5 Gaddamadugu - Pudota

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Harrison Noah

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

Team Code #: PROP 4

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 Partzuf pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Gaddamadugu pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Rubsamen pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Pudota 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: Great confidence in your voice, had composure throughout the round.

When framing a debate, justify your definitions and value.

Prop 2:

Excellent rebuttal skills, put a lot of arguments on the flow. Work on impact turns

Opp 1: You want to come out of the gate swinging, your start was a little weak and it took time for you to find your voice. When running topicality, GO HARD! Prove abuse, attach voting implications.

Opp 2:

You're the only one in the round who tried to outweigh on timeframe, which really should have been the thesis of your case from the beginning

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

They beat (1) and outweighed on impacts.

NWELL research

MINA

FS...
C.F.S...

FS...
M...

abstract data

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

PARLI Debate

Calderon, Lisa (*1)
Round 2 11:00am Room 211
Gov: 10 Nash - Thrasher
Opp: 17 Ernst - Davis
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Lisa Calderon

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 17

Prop Speaker #1 NASH pts 26

Opp Speaker #1 Ernst pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 THRASHER pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Davis 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 job referring back to some of your points*
• good question of opponent - effective
 - slow down, add more details per point, organize ideas a bit more - partners
 Prop 2: *less is better.*
• good organization and specific points and vocabulary

Opp 1: *• very well organized, explained ideas clearly with specifics and good vocabulary to explain points*
• enjoyed final point by point rebuttal to prop. team
• good personalized (Calif) points
 Opp 2: *• well organized for most points*
• nice to refer to partners' points "team"
• pleasant delivery

TEAM CODE #: 17 on the OPP wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: *The point that developing countries are exploited for economic gain with no benefit to its people and irreparable damage to the environment that a strong economy later can not change.*

PARLI Debate

Kay, Jeanette (*1)
Round 2 11:00am East13
Gov: 9 Hardwick - Der
Opp: 7 Wilcox - Sutton
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Jeanette Kay
Judge's School Affiliation: Family

Team Code #:	PROP <u>9</u>	Team Code #:	OPP <u>7</u>
Prop Speaker #1	<u>Hardwick</u> pts <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #1	<u>Wilcox</u> pts <u>29</u>
Prop Speaker #2	<u>Der</u> pts <u>27</u>	Opp Speaker #2	<u>Sutton</u> pts <u>29</u>

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 delivery*

Prop 2: *good delivery but hard to follow*

Opp 1: *Made excellent points but spoke too fast (probably because of the time limit)*

Opp 2: *Made good delivery - easy to follow*

TEAM CODE #: 7 on the 7 wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Jackson Thomas

PARLI Debate

Sutton, Emma (*6)

Round 2 11:00am Room 210
Gov: 10 Day - Siebels
Opp: 17 Streater - Stewart
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Jackson Thomas

Judge's School Affiliation: AHS

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 17

Prop Speaker #1 Siebels pts

Opp Speaker #1 Stewart pts

Prop Speaker #2 Day pts

Opp Speaker #2 Streater 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: Very clear
Good Summary

Opp 1: Clear
Good speaking tone + speed

Prop 2: Addressed all pts
and refuted individually - good

Opp 2: Handled question very well

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Neither team had arguments specifically linked to developing nations. Neg said directly that the environment can't be fixed and offered no points on why keeping the status quo would help quality of life / standard of living. Aff at least showed that QoL can increase sometimes. Overall very enjoyable!

~~Minick Minick~~

PARLI Debate

Minick, Karen (#2)

Judge's Name: Karen Minick

Round 2 11:00am Annex 5
Gov: 14 Kornfein - Raesfeld
Opp: 13 Masters - Fehring
Open Parli Debate

Judge's School Affiliation: Bear Creek HS

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Raesfeld pts _____

Opp Speaker #1 Masters pts _____

Prop Speaker #2 Kornfein pts _____

Opp Speaker #2 Fehring 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: Very fast speaker
Slow Down - very passionate

Opp 1: Clear, concise, good
Citation

Prop 2: Points Clear, well spoken

Opp 2: Strong voice, stop swaying.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both teams had great points. Neg not quite as polished and ended up contradicting themselves re; Focus of develop. City

12:00

PARLI Debate

Finn, Nadine (*1)

Round 2 11:00am Annex7
Gov: 17 Manni - Brown
Opp: 13 Cheng - Shifs
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Nadine Finn
Judge's School Affiliation: Family (sister)

Team Code #: PROP 17

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Manni pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Shifs pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Brown pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Cheng 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:

Manni
 Prop 1: Very courteous
 * Lives trump all "powerful"
 * * Gave strong clear examples,
 * * Take a breath and slow down a bit. 😊
 * * Stated clear reasons why countries should focus
 Prop 2:
 Good argument; Time to prioritize gave clear reasons. Fast speaker but good articulation. Very courteous.

Shifs - Very courteous
 Opp 1: * Effective articulation
 * Strong statement "Chinese citizens have to wear masks."
 * Environmental collapse causing ↓ human population.
 Opp 2: * Very confident speaker.
 20 years of H2O (safe drinking) China argued slow steady changes
 Very courteous.
Shifs Rebuttal

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

REASON FOR DECISION: →

Environment is Foundation for all

Manni rebuttal:
 • Quality of life ↑ due to economic decisions.
 • Good use of humor in rebuttal
 • Strong summary / Improved articulation 😊

Well Done Both Teams!!

Raymond, Bill

PARLI Debate

~~Ehr, Rick (#14)~~

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 209
Gov: 4 Booth - Pracar
Opp: 17 Streeter - Stewart
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Bill Raymond

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

Team Code #: PROP 4

Team Code #: OPP 17

Prop Speaker #1 Booth pts 28.5

Opp Speaker #1 Stewart pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Pracar pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Streeter 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: A very strong team!
Good use of evidence,
super presentation.
Rebuttal jumped around,
just a bit - not deliberate
the outline promised at the start

Prop 2: Poised, smooth,
articulate, organized,
complete sentences, hand
gestures. The whole package!

Opp 1: Really nice job against
a very tough team. Argument
that PROP was using logic to
argue for emotion fell flat.

Opp 2: Great work! It is hard
to keep your mind from jumping
ahead of your mouth. Finish
one thought at a time.

TEAM CODE #: 4 on the PROP wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: ^(Prop or Opp) OPP had some good examples of where emotional decisions have not been as effective. But PROP presented only real evidence, effectively challenged OPP assumptions/ assertions for lack of evidence

Raymond, Bill

PARLI Debate

~~Fehr, Rick (#11)~~

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 209
Gov: 17 Hatcher - Butler
Opp: 5 Su - Her
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Bill Raymond
Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

Team Code #: PROP 17

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 Butler pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Her pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Hatcher pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Su 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: Clever definition of topic. Good delivery but nervous looking hands distract.

Prop 2: Great organization, delivery & argumentation

Opp 1: Impressive combination of organization, delivery & speed. The jokes were cute but do not constitute a case. PROP case had many weaknesses that were not attacked.

Opp 2: Organization good and strong delivery. Not as effective in attacking PROP case.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: PROP won most points including topicality. with call for criteria and response that expected definition is unarguable. OPP never really presented an alternative but argument about nutritional value of corn was won by OPP.

PARLI Debate

Ellyn, Wendy (*1)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 112

Gov: 7 Yee - Morrell

Opp: 14 Kornfein - Raesfeld

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Wendy Ellyn

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

Team Code #: PROP 7

Team Code #: OPP 14

Prop Speaker #1 Morrell pts 27.5

Opp Speaker #1 Kornfein pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Yee pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Raesfeld 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 breadth of information, would like to see more structure to make fast-paced delivery easier to follow. Also would prefer more direct eye contact/speaking to judge instead of the room.

Prop 2:

Great delivery, combining passion + logic. Good evidence. More precision in facts would be helpful.

Opp 1:

Excellent delivery + structure. Broadened the debate by reframing as what is best for developing nations not just the well-fed. Good connection w/ judge & audience. rebuttal could have used more structure

Opp 2:

Excellent argumentation. Good structure, easy to follow.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Team 14 had more compelling argumentation + their facts seemed more credible. Also they reframed some aspects of the proposition to make their props statements work for them (corn = more calories) Reframed to a 1st word / 3rd word discussion very good ..

PARLI Debate

Ellyn, Wendy (*1)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 112
Gov: 14 Greenberg - Kolling
Opp: 4 Furer - Skepner
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Wendy Ellyn
Judge's School Affiliation: Analys

PROP Team Code #: 14 **OPP** Team Code #: 4
Prop Speaker #1 Kolling pts 28.5 Opp Speaker #1 Furer pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Greenberg pts 29 Opp Speaker #2 Skepner 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: Great argumentation
Great structure, easy to follow.
would have liked you to open a bit
louder + with more conviction

Prop 2: Great evidence
Amazing delivery, combining logic
& passion. ~~the~~ Good courtesy and
connection w/ other team.

Opp 1:
Excellent delivery + physical
presence. Redefining the terms
was a good move. Could work
on rebuttals/argumentation being
Opp 2: more precise.

Good structure, relevant information.
Argumentation needed more precision.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Team 14 had great examples and elevated the relevance of the topic
with ~~examples~~ ^{events} from history. They also had a broader analysis +
more direct + effective response to the opposition's arguments than
vice-versa. The opposition got hooked into a narrow + repetitive point →

about the debate format itself being ^{an exclusively} rational exercise but proof of this one point does not negate the many other ~~goods~~ compelling pieces of evidence offered by the proposition team, which effectively blended logic + passion/conviction to make their case.

PARLI Debate

Stephan, Susan (*9)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 202
Gov: 4 Stamm-Kirk - Burshteyn
Opp: 17 Skarr - Escarcega
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: S. Stephan

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

Team Code #: PROP 4

Team Code #: OPP 17

Prop Speaker #1 K Stamm Kirk pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 JP Escarcega pts 28.5

Prop Speaker #2 Burshteyn pts 28.5

Opp Speaker #2 Anna Skarr pts 28.5

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

Going bananas is better than being corny.

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 sides talked or too broad

Prop 1: *v. good at setting up framework*

Opp 1:

excellent at refuting the structure

well argued

Prop 2: *-good at turning around rooting refutation. would be stronger if had examples when noting lead to pos. change.*

Opp 2:

at end of speech got a little fast but good covering that much info.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Better framework, organization & arguments. Couple points better refuted.

PARLI Debate

Stephan, Susan (*9)

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 202

Gov: 7 Wilcox - Sutton

Opp: 10 Nash - Thrasher

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Stephan

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

Team Code #: PROP 7

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 F. Sutton pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 S. Nash pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 A. Wilcox pts 28.5

Opp Speaker #2 C. Thrasher 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 definition & framework
good delivery, v. clear*

Opp 1: *M. good, pace little fast
when taking question, better start
to respond if "absolutely not,
because..." if able to will strengthen
refutation*

Prop 2: *well argued, good
refutations.*

Opp 2: *well argued
when going overtime, better to
have partner continue your
points if possible*

TEAM CODE #: 7 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
*Better Framework, arguments & refutations.
Also more points that emotive better than logic
to mass audience.*

Susan Lundy PARLI Debate

Young Wendy (*17)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 204
Gov: 9 Kapoor - Berger
Opp: 7 Shin - Shevelev
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Lundy
Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

Team Code #: PROP 9

Team Code #: OPP 7

Prop Speaker #1 Kapoor pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 David Shin pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Berger pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Daniel Shevelev 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: ~~He Kapoor~~
 Your argument shifted a bit down to the clarification that "thinking outside the box" was better than being normal. Your 1st 3 arguments were entertaining but not sure.

Prop 2: ~~He Berger~~
 Since you kept coming back to your definition of "crazy" as being funny and not normal, you rescued the contention.

Opp 1: ~~Shevelev~~ Shevelev
 David, Once you realized the value def was not set by Prop - you should have set it in your first speech. Accepting their definition of "crazy" & "corny" was not a good move. Your definition was really better - "radical" vs "status quo".
 Opp 2: Shin
 Good examples! Bullying - Isis vs Trump
 You are correct that you won the 1st/corn contentions.

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

This debate hinged on the definition. If the negative had held the Prop to "crazy" as "funny" then their argument that "corny" (being normal) was better overall would have held. But they let the Prop team shift to "crazy" as being thinkers "outside the box" and slide into winning.

PARLI Debate

Susan Lundy

Young Wendy (*17)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 204
Gov: 9 Fogarty - McAvenia
Opp: 7 Sutton - Moon
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Lundy
Judge's School Affiliation: San Juan

Team Code #: PROP 9 Team Code #: OPP 7
Prop Speaker #1 28 pts Opp Speaker #1 28 pts
Prop Speaker #2 28 pts Opp Speaker #2 29 pts

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: **LOW POINT WIN**
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: McAvenia

Examples of emotion causing donations: well done & you kept the thread well. The Paris attack example had a few more bumps - assertion without proof. Also, Pol Pot good example of using emotion -

Prop 2: Fogarty

Final summation did excellent job of carrying all threads & refuting the opposition contention.

Opp 1: Sutton

Well analyzed - "Appeal to problem-solving" was a good main contention.

Opp 2: Moon

Excellent tracking and your point about skeptics need logic to convert was a good redefense.

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The examples of appeals to emotion causing mass response ~~was~~ were carried throughout the debate by the affirmative

Appeals to Emotion are more effective than appeals to logic

PARLI Debate

Lustig, Robert (*7)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 113

Gov: 13 Cervantes - LaCarrubba

Opp: 5 Sawhney - Liang

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Lustig

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

Team Code #: PROP 13.

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 Cervantes pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Sawhney pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 LaCarrubba pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Liang 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 definition, but needs to counter opposition - ultimately did → rebuttal
 Never attacked "copy" - should have used it against them

Prop 2:

Being someone other than themselves - good start, but didn't follow through on the argument.

Opp 1: Spent way too much time on "frivolous mental illness"; also spent way too much effort trying to say routines such as college applications were "valuable"

Opp 2:

Bad point about routines bringing happiness later in life; + that sometimes being spontaneous can lead to negative outcomes.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Ultimately the opposition's hammering of the mental illness question, which was not part of the resolution, led to their loss of this debate. But well done on a difficult resolution on both sides.

PARLI Debate

Lustig, Robert (*7)

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 113

Gov: 9 Casendino - Honaryar

Opp: 13 Mubarak - Troup

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Lustig

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP

OPP

Team Code #: 9

Team Code #: 13

Prop Speaker #1 Honaryar pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Mubarak pts 26

Prop Speaker #2 Casendino pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Troup 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: Strong elaboration of argument - 2/3 cites were good (unlike Tom's Celine's not effective - North + South went to war for other reasons). Very good rebuttal.

Prop 2: Good debating style - gun control + abortion - led to divided action because of emotion - good points.

Opp 1: Did not buy the "topicality" argument, on which half of their was based - Funding truth + just society wasn't in the resolution. ~~There is~~ rebutting to 32 of scientists is "logic".

Opp 2: There is no logic to xenophobia. That's just the justification of the emotion. Also "sweet" isn't based on logic - if it were, we would never drink a soda.

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the Prop wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Use of topicality by opp side was misguided. Statement about emotions being excuses for illogic also not correct.

PARLI Debate

Newell, Karen (*1)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 210
Gov: 4 Holt - Mizin
Opp: 17 Inman - Young
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Karen Newell

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy
Better Than Being Comy

Going Bananas
PROP

OPP

Team Code #: 4

Team Code #: 17

Prop Speaker #1 Holt pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Inman pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Mizin pts 25

Opp Speaker #2 Young 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: Holt 27
Witty, strong delivery
Watch use of 'um'
'you know' and 'so'

Prop 2: Mizin 25
holding timer/paper
distracting

Opp 1: Inman 28 go into politics!
Strong, well-structured
2 spheres complicated but
like how it unfolded
and ties to politics

Opp 2: Young 26
Spoke passionately
stumbled on words several
times

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Strong and engaging; liked the two spheres and how it unfolded. Great job.

Holt *2

- Pun/cute
Witty

you know
'lim'
so
strong delivery

- Sentimental
- Express/ind
- btr food/btr on fly/all vers/around
- Standing out there/true contribution

Inman

* 2 spheres
(liked bit complicated - but interesting how it unfolded)

- pun/corny
- jokes/sarcasm
- anarchy
- food: both good
- threat of pot.
- deceased

ties to banana/com
engaging
unfolding
tie to politics
foreign policy
banana/com
extinct
- fungus

Educ

life choices
food
2 sphere

Strong well structured

think good
- go
- banana
- while
- still
- animal

Mizn 4

hands holding timer
paper distracting

2d
Russia/Turkey
practical
improve trade/econ.
com
competes w' food in Ame
no use
- pot in bananas

angry
going banana
good thing
com made other
reused jokes
progress

3
Young

sent - crazy/mental health
healthcare prob
healthy of mind
corn in us econ.
corn syrup/chips -
stumble on words
several times

ties to society
passionate

PARLI Debate

Newell, Karen (*1)

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 210

Gov: 9 Aguilera - Zhou

Opp: 7 Jarmel-Schneider - Bernstein

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Karen Newell

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

Appeals to Emotion ++

PROP

Logic OPP

Team Code #: 9 Zhou

Team Code #: 7

Prop Speaker #1 ~~Aguilera~~ pts 25

Opp Speaker #1 Jarmel pts 28
~~Schneider~~

Prop Speaker #2 Zhou pts 27
~~Aguilera~~

Opp Speaker #2 ~~Schneider~~ - pts 26
Bernstein

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: Zhou 25
Aguilera

Good info, good quotes.
delivery a bit weak, better
in rebuttal

Prop 2: Aguilera 27
Zhou

Strong delivery.

Opp 1: Jarmel 28
Schneider

Great eye contact. Watch = cool
Strong delivery

Opp 2: Bernstein 26
Schneider

POI's caused a stumble
Good info.

TEAM CODE #: 7 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

I think I personally think emotion, but you persuaded me by your presentation. Very close but great job. You did great - all of you!

~~Aguilera~~ Zhou 4

Net benefits

Emotion/logic - life choices

always opposition

Quote Aristotle: don't respond to logic

Good info, good quotes - delivery
a bit weak


Mass shooting / gun control

- Psy Today -
Net benefits

Appeal = emotion

Btr in rebuttal

tries to govt./example
refuge



~~3/21~~ J-S

great eye contact

watch/coul

fixe cold logical
for/land not true
we know

Syns - POI / agree

Pascal = math Δ

People like the truth

Stat - using sways/biz

Strong

Commercial/phrases

stats/numbers - commit

Pol use #s

Reaches wide grp / Sanders uses #s

#s universal

logic more efficient

logic is reason

- lgr grp
- truth
- bio

Aguilera 2

Strong

Obama speech

Emotion/decisions

impacts logic/reasoning

= sympathy

want feeling to be right...

emotionally attached

Emotional effect emotion → logic

~~3/21~~ 3

Bernstein

Appeals emotion over logic better

Emotion needs logic

- Logic leads to emotion

Voting/yes - tie to emotion

POI - confused heir/stumbled

- Facts/taught in debate
not emotion

Week - camp pres./Christian

Survival vs logic vs %

not in primitive state

think more logically

PARLI Debate

Shen, Alfred (*5)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 201
Gov: 4 Cohen - Brogan
Opp: 17 Lavell - Hall
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Alfred Shen

Judge's School Affiliation: Dougherty Valley

Team Code #: **PROP** 4

Team Code #: **OPP** 17

Prop Speaker #1 Brogan pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Hall pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Cohen pts 26.5

Opp Speaker #2 Lavell 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 argumentation

Opp 1:

Excellent delivery

Prop 2:

Might want to enhance delivery & courtesy

Opp 2:

Great points of info, might want to enhance delivery with confidence.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

It's a close call. Both teams did a great job in prep the content and pre was able to present effectively. However, team opp was able to rebut in detail of the PROP's evidences.

PARLI Debate

Shen, Alfred (*5)

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 201
Gov: 9 Fishlow - Fishlow
Opp: 13 Cheng - Shifts
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Alfred Shen

Judge's School Affiliation: Dougherty Valley

Team Code #: PROP 9

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Fishlow (adv) pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Shifts pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Fishlow pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Cheng 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:

Excellent delivery

Opp 1:

Great content / evidence.

Prop 2:

Excellent argumentation on "apeels"

Opp 2:

Great points on intro, might want to improve delivery.

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The prop team had better evidence & was able to rebut effectively on "Apeels" vs. subjects themselves.

PARLI Debate

^{Brett}
Ainsworth, Doug (*8)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 205
Gov: 13 Katewa - Colenbrander
Opp: 5 Mattegunta - Nandakumar
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Brett Ainsworth

Judge's School Affiliation: Maria Carillo

Team Code #: PROP 13

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 Katewa pts 30

Opp Speaker #1 Nandakumar pts 29.5

Prop Speaker #2 Colenbrander pts 29.5

Opp Speaker #2 ~~Mattegunta~~ Mattegunta 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: Good case.

Opp 1: Ability to only argue (K) particularly when the aff doesn't really force the label

Prop 2: Good Arguments against the (K)

Opp 2: You try to explain the (K) but end up labeling more than the AFF

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

REASON FOR DECISION: I am only able to look at case or (K). I don't think the neg does a good enough job ties the topic or case to Ableism. The act of being removes the "label" that the neg applies. AFF states that people can be wrong or other things. This means that the only team trying to force a label is the neg. So, I vote AFF

PARLI Debate

Ainsworth, Doug (*8)

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 205
Gov: 5 Sawhney - Jeong
Opp: 13 Masters - Fehring
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Brett Ainsworth

Judge's School Affiliation: María Canillo

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Sawhney pts 30

Opp Speaker #1 Fehring pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 Jeong pts 30

Opp Speaker #2 Masters 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: Interesting case. It could be problematic that you didn't define effective.

Opp 1: Good new definition. You are supporting AFF so this is only going to work if you win the definitional debate.

Look examples of logic better than emotion.

So glad you used Starbucks example!! You're more effective!

Prop 2: Very strong extension + turn of Neg arguments - They all show Emotions as wrong and being effective

Opp 2: Great job with your examples of logic + success. Your return default Appeal was what's best for human race. Let the aff confuse you.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

I am left with a muddled Definitional Debate and not much else.
I end up AFF but Neg find many ways to win this.

Single fight

PARLI Debate

Sappington, John (*14)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 211
Gov: 5 Giang - Shen
Opp: 10 Fischer - Jicha
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: JOHN SAPPINGTON

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 Giang pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Fischer pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Shen pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Jicha 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: Good substantive well done (examples)

I would work on relating and breathing - your discussion was good but you kept throwing in all the present. w/ too much affect.

Prop 2: Excellent work although your thoughts and objective well may unclear

Opp 1: Great work - you did a good job establishing your position then tended to get to content up in delivery vs the content of the argument

Opp 2: Well done rebuttal and very direct in addition thoughts were clear & succinct.

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Decisive debate in rebuttal and later stages clearer and more focused in opposition

PARLI Debate

Doherty, Sarah (*1)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 208
Gov: 14 Saxena - Duncan
Opp: 7 Chin - Rosenfeld
Open Parli Debate

(Aff)
(Neg)

Judge's Name:

Sarah Doherty

Judge's School Affiliation:

Analy

Team Code #: 14 PROP

Team Code #: 7 OPP

Prop Speaker #1 Saxena pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Chin pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Duncan pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Rosenfeld 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: Strong, valid arguments and evidence, rushed delivery
 • Was Kennedy crazy for ~~keep~~ wanting space exploration or was he trying to keep up with other nations?
 • Better clarity, delivery in closing

Opp 1: Excellent dissection of opponent's definitions - especially in refutation of Aff's gun control argument
 Excellent re-definition of the terms in closing

Prop 2: Clear even speaking not sure if you really addressed your opponents' arguments against your definitions

Opp 2: Great distinction between "going bananas" versus change being called crazy versus being crazy

TEAM CODE #: 7 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp had clearer definitions for "going bananas" "Corny", and upholding their positions for definitions

PARLI Debate

Doherty, Sarah (*1)

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 208

Gov: 17 Manni - Brown

Opp: 2 Castro-Chavez - Barber

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name:

Sarah Doherty

Judge's School Affiliation:

Analy

Team Code #: PROP 17

Team Code #: OPP 2

Prop Speaker #1 Manni pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Castro-Chavez pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Brown pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Barber pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

low point win

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 example with terrorism being effective emotional appeal lacked focus and confidence in other examples. Good addressing "effective" definition. You know what you're talking about. Don't apologize.

Opp 1: Good point that emotions are powerful but not the most effective way to act out. Strong, clear outline of original argument.

Prop 2: Excellent upholding of the effectiveness of appeals to emotions with statistics of dying in terrorist attack versus other more likely ways.

Opp 2: Thank you for defining effective! It needed to be addressed!

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

REASON FOR DECISION: While Neg demonstrated emotional appeals ~~most~~ ~~always~~ don't always create a positive outcome, Aff provided strong examples of emotional appeals being used more often to sway public opinion.

PARLI Debate

Siegel, Mike (*15)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 206
Gov: 9 Banisadr - Weiner
Opp: 13 Cao - Gunn
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Mike Siegel

Judge's School Affiliation: SCDS

Team Code #: PROP 9

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Banisadr pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Cao pt 28

Prop Speaker #2 Weiner pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Gunn 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: organized, good poise,
Speaks clearly and confidently
Speaks too fast, strong conclusion

organized, clear ideas
Opp 1: a little less fluid in delivery
Very cordial to opponent

Prop 2: articulate, clear arguments
Strong points of contention
work on conclusion

Opp 2: speaks clearly and slowly, good
eye contact, clear points
Calm demeanor

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Team 9 created a better argument for the topic that they debated. Their arguments were more organized and better supported. Team 13 also did an excellent job.

PARLI Debate

Siegel, Mike (*15)

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 206

Gov: 10 Day - Siebels

Opp: 5 Gaddamadugu - Pudota

Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Mike Siegel

Judge's School Affiliation: SCDG

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 Siebels pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Gaddamadugu pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Day pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Pudota 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: slow and thoughtful in approach, thought process is a little clunky, solid arguments perhaps examples should be more fully thought through with specific points (unarguable) highlighted.

Opp 1: unorganized format, goals of argument clearly stated. logical argument for each point of contention. Excellent argument with thoughtful point. Logical conclusions based on solid points. Don't rush argument. slow down speech to better engage with audience.

Prop 2: organized format, concise arguments, poignant points of contention. Excellent point. Logic is learned, emotion is experienced

Opp 2: clear speaking, good pace great arguments on points of contention but thought process is a little choppy nice use of supported facts.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very close decision both teams made excellent arguments I felt the examples brought up were not taken full advantage of by either side but the oppositions argument was a little stronger and more organized.

"A peels to emotion are ^{more} effective than a peels to logic."

PARLI Debate

Ambrosio, Leane (*1)

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 207
Gov: 17 Rosenthal - Dondero
Opp: 4 Rubsamen - Partsuf
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: V. Ambrosio

Judge's School Affiliation: Anady

Team Code #: **PROP** 17

Team Code #: **OPP** 4

Prop Speaker #1 Donero pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Rubsamen pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Rosenthal pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Partsuf 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: Donero

- persuasive delivery - could slow down
- very good voter criteria presentation

Opp 1: Rubsamen

- smooth strong delivery but too fast!
- ~~upbeat~~

Prop 2: Rosenthal

- nice tempo, good refutation
- polite

Opp 2: Partsuf

- very strong argumentation
- nice tone of voice (courteous)
- good delivery
- sweeping eye contact = inclusive

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Presentation of voter criteria wrapped it up in a strong way for the win.

"Why going bananas is better than being corny"

PARLI Debate

Ambrosio, Leane (*1)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 207
Gov: 9 Hardwick - Der
Opp: 7 Lustig - Gerenrot
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: L. Ambrosio

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

Team Code #: **PROP** 9

Team Code #: **OPP** 7

Prop Speaker #1 Jasmine pts 28.5

Opp Speaker #1 Lustig pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Jordan pts 28.5

Opp Speaker #2 gerenrot pts 28.5

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:

AF Prop 1: Jasmine

- very polite to opp
- good points

Prop 2: Jordan

good delivery of musde facts

Meg
Opp 1: Lustig

- ~~did not~~ to opponents
- could be more polite
- persuasive delivery, could ~~talk~~ slower talk

Opp 2: gerenrot

nice delivery tempo

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Final evidence reinforced that opps did not directly and effectively argue the topic.

PARLI Debate

Shifs, ~~Wesley~~ (*13)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 203
Gov: 7 White - Hall
Opp: 17 Chu - Fraga
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Don Shifs
Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN

Team Code #: PROP 7 Team Code #: OPP 17
Prop Speaker #1 HALL pts 29 Opp Speaker #1 FRAGA pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 WHITE pts 28 Opp Speaker #2 CHU 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: WELL THOUGHT OUT
- GOT ALL IDEAS ACROSS IN TIME ALTOGETHER

Opp 1: THOUGHT WELL ON FELT.

Prop 2: ANSWERED ALL ARGUMENTS.
SPoke FAST BUT CLEAR

Opp 2: SPoke CLEARLY BUT HAD TIME
FOLLOWING TRAIN OF THOUGHT

TEAM CODE #: 7 on the PROP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: PROP WON BECAUSE THEIR DEFINITION WAS
MORE THOUGHT OUT & I CONSIDER IT BETTER. CIVIL RIGHTS,
WOMENS RIGHTS ETC.

PARLI Debate

Shifs, Masha (*13)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 203
Gov: 3 Macpherson - Humphreys
Opp: 17 Ernst - Davis
Open Parli Debate

Judge's Name: DOUSHIPS
Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN

Team Code #: PROP 3

Team Code #: OPP 17

Prop Speaker #1 MACPHERSON pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 ERNST pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 HUMPHREYS pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 DAVIS 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: Needs to slow down, but very clear in thought. Bringing very good points

Opp 1: Very clear speaker - has well organized thoughts.

Prop 2: Present his points well but spoke fast

Opp 2: Spoke at right time but should include more examples

TEAM CODE #: 3 on the PROP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: PROP WON ON THE POINT OF CLEARLY POINTING OUT THE CONTRADICTION THAT IF TRUMP'S 200 DAYS OUT ARE MEANINGLESS THAN SO ARE HILLARY'S