PARLI Debate

Mark Cabasino (*13)
Round 1A 9:00am E4
Gov: 14 Eng - Morgenstein
Opp: 10 Dara - Randeria
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: CABASINO

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	10
Prop Speaker #1	MORGNSTEIN pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	RANDERIA pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	ENG pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	DARA 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 CLEAR DELIVERY, GOOD JOB FLESHING OUT CONTENTIONS, AND GOOD RECAP/SUMMATION DURING VOTER ISSUES. EXPAND ON 2C AND DON'T BE AFRAID TO ASK P.O.I. QUESTIONS DURING NEG.

Prop 2: GOOD PASSIONATE DELIVERY AND GOOD ELABORATION OF YOUR OWN CASE. RESPONSES ABOUT DISEASE/CONDITIONS AND EQUITY WERE PARTICULARLY PERSUASIVE, EXPAND REBUTTAL?

Opp 1: GOOD EXPLANATION OF YOUR CASE, AND INTERESTING REBUTTALS OF AFF CASE. I THOUGHT REBUTTAL OF AFF 1C AND 3C WERE PARTICULARLY EFFECTIVE. WORK ON SMOOTHENING OUT DELIVERY.

Opp 2: GOOD ARTICULATION OF DIFFERENCES IN SENTENCING AND IMPORTANCE OF HAVING SOME MINIMUM. I FOUND YOUR REBUTTAL OF AFF ABOUT POTENTIAL FOR REPEAT OFFENDERS PERSUASIVE.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
AFF'S CASE WAS A BIT MORE FLESHED OUT, AND AFF HAD MORE CONVICING REBUTTALS AND VOTER ISSUES. I WOULD'VE LIKED TO HAVE SEEN MORE ELABORATION AND VARIETY OF EXAMPLES ON BOTH SIDES. ALSO WOULD ENCOURAGE BOTH SIDES TO INTERJECT WITH P.O.I's. BOTH TEAMS WERE VERY POLISHED IN DELIVERY AND VERY POLITE/COURTEOUS. AS WELL AS CLEAR/POISED

PARLI Debate

Mark Cabasino (*13)
Round 1B 9:00am E4
Gov: 23 Carver - Garcia
Opp: 27 Lavell - Cohen
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: CABASINO

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

PROP
Team Code #: 23

Prop Speaker #1 CARVER pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 GARCIA pts 27

OPP
Team Code #: 27

Opp Speaker #1 COHEN pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 LAVELL pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: GOOD CLARITY OF CONTENTIONS AND ELABORATION WITH EXAMPLES. AFF 1C AND 2C WERE MOST PERSUASIVE. BE SURE TO COVER VOTING ISSUES IN SPEECH 3 AND WATCH TIME.

Prop 2: I FOUND YOUR BEST POINTS WERE EMPHASIS ON MENTAL ILLNESS AND ALSO THE FACT THAT SOME PEOPLE GO THROUGH CHANGE AND CAN BE REHABILITATED. WORK ON STRENGTHENING REBUTTALS.

Opp 1: NEG 1C AND 2C WERE STRONG POINTS. I ALSO FELT LIKE EMPHASIZING THE AFF BURDEN WAS A GOOD RESPONSE. I WOULD EXPAND MORE ON VOTING ISSUES IN SPEECH 3 TO INCLUDE DROPPED POINTS AND ALSO WHICH POINTS ON YOUR

Opp 2: CASE WERE THE BEST. GOOD ADDED EXAMPLES TO YOUR CASE (eg 9/11, RAPE ≠ RAPE) AND GOOD REBUTTALS (eg. LIFE IMPRISONMENT IS A FORM OF RETRIBUTION). DON'T LET P.O.I's THROW OFF YOUR SPEECH.

TEAM CODE #: 27 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: [redacted] NEG 1C AND 2C OUTWEIGHED AFF 1C AND 2C. NEG'S VOTER ON AFF BURDEN WAS ALSO PERSUASIVE. AT TIMES IT FELT LIKE BOTH SIDES WERE ARGUING FOR PROPORTIONATE JUSTICE. ALSO, [redacted] AT TIMES BOTH SIDES ENDED UP MAKING CONCESSIONS AGAINST THEIR OWN CASES (eg. AFF CONCEDED CRIMINAL CAN BE DANGEROUS AND THUS SHOULD BE JAILED, NEG CONCEDED POINTS ABOUT BIAS AND MENTAL ILLNESS).

Mandatory minimum sentencing laws are unjust

PARLI Debate

Liru Chin (*14)
Round 1A 9:00am E3
Gov: 23 Campagna - Mortensen
Opp: 17 Day - Shah
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Liru Chin

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	17
Prop Speaker #1	Mortensen pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Shah pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Campagna pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Day 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 speaker, good connection w/ audience, flip/flop on points between 1st aff / 2nd aff & closing ⇒ not a consistent thread of argument

Prop 2: Affirmed team's contentions and points presented in disjointed manner. A bit of a ramble

Opp 1: offered good counterpoints. Recommend less note reading

Opp 2: Connected and re-affirmed team's arguements. thorough refutation. Clear & articulate.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both teams agree that this is a value round with definition "Justice - fairness to everyone in every situation". ~~Opp~~ Prop in ~~final~~ closing argument flip the definition + ~~not~~ no longer about fairness and alter/negated their own contentions about 1. relying on judges' expertise vs. 2. cannot rely on judges to know the laws

Prop team also explicitly went against stated judging preferences. The persistent whispering was a distraction

Retribution has no place in modern criminal justice system

PARLI Debate

Liru Chin (*14)
Round 1B 9:00am E3
Gov: 15 Barbir - Deng
Opp: 13 Jung - Houck
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Liru Chin

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	15	Team Code #:	13
Prop Speaker #1	Deng pts 30	Opp Speaker #1	Jung pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Barbir pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Houck 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: Excellent presenter. Really like how you set out your points and supported it in 1st aff & closing.

Prop 2: able to support 1st aff but broad generalizations was a detriment to your team's argument

Opp 1: Wow. Also excellent. One minor point, your swaying back & forth made me a little dizzy. Your definitions plus was excellent. Your presentation also outstanding, but Prop 1 was able to close the deal & win the argument.

Opp 2: Your point on rehabilitation centers becoming jails was an excellent point. On your way to be a very good speaker. Be more comfortable with yourself.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop provided clear arguments and was able to support it and defend against neg's well-presented counter arguments.

PARLI Debate

Min. Sentencing is unjust?

Kimiko Cheng (*21)
Round 1A 9:00am I2
Gov: 3 Brogan - Modi
Opp: 10 Shingwekar - Vichare
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: K. Cheng

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 10	
Prop Speaker #1 Brogan	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Priyanka Shingwekar	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Modi	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Aditi Vichare	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:
The fact that more African-American are incarcerated has more to do with racial profiling and other reasons. Weak reason for affirm. Closing is better than aff. #1.

Prop 2:
Too much emphasis on race, too little explanation on "unfairness" mentioned in Prop 1.

Opp 1:
Convincing reasons – less conceptions in equal sentencing – needs to slow down a bit, ~~[illegible]~~ thinking faster than talking ~~[illegible]~~

Opp 2:
Good argument on refuting prop's emphasis on "race". ~~[illegible]~~

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
"Prop" ~~[illegible]~~ spends less time on "types of crimes", too much emphasis on "race". Negation has refuted strongly on every pt aff. brought up.

certain pop.

unconstitutional 5th amend

lack of fairness

prevent racial unjust – equal sentencing

judge has discretions

Reduce corruptions

PARLI Debate

Retribution has no place in a modern criminal just. sys.

Kimiko Cheng (*21)
Round 1B 9:00am I2
Gov: 15 Lee - Peled
Opp: 23 Banks - Corbett
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: K. Cheng

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	15	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	Lee pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Banks pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Peled pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Corbett 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:
Aff 1 made it sound like all criminals have mental health issues that do not warrant retribution. Too generalized. Lower your pitch as you sound more calmed in the future

Prop 2:
Opp 2 - speaker brought up a good pt in saying Aff's pt of view is not pragmatic, not possible.

Opp 1:
Good pt in bring up the issue of "closure for the victims" and a deterrance of crimes

Opp 2:
Speaker's statement that retribution does not deter crime is not a proven statement - weak argument.

TEAM CODE #: 23 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Aff's statement is too "generalized" when saying every criminal should have mental health help and given 2nd chance. Opp refuted every statement of Prop.

criminal record - cycle of poverty

Cited evidence - not enough mental health help

No closure for the victims

PARLI Debate

Mr Olson (*23)
Round 1A 9:00am E2
Gov: 14 Vaisse - Scott
Opp: 27 Manni - Brown
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ROBERT OLSEN

Judge's School Affiliation: 23

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 SCOTT	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 MANNI	pts 29 +
Prop Speaker #2 VAISSE	pts 27+	Opp Speaker #2 BROWN	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 GOOD TEAMS.

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

Prop 1:
GOOD STATEMENT OF FACTS - A LITTLE FAST.
- KNOWS HIS MATERIAL! GOOD CONTRA POINT.
VERY GOOD - NOT RATTLED. GOOD QUESTIONS
- COMMAND WELL, WRAPPED UP VERY WELL.
EXCELLENT CONCLUSION. MUCH IMPROVED FROM FIRST SPEECH.

Prop 2:
- KNOWS FACTS, A LITTLE FAST, ANSWERED QUESTIONS
- JUST SLOW DOWN, VERY CONVINCING, KEEPS YOUR ATTENTION
GREAT FEELING - POSITIVE SPEAKER [redacted].
SHE WILL BECOME A GREAT DEBATER WITH EXPERIENCE.

Opp 1:
GOOD SPEED. GOOD EYE CONTACT. GOOD REBUTTALS.
OPPOSITION - SUPPORTING MATERIALS, GOOD TIMES.
SOLID ON POSITION. VERY CONVINCING. A LITTLE TIRED AT END. BROUGHT AUDIENCE IN - EXCELLENT OVERALL.
GOOD WRAP UP AT END, LIKED WRAP UP. PERFECT ON TIME.
ALMOST PERFECT.

Opp 2:
- GOOD ON POINTS, EXCELLENT WHEN HE KEEPS IT SLOW, SHOULD A LITTLE WATCH GOING TOO FAST. REFUTES WELL. GOOD EYE CONTACT. REBUTTED WELL, KNOWS TOPIC.
GOOD USE OF TIME.

TEAM CODE #: 27 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
BOTH TEAMS WERE WELL PREPARED & KNEW MATERIAL, TEAM #27 JUST PRESENTED SLIGHTLY MORE SMOOTHLY AND BOTH TEAMS HAD EXCELLENT MANNERS + BEHAVIOR.

PARLI Debate

Mr Olson (*23)
Round 1B 9:00am E2
Gov: 15 Lin - Hu
Opp: 25 Hassan - Goody
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ROBERT OLSEN

Judge's School Affiliation: 23

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 15		Team Code #: 25	
Prop Speaker #1 HU	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 GOODY	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 LIN	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 HASSAN	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
STRONG CLEAR OPENING - GOOD SPEED
EYE CONTACT, FINISHED EARLY - SHOULD SUPPORT OPENING. GREAT PACING LATER.
MUCH BETTER CLOSING, CLEAR CONCISE WRAP UP. CONFUSED KNIFE W/ FOREIGN GROUP.
- IMPROVE EYE CONTACT. TO FAST TO BEGIN.

Prop 2:
GOOD EYE CONTACT, EMOTIONAL DELIVERY, CARES ABOUT TOPIC. GOOD REBUTTALS.
LIKED THE BLINDNESS POINT. GOOD QUESTION.

Opp 1:
VERY EMOTIVE SPEAKER, PASSIONATE, NEEDED TO ORGANIZE A LITTLE MORE AND WOULD BE PERFECT. WENT A LITTLE TOO LONG. DEFINED WELL. GOOD ANALOGY.
VERY GOOD WRAP UP.

Opp 2: CLEAR AND TO THE POINT, HANDLED QUESTION WELL.
GOOD POINTS

TEAM CODE #: 25 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
LIVELY TOPIC. CLOSE VOTE, TIMING & FACTS DECIDED VOTE.

Rules + Handbook points of discussion

PARLI Debate

Elizabeth Murphy (*5)
Round 1A 9:00am G2
Gov: 10 Wang - Lin
Opp: 15 Steinberg - Zhou
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Elizabeth Murphy

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd H.S.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 10		Team Code #: 15	
Prop Speaker #1 Wang	pts 25	Opp Speaker #1 Steinberg	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Lin	pts 25	Opp Speaker #2 Zhou	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:
Clear but should slow down on speaking and speak more calmly
Good rebuttal.

Prop 2:
Good response to Opp 1/POI in first speech. Good job at remaining calm.

Opp 1: made good job on setting forth argument and supporting it good
good job in refuting Props argument and analysis

Opp 2:
Good analysis of topic. Good job at remaining calm.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop did not effectively argue their value. References to US economy not relevant to fairness of mandatory sentencing. Reference to Rules of Parliamentary Debate did not support their value. Opp did a very good job in countering Prop's value. Neither side adequately addressed policy arguments.

PARLI Debate

Elizabeth Murphy (*5)
Round 1B 9:00am G2
Gov: 14 Kwong - Tan
Opp: 25 Stephens - Flanagan
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Elizabeth Murphy

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 25	
Prop Speaker #1 Tan	pts 25	Opp Speaker #1 Stephens	pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 Kwong	pts 25	Opp Speaker #2 Flanagan	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: State Name at Intro + Role
Good use of evidence but could improve analysis

Prop 2: State name at Intro + Role - Addressed Opp 1's argument that revolt does not equate to conclusion that First Amendment rights should not exist

Opp 1: Stay on time
State name at Intro + Role
Improve eye contact
Tie hair back so not distracted by hair in face
~~Do no~~ Try not to be so nervous - she's a clear speaker + she should be confident

Opp 2: State name at Intro + Role
good job at refuting Prop's argument by pointing out equality is important
Reference to communism not relevant + did not support argument

TEAM CODE #: 25 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Unclear as to what Proposition / Value is. Does retribution mean payment of fine only? Murder not a crime punishable by fines or retribution + ∴ not relevant to argument. ~~Could improve~~ rebuttal of rebound Opp's arguments, ~~irrebuttal~~ Did not understand arguments regarding poverty - Very close decision because neither side persuaded me to make a final decision.

PARLI Debate

~~Ashok Vijay (*10)~~
Round 1A 9:00am G4
Gov: 23 Crenshaw - Bulger
Opp: 11 Nour - Kuo
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Kristina Duong

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:		Team Code #:	
Prop Speaker #1 Crenshaw	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Nour	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Bulger	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Kuo	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

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

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Opp 1:

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

TEAM CODE #: 11 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Provided more real life present examples of occurances on a local + national level to support arguments.

PARLI Debate

~~Ashok Vijay (*10)~~
Round 1B 9:00am G4
Gov: 23 Bodisco - Ransweiler
Opp: 16 Chou - Kim
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Kristina Duong

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:		Team Code #:	
Prop Speaker #1 Bodisco	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Chou	pts 30
Prop Speaker #2 Ransweiler	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Kim	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:	Opp 1:
Prop 2:	Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opposition team provided very clear, detailed arguments. Team also spoke at the ~~fast~~ right pace using proper hand gestures.

Mandatory minimum sentencing laws are unjust

PARLI Debate

Teresa Skarr (*27)
Round 1A 9:00am G3
Gov: 10 Yang - Ho
Opp: 19 Rahman - Zhou
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Teresa Skarr

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	10	Team Code #:	19
Prop Speaker #1 Ho	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Zhou	pts 27.5
Prop Speaker #2 Yang	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Rahman	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: Ho
+ persuasive manner
+ Well organized, good eye contact
+ good link story on econ point
– Provide more background on how mand. minimums work.
+ good time management
– explain better how police bias is relevant to sentencing

Prop 2: Yang
+ nice engaging manner, good time management
– work on organization / stopped around confused N 2nd cont.
+ good evidence
– work on better rationale for your def.
– dropped round type (value vs. fact)
– work on logic for your 2nd cont.

Opp 1: Zhou
+ good pushback on definitions
– relate each contention to judging criteria
+ good refutation to 1st Aff contention
– work on confidence: you had good things to say!
– could turn Aff 2 re: police bias
– Unrebuttal relate back to fairness.

Opp 2: Rahman
+ good calling out framework drops by opponents
+ good clear speaker, organized.
+ good turn on Aff 2nd contention
– work on stronger evidence, examples (bias)
– work on time management pleas

TEAM CODE #: 19 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The Opp team had better reasoning for their framework, and 2nd Aff speaker didn't address Opp's value interpretation. In addition, Aff didn't explain how police bias relates to sentencing, and the Opp team did a great job pointing out these problems. Aff could've won by how explaining these arguments each.

Retribution has no place in a modern criminal justice system

PARLI Debate

Teresa Skarr (*27)
Round 1B 9:00am G3
Gov: 14 Bernstein - Jarmel-Schneider
Opp: 11 Tong - fung
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Teresa Skarr

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 11	
Prop Speaker #1 Bernstein	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Fung	pts 26.5
Prop Speaker #2 Jarmel-Schneider	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Tong	pts 26

Team 14 Bernstein/Jarmel-Schneider showed considerable debating Varsity! Awesome, excellent speakers!!

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: Bernstein → + good POI during 1st Neg speech.
+ great intro, engaging + clear speaker
– work on numbering/taglines
+ very good points, excellent persuasive
+ great time management
– state judging criteria @ beginning
+ good format for rebuttal with questions + nice

Prop 2: Jarmel-Schneider
+ good, clear speaker, good logic
– comment on their definitions/framework first
+ good answer to POI
+ good calling out opp's drop of Aff 3rd contention.
+ very poised

Opp 1: Fung
+ good defining type of motion, but next time include judging criteria also.
– smooth out speech
– work on numbering/taglines ~~for own~~ ~~Error~~
– thoroughly address Aff's case/dropped
– come higher level in rebuttal vs. some points repeating your case.

Opp 2: Tong
+ good intro/confirming your framework
– watch speed/hard to follow you.
– seemed to dismiss 1/7 error for death penalty
– address facts from aff case vs. hypotheticals in your own.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Aff had excellent speakers who were well prepared with good evidence and reasoning that wasn't adequately refuted by Neg. You could all improve by emphasizing, even establishing, a judging criteria. Neg could have won by focusing on the phrase "no place" – even 1 example of a place for retribution could have won you the round.

PARLI Debate

Sam Roberson (*19)
Round 1A 9:00am G5
Gov: 6 Bonet - Stankus
Opp: 14 Rettenmaier - Pineda
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Sam Roberson

Judge's School Affiliation: RHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 6		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Bonet	pts 30	Opp Speaker #1 Pineda	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Stankus	pts 30	Opp Speaker #2 Rettenmaier	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: great JOB very captivating speaking, good body language tone and volume, 3rd point at the end was very very good great JOB! try to use all of your time

Prop 2: very good eye contact very clear when speaking try to use all of your time good

Opp 1: good JOB when speaking watch out for your body language and eye contact.

Opp 2: good JOB try to relax when speaking so your thoughts can be relayed clearly and coherently

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Dropped point from neg with lack of examples.

PARLI Debate

Sam Roberson (*19)
Round 1B 9:00am G5
Gov: 24 Lacombe - Appel
Opp: 14 Stroumza - Chen
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Sam Roberson

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	24	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Lacombe pts 30	Opp Speaker #1	Stroumza pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Appel pts 30	Opp Speaker #2	Chen pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: great body language, tone and volume. clear examples. Great job paying attention to details.

Opp 1: very pleasant and easily understandable.

Prop 2: Captivating speech. Great job with no stutters and eye contact.

Opp 2: Make sure you use adequate body language when speaking. very good points.

TEAM CODE #: 24 **on the** prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

dropped points from the negation

PARLI Debate

Bill Holt (*3)
Round 1A 9:00am E5
Gov: 14 Huang - Luc
Opp: 5 Johnson - Murphy
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Jenny Holt

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 5	
Prop Speaker #1 Huang	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Murphy	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Luc	pts 27.5	Opp Speaker #2 Johnson	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

Both teams good > more?

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 rebuttal > good rebuttal using value as point, that was strong. Need more evidence/argument for own contentions.

Prop 2:
Need more argumentation and evidence supporting contentions. Good delivery - easy to understand

Opp 1: opp had a bit more evidence. But, both teams could use some facts/true life examples.
opp 1: good delivery, easy to understand. good rebuttal

Opp 2: excellent delivery
good point that minimum is a baseline

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Better rebuttals, and evidence. Argument of "min" is a baseline supported contentions. Excellent debate by all.

PARLI Debate

Bill Holt (*3)
Round 1B 9:00am E5
Gov: 14 Bystrom - Gast
Opp: 10 Pandit - Mandal
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Jenny Holt

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	10
Prop Speaker #1 Bystrom	pts 27.5	Opp Speaker #1 Pandit	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Gast	pts 27.5	Opp Speaker #2 Mandal	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:

Prop 1: Good first speech → clear. Avoid using "Kinda", softens your argument.

Prop 2: good speaker. need a little more argumentation against Opp. w/ evidence or clear statements.

Opp 1: good refutation, re-dinfed retribution. Contentions good - a little unclear on #3? good evidence/middle east example

Opp 2: ~~Excellent~~ Excellent delivery & analysis good points about layout of argument, great job answering security question.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Good job both sides! Tough one - very close. Opp 2 had clearest Argument. Prop needed slightly stronger rebuttals. Great courtesy and delivery by all!

PARLI Debate

Dan Fishlow (*15)
Round 1A 9:00am I1
Gov: 5 Jayasuriya - Schulz
Opp: 23 Vawter - Olson
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Dan Fishlow

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 23	
Prop Speaker #1 Schulz	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Vawter	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Jayasuriya	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Olson	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:
Overall good job. one suggestion would be to finish stronger... Sort of mumbled conclusions and lowered voice so hard to hear

Prop 2:
Very passionate. Used emotion to make case. Used one example but not in general overall good

Opp 1:
Good speaker; clear confident voice
Best point was min sentences are equal before the law. Did a good job of organizing thoughts

Opp 2:
Did a good job clearly articulating case.
One point would be to stick on target/topic be more focused → point of prison reform...

TEAM CODE #: 23 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The prop did not do enough to off-set the argument that sentences are unjust vs. All are equal before the law. Overall, there were mostly points of emotion or one example but not facts enough to show in general min. sent are unjust. Needed more about taking away "discretion" +

PARLI Debate

Dan Fishlow (*15)
Round 1B 9:00am I1
Gov: 21 Fields - Gersh
Opp: 14 Tran - Vainberg
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Dan Fishlow

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 21		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Fields	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Tran	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Gersh	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Vanberg	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Clear & succinct. Did a good job framing the debate

Prop 2:
Good use of facts and reiterating argument.

Opp 1: Very good speaker → clear/good voice. well organized.

Opp 2: well done and well thought out

TEAM CODE #: 21 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Close debate; with disagreement on the definition. Prop wins based on good use of statistics as well as the point of "just because someone wants something, does not justify". Good job by both teams.

PARLI Debate

Kathleen von Raesfeld (*25)
Round 1A 9:00am I3
Gov: 14 Lee - Fairchild
Opp: 23 Woerner - Miner
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Von Raesfeld

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

PROP			OPP		
Team Code #:	14		Team Code #:	23	
Prop Speaker #1	Lee	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Woerner	pts 29.5
Prop Speaker #2	Fairchild	pts 29.5	Opp Speaker #2	Miner	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 eye contact
- it is a good idea to restate the short topic when presenting your 2nd point - it adds continuity & passion
- do not need "thank you's" in final speech
+ good overview in final speech - start there :)

Prop 2:
+ very well organized and strong argumentation of lawmaker vs judge +++
+ evidence and passion were fantastic and links to rehabilitation in jail were spot on.

Opp 1: + Like road map intro & review, strong style
+ fluid style and speaking face was very convincing
+ overcrowding was perfectly argued
+ You seem very ready for varsity level - well done

Opp 2: + excellent eye contact
+ good link to jail investment and aff argument
- got a little unorganized in last 2 minutes but strong summary :)

TEAM CODE #: 23 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Won more arguments

PARLI Debate

Kathleen von Raesfeld (*25)
Round 1B 9:00am I3
Gov: 23 Nearon - VonSosen
Opp: 14 Liu - Fu
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Von Raesfeld

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	~~[redacted]~~ Nearon pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Liu pts 28.5
Prop Speaker #2	~~[redacted]~~ VonSosen pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Fu 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:
- definitions were not clear. . need to present your points so that everyone is on the same page ☺ You did not seem to care until the end ☹

Prop 2:
+ better definitions, helped partner,
- need eye contact and

Opp 1: + excellent start, glad added benefits/value
+ clear definitions and summary making your argument the most clear to follow of debate

Opp 2: + excellent work with partner and professionalism
+ You listened well and refuted points clearly

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Solvency - harms were not presented clearly

PARLI Debate

Ted Appel (*24)
Round 2A 11:00am I1
Gov: 17 Day - Shah
Opp: 14 Kwong - Tan
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ted Appel

Judge's School Affiliation: Santa Rosa HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 17		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Shah	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Kwong	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Day	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Tan	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: Extremely thorough and well-conceived argument. To improve, read less and speak more extemporaneously.

Prop 2: Effective job of refuting Opp arguments

Opp 1: Good hand gestures. Nice summation

Opp 2: Strong voice, good eye contact. Good answer to Prop question. Shows ability to think on feet

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Clearly defined terms and offered innovative plan to achieve goal of ending animal testing

PARLI Debate

Ted Appel (*24)
Round 2B 11:00am I1
Gov: 19 Rahman - Zhou
Opp: 14 Vaisse - Scott
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ted Appel

Judge's School Affiliation: Santa Rosa HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	19	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Rahman pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Scott pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Zhou pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Vaisse 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 hand gestures Strong clear voice; need to watch time better.

Opp 1: Highly effective closing argument carried the day - Natural speaker.

Prop 2: Good command of topic; to improve slow down a little to make key points.

Opp 2: Good job of not using notes is a catch

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Good close (best case vs. worst case) carried the argument

PARLI Debate

Lori-Jill Seltzer (*5)
Round 2A 11:00am G3
Gov: 23 Woerner - Miner
Opp: 14 Bernstein - Jarmel-Schneider
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Lori-Jill Seltzer

Judge's School Affiliation: BAD

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Woerner pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Jarmel-Schneider pts 30
Prop Speaker #2	Miner pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Bernstein 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: Both teams were well-spoken!

Prop 1: Clearly defined the resolution. Gave relevant information with facts and references. Good summation but claimed Opp Counter changed definitions - which I didn't.

Prop 2: Spoke clearly, but didn't effectively respond to Opp's points or elaborate on originally stated alternatives.

Opp 1: Good eye contact; clearly covered + refuted Prop's points. Backed up arguments with facts. Strong counterpoints.

Opp 2: I had a counter-arguments that clearly addressed all of the Prop's points. Very focused + relevant points of information. Clear speaker, easily understandable.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: They were clear on their points + counterpoints which they backed up with facts. The Prop Team made claims that the Opp team changed definitions, but this wasn't accurate.

PARLI Debate

Lori-Jill Seltzer (*5)
Round 2B 11:00am G3
Gov: 14 Liu - Fu
Opp: 10 Yang - Ho
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Lori-Jill Seltzer

Judge's School Affiliation: BOD

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 10	
Prop Speaker #1 Liu	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Ho	pts 24
Prop Speaker #2 Fu	pts 28 (28)	Opp Speaker #2 Yang	pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Both teams had too many "POI's that were interuptive. Both teams worked hard to clarify points

Prop 1: Clearly defined the topic.

Opp 1: Good eye contact but spoke way too much. Seemed to stray from the topic with external topics. Had some good factual points. Did address all of Prop points.

Prop 2: Good eye contact. Inserted important facts to round out argument very passionate speaker. His summation did a good job of wrapping it up.

Opp 2: Passionate speaker but also strayed from topic. Did address other teams points with accuracy. Inserted points that were off topic.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: It was a difficult topic, but Liu & Fu stayed on topic and used more relevant & factual arguments. Opps summation was stray but still not fully a topic

PARLI Debate

John Brouhard (*6)
Round 2A 11:00am I3
Gov: 23 Vawter - Olson
Opp: 14 Eng - Morgenstein
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: John Brouhard

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Vawter	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Morgenstein	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Olson	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Eng	pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good emotion + eye contact. Be careful of conversational use ("you guys"). Testy on humans as animals became a distraction — not relied on you in your 1st argument.

Prop 2: Good focus on last moments of animal life. Could improve eye contact. Be careful not to start sentences with "So..."

Opp 1: Very well spoken. You set out a very clear and understandable road map to arguments. Be careful not to start sentences with "So..." Great argument about comparing worlds.

Opp 2: Good appeal to Seattle world and real life. Arguments could be better organized. Avoid overusing — e.g. "absolutely ridiculous!"

TEAM CODE #: 23 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Very close debate. Arguments about testing on humans was a distraction, not important to opp's argument. But Prop made strong points about cruelty and alternatives

PARLI Debate

John Brouhard (*6)
Round 2B 11:00am I3
Gov: 11 Tong - fung
Opp: 23 Carver - Garcia
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: John Brouhard

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	Fung pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	~~Carver~~ Garcia pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Tong pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Carver 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: Well spoken & overall argument to relight on GMO issue. Be careful starting sentences with "So..." Good rebuttal — took on opposition points rather than just re-summarizing proponent

Prop 2: Good job coming up with real world examples. Try to slow down speech. Focus on quality of arguments rather than trying to make all of the arguments.

Opp 1: Very well spoken. Good organization of arguments. Good re-cap at end. Be careful using conversational tone ("That is insane" — "cool"). Nice job separating GMO issue.

Opp 2: Good job pointing out assumptions in opposing argument. Be careful starting sentences with "So..." Be willing to ~~dodge~~ engage with at least one POI.

TEAM CODE #: 23 on the Opp wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Linchpin of prop argument depended on GMOs. But relationship between GMO + subsidies not logically developed

Pharmaceutical testing on animals ban

2A JV Parli

Gov 13: Jung - Houck
Opp 21: Fields - Gersh

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Catherine Singstad

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell H.S.

PROP

Livermore H.S.

Team Code #: _____

Prop Speaker #1 Ryan Jung pts 28.5

Prop Speaker #2 Cory Houck pts 27

OPP

Team Code #: 21 San Marin H.S.

Opp Speaker #1 Noah Gersh pts 28.5

Opp Speaker #2 Brandon Fields 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: Your voice was hesitant and a little too quick at first, but you relaxed as debate progressed & gave an excellent final speech/summary. You made a good case around ethics & morality but the argument felt simplistic and could have been strengthened by more concrete ideas. Excellent questions for opposition - were well presented.

Prop 2: Your nervousness was a little distracting, but you had good points about unsafe drugs being on market now. Wanted more ideas about how companies would make safe drugs & good arguments made against opposition.

Opp 1: Your tone is strong & convincing; you have passion. You took the prop's question in a polite & respectful manner. Great presentation of need to test on animals for safety's sake — good evidence.

Opp 2: You were confident - great job. Your response to prop 1's challenges was very strong. Good thinking on your feet. Could explain more what you meant in saying opp dropped points.

TEAM CODE #: 21 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

David Duncan (*25)
Round 2B 11:00am G5
Gov: 10 Dara - Randeria
Opp: 23 Crenshaw - Bulger
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Catherine Singstad

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell H.S.

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 10	Team Code #: 23
Prop Speaker #1 Rohith Dara pts 28.5	Opp Speaker #1 Drake Crenshaw pts 28.5
Prop Speaker #2 Shanay Randeria pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Ryan Bulger 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:

Prop 1: Strong & passionate presentation with good eye contact. Strong analysis & use of evidence regarding economy. Not sure about using poorer countries needing subsidies so they'll be on our side in a war – shaky argument but creative nonetheless. Overall, easy to understand & compelling.

Prop 2: Could sense your nervousness, but you make very strong points about obesity and fossil fuels and long term solutions. Your response to opp's (?) about obesity v. clear & convincing.

Opp 1: V. good eye contact. Great job at clearly presenting your points & summary. Could be more impassioned when speaking. Especially strong when speaking on economy, less so regarding farmers. Burden of proof-excellent idea to mention.

Opp 2:
Very strong delivery. Excellent presentation of farms being central to American identity → convincing & clear. Great example of small farms needing subsidies to compete w/ Monsanto. Good use of evidence.

TEAM CODE #: 23 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

#1 Rohit

#2

#1

#2

Aff

Rohit 28.5 good, presentation strong, passionate

net ↓ # V. good eye contact

corn as problem
health problem w/ corn products

good argument economic-related to health
ability to work more jobs..?

subsidies
forces prices lower
poorer countries need our help
world war on our side
creative
Renewable Resources

---

28 arguing opp nervous but impressed

Shanay

- Not refuting our budget → agree with it
- obesity argument
neg impacts on mental health

✓✓ fossil fuels → LT solutions
betterment of our society

Great response to Raeonna obesity/starvation

Neg.

Drake 28.5 V. good eye contact

argue - ↓ $
cash market

Burden of proof - any doubt.

- obesity/health problem
ppl need cheap food otherwise starve
- other countries
scientists need corn production (↓)

1. Small farmers
- run the economy (↓)
- backbone - could be more impassioned

✓ would raise prices - imp. pt.

2. economic effect on other spending
v. good pt. effect economy greatly

3. Ripple effect of Corn so predominant
Corn - helps keep economy & ag bus running

V. clear presentation of points $ summary

Ryan 28.5 29. Strong delivery

Economic impact insane trickle down

Obesity - yes it is a huge problem

don't trade food w/ other countries - really?

Tax $ decrease bc of ↓ income

Farmers - backbone - good argument re importance of farms in America

Monsanto Example - excellent pt. farmers ~~food~~ subsidies to compete

Land → Nutrition efficient

PARLI Debate

Karina Giang (*8)
Round 2A 11:00am G2
Gov: 5 Johnson - Murphy
Opp: 24 Lacombe - Appel
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: KARINA GIANG

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: ~~Murphy~~ 5		Team Code #: 24	
Prop Speaker #1 ~~Johnson~~ Murphy	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Appel	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Johnson	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Lacome	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Well organized and good POI.

Opp 1: Speech delivered pleasantly. Would like to see more evidence to support your own side. You will get better and better.

Prop 2: Argument clear and delivered nicely. Remain calm during speech

Opp 2: Speech delivery fluently with good evidence. Would like to see more analysis of the topic

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

REASON FOR DECISION: PROP Team because they are more organized and stay on topic. It was a good debate and I enjoy it very much.

PARLI Debate

Karina Giang (*8)
Round 2B 11:00am G2
Gov: 14 Tran - Vainberg
Opp: 15 Lee - Peled
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: KARINA GIANG

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	15
Prop Speaker #1	Tran pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Peleb pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Vainberg pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Lee 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: POI clearly delivered. Stayed calm during debate.

Opp 1: Good points provided. Would like to see the more organized speech during the debate.

Prop 2: Well organized and speech delivered fluently.

Opp 2: Good standing. Wish to see answering opponents question more effectively. You will get better and better.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: PROP team provided more POI and speech delivered more effectively.

Resolution: US Fed'l Gov't should ban pharmaceutical testing on animals

PARLI Debate

Katrina Fehring (*21)
Round 2A 11:00am E3
Gov: 14 Rettenmaier - Pineda
Opp: 15 Barbir - Deng
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Katrina Fehring
Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	15
Prop Speaker #1	Rettenmaier pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Deng pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Pineda pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Barbir 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: Came out strong & confident but follow up arguments could have been stronger.

Opp 1: Great presence - very good flow of speaking. Liked use of examples.

Prop 2: Friendly demeanor but could have been more forceful in defending & clarifying the value of your position.

Opp 2: Nice job finding/addressing weak areas of plan presented. A little repetitive - Could have been more powerful with a stronger wrap up.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

the opp. gave excellent examples of how testing in past has been successful without any evidence to contrary from aff. Although good effort

Resolution: Fed Govt sh. significantly reduce agri subs.

PARLI Debate

Katrina Fehring (*21)
Round 2B 11:00am E3
Gov: 11 Nour - Kuo
Opp: 23 Campagna - Mortensen
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Katrina Fehring

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	~~Nour~~ Kuo pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Campagna pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	~~Kuo~~ Nour pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Mortensen 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: Strong initial presentation of points. Make sure to let judge know resolution. Talking during presentation of other team was too loud & distracting. Liked seeing your passion in rebuttal.

Prop 2: Excellent confidence. Good clarification of your points but not as strong challenging opps.

Opp 1: Good presence - very relaxed. Liked clear points & good conclusion. Watch out being over-relaxed as can come across as dismissive/disrespectful.

Opp 2: Liked how you summarized at beginning & end. Clearly worked through your case & points & methodically addressed the Affs pts. Watch out looking at partner too much.

TEAM CODE #: 23 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmation defined agricultural as farming but focused too narrowly on GMO's. Opp successfully raised a greater number of benefits if policy failed.

The US Fed G should ban pharmaceutical testing on animals

PARLI Debate

Eszter Erdelyi (*14)
Round 2A 11:00am E2
Gov: 25 Hassan - Goody
Opp: 10 Wang - Lin
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: E ERDELYI

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	25	Team Code #:	10
Prop Speaker #1	GOODY pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	LIN pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	HASSAN pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	WANG pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: VERY ENERGETIC SPEAKER MAY I SUGGEST MORE EYE CONTACT AND LESS CASUAL SPEECH USING WORDS "LIKE" "SO YES"

Opp 1: MOST ORGANIZED SPEAKER, EASY TO FOLLOW POINTS, EXTREMELY COURTEOUS STEVE JOBES EXAMPLE DID NOT DISCUSS THE NUMBER / RATIO OF PEOPLE WHO DO NOT CONTRIBUTE TO SOCIETY

Prop 2: BEST LOGIC APPLIED PUT THREE OF THE STATMENTS' IMPACT IN PERSPECTIVE — THAT WON THE DEBATE

Opp 2: BEST FORM, FULL SENTENCES, EYE CONTACT, I LIKED THE DELIVERY MAY I SUGGEST TO KEEP YOUR ORGANIZATION AS YOU "RAISE THE HEAT"

TEAM CODE #: 25 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: SECOND PROP SPEECH ADDRESSED EVERY ARGUMENT IN PERSPECTIVE ("LOT MORE PEOPLE POLLUTING THAN SAVING EARTH, CAN MAKE SURE THAT TESTING IS DONE RIGHT IN REAL LIFE BE DONE?) AND THAT QUESTIONED THE EVIDENCE SUPPORTING NEG. TEAM

PARLI Debate

Eszter Erdelyi (*14)
Round 2B 11:00am E2
Gov: 10 Shingwekar - Vichare
Opp: 23 Nearon - VonSosen
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: E ERDELYI

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	10	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	SHINGWEKAR pts 30	Opp Speaker #1	VON SOSEN pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	VICHARE pts 30	Opp Speaker #2	NEARON 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: WELL ORGANIZED WELL DELIVERED, IMPACTFUL CLOSING, MAY I SUGGEST THAT THE EVIDENCE ON THE MAIN CAUSE OF OBESITY BEING HFCS IS NOT STRONG, GOOD POI

Prop 2: WELL ORGANIZED GREAT POINTS: "~~EFFORDABLE~~" "PREVENT IN FUTURE BUT CAUSING NOW" EXCELLENT ANALYSIS

Opp 1: STARTED OUT WITH GOOD USE OF DATA BUT THEN BROUGHT UP UNSUBSTANTIATED POINTS: "PERSONALLY I HAVE SEEN.." "RESEARCH WILL EVENTUALLY LEAD TO HEALTHIER" MAY I SUGGEST MORE EYE CONTACT

Opp 2: GOOD ORGANIZATION, GOOD ANALYSIS ON "NOT DEBATING EQUALITY OF DISTRIBUTION" FINISHED SPEECH ABRUPTLY - VERY CURTEOUS GREAT SENSE OF HUMOR

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

REASON FOR DECISION: More relevant and supported evidence, good argumentation directly disputing every point the OPP team made, excellent use of POI, better delivery

PARLI Debate

Winnie Wang (*10)
Round 2A 11:00am G4
Gov: 25 Stephens - Flanagan
Opp: 6 Bonet - Stankus
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Winnie Wang

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington ₹ High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: Gov 25		Team Code #: Opp 6	
Prop Speaker #1 Flanagan	pts 28.5	Opp Speaker #1 Bonet	pts 28.5
Prop Speaker #2 Stephens	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Stankus	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:

Prop 1: Flanagan
- grand opening
- nice hand gesture
- pleasant ~~+~~ speaking style
- great eye contact

Prop 2: Stephens
- speak with passion~~ate~~
- good ~~re~~solutions

Opp 1: Bonet
- good arguemention points
- provide more supportive information
- more persuasive ~~ev~~ evidence.

Opp 2: Stankus
- good ~~re~~attacks on Prop. side
- very convicing speaking skills

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams are very good on presenting the information, but the ~~p~~opp side ~~is~~ was more ~~co~~ persuasive and building a strong case.

PARLI Debate

Winnie Wang (*10)
Round 2B 11:00am G4
Gov: 27 Lavell - Cohen
Opp: 5 Jayasuriya - Schulz
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Winnie Wang

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: Gov 27		Team Code #: Opp 5	
Prop Speaker #1 Cohen	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Jayasuriya	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Lavell	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Schulz	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: Cohen
- good ~~speaking~~ rate & volume
- deliver information well
- ~~need~~ more explanations of information will be better

Prop 2: Lavell
- good eye contact
- interesting points
- nice structure

Opp 1: Jayasuriya
- good taking POI
- present material well
- provide strong ₹ evidence
- very confident

Opp 2: Schulz
- good POI, good question
- clear speech easy to follow

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote for ~~the~~ Opp team because they have more reasonable points and good support ~~of~~ the topic. ~~a~~evidence to

PARLI Debate

Peter Brown (*27)
Round 2A 11:00am I2
Gov: 23 Banks - Corbett
Opp: 14 Bystrom - Gast
JV Parli Debate

USFG should ban pharmaceutical testing ads

Judge's Name: Peter Brown

Judge's School Affiliation: Wmls

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Banks	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Gast	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Corbett	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Bystrom	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 analysis of definition. Only spoke for 2:58. Starts out very strong. Need to keep that for the entire speech.

Prop 2: Clear speaker. Good evidence. Dropped contentions.

Opp 1: Good argumentation. Easy to follow. Could make better use of time

Opp 2: Good use of time. Speaks clear

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The prop attempted to refute unsuccessfully all of the Opp contentions in one small statement. Did not work.

PARLI Debate

Peter Brown (*27)
Round 2B 11:00am I2
Gov: 16 Chou - Kim
Opp: 14 Lee - Fairchild
JV Parli Debate

U.S.fg should significantly reduce its ag. subsidies

Judge's Name: Peter Brown

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

PROP			OPP		
Team Code #:	16		Team Code #:	14	
Prop Speaker #1	Chou	pts 24	Opp Speaker #1	Lee	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Kim	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Fairchild	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: Passionate debator
Good use of references.

Prop 2: Poised and dropped contentions
Great delivery.
Good use of time

Opp 1: Cited references
Easy to follow.
Dropped contentions.
Could use clock better to help strengthen argument.

Opp 2: Good argumentation
Stay calm.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The prop successfully defined and argued the debate. The prop refuted all contentions by the opp. The opp missed/dropped contentions.

The USFG should ban pharmaceutical testing on animals.

PARLI Debate

Pauline Honaryar (*15)
Round 2A 11:00am E4
Gov: 27 Manni - Brown
Opp: 3 Brogan - Modi
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Pauline Honaryar

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: Gov 27		Team Code #: Opp 3	
Prop Speaker #1 Manni	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Brogan	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Brown	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Modi	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: Nice clear voice. Analysis/definition of terms good but missed definition of Micro Carbon Tubing. Strong presentation & evidence; good POI & great rebuttal.

Opp 1: Work on eye contact; excellent voice; very clear. but may need to speak a tad slower. great POI excellent refutes.

Prop 2: Work on coesive presentation and delivery; arguments stated but not supported. Very courteous; good voice.

Opp 2: great responses to POI; very confidents in responses. delivery can be improved by being more coesive in delivery. Great arguments & counter points.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Overall nice delivery; good confidence voice. great arguments; strong responses to POIs.

The USFG should significantly reduce its agricultural subsidies

PARLI Debate

Pauline Honaryar (*15)
Round 2B 11:00am E4
Gov: 10 Pandit - Mandal
Opp: 23 Bodisco - Ransweiler
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Pauline Honaryar

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 10		Team Code #: 23	
Prop Speaker #1 Pandit	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Bodisco	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Mandal	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Ransweiler	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:

Too loud when entering with each other causing distraction

Prop 1: excellent tonation/voice of delivery. Nice case analysis; evidence a bit weak on some arguments. argument analysis strong. Excellent Final rebuttal.

Prop 2: good job on clarification of misrepresented points (by opposition) however, arguments countering the opposition not too effective. great organization on delivery. Too much swaying as speaking

Opp 1: great/stronger on the arguments. excellent voice; clear arguments; portrayed confidence; nice eye contact. Final rebuttal excellent on argument portion

Opp 2: A few too many "um"s. showed nervousness by being a little figety. excellent counter arguments. Ignored the questions being raised. delivery was organized but lacked in the communicative side.

TEAM CODE #: 23 **on the** Opp. **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Mainly due to the excellent argumentation portion

PARLI Debate

Doug Barton (*23)
Round 2A 11:00am E5
Gov: 15 Steinberg - Zhou
Opp: 14 Huang - Luc
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: DOUG BARTON

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 15		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 STEINBERG	pts 30	Opp Speaker #1 HUANG	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 ZHOU	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 LUC	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: Clear, concise & confident. Had good examples and data to support position. Turned around the opp's arguments. Excellent closing!

Prop 2: Confident speaker. Good counterexamples & rebuttal of opp. Good POI

Opp 1: Logical and well spoken. Good reponse to a POI but maybe don't allow so many.

Opp 2: Remained calm and had good responses to tough POIs! Use a bit more eye contact.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop had great argumentation ~~and~~, examples, and data to ~~opp~~ support position. Opp didn't refute.

PARLI Debate

Doug Barton (*23)
Round 2B 11:00am E5
Gov: 14 Stroumza - Chen
Opp: 15 Lin - Hu
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: DOUG BARTON

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 15	
Prop Speaker #1 CHEN	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 LIN	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 STROUMZA	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 HU	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Clear, confident speaker. Could add to the opening a bit more. Great closing

Prop 2: Very clear speaker. Good eye contact. Good explanation of the positive outcomes of the plan.

Opp 1: Affable, confident speaker. A bit repetitive in opening. Much improved on rebuttal

Opp 2: Clear speaker. Good point by point analysis! Maybe add a bit more inflection or enthusiasm.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very close debate! The PROP side edged out the OPP in the closing argument that encorporated the American independence tradition that supports the Resolution