Wondy Young (*27 Round 3A 1:30pm E5 Gov: 23 Banks - Corbet	•		Judge's Name	: Young, M	harlon
Opp: 14 Liu - Fu JV Parli Debate			Judge's Schoo	ر ا Affiliation:	Nor
Team Code #:	PROP 23	er, ser storenille urigion siddoleri	Team Code	OPP e#:/4	managed and the first that the state of the
Prop Speaker #1_	Bank	pts_ <i>28</i>	Opp Speaker #1	4iu	pts <u>'27</u>
Prop Speaker #2_	Corbet	pts_285	Opp Speaker #2	FU	pts_2_7
Please award	each speaker poir		, -		A TOTAL MONTH PROPERTY AND A STATE OF THE ST
•			utstanding 28 =		
26-25 = Fair	7 = Good (but poss) 24-20 = P		- /		ropriate behavior
		Judg	ing Criteria		
	How reasonably an ring the debate	d effectivel	y the debaters an	alyze the topic an	d the arguments
	How appropriately	and efficie	ntly the debaters	support argumen	ts with
	-which may include				
	ation: How directl	y and effect	ively the debate	rs respond to the a	rguments made
by the othe			d .eff	41	41
	Information: How How well the debar	,		•	
	understandable		i un organizou, e	ommunican vo sty	io mar is proasant
• Courtesy:	How courteous an	d respectful	the debaters wer	re to opponents an	nd judges
Using the aboeach debater:	ve criteria, please	offer comp	oliments and/or	suggestions for i	mprovement to
Prop 1: Banks	. /		Opp 1: Liu		
Good Job Pull together in	ing Packners A	rgumen -	Made	good use	I Point, — and gument, when Hard
together in	Simmificon		Makin	Counter Ar	guments when Hard
			10 6	les.	0
Prop 2: Carbe at Pace, Dicta ogic & Ease of	#.	/	Opp 2:		
eat Pace, Dicta	ation, organiz	mion,		, 11 00	1. 1. West allow
ogic & Ease of	= following a	rgiment	6000 P	0)n+_ TU/M	and 1-1x) by omode
TEAM CODE REASON FOR	Off's argumen	ts Courin	Knowle	dy to Pass	antion-14, buy allows
TEAM CODE	#:23	_ on the	ProP wins the	his debate.	
REASON FOR	DECISION:	/ /	C- · C	0 1	1 Acromente
Did a Bette	r Job of	Lisking	specific	Points a	na programa 3
And then Ty.	ing then	- ary	ument, to	gether. Did	nd Arguments 1 Well Countering Opp Had Harder
Off I Hyune	nts. I thin	K KOP	Argument	Was Easier,	Opp Had Harder

		PARLI Debate	
Round 3B 1:30pm E5 Gov: 14 Tran - Vainberg	•	Judge's Name: Joung Marlon	
Opp: 13 Jung - Houck JV Parli Debate		Judge's School Affiliation: Windsol	
Team Code #:	PROP	OPP Team Code #: /3	
Prop Speaker #1	Tran pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Jung pts 77.5	
Prop Speaker #2_	Vainberg pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Jung pts 27.5 Opp Speaker #2 Houck pts 27	
		Outstanding 28 = Very Good	
26-25 = Fair		ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior	
	Jud	dging Criteria	
Low Point Analysis: I offered duri	How reasonably and effective ing the debate	dging Criteria vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ciently the debaters support arguments with d references to authority as well as general knowledge	
A four. • Evidence:	How appropriately and effic	ciently the debaters support arguments with	
		d references to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made	
by the other	r side		
		and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant	
	anderstandable	t in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant	
• Courtesy:	How courteous and respectf	ful the debaters were to opponents and judges	
Using the above each debater:	ve criteria, please offer con	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to	
Prop 1: Tran	I will "one water fuga	4) Opp 1: J-ng	
Versus Making We End	off Cuff Goment	- "Mural Obligation" feeds to Bad Politic Bolicy was good argument - Could How argued belie - positive w.	za /
ar Eis		- Gold Hour argued bette positive w	L
Prop 2: Vaint	ærg /		
- 600il Ete Engagemen	corq Confact & Audians		
	/1	wins this debate. Prop or Opp)	
REASON FOR I	DECISION: debute was Mor	ral Obligation). Prop focused to mu	c4
on we have	ability and why	Refigues World Herr Hurt, Should	1.50
Have focused With Ackno	on morally. Le	ral Obligation), Prop Coursed to must Refigues World Hear Hurt, Should eft Door open for opp to Wing re for moral Obligation Leads to Ball	type

PARLI Debate <u> Nadeem Alam (*19).</u> Round 3A 1:30pm G4 Parl Mosh Gov: 5 Johnson - Murphy Opp: 27 Manni - Brown Judge's School Affiliation: Mfany H-5. JV Parli Debate **PROP** Team Code #: Prop Speaker #1 Marky pts 27 Opp Speaker #1 Marki Opp Speaker #2 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 = Fair24-20 = 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: lock of Cancrele examples Opp 1: polsed Clear deliver .

and nervousness hurt - Superior meta analysis + auscussian with other had firmer in second speech of evidence - over-claim for music second speech

Prop 2: bit Phonoch deehnological
history - need both I good point pohing jobs - hovery, some good
(Case for music, cald stem world good aret cusing _____ on the <u>Θργ</u> wins this debate. **TEAM CODE #:**

REASON FOR DECISION:

Tean 27 was will preticulational, patient exposition again Tean 5 slight tendency to pronounce an argument won simply by making it

V°3(O)		PARLI Debate
Nade	em Alam (*19)	\mathcal{A} , \mathcal{C} :
Round : Gov: 1	3B 1:30pm G4 4 Rettenmaier - Pineda	Judge's Name: Kar Jerz
	15 Lin - Hu rli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Albany H. S.
_	PROP Team Code #: 14	OPP Team Code #:
	Prop Speaker #1 Renemacer pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Lik pts 28
	Prop Speaker #2 fined pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 HU pts 28
		Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Jud	ging Criteria
		ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
		iently the debaters support arguments with
		references to authority as well as general knowledge
	by the other side	ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
	•	nd effective were the questions and the answers
	• Delivery: How well the debaters speak	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
	and easily understandableCourtesy: How courteous and respectful	al the debaters were to opponents and judges
	Using the above criteria, please offer comeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	Prop 1: Alivers	Opp 1: 1000 Cose for notionalism close to dismonthing moral obligation hote crimes case weaker
	Prop 1: precise corefit delivery	class to dispersition, moral obligation
	good stromen of duty to profect correct - don't be fiscal only	la come case weaker
	correct - don't by fiscal only	1 Mar Color of peliver
	bekerme hot feverywhen	Stong, sometimes passional, selver
	Prop 2: good point dut ist world needs to part brilding corred on extremit of refge life	Opp 2: terror problem with religies andisquitable alundra of religies important
	refge life	largest that money bet light in
	•	news ariber good cape for notionalish
	TEAM CODE #: /5 on the	Prop or Opp) wins this debate.
	REASON FOR DECISION:	
	Very very close . Ofpo	siking wind on extraction of from
Conce	or of hatoral community is	Le Community of the second
Sic	er could not by dispell d	lespite making excellent bases themselves.

Arna Katewa (*21) Round 3A 1:30pm E2 Gov: 15 Lee - Peled Opp: 14 Bystrom - Gast JV Parli Debate			Judge's Name Judge's Schoo	: ARNA K1	MARIN HIGH
\mathbf{P}	ROP		anticial contract of the second of the secon	OPP /	erective and all masses are as a second
Team Code #:				e #:14	
Prop Speaker #1	Peled	pts <u>29</u>	Opp Speaker #1	Cast	pts9
Prop Speaker #2	Lee.	pts28	Opp Speaker #2	Bystrom	pts <u>29</u>
	30 = Pe = Good (but po	rfect 29 = 0 ssibly not goo		Very Good for elimination rou	
20-25 – Fair	24-20 =	Poor	<20 = Reserved	l for rude or inappr	opriate benavior
			ging Criteria		
offered durin Evidence: H evidence—w Argumentat by the other: Points of Int Delivery: Ho and easily un Courtesy: H Using the above each debater:	g the debate ow appropriate which may inclu ion: How direct side formation: Ho ow well the deb derstandable ow courteous a e criteria, pleas	ely and efficience facts and effects we relevant and effects speak in and respectful effects of the company of	ently the debaters references to authoritively the debater and effective were an an organized, coll the debaters were pliments and/or	support arguments nority as well as gets respond to the arthur questions and tommunicative styles to opponents and suggestions for in	s with meral knowledge rguments made the answers that is pleasant d judges inprovement to
Prop 1: Good put forth to well inth a length but and argume Prop 2: Good A little of the conta	vie coutes strong argu and prebutts had some wistobout To	Hone iments. al, a bit great point in case Lesitation	Strong of Rebuttal - Strong e Opp 2: Good	arguments. Very organize losing comme ! and thorous brong conten	a very well. contentions. ed, great refuted b ents. the refute,
REASON FOR DE	ECISION: 600	(Pi the leaw there	OPP wins the op or Opp) and well alear and	nis debate. however, stronger	llie arguments

Arna Katewa (*21)

Round 3B 1:30pm E2 Gov: 5 Jayasuriya - Schulz Opp: 23 Crenshaw - Bulger

JV Parli Debate

ARNA KATEWA Judge's Name:

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN HIGH

PROP	and an order of the	те — то протовет потовото по то боления и поставания в поставания в поставания в поставания в поставания в пос Поставания	OPP	\$\$\$\$ \$\$ \$\$\$(\$0.500000000000000000000000000000000
Team Code #:		Team Cod	de #:23	
Prop Speaker #1 Schulz	pts <u>29</u>	Opp Speaker #1	Bulger	_pts_29
Prop Speaker #2 Jayas wu'ya	- · ———		Crewshaw /	pts 29.
Please award each speaker poin	nts based o	on the following	scale:	COLOR COMMISSION CONTROL AND COLOR COMMISSION COMISSION COMMISSION
30 = Perf	ect 29 = 0	Outstanding 28	= Very Good	

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

26-25 = Fair24-20 = 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 and composed start.	Opp 1: You refuted very nicely mi
Strong contentions backed	1st affirmation case strong
up mui good examples. Good	contentions, that were packed up. Good analogy of candiel eyande.
up with good examples. Good point on Radicalization.	up. Good analogy of candier l'ayanier.
Rebuttal - Good points on your arguments but ful short on being assertine of the fend.	Rebuttal Good organization & chain of arguments. Very strong closing comments
Propagation of the fend.	Opp 2: Great oration, had good arguments,
Prop 2: Great slart, you had	Opp 2: great diversations by guing
some great arguments, but should have backed up	refuted the affirmations by guiling examples.
but should have backed up your argument feether.	'c '
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	

on the <u>OPP</u> wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp) TEAM CODE #:

REASON FOR DECISION: Both leans did great, however, the opposition than refuted the affermations very well, the and put fosting good examples for their contentions I finished stronger.

Ken-Stone (*16) Round 3A 1:30pm 13

Gov: 19 Rahman - Zhou Opp: 15 Steinberg - Zhou

JV Parli Debate

Judge's School Affiliation:

PROP OPP Team Code #: Team Code #: Opp Speaker #1_5 the berg Prop Speaker #1 Opp Speaker #2

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 ϕ imination rounds)

26-25 = Fair24-20 = 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 contract, where Strong argunat with 5001 thumoles -Herributtal was a bit less clear and did not distinguit enoyt from OTK. Prop 2: Responded nell to Pol raized earlier And closently for value of STEM. A lit contred at beginning, their sittled in-TEAM CODE #:_

Opp 1: Excellent presentation, chritical meaning of net benefit which helped ne whestend terms of debate. Railed good POI whill was not guit!
answered and be expressed footration at this.
The conject explanation of Oppis counter-glan

Opp 2: strong relatation, good reprix of evidence, good strategy - "he agree VITE PROPERTY

on the \mathcal{OPP} wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP was un strong in their comter plan and in railing critical grestions of Photoubonever grite laid out Their Clear plan. All wer civil, per though there was a dispute on tu Pols Very impressive, all around - excellent debate.

		PARLI Debate	
Ken Stone (*16) Round 3B 1:30pm I3 Gov: 23 Nearon - VonSosen		Judge's Name:	Chneider
Opp: 10 Wang - Lin JV Parli Debate	Olinia, and a second	Judge's School Affiliation:	Lowell
PROP Team Code #: 23	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	OPP Team Code #: \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	
Prop Speaker #1 NEA	<u>L</u> pts <u>29</u>	Opp Speaker #1	pts <u>27</u>
Prop Speaker #2_VA~\S	OFEN pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 WANG	pts <u>28</u>
Please award each sp	•	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good	T is
27 = Go 26-25 = Fair	od (but possibly not goo 24-20 = Poor	d enough to qualify for elimination of the description of the descript	
	Ind	ging Criteria	, N. D.
 Evidence: How a evidence—which Argumentation: by the other side Points of Inform: Delivery: How wand easily underst Courtesy: How contractions 	asonably and effective debate ppropriately and efficiency include facts and How directly and effectation: How relevant are lell the debaters speak is andable ourteous and respectful	ently the debaters analyze the top ently the debaters support arg references to authority as well ctively the debaters respond to and effective were the question in an organized, communication all the debaters were to oppone pliments and/or suggestions	uments with It as general knowledge the arguments made and the answers we style that is pleasant unts and judges
Prop 1: Excellent comprehensible, we argument. Rebot clear rettations revealed him as s think on his feet point dettly. Prop 2: Good rettetions (18,000 v. 800 Soud point, a	Il laid-out tel offerd of OPP god one one who can - Retred Isis but a bet the numbers opp) f made	costs of accepting not accomed y sin (Prop said ferman) that all contries somethat all contries some a good clear de Opp 2:	refiger, by did refiger, by tentions thou is 800 000 not should, neitel was thought, neitel was the refiel was gien tu mobel). their of net benefits good refitations, e in an appropriate counter-argument rell.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Nearon's presentation was very strong and he responded

thoughthing and intelligently to the OPP. All were generous
and courters, measured and thought fil.

Abbas Rangwala (*8)

Round 3A 1:30pm G5 Gov: 14 Vaisse - Scott

Opp: 23 Campagna - Mortensen

JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ABBAS RANGWALA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVH 3

	PROP ,		OPP	
Team Code #:	14		Team Code #:	
Prop Speaker #1	VAISSE	pts_30	Opp Speaker #1 CAM PA GNA	pts_ <u>2</u> 9
Prop Speaker #2	SCOTT	pts_ <u>29.</u> 5	Opp Speaker #2 MURTENSEN	pts 3 C
5 - 1 - 4 - 12 - 11 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 -				

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: VAISSE ANA — 5 EVI — 4.5 ARG — 5 POI — 5 OEL — 5 COV — Prop 2: SCOTT ANA — 5 EVI — 5 ARG — 4.5 POI — 5 COU — 5	Great July!	Opp 1: CAMPAGNA ANA — 5 EVI — 4.5 ARG — 4.5 POI — 5 COU — 5 Opp 2: MORTENSEN ANA — 5 EVI — 4.5 ARG — 5 POI — 5 COU — 5 PROP wins this debate.	Great Job! Pay a boit more attention on dress code!
LEAW CUIPE #:	<i>i —</i> on the	<i>i' Nur</i> wins this denate.	

REASON FOR DECISION:

PROP WON BY ASLIM MARGIN. BUTH TEAMS DID A CREAT JOB. COULD APPLY A BIT MORE ON KEY POINTS. TEAM OPP SHOULD FOULS ON DRESS CODE A BIT - IT TAKES AWAY IN CLOSE CALLS! GREAT JOB BOTH TEAMS!

(Prop or Opp)

Abbas Rangwala (*8)

Round 3B 1:30pm G5 Gov: 23 Vawter - Olson

Opp: 14 Bernstein - Jarmel-Schneider

JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ABBAS RANGWALA

Judge's School Affiliation: <u>DYHS</u>

Prop Speaker #1 Vawter pts 30 Opp Speaker #1 JARMEL-SCH. pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 0180n pts 29.5 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:

Prop 1: VAWTER

ANA — 45

EVI — 4.5

ARG — 5

POI — 5

DEL — 5

COV — 5

ANA — 4.5

EVI — 5

COV — 5

ANA — 4.5

EVI — 5

COV — 5

ANA — 4.5

EVI — 5

DEL — 5

ANA — 5

EVI — 5

DEL — 5

COV — 5

ARG — 5

POI — 5

ANA — 5

EVI — 5

ARG — 5

POI — 5

DEL — 5

COV — 5

TEAM CODE #:

(Prop or Opp)

Opp 1: JARMEL 2CH.

ANA — 5

EVI — 5

ARG — 5

POI — 5

DEL — 5

COV — 5

REASON FOR DECISION:

BOTH TEAMS DID AN OUTSTANDING JOB. IT'S A CLOSE CALL BUT TEAM OPP WON BY A SLIM MARGIN DUE TO BETTER REBUTTAL. BOTH TEAMS CAN DO A BIT BEFTER JOB OF COMING UP WITH MORE ROBUST POINTS - ONE OF WHICH IS WHAT HAPPENS FO ECONOMIES OF LOUNTRIES IF WE ALLOW BRAIN DRAIN LIKE GEMANY IS DOING!

Ritu Khurana (*10)
Round 3A 1:30pm G3
Gov: 14 Eng - Morgenstein
Opp: 23 Woerner - Miner
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: AShiSh Khurana

Judge's School Affiliation: Trivington High School

PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #: 23
Prop Speaker #1 Morgenstoin pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Weeney pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Ful pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Miner pts 28
Please award each speaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = 0	n the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ging Criteria
offered during the debate	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with
evidence—which may include facts and	references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
 Points of Information: How relevant an Delivery: How well the debaters speak is and easily understandable 	nd effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
• Courtesy: How courteous and respectful	I the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: - Crood presentation	Opp 1: Rescellent Besentation
Prop 1: - Crood presentation - list of assuments didn't wown't comprehensive Opp. had a field sun on your assume	-You just oversan peop team as your
worm't comprehensive Opp.	Obsuments.
had a field sun on your asfuma	tr-
Prop 2: - Good poesentation	Opp 2: - Excellent Brosentation
-focus on concentration of	-a little more structure in your
thoughts and ideas to present	presentation would help.
TEAM CODE #: on the	
(Pr REASON FOR DECISION:	op dr Opp)

Ritu Khurana (*10)
Round 3B 1:30pm G3
Cour 33 Radiana Banau

Gov: 23 Bodisco - Ransweiler

Opp: 3 Brogan - Modi JV Parli Debate Judge's Name: Ash Sh Khurang

Judge's School Affiliation: Tryington Hal School

PROP Team Code #: 23	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Bodis Co pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Boosan pts 30
Prop Speaker #2 Rons weifer pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Modi pts Z8
	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Ju	dging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts an Argumentation: How directly and efficient by the other side Points of Information: How relevant Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respects 	vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ciently the debaters support arguments with ded references to authority as well as general knowledge electively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers as in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
Prop 1: -Excellent Besentation - Very passionate pitch for Zerra posthon Some of the assuments dos the topic in limited scope. Prop 2: - Pexcellent presentation - Very impressive knowledge of american usas Counter to opp assument was weak	Stronger- Opp 2: - Crood Courter alguments. - Overall excellent presentation - collect your translits and structure your speech well for more impact. Opp wins this debate.
((Prop or Opp)
very belonced debate. Strong Some fines point	Both sides of work equally so helped opp. team.

Vivian Levy (*14) Round 3A 1:30pm E3 Gov: 27 Lavell - Cohen Opp: 6 Bonet - Stankus	Judge's Name: Levy VIVIII
JV Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: DWU -
PROP 27 Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Cohen of the pts	Opp Speaker #1 BONet pts 2
Prop Speaker #2	Opp Speaker #2 Stankus pts
	= Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
J	Judging Criteria
	tively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
 evidence—which may include facts at Argumentation: How directly and experience by the other side Points of Information: How relevanted the Delivery: How well the debaters spend easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respect 	- hot clear an ex or
alls majors is teacher.	-good at what on interceptancy
Prop 2:	Opp 2: what about tech jobs pay more
- Cold is some improvement	(thele 22.1.
TEAM CODE #: Cohen Lovell REASON FOR DECISION: 27	- 3000 pts on shuld value equally. The PNU wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)

Vivian Levy (*14) Round 3B 1:30pm E3 Gov: 16 Chou - Kim Opp: 17 Day - Shah JV Parli Debate		Judge's Name:	filiation:	Vivian owell-
PROP Team Code #:	New Britania Carania C	Team Code #:_	OPP \	CONTRACTOR STREET, THE CASE OF THE CONTRACTOR OF
Prop Speaker #1 Chau		Opp Speaker #1	Day	pts27
Prop Speaker #2	1 pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Shah.	pts <u>Z</u>
27 = Good (b	= Perfect 29 = Ou out possibly not good	the following scal atstanding 28 = Ver enough to qualify for <20 = Reserved for	ery Good r elimination rou	7
	Judgi	ing Criteria		
 Analysis: How reason offered during the debate Evidence: How approve evidence—which may Argumentation: How by the other side Points of Information Delivery: How well the and easily understanda Courtesy: How courte 	ate priately and efficient include facts and reducted include facts and reducted include facts and effects. How relevant and the debaters speak in the left include include include include in the left include inclu	ntly the debaters sureferences to authoritively the debaters real defective were the an organized, com	pport arguments ity as well as ge espond to the ar questions and t municative styl-	s with meral knowledge guments made the answers e that is pleasant
Using the above criteria, each debater:	please offer comp		_	aprovement to
Prop 1: CHOU clear, possivant voice Out-reliance in moral arg	uneur	Opp 1: Depart	IN MASSIU	rg - but could used.
mult mishineal examples of law argument somaled Prop 2: Kirl	like moraling	(h) a cept or	olmy of land threes) could SHDH.	have be bette duelliple
- need in develop - ele 3 small channel of orthogic in miral organ TEAM CODE #:	notury pats. Lest on the (Pro	- elaborat	g water to or occur debate. Glucys ha	phra religees mor a prediction le rema.

POPIC: High school should	Value Science, technological	Typichsinenz i math over s	liberalaxts humanties
Cathy Aguilera (*15) Round 3A 1:30pm E4 Gov: 10 Pandit - Mandal		me: Cathy Agulera	
Opp: 25 Stephens - Flanagan JV Parli Debate	Judge's Sch	nool Affiliation: Miramonte.	
Team Code #:	Team C	OPP 45	
Prop Speaker #1 Pandt	pts 30 Opp Speaker #1	stephens ps/27	
Prop Speaker #2 Manda	pts 29 Opp Speaker #2	Flanagan pts 27	
30	er points based on the followin = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28	B = Very Good	
-	ut possibly not good enough to qua 20 = Poor <20 = Reserv	lify for elimination rounds) ed for rude or inappropriate behavio	r
The state of the s	Judging Criteria		
Analysis: How reasons	0 0	analyze the topic and the arguments	
offered during the deba	te	/ · · · · · · ·	
	oriately and efficiently the debate		
	,	uthority as well as general knowledg ters respond to the arguments made	е
2001	ancony and onconvery and deca	nois respond to the digaments made	
		re the questions and the answers	
	, ,	, communicative style that is pleasan	t
and easily understanda	ous and respectful the debaters v	were to opponents and judges	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ous una respectiujulo acoutois v	vote to opponents una juages	
y fem Using the above criteria,	please offer compliments and/	or suggestions for improvement to	hanw China =
MA COOK debatem	benefit society as	A-good 1) good	rpowchina= levaleducto
	hole Mijobs Melva Opp 1: St	DEATER D. FT- 1000	Kst
A-great, analysis 2)	Jacob Proch Proch	D. anaddally 2) MO	be in oram
		C- good Note	nough IN
	CIDANY ON STATES	hish:	school W
o-Delivery good one, projection i ec c-apod hand hand gestures	econtacti living Keep um	" Gasifix to stud	ents morgood
ADJUM AIDIUC IONE	AST ACT-STEM, REP WITH	/ , / , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	TEMP
Prop 2: I Vanaal	Masin Based Opp 2: F	and Lung 1000 51169	s survive
1 and analysis	hich colors	14 2001 94	
	dut more chales A- 4000	I Vale in I WO	BM
A-Argumentation - Very good b	etter south p- good ev	of the contract of the contrac	billes
D-good hard gesture, tome, don't e	good good	LA LANKE C. [1] Ale	entales.
C- good TEAM CODE #:	on the win	s this debate. Capabilles 4) dis	K POHITES ?
REASON FOR DECISION:	(Prop br Opp)	-humanites law	e politics à degrees.
good evidence on	both parts but	undervalued.	
Prop delivery, a	nalysis i arguementat	iow was impressive	

Barrang of the year of home and of the standard brains and the ment of the life in Managate. TE CANAL ST the Million of the Mill The second of th Towns. In which Sign. KM Find Posts X Sillions in 826 11. Particular Company भ हेते हिन्द्रकेट हेता. भूगाहरू James 105 grade of JAP 100 ge The Stewart Anne Control of the C 1000 : 447 The part of which PROPERTY PROPERTY E Kanagaria De Trollycor. Association for the color "the street on bords and Envicement of the Control of the Con

10DIC: Wealthy	countries have	a moral, Obligat PARLI Debate	100 10 aceps	t Refusees from war Zones.
Cathy Aguilera (*15) Round 3B 1:30pm E4 Gov: 25 Hassan - Goody			hy Aguilera	
Opp: 10 Shingwekar - Vichare JV Parli Debate		Judge's School Affiliation:	Miramo	nte
PROI	25	OPF Team Code #:	,	- /
Prop Speaker #1 Hassa N	Each pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Shing We	kar pts 30) /
Prop Speaker #2	00 pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	ire pts 20	Ź
Please award each s		on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Goo	od /	
27 = Go 26-25 = Fair	ood (but possibly not go 24-20 = Poor	od enough to qualify for eliminated with the control of the contro	,	havior
	Jud	ging Criteria		
	easonably and effective	ely the debaters analyze the t	opic and the argun	nents
offered during th		ently the debaters support a	raumanta with	
	•• •	references to authority as w	•	vledge
 Argumentation: 		ctively the debaters respond		
by the other side	action. Uosy relayant a	nd effective were the question	and the engineer	
Courtesy: How Courtesy: How of Using the above cri	courteous and respectfo	in an organized, communica Il the debaters were to oppor	ا) nents and judges درو	cita voks
Using the above cri	teria, please offer con	pliments and/or suggestion	ib ioi iiiipio o ciiio	V VLIANY
each debater:	1) human Hees m 2) economy Germa		Ti () Means 2 rai	lefyeo isjust.
very Prop 1: 600dy		Opp 1 Evidence A exce	Hent 2) over population	Marron bjobs,
A-good analysis	un better would relate	. \\Assaula \\Y\ADM		
B = Excellent ansumentation	Ogreat future	vuls diplomatically PNC	relient B) refusees number by Sharing and protificatione, voice, great fone, voice, mand gostum	eye low act single
0-goodeye, toned h	and glestures. 5) ch	arin, is caring build human	good coures b	_
C-good Prop.2: Propage H	astan Maral obligation	Cruova	1) 5	ocial Contract
A - very good analysis	mind set	A-		al their own,
E- good evidence A-chellent orgumentation	/ Overpopulation futor.	wota & excellent exit	<u>kuementation</u>	attrens regard
P- NO POI b- good eye contact, hand			ntact Hone	values opinions of own citers
(- 9000 TEAM CODE #	on the	OPP C- 300A wins this debate.		first -
•	(I	Prop or Opp		economy Nothing do
REASON FOR DECIS	i e	,		~ [MUI OU OUT (MICH
very strong dek	had siles	More evidence	Ą	financial military
are summer to the summer of	n inth diaco			over L gave period.
on opposition	. Great job	Doll 10011	3 , 5,	•

Commence in a new commence of the second stay of the Killamonk · Alexand Maring. The same of the sa ाजकार अधिकार १ To have Donot to local commence of the first Grego West from The form of the state of the st CHERRY RESERVE Covering and in and in the same 40 A WARY PROPERTY. Complete Lines Carpanyon, and Colors of Colors, Marc ordered and the meson of Co Sylver of Services of Astron of Services o evy specificaci. Erect jeb bellisterne

Sophia Burshteyn (*3) Round 3A 1:30pm G2 Gov: 14 Kwong - Tan Opp: 10 Yang - Ho JV Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Sophia BURSHIESTA Judge's School Affiliation: BENILE IN
Kide Addition 1997 Control of the Co	SOME AND AND THE STATES OF THE
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Tom pts 27	,
Prop Speaker #2 Kwong pts 27	7 Opp Speaker #2/9009 pts 29
Please award each speaker points base	ed on the following scale:
	= Outstanding 28 = Very Good
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 /= Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jı	ludging Criteria
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	tively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
	ficiently the debaters support arguments with
	and references to authority as well as general knowledge effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	receivery the debaters respond to the arguments made
,	nt and effective were the questions and the answers
	ak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Courtesy: How courteous and respect	ctful the debaters were to opponents and judges
-	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
Prop 1:	Opp 1: put stouding speaker,
Prop 1: 90 0 d & peopler consistent plan with relevant evidences	Opp 1: out extouding speaker, stoong & contoutions, good good evidence is
with relevant	good evidence se
/evidenels	
Prop 2:	14 0 - 2
Prop 2: full, strong augui	ment Opp 2. Kelevant POI, strong
	ment Opp 2: relevant POI, strong flow and support for part ner.
. 0	/\frac{1}{2}
TEAM CODE #:On th	ne UVV wins this debate.
DD LOON FOR DEGRACE.	(Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	
Hump co	ase **
' \	

Sophia Burshteyn (*3) Round 3B 1:30pm G2 Gov: 15 Barbir - Deng Opp: 21 Fields - Gersh JV Pai

Judge's Name: SOPHIA BURSHIEW

READILEYA)

rli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
Team Code #: PROP 15	OPP 2 /
Prop Speaker #1 Den 9	pts 1 Opp Speaker #1 Fields pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Barbin	pts 18 Opp Speaker #2 Gersh pts 18
Please award each speaker poin	AND
	bly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Po$, , ,
	Judging Criteria
• Analysis: How reasonably and offered during the debate	d effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	and efficiently the debaters support arguments with
	e facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
	y 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 debate	ers speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and	d respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please each debater:	offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: good presentation solid containts	ou, Opp 1: good speakeri
"in points	
Prop 2:	pport good communication;
TEAM CODE #:	on the <u>PROP</u> wins this debate.
TEAM CODE #.	(Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	
8+40mg	case and rebutting relevant impa and originates more than meg convincting more than meg
	convincing more ments.

Cindy Bulger (*23) Round 3A 1:30pm I1	Judge's Name: <u>Cindy Bulger</u>
Gov: 11 Tong - fung Opp: 14 Stroumza - Chen	, ,
JV Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramm Valley
PROP ,	OPP /.
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Fung pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 CNe pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Tong pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 St/vum7 a pts 24
Please award each speaker points based or	n the following scale:
	outstanding 28 / Very Good
	d enough to quadify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Inda	ring Cuitoria
	ing Criteria y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficie	ently/the debaters support arguments with
_ _	references to authority as well as general knowledge
	tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
• Points of Information: How relevant an	d effective were the questions and the answers
• Delivery: How well the debaters speak in	n 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 compeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: You repeated a few of	Opp 1: Good use of examples
Your points several time This	and nili speaking style,
time and have been bethe	
spent developing the ideas	
or sound lad later here!	
Prop 2: I don't mind a fast	Opp 2: Show a lette more confidence
speaker but make sive you	
Prints are well images out	Vin had some good pourts.
and not hard to follow	
TEAM CODE #:\\ on the A	FF wins this debate.
	op or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	
	ucussfulness of the students tred to the
Newtonter of Jobs in Ju bi	otechand related fields as well as the
In creased equelity between me	n & women in the work force I let the

Att position on increased emphasis in The steat fields was better.

Cindy Bulger (*23) Round 3B 1:30pm I1 Gov: 10 Dara - Randeri Opp: 14 Huang - Luc JV Parli Debate
Team Code #:

Judge's Name:_	andy	Bulger	
_	- 1		

rli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: San Rausn Valley
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Rander a pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Huana pts 2
Prop Speaker #2 DW pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 LuC pts/
	utstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination younds)
Judg	ing Criteria
 Evidence: How appropriately and efficie evidence—which may include facts and r Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater: 	references to authority as well as general knowledge cively the debaters respond to the arguments made deffective were the questions and the answers an an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges bliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
use your bill of you time to make your prints	Opp 1: You made some very good points. Thy and project a bit more confidence into your speaking style
Prop 2: Great less of the and very effective yer of body language and local condence white making your prints	Opp 2: Mile speaking style. You were able to refuse must of what they saw in the time allated.
,	wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	op or Opp)

This is a big topic to tackle in as minutes of study time and I Commend both states in a Job well done the AFF wom because with their value prop being somable welfare it is hard to argue that refugers drived by lat in their home countries which have times into zone,

3A 1:30pm l2 11 Nour - Kuo 24 Lacombe - Appel ırli Debate	Judge's Name: Dona Kanacke Judge's School Affiliation: MONTADMOM
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #: 24
Prop Speaker #1 KUO pts	
Prop Speaker #2 pts	Opp Speaker #2 Appo pts 27
	29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
 evidence—which may include fact Argumentation: How directly and by the other side Points of Information: How releved Delivery: How well the debaters so and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectively. 	efficiently the debaters support arguments with ts and references to authority as well as general knowledge d effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made want and effective were the questions and the answers speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant pectful the debaters were to opponents and judges r compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
Prop 1: Workon eye conte H possible	opp 1: Vary polite, good eye correct, tempor + Modulation. Poised,
Avoiro disverpent	
Prop 2: Emphatic +	Opp 2: Avoir disrespectful tone
Prop 2: Emphatic + Prop 2: Emphatic +	opp 2: Avoir disrespectful tone of voice / \ >nguzer - or
Prop 2: Emphabic +	Opp 2: Avoir divrespectful tone of voice / 1 successe - or where prétation et l'excellent prosent
Prop 2: Emphatic + Prop 2: Emphatic + These is without or allo emotionalism	Opp 2: Avoir disrespectful tone of voice / \sugarse - or

omery Judge 1 (*17) ^{1:30pm 12} Carver - Garcia Lee - Fairchild Debate	Judge's Name: DWN Clenblu Judge's School Affiliation: Mentagen
PROP Team Code #: 23	OPP Team Code #: \(\frac{4}{4} \)
Prop Speaker #1 CAOVOV pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 FAICHIL pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 GARUA pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 <u>a pts 26</u>
	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
.Inc	dging Criteria
 Evidence: How appropriately and effice evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant a Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectified 	ciently the debaters support arguments with direferences to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant full the debaters were to opponents and judges Inpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: Sold probablished Skills Curl Contect time / use of the content of
	Opp 2: Slow clown Abilt Strive-to A Smoother presentation. Prop of Opp) Wins this debate. Prop of Opp)

Prop Speaker #2 <u>Barn Steth</u> pts <u>9</u> Please award each speaker points based on 30 = Perfect 29 = Or 27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	utstanding 28 = Very Good denough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior ing Criteria y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments onthy the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge
Prop Speaker #1 <u>Jarmel-Shneider</u> Prop Speaker #2 <u>Barmster'n</u> pts <u>Jar</u> Please award each speaker points based on 30 = Perfect 29 = On 27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	Opp Speaker #1
Prop Speaker #2 <u>Farn Fe(h</u> pts) 1 Please award each speaker points based on 30 = Perfect 29 = Or 27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	Opp Speaker #2
Please award each speaker points based on 30 = Perfect 29 = Or 27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good denough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior ing Criteria y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments onthy the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge
$30 = Perfect 29 = Or$ $27 = Good (but possibly not good$ $26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	utstanding 28 = Very Good denough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior ing Criteria y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments onthy the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge
.Indo	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge
	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge
 Evidence: How appropriately and efficiency evidence—which may include facts and revidence—which may include facts and respective to the other side Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater: 	d effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges the components and judges oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Jarmel-Schneider great pace of the great wrap-inp	opp 1: Nour very good pacing dege contact- on improvement would be to meet more on judged not look at opposed ont window
Prop 2: Bernstein great pace of fore great pace of fore Excellent job outlining resultations of terating Prop Side points. Stepping Store to to not say something like stepping Store to to not say something like stepping store to this weakens cale.	Opp 2: Kldd great pace of thre great good organization great call on Poo
TEAM CODE #: on the	or Opp)
DEACON FOR DECICION.	_
arguments, excelle	Largements, Stronger at organization,

Susan Stephan (*15) Round 4B 3:30pm E2 Gov: 6 Bonet - Stankus Opp: 23 Carver Sarcis JV Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>Stephan</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Mira monte</u>
PROP	Team Code #: 23
Prop Speaker #1 <u>S. Bone</u> +	pts 27 Opp Speaker #1 6. Carver pts 27 John
Prop Speaker #2_S, Stankus	pts_37 Opp Speaker #2 6, Carver ptspts
30 = Peri	nts based on the following scale: fect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good sibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
 offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately evidence—which may included Argumentation: How direct by the other side Points of Information: How Delivery: How well the debat and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous are conditional contractions. 	and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments y and efficiently the debaters support arguments with de facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge ely and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made y relevant and effective were the questions and the answers atters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Prop 1: Boret -very good pacing a ye want to remember to your intonation as thi seem not as respectful Prop 2: Stankus - very good pacing	to watch opp 1: Carver speed of egg contact so watch opposed of egg contact so can in expanding your
TEAM CODE #:	on the wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)
Den	Her arguments a organization,

Evan Hubinger Round 4A 3:30pm G4 Gov: 21 Fields - Go Opp: 5 Johnson - N JV Parli Debate	ersh	Judge's Name: Evan Judge's School Affiliation:	Hubinger Senthey
Team Code	PROP #:2	Team Code #:	Grand Contract Annual Contract
Prop Speak	er#1 Noah Gersh pts Z.	7.5 Opp Speaker #1 Mageleine	Murphytis 28,5
		6.3pp Speaker #2 Maia John	•
Please aw 26-25 = 1	27 = Good (but possibly not	ed on the following scale: 9 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good t good enough to qualify for elimination <20 = Reserved for rude or in	•
	•	Judging Oriteria	
offere Evide evider Argum by the Point Delive and ea	sis: How reasonably and effected during the debate nce: How appropriately and effected. Which may include facts mentation: How directly and effected other side sof Information: How relevants of the side with the debaters specially understandable	ectively the debaters analyze the topic officiently the debaters support argument and references to authority as well are frectively the debaters respond to the total and effective were the questions are ak in an organized, communicative ectful the debaters were to opponent	ments with as general knowledge he arguments made and the answers e style that is pleasant
each debined the Prop 1: (.) Thent the result think, how of your	ood job redizion per job per j	wen an any show and lead being show only opp 2: the wording very strong very strong we have the wording of the wordings	iob recognizing west ves comeded, ry impacet analysis sust beep in mind of the resolution. enguments and a good structured a good structured.
	retrons, to con	he Opp wins this debate. The proportion of the p	re flow. Also vertically in mind the wondry resolution.

Evan Hubinger (*3 Round 4B 3:30pm G4 Gov: 23 Campagna - M	•		Judge's Name: <u>En</u>	un s	Julinger
Opp: 14 Tran - Vainber JV Parli Debate			Judge's School Affiliation	Ra	nfley
Team Code #:	PROP	the the second s	O] Team Code #:	PP Ł	and the six of the second beginning and the second of the second
Prop Speaker #1	Mortenson	pts_ <u>2\$</u> ,50	pp Speaker #1		_pts_Z&
Prop Speaker #2	Campagna	pts_ <u>7.7</u> .5	Opp Speaker #2_VAINBE	Po	pts
Please award			the following scale: standing 28 = Very G	ood	
26-25 = Fair	27 = Good (but po	ssibly not good	enough to qualify for elim 20 = Reserved for rude	ination roun	7
		Judgii	ng Criteria		
•	How reasonably ring the debate	and effectively	the debaters analyze the	e topic and	the arguments
 Evidence: 	How appropriate	=	tly the debaters support	_	
			ferences to authority as vely the debaters respon		
by the oth		city and effecti	very the debaters respon	id to the arg	guments made
• Points of	Information: Ho		effective were the ques		
	How well the del understandable	baters speak in	an organized, communi	cative style	that is pleasant
•		and respectful t	he debaters were to opp	onents and	judges
		_			
Using the aboreach debater	· •	se offer compl	iments and/or suggesti	ions for im	provement to
		ı	11504	から	
Prop 1: 6 6	od strut	egiz	9pp 1: I really	like	the count
shring to	focus on	crime 1	plan - it	nces	a yood
d por cycle	8, and v	reni /	Stritegiz O	DTP	it just here
proneg ceryan	entaction	and/	to be link	ad la	ede to the
Etutation.	·	/	Drap Do	₩I	
	ed 106 od	wood aran.	Opp 2: 15 OPP 8tale Lychules	1100	
flo (Dento	r- 0/000 to		8tula i valita	1000	good spec
the counter	incli	Y 10 1	0 7		wong () ca
very tricky	west the	colution	2nd Of	T GOOD	d crawent
THIN TEAM CODE	#: 7.3	on the	POA wins this debat		Illust 2 10 A
Mor pan	<u> </u>	on the (Pro	Prof wins this debate or Opp) I nal () s of outweigh	thme	1095, 7 10pc
REASON FOR	DECISION:		1 m on	sver	To cost tr
of wms	on the	il Exte	rnal (!)s of	- crit	ne and for
e poverty	cycle,	Which	outweigh	tho	net love
a harr cor	and cons	2001 /-	aunter-Alam	مأحمد	- the sine as

	1 AICH Devate
Emma Sutton (*12) Round 4A 3:30pm 12 Gov: 15 Steinberg - Zhou Opp: 16 Chou - Kim	Judge's Name: E. Sutton
JV Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: 15 K (11)
Prop Speaker #2 Prop Speaker #	OPP Team Code #: Opp Speaker #1 Opp Speaker #2 pts 28
	The second secon
	ed on the following scale: = Outstanding 28 = Very Good good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
J	Judging Critéria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effect offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and effective evidence—which may include facts at a Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant Delivery: How well the debaters spending and easily understandable 	tively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ficiently the debaters support arguments with and references to authority as well as general knowledge effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers tak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant efful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer ceach debater:	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Veed to get your facts Streight, but good job angua Recellent wer of Poil to the Question credibility of Dandy Statement Prop 2: Liked the Star Wass analogy but you dropped an lot- Be more wary in Poil be careful what you's	Argument that because no violence has Argument that because no violence has happened yet = none will happen is illogical. Unclear when a few deaths" crosses into Wational Security rook."
REASON FOR DECISION: AH h	\wedge

ta
Yaci
: دادمو(
COM
alia comment - often consideral racist
1
COM
Scalia
رن
ret was
المارمي
4

Emma Sutton (*12) Round 4B 3:30pm I2 Gov: 14 Huang - Luc

Opp: 11 Tong - fung JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: E. Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: <u>JSHS</u>(1)

Team Code #:	PROP L	}	Team Cod	OPP e #:	1) /
Prop Speaker #1	Huang	_ pts_27	Opp Speaker #1	Fung	pts\delta
Prop Speaker #2	Luc	_pts	Opp Speaker #2_	Tons	pts 2

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: Vice delivery & pacity Need to explaining judging

Opp 1: Lots of great points but Somewhat disjointed. Vecato explain butter how prints apply to

Prop 2: Proposed some contical
issues. Theis always something
to say in respond. Did not
address issue of accessively

Opp 2: Cook job hotting all points to highlighting when att drapped.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Negative, you came across as elitist suches. Duly aich people can get into college anyway, so who cares about many - put - aft dropped it! Aft, you could have made them look how the AH also dropped constitutionally argument (outside the

Matt Petruska (*27) Round 4A 3:30pm G2 Gov: 24 Lacombe - Appel	Judge's Name: MAH Petruska Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High School
Opp: 14 Eng - Morgenstein JV Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Winclsor High School
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Lacouse pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Morgenstein pts 28.5
Prop Speaker #2 APP& pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 EV9 pts 27
27 = Good (but possibly not good	utstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rade or inappropriate behavior
	ing Criteria y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	ntly the debaters support arguments with eferences to authority as well as general knowledge ively the debaters respond to the arguments made
 Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable 	d effective were the questions and the answers and organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: txcelent delivery, very (t) concise a clear.	Opp 1: (+) very persuasive in contentias and with arguments. This especially came through in rebutal. Courteaus. Clear & concise delivery. Creat
Prop 2: (+) Cont Argumentation continued debate and longing personsive contention to OPP 1	Speaker
TEAM CODE #: 14 on the	wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	op or Opp)
this was a very close debate.	

Matt Petruska (*27) Judge's Name: Matt Petruska Round 4B 3:30pm G2 Gov: 14 Lee - Fairchild Opp: 10 Dara - Randeria Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High School JV Parli Debate **PROP** Team Code #: Team Code #: Prop Speaker #1 Opp Speaker #1 Prop Speaker #2 Fair chil c Opp Speaker #2 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 = Fair24-20 = 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: / clear and Relinery was concinse. Persuasive Prop 1: Opp 1: (+) Counteous & clec-Prop 2: Bent Specker, Very Articulate Opp 2: (+) A good a direct response to debaters

Prop 2 & Prop 1 briaging continuing debate

through signamon total and smallysis of

topic in continuing debate. Excelent (+) Excelent use of Argumentation responding to contentias & refunctions during desate of of 1. very Clear & encise delivery. Very on the NT **TEAM CODE #:** wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: The OPP related the contentions strong and they were more prepared for their specific arguements. Good personsive of clear Arguements

yun Shang (*6) Ind 4A 3:30pm G3			Judge's Name: Yun Shang
v: 14 Liu - Fu			Judge's Name:
p: 23 Vawter - Olson Parli Debate			Judge's School Affiliation: Lampo lindo HS
	ROP	The second section of the section of	OP/P
Team Code #:	,		Team Code #: 23
Prop Speaker #1	2iu	pts28	Opp Speaker #1 Olsen pts 29 Opp Speaker #2 Nawter pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Fu	pts2 <u>%</u>	Opp Speaker #2 Nawter pts 27
Please award ea	ch speaker j	points based	on the following scale:
25			Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = 26-25 = Fair		possibly not god = Poor	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
		1001	20 Special contract of mapping comments
- 4 3			lging Cylteria
• Analysis: Ho offered durin		y and effective	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	•	ately and effic	ciently the debaters support arguments with
	-		d references to authority as well as general knowledge
• Argumentat by the other s		rectly and effe	ecfively the debaters respond to the arguments made
•		/	/
 Points of Inf 	formation: H	łow relevant <i>f</i> a	and effective were the questions and the answers
• Delivery: Ho	ow well the d	lebaters speak	and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
• Delivery: Ho and easily un	ow well the d derstandable	lebaters speak	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
Delivery: Ho and easily unCourtesy: H	ow well the daderstandable ow courteous	lebaters speak ; s and respectfi	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
Delivery: Ho and easily unCourtesy: H	ow well the daderstandable ow courteous	lebaters speak ; s and respectfi	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
 Delivery: Ho and easily un Courtesy: H Using the above each debater: 	ow well the daderstandable ow courteous	lebaters speak s s and respectfo ease offer con	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges inpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
 Delivery: Ho and easily un Courtesy: H Using the above each debater: 	ow well the diderstandable ow courteous ecriteria, ple	lebaters speak s and respectfor ease offer con	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges inpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
 Delivery: Ho and easily un Courtesy: H Using the above each debater: 	ow well the diderstandable ow courteous ecriteria, ple	lebaters speak s and respectfor ease offer con	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges inpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: ** Clearly illustrated Contentions ** Strong rebutted on not a prime
• Delivery: Ho and easily un • Courtesy: H Using the above each debater: Prop 1: ** Re l " We	ow well the diderstandable ow courteous criteria, ple	lebaters speak s and respectfor ease offer con	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges Inpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: * Clearly illustrated (antentions) * Strong rebuttal on not a primal issue for US government
• Delivery: Ho and easily un • Courtesy: H Using the above each debater: Prop 1: * Reb " We have	ow well the diderstandable ow courteous criteria, ple	lebaters speak s and respectfor ease offer con	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges inpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: * Clearly illustrated (artentions * Strong rebuttal on not a prime issue for US government
• Delivery: Ho and easily un • Courtesy: H Using the above each debater: Prop 1: ** Cleater to the courtesy of the courtesy of the courtesy: H Using the above each debater: Prop 2: ** Reb	ow well the diderstandable ow courteous criteria, ple	ebaters speak s and respectful ease offer con ease offer con address efue opp's	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges Inpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: * Clearly illustrated (intentions) * Strong rebuttal on not a primal issue for US government Opp 2: * Opp 1: * Opp 2: * Op
• Delivery: Ho and easily un • Courtesy: H Using the above each debater: Prop 1: Reb " Wo had Prop 2: # Goo	ow well the diderstandable ow courteous criteria, ple	lebaters speak s and respectful ease offer con lease of peaceful	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges Inpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: * Clearly illustrated Contentions * Strong rebutted on not a primal issue for Us government Opp 2: * Strong refute on Prop's points were
• Delivery: Ho and easily un • Courtesy: H Using the above each debater: Prop 1: Reb Reb Prop 2: * Goo Prof Coul	ow well the diderstandable ow courteous criteria, ple crit	lebaters speak s and respectful ease offer con Zell (Intention	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges Inpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: ** Cleady illustrated Contentions ** Strong rebuttal on not a primal issue for US government Opp 2: ** Strong refute on Prop's points us based on inwhat if in projections ** Strong refute on this issue is no
• Delivery: Ho and easily un • Courtesy: H Using the above each debater: Prop 1: Reb Reb Prop 2: * Goo Prof Coul	ow well the diderstandable ow courteous criteria, ple crit	lebaters speak s and respectful ease offer con Zell (Intention	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges Inpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: ** Cleady illustrated Contentions ** Strong rebuttal on not a primal issue for US government Opp 2: ** Strong refute on Prop's points us based on inwhat if in projections ** Strong refute on this issue is no
• Delivery: Ho and easily un • Courtesy: H Using the above each debater: Prop 1: Reb Reb Prop 2: * Goo Prof Coul	ow well the diderstandable ow courteous criteria, ple crit	lebaters speak s and respectful ease offer con Zell (Mention Zel	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges Inpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: ** Cleady illustrated Contentions ** Strong rebuttal on not a primal issue for US government Opp 2: ** Strong refute on Prop's points us based on inwhat if in projections ** Strong refute on this issue is no
• Delivery: Ho and easily un • Courtesy: H Using the above each debater: Prop 1: Reb Reb Prop 2: Goo Prof Coul	wwell the diderstandable ow courteous criteria, ple criteria, ple criteria, ple criteria, ple criteria coula di evidance fest became di add me put content 23	lebaters speak s and respectful ease offer con Zell (Mention Zel	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant in the debaters were to opponents and judges Inpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: * Cleady illustrated Cartentions * Strong rebuttal on not a primi issue for US government Opp 2: * Strong refute on Prop's points we besid on "What if" projections * Strong refute on this issue is no

he WSFG Should & Guarantee	Citizens to Free Higher Zolucation PARLI Debate
uyun Shang (*6) und 4B 3:30pm G3 ov: 23 Woerner - Miner	Judge's Name: Yun Shang
pp: 11 Nour - Kue - 25 Hassan - Goody Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Jun Shang Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo 45
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Woerne- pts	Opp Speaker #1 Goody pts_
Prop Speaker #2 Mine pts	Opp Speaker #2 Hassan pts
Please award each speaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = 0	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	ging Criteria
 evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant at Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful Using the above criteria, please offer comeach debater: 	ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges apliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
(Elaboration of contentions Sounded not necessary— repetitative) * Strong rebuttal on unclearly Prop 2: explained counted plan by opp's toam * Refuted all the points in opp's contention * Could have refute the "Count TEAM CODE #: on the REASON FOR DECISION:	proposed * Strong rebuttal Opp 2: * Great point people may pay more tax to got the free education * Good eated that USFG & is Still from
9	great refute! Fabular sporkers!

Katrina Fehring (*21) Round 4A 3:30pm I3 Gov: 10 Yang - Ho Opp: 23 Nearon - VonSosen		Judge's Name: TAYDEEP	
JV Parli Debate		Judge's School Affiliation: #	1)
PR Team Code #:	OP 10	OPP Team Code #: <u># 2 3</u>	THE PROPERTY OF CHIEF CONTROL AND ASSESSED ASSESSED.
Prop Speaker #1	140 pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 NEARON	pts_ <u>28</u>
Prop Speaker #2	YANG _ pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 NEARON	pts_ <i>27</i>
		Outstanding $\sqrt{28}$ = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds.	
			•
		ging griteria	
 Evidence: How evidence—white the other side by the other side of the points of Information of the courtesy: How and easily under the courtesy: How are courtesy: How	the debate w appropriately and efficition may include facts and on: How directly and effectle rmation: How relevant and well the debaters speak the erstandable w courteous and respectful	ely the debaters analyze the topic and tently the debaters support argument references to authority as well as gottively the debaters respond to the and effective were the questions and in an organized, communicative stylulation that the debaters were to opponents and pliments and/or suggestions for in	ts with eneral knowledge rguments made the answers le that is pleasant d judges
Prop 1: Escellent information anderguois	delivery the some of the not felwant and belivery Passion equinent not	Effective Orig	al. and effective
TEAM CODE #:	23 on the (P) (P) (SISION:	OPP wins this debate. rop or Opp) the relevant supporter	materials.

Katrina Fehring (*21) Round 4B 3:30pm 13 Gov: 14 Stroumza - Chen	Judge's Name: Dr. JAYDEEP SIWHA
Opp: 19 Rahman - Zhou JV Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: # 13
PROP Team Code #: 14.	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Chem pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 <u>Rahmar</u> pts <u>27</u>
Prop Speaker #1 <u>Chem</u> pts <u>27</u> Prop Speaker #2 <u>Stroum 2 a</u> pts <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #2 Lhow pts <u>27</u>
Please award each speaker points based on 30 = Perfect 29 = Ou 27 = Good (but possibly not good)	utstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
 Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficiency evidence—which may include facts and r Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful 	d effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
Prop 1: Good delwing Point of information Sometime Self Contradictory Prop 2: Great delaviery Clear messaging and argument TEAM CODE #:	Opp 1: Good start and initial arguments. Inconsistent after gelley distracted for the positive with superporting information of the positive of and points of informations and covoided questions of the courtsey and covoided questions of the positive of the courtsey and covoided questions of the positive of the courtsey and covoided questions of the covoided questions
(Pro	op or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	argument

		PARLI Deb	ate	
Jesse MacKinnon (*5) Round 4A 3:30pm E4 Gov: 15 Lin - Hu Opp: 14 Kwong - Tan	~	Judge's Name:	4 Brown	<u> </u>
JV Parli Debate		Judge's School Affilia	ution:/ (anno	15,20
PROP Team Code #: 1 \$			ØPP . J	e Williad (1995) en profet in 2004
		Team Code #:	17	
Prop Speaker #1	pts_ <u></u> 8	Opp Speaker #1	1.5 pts	<u>2</u> 7
Prop Speaker #2 H w	pts <i></i>	Opp Speaker #2	<u> </u>	ts <u>28</u>
Please award each speaker po			ezen (h.). Eskis (ozene) (h.). eta	eursteelkur
		outstanding 28 = Very		
27 - Good (but pos) 26-25 = Fair $24-20 =$		d enough to qualify for el < 20 = Reserved for ru		te behavior
	T J			
• Analysis: How reasonably a	•	ying Criteria v the debaters analyze	the tonic and the s	irgiiments
offered during the debate		y the debaters unaryze	are topic and the a	irguments
• Evidence: How appropriate				
evidence—which may inclu	,	•	_	
• Argumentation: How direct	ctly and effec	tively the debaters resp	ond to the argume	nts made
by the other sidePoints of Information: How	w relevant ar	nd effective were the an	estions and the an	cwerc
• Delivery: How well the deb				
and easily understandable		918		io prouduit
• Courtesy: How courteous	and respectful	the debaters were to o	pponents and judg	es
Using the above criteria, pleas	se offer com	oliments and/or sugge	stions for improv	ement to
each debater:		p	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Prop 1: 6 00 2 30 / 1001 3	וזיי ליינאניי	Popp 1: (12.)	culi for	non dia
the hove benefited from lone of the time of gy his.	nore			
Marie Niu finish - ex	ne cially	eye contests to	-4-6-14	41 14
king alon # of 94 his	(400)	argumas +	10 (00	
	C	Macht. Good	10 2010)	6 HCA+1 1
		produs VI.	resell-37	
، دوره ام کے دیے Prop 2:	2~	Opp 2: FHIH	: + lively	argumbs
Prop 2: Lood English of	hedit	Style. Ars.	1 2 2 2 char	الماء لم
on Concress examples of	-0 ~ n a / Y	1 6		
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ť'	Jose Gar Was	n ww	great!
	on the	ορ wins this deb	ate.	
TEAM CODE #:				
TEAM CODE #: 14	On the(Pr	op or Opp)		
REASON FOR DECISION.	(Pi	op or Opp)		1
	(Pi	op or Opp)		Mes

Jesse MacKinne Round 4B 3:30pm E4 Gov: 3 Brogan - Mod Opp: 27 Lavell - Coh JV Parli Debate	li				iation: Ca	Browhando Logol Jalo	<u>/_/</u> -
Team Code #	PROP		Тез	ım Code #:	OPP 2 5	7-	
		-					
	#1 Broska pts					pts_ <u>27</u>	
Prop Speaker	#2	<u> 28</u> c	Opp Speak	er #2	vell	pts_26	
Please awa 26-25 = Fa	30 = Perfect 27 = Good (but possibly air 24-20 = Poor	29 = Outs	standing nough to	28 = Very qualify for e	y Good elimination re	ounds) propriate behav	vior
		Judgin	g Criter	ria			
offered Eviden evidence Argum by the co Points Deliver and eas Courte	is: How reasonably and enduring the debate ce: How appropriately and enduring the debate ce—which may include farentation: How directly and ther side of Information: How release of Information: How release ily understandable sy: How courteous and relabove criteria, please off	d efficient cts and refective evant and capeak in a	the debate	baters supp to authority lebaters res were the quized, comme	port argument as well as a pond to the uestions and unicative stropponents as	nts with general knowle arguments mad the answers yle that is pleas	dge le sant
each debat	_					-	
Prop 1: 6 hell o-sanit rsumbs.	seed by Control.		vey	(acti	on John to Con Ar	when a co	irsunda nuch Use
Prop 2: 6 lay points,	especially equa	s . l . l . l . l . l . l . l . l . l .	0050	N)u sinht,	Deliny	Scholors needs n es off as	Lip One
TEAM CO	DE #:3	on the	م م	wins this de	bate.		
	OR DECISION: Be 47	(Prop	or Opp)			nesits.	

Robert Lustig (*14) Round 4A 3:30pm E5 Gov: 25 Stephens - Flanagan Opp: 5 Jayasuriya - Schulz JV Parli Debate	Judge's Name: W376 Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell.
Team Code #: PROP	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Flangan pts 24	Opp Speaker #1 Jaining pts 77
Prop Speaker #2 51, hers pts 2	D. Opp Speaker #2 5chilty. pts 26
	= Outstanding 28 = Very Good
$26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria /
 Analysis: How reasonably and effect offered during the debate 	tively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and ef	ficiently the debaters support arguments with
	and references to authority as well as general knowledge
• Argumentation: How directly and e by the other side	effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
▼	nt and effective were the questions and the answers
	eak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and respe	ctful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer ceach debater:	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Only 1000 This could	Opp 1: agree This word a recomme -
a luce to Noth security is it	the think the transfer of the state of the s
Gort witerferes, someono shes, and	but not a treat ASNOOD SECURITY
If This took place on non gov's M Prop 2: 900 & would where to	operly rights:
A The Took places of the Teleste	wolve. & They have trans regio Ittella !
· This is a "Three I be Two to Not	1 reging 5001 pointy.
The Roce found tony army This to	The Scale-duesn't me the - lot in
Bothioto was records or que	ent. motesta block Traffic - Theto met to
TEAM CODE #: on the	ent. Scale-due ind me the - lots of motor to block to the the most to met to me
REASON FOR DECISION: pot unate	Q, The applied not prove its care as
to why Their was a Thoot of	2, The affidid not prove its coilas.
be fact The possibility of es	by To Negetwon

Robert Lustig (*14) Round 4B 3:30pm E5 Judge's Name: Gov: 27 Manni - Brown Opp: 10 Pandit - Mandal JV Parli Debate Judge's School Affiliation: PROP A Team Code #: Team Code #: Prop Speaker #1 Opp Speaker #1 Prop Speaker #2 Opp Speaker #2 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) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior 26-25 = Fair24-20 = Poor**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: does it how it 1.0 **TEAM CODE #:** on the wins this debate. Lead with the money of the

AY		FARLI Debate
Shingwekar (*10)	
ind 4A 3:30pm E3	, •••	Judge's Name: UD HY SHINGTON HIGH
v: 17 Day - Shah p: 15 Barbir - Deng		TONIAL TOAL HIGH
Parli Debate		Judge's School Affiliation:
ggilde 1918-1919 (No Loverine accompag	PŖOP	OPP
Team Code #:	17	Team Code #: 15
Prop Speaker #1_	SHAH pts 77	Opp Speaker #1 Deng pts 29
		Opp Speaker #2 Bay bir pts 28
	20000000000000000000000000000000000000	φω γω
Please award	each speaker points based	l on the following scales
		Outstanding 28 = Very Good
		ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Tu	odging Criteria
• Analysis		vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
-	ring the debate	very the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	S	ciently the debaters support arguments with
		nd references to authority as well as general knowledge
	•	fectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other		
• Points of]	Information: How relevant	and effective were the questions and the answers
• Delivery:	How well the debaters spear	k in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
	understandable	
Courtesy:	How courteous and respect	ful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Ylaina tha aha	ava avitania mlasa affadas	
each debater:	· -	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
cach debater.	· /	
Prop 1:		Opp 1:
Define	topic clearly	Vice coherent speech
420	topic clearly down	
Slow	down	
<i>D</i> •	/	
Prop 2:		Opp 2:
	/	
TEAM CODE	#: on the	e <u>OPP</u> wins this debate.
		(Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	Successfully mad	e own point a and refute I all Prop Point

UDAY	PARLI Debate
Shingwekar (*10)	
Round 4B 3:30pm E3	Judge's Name: UDAY SHINGWE HAR
Gov: 23 Crenshaw - Bulger	Judge 5 Hame.
Opp: 14 Vaisse - Scott JV Parli Debate	Judge's Name: UDAY SHINGWE KAR Judge's School Affiliation: JRVINGTON HIGH
Winds the same and	Judge o Soliton Milliannia.
PROP	OPP /
Team Code #: 23	Team Code #:
1 W A	+ / + /
Prop Speaker #1	pts 28 Opp Speaker #1 Scott pts 28
Pron Speaker #2 (7 a).	pts_28
Frop Speaker #2	ut pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 Vaisse pts 27
Please award each speake	r points based on the following scale:
	= Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	it possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
20-25 Tan 24-2	v – 1 ooi – Reserved for rude or mappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
Analysis, Hayy rangana	<i>5 </i>
Alialysis: How leasona	bly and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the deba	<i>1</i>
• Evidence: How approp	riately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with
	nclude facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
	directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
	debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandab	,
• Courtesy: How courted	ous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
	please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
5	
Prop 1: Make eye de	ntact Opp 1: Good challenge to definition - Make your own points intea of arguing the ad challenge
Make eye of	wide the state of
	an point intea
	- Make your own to
/	of arguin, the and draller
Prop 2:	Opp 2:
/	
/	
l	
	00.40
TEAM CODE #: 25	on the PROP_wins this debate.
	(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Nanny Tunnell (*16) Round 4A 3:30pm I1	Judge's Name: Nanry Tunnell
Gov: 13 Jung - Houck Opp: 14 Rettenmaier - Pineda	
JV Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: MV+5
PRQE	OPP.
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
	Opp Speaker #1 Re Henmaier pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Juny pt 2	7 Opp Speaker #2 Pined pts 26
Please award each speaker points ba	ased on the following scale: Re: struct in the on 13 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good & Knows thought to not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) Very Seurice of the control of
30 = Periect $27 = Good (but possibly possibl$	and good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) Notice Start
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and eff 	ectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
	efficiently the debaters support arguments with
	ts and references to authority as well as general knowledge d effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	refrectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
	vant and effective were the questions and the answers
	peak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and response	pectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
	r compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	,
· Prop 1: Hunch (27)	alysis Opp 1: Rettermaier (26)
- 4411 Neanited Contact	- Hardled PoI well lant analysis
	- Chroma was
- Hood call the part of property	seem Insufficient cine along with
- Evidence un mell usuff	- topinins should be ausitable
- Evidence un mell nesser - Endry with question tras or	isinal - topining should be siven along with to - topining should be siven along with endered to strong them position security - need strengthy stronger voice projection
- Gurl gob connecting terrois in Prop 2: Inna (21) Speech + res	sound, - ned stightly stronger voice projection
Prop 2: Inny (2)	that Opp 2: Private a language would of helper
	ing - careful was harming our position
- need to reduce body suing but voice projection is go	ing - Careful use of lasses our position in steed of harming our position in steed of harming our position and - Did not address all the center tiens
dula it alithe longer	- bungelech pale 2011
TEAM CODE #: 13 on	the Prop wins this debate.
DEAGON FOR DEGICION	the Prop (work at taking POI's wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	1 mareles
- stronger analysis	and evalue property fams
- Well organized a	and evidence provided voladdressed all the apprising frams
contentions strong	16

	I ANDI Debate
Nanny Tunnell (*16 Round 4B 3:30pm 11	Judge's Name: NOMMU (14M M)
Gov: 14 Bystrom - Gast	
Opp: 23 Bodisco - Rans JV Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: WULS
]	PROP _{1/} OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1_	Bystom pts 20pp Speaker #1 Budisco pts 29
Prop Speaker #2_	That pts 26 Opp Speaker #2 Pan sweiler pts 28
Please award e	each speaker points based on the following scale: Resolutive: USF granated 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good City to Tree
7.5	30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good 7 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair	7 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
	low reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	ing the debate
	How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with
• Arguments	which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge ation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other	side
——————————————————————————————————————	iformation: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
• Delivery: H	Iow well the debaters speak in an organized communicative style that is pleasant
	anderstandable
	How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
,	were to opponents and judges
Using the abov	e criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
	(29)
Prop.1: Kyst	Opp 1: Bodi's w (29) Tight speech - organized speech + addressed contenting - organized speech + addressed outenting
- ven orsa	1 - orzanileo stati
- very pers	
	chald characteristics
- burn sue	to see to noisely the total their argundo
- need mon	style - Strong analysis culated a strong - Paradi in the all their arguita - Pasy to follow speech style on typic concepts
richlynn	on typic concepts
Prop 2: Const	e breignand and - Easy to follow speech style Opp 2: Pansweiler (28) Address you not - Man and their arguite - Casy to follow speech style Opp 2: Pansweiler (28)
- contentine	address was not opp 2: Parisher wentin mebuttents organized contention mebuttents - expanded our contentions mell
notes,	- apparated our control
- need to	also malk eye contact - bood breath of analysis
- Grand la l'u	ance & sound level - took eye antivet
TEAM CODE #	en price + sound level - trood breath of analysis on the Opp-Rodright first own clothes to created wins this debate. of higher sense of circles (Propor Opp)
REASON FOR D	DECISION:
- Beth	DECISION: er and strungen analysis on subject matter min s are supported by evidence her overall delivery
- Opi	mins are supported by
- Be	Her ovorall delivery

Tai Phan (*19) Round 4A 3:30pm G5 Gov: 10 Wang - Lin		Judge's Name:	1 PHAN H
Opp: 15 Lee - Peled JV Parli Debate		Judge's School Affiliation	on: P. IJ. H. S
PROP Team Code #:	_ <i>28</i>	Team Code #: <u>/5</u>	PP /29
Prop Speaker #1 Lin	28 -> pts	Opp Speaker #1 peled/	$29 \rightarrow \text{pts}$
Prop Speaker #2 WANG	29 -> pts	Opp Speaker #2	$29 \rightarrow pts$
27 = Goo	30 = Perfect $29 = 6$ od (but possibly not good)	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very G od enough to qualify for elim	ination rounds)
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude	e or inappropriate behavior
• Evidence: How ap evidence—which no Argumentation: How the other side • Points of Informa: • Delivery: How we and easily understa: • Courtesy: How co Using the above criteric each debater: Prop 1: * Solve how FBF **Movery to myle prop 2: **Very good Red **Korne work get **Analysis. God **Korne the forts ** Delivery / Court ** Good Guestions ** Good Guestions **TEAM CODE #:	sonably and effective debate oppropriately and efficiency include facts and low directly and effective description. How relevant a sell the debaters speak andable ourteous and respectful ria, please offer company of the to present a control of the to present and speak clear & good evidence of information and respectful.	of pelivery / courter Delivery / courter The topic The prove the point The prove the point the p	arguments with well as general knowledge and to the arguments made tions and the answers cative style that is pleasant conents and judges tions for improvement to good Speak, good and. to prove under what argumances by: good / respectful. by: good / respectful.
	(T	Prop of Opp) - 1 choose tee	

Tai Phan (*19) Round 4B 3:30pm G5 Gov: 10 Shingwekar - Vichare	Judge's Name: 711 PHAN . H
Opp: 23 Banks - Corbett JV Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: PV.H.S.
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #: 23
Prop Speaker #1 Vichare: pts 2	9 Opp Speaker #1 Banks : pts 28
Prop Speaker #1 Vichare: pts 2:	Opp Speaker #2 Corbett: pts 18
27 = Good (but possibly not 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor • Analysis: How reasonably and effect offered during the debate	Description 28 = Very Good a good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior Judging Criteria etively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
 evidence—which may include facts Argumentation: How directly and e by the other side Points of Information: How relevanted to the debaters speared and easily understandable 	efficiently the debaters support arguments with and references to authority as well as general knowledge effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers eak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer each debater:	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: - ANALYTIS - good prehypes He points of informations. - Evidence solve, good speeck evidence good Home work. - good act, importeriolence. - pelivery content respect Prop 2: very good analysis the points of topic good act to good at the periffs points of evidence. Delivery Clear & organize courtery respectful clear good Home Work.	the Delivery/courtesy: good and respectful. Opp,2: good speeck. Solve - Should brins evidence, Ex: number, - 6 - Points of wifermedian need more delivered.
	m Work, Imprest hetern code (10)