PARLI Debate

~~Wendy~~ Young (*27)
Round 3A 1:30pm E5
Gov: 23 Banks - Corbett
Opp: 14 Liu - Fu
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Young, Marlon

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Banks	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Liu	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Corbett	pts 28.5	Opp Speaker #2 Fu	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: Banks
- Good job pulling Partners Argument together in Summation

Opp 1: Liu
Made good use of Points — and making Counter Arguments when Hard to Counter.

Prop 2: Corbett.
Great Pace, Dictation, organization, Logic & Ease of following argument
Good - Countering Opp's arguments Contain Issues Raised

Opp 2: Fu
Good Point - Humanities - History allows Knowledge to Pull to Next General

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Did a Better Job of Listing Specific Points and Arguments And then Tying their arguments together. Did well Countering Opp's Arguments. I think Prop Argument was Easier; Opp Had Harder Position to Defend

PARLI Debate

~~Wendy~~ Young (*27)
Round 3B 1:30pm E5
Gov: 14 Tran - Vainberg
Opp: 13 Jung - Houck
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Young, Marlon

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 13	
Prop Speaker #1 Tran	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Jung	pts 27.5
Prop Speaker #2 Vainberg	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Houck	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

Low Point win Because of Folks.

- **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: Tran
- Should Have Led w/ "one nation/people" versus making off cuff comment at End

Prop 2: Vainberg
- Good Eye Contact & Audience Engagement

Opp 1: Jung
- "Moral Obligation" leads to Bad Political Policy Was good argument
- Could Have argued better — positive with $

Opp 2: Houck :

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
the Key to this debate was "Moral Obligation". Prop focused to much on we have ability and why Refugees won't ~~Heal~~ Hurt, Should Have focused on morality. Left Door open for Opp to Win Strategy like with Acting as ~~world~~ world Police for Moral Obligation Leads to Bad Situations

2nd 10 (1)

~~Nadeem Alam (*19)~~
Round 3A 1:30pm G4
Gov: 5 Johnson - Murphy
Opp: 27 Manni - Brown
JV Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Paul Stark

Judge's School Affiliation: Albany H.S.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 Murphy	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Manni	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Johnson	pts 28	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

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

Prop 1: Lack of concrete examples and nervousness hurt - much better and firmer in second speech

Prop 2: Bit thin on technological history - need both! good point

Opp 1: poised. Clear delivery. Superior meta analysis + discussion of evidence - over-claim for music

Opp 2: fragile case for humanities making jobs - however, some good case for music, cold stem world good. direct closing

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Team 27 wins with ~~reflected~~ rational, patient exposition against Team 5 slight tendency to pronounce an argument won simply by making it.

2nd 10 (11)

Nadeem Alam (*19)
Round 3B 1:30pm G4
Gov: 14 Rettenmaier - Pineda
Opp: 15 Lin - Hu
JV Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Paul Stein

Judge's School Affiliation: Albany U.S.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: [redacted] 14		Team Code #: 15	
Prop Speaker #1 Rettenmaier	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Lin	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Pineda	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Hu	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: precise. Careful delivery good statement of duty to ~~protect~~ protect correct - don't be fiscal only hate crime not everywhere

Prop 2: good point that 1st world needs to start building correct on extremists of refugee life

Opp 1: good case for nationalism close to dismantling moral obligation hate crimes case weaker strong, sometimes passionate, delivery

Opp 2: terror problem with refugees undisputable alienation of refugees important correct that money not legal for aid makes another good case for nationalism

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very, very close. Opposition wins on articulating a concept of national community and communitarianism that Prop side could not dispel, despite making excellent cases themselves.

PARLI Debate

Arna Katewa (*21)
Round 3A 1:30pm E2
Gov: 15 Lee - Peled
Opp: 14 Bystrom - Gast
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ARNA KATEWA

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN HIGH

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 15		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Peled	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Gast	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Lee	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Bystrom	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good start; well organized. put forth the contentions well with strong arguments.

Rebuttal - Good rebuttal, a bit longer, but had some great points and arguments about their case

Prop 2: Good start, but hesitated a little during backing up the contentions a little. however had strong arguments

Opp 1: Very well spoken; refuted the first affirmation very well. Good negation. Good contentions, strong arguments.

Rebuttal - Very organized, great refuter & strong closing comments.

Opp 2: Good and thorough refute, again strong contentions & great arguments.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: both team did well, however, the opposition had very clear and stronger arguments to make their case.

PARLI Debate

Arna Katewa (*21)
Round 3B 1:30pm E2
Gov: 5 Jayasuriya - Schulz
Opp: 23 Crenshaw - Bulger
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ARNA KATEWA

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN HIGH

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 23	
Prop Speaker #1 Schulz	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Bulger	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Jayasuriya	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Crenshaw	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: Great and composed start. Strong contentions backed up with good examples. Good point on Radicalization.
Rebuttal - Good points on your arguments, but fell short on being assertive at the end.

Prop 2: Great start, you had some great arguments, but should have backed up your argument better.

Opp 1: You refuted very nicely the 1st affirmation case. Strong contentions, that were backed up. Good analogy of candied cyanide.
Rebuttal - Good organization & chain of arguments. Very strong closing comment.

Opp 2: Great oration, had good arguments, refuted the affirmations by giving examples.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Both teams did great, however, the opposition team refuted the affirmations very well, ~~and~~ and put forth good examples for their contentions & finished stronger.

PARLI Debate

~~Ken Stone~~ (*16)
Round 3A 1:30pm I3
Gov: 19 Rahman - Zhou
Opp: 15 Steinberg - Zhou
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ken Schneider

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 19		Team Code #: 15	
Prop Speaker #1 Zhou	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Steinberg	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Rahman	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Zha	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: Clear, confident, made strong arguments with good examples -
Her rebuttal was a bit less clear and did not distinguish enough from OPP.

Prop 2:
Responded well to POI raised earlier. Argued eloquently for value of STEM - A bit context at beginning, then settled in.

Opp 1: Excellent presentation, clarified meaning of "net benefit" which helped me understand terms of debate.
Raised good POI which was not quite answered and he expressed frustration at this.
Gave cogent explanation of Opp's counter-plan

Opp 2:
Strong refutation, good reprise of evidence, good strategy - "We agree with PROP, but..."

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
OPP was very strong in their counter plan and in raising critical questions of PROP, who never quite laid out their clear plan. All were civil, even though there was a dispute on the POIs. Very impressive, all around - excellent debate.

PARLI Debate

~~Ken Stone~~ (*16)
Round 3B 1:30pm I3
Gov: 23 Nearon - VonSosen
Opp: 10 Wang - Lin
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ken Schneider

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 10	
Prop Speaker #1 NEARON	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 LIN	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 VANSOSEN	pts 27	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

Which helped me. Raised critical questions about moral obligation and involved ISIS in an interesting way.

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

Prop 1: Excellent presentation, comprehensible, well laid-out argument. Rebuttal offered clear refutation of OPP and revealed him as someone who can think on his feet. Rebuttal is point deftly.

Prop 2: Good refutations but a bit confused about the numbers (18,000 v. 800,000). Made good points, a bit nervous.

Opp 1: Made interesting arguments about costs of accepting refugees, but did not accurately sum up PROP's contentions (PROP said Germany took in 800,000, not that all countries should, Merkel was nominated for, not given, the Nobel). Gave a good clear definition of net benefit.

Opp 2: Strong debater - good refutations, restated evidence in an appropriate manner, presented counter-argument well.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Nearon's presentation was very strong and he responded thoughtfully and intelligently to the OPP. All were generous and courteous, measured and thoughtful.

PARLI Debate

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: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1 VAISSE	pts 30	Opp Speaker #1 CAMPAGNA	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 SCOTT	pts 29.5	Opp Speaker #2 MORTENSEN	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: VAISSE
ANA — 5
EVI — 4.5
ARG — 5
POI — N/A
DEL — 5
COU — 5

Prop 2: SCOTT
ANA — 5
EVI — 5
ARG — 4.5
POI — N/A
DEL — 5
COU — 5

Great Job!

Opp 1: CAMPAGNA
ANA — 5
EVI — 4.5
ARG — 4.5
POI — 5
DEL — 4.5
COU — 5

Opp 2: MORTENSEN
ANA — 5
EVI — 4.5
ARG — 5
POI — 5
DEL — 5
COU — 5

Great Job! Pay a bit more attention on dress code!

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PROP WON BY A SLIM MARGIN. BOTH TEAMS DID A GREAT JOB. COULD APPLY A BIT MORE ON KEY POINTS. TEAM OPP SHOULD FOCUS ON DRESS CODE A BIT — IT TAKES AWAY IN CLOSE CALLS! GREAT JOB BOTH TEAMS!

PARLI Debate

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: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Vawter pts 30	Opp Speaker #1	JARMEL-SCH. pts 30
Prop Speaker #2	Olson 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 — 4.5
EVI — 4.5
ARG — 5
POI — 5
DEL — 5
COU — 5

Prop 2: OLSEN
ANA — 4.5
EVI — 4.5
ARG — 5
POI — 5
DEL — 5
COU — 5

Great JOB! Not much feedback!

Opp 1: JARMEL-SCH.
ANA — 5
EVI — 5
ARG — 5
POI — 5
DEL — 5
COU — 5

Opp 2: BERNSTEIN
ANA — 5
EVI — 5
ARG — 5
POI — 5
DEL — 5
COU — 5

Great JOB

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

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 BETTER JOB OF COMING UP WITH MORE ROBUST POINTS - ONE OF WHICH IS WHAT HAPPENS TO ECONOMIES OF COUNTRIES IF WE ALLOW BRAIN DRAIN LIKE GEMANY IS DOING!

PARLI Debate

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: Irvington High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 23	
Prop Speaker #1 Morgenstein	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Woerner	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Eng	pts 27	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: -Good presentation
-List of arguments ~~didn't~~ wasn't comprehensive - Opp. had a field run on your arguments.

Opp 1: Excellent Presentation
-You just overran prep team w/ your arguments.

Prop 2: - Good presentation
-focus on concentration of thoughts and ideas to present your arguments.

Opp 2: - Excellent Presentation
-a little more structure in your presentation would help.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Ritu Khurana (*10)
Round 3B 1:30pm G3
Gov: 23 Bodisco - Ransweiler
Opp: 3 Brogan - Modi
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ashish Khurana

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 3	
Prop Speaker #1 Bodisco	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Brogan	pts 30
Prop Speaker #2 Ransweiler	pts 28	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: -Excellent Presentation
-very passionate pitch for your postion.
-Some of the arguments dosee the topic in limited scope.

Prop 2: -Excellent presentation
-very impressive knowledge of american wars.
- Counter to opp argument was weak.

Opp 1: -Excellent Presentation
-very balanced view of a complex topic
-Excellent analysis of facts.
-Some of the counter arguments could be stronger.

Opp 2: - Good counter arguments.
-Overall excellent presentation
- collect your thoughts and structure your speech well for more impact.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very balanced debate. Both sides ~~to~~ were equally strong. Some finer points ~~to~~ helped opp. team.

PARLI Debate

Vivian Levy (*14)
Round 3A 1:30pm E3
Gov: 27 Lavell - Cohen
Opp: 6 Bonet - Stankus
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Levy, Vivian

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP 27

Team Code #: _____

Prop Speaker #1 Cohen pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Lavell pts 26

OPP 6

Team Code #: _____

Opp Speaker #1 Bonet pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Stankus 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, speaking voice.
- good eye contact.
- good intentions.
- clearly state not eliminate arts/humanities.
- not clear that private school for arts majors is feasible.

Prop 2:
- Could use some improvement in organization.

Opp 1: Great energy, persuasive.
- Not convinced. "Cushing time" is valid point.
- Not clear on use of ten-backers.
- Good argument on interdependency.

Opp 2: What about tech jobs pay more? (theft 22:1.
- good pts on should value equally.

TEAM CODE #: Cohen/Lavell **on the** PNW **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: 27

PARLI Debate

Vivian Levy (*14)
Round 3B 1:30pm E3
Gov: 16 Chou - Kim
Opp: 17 Day - Shah
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Levy, Vivian

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell.

PROP			OPP		
Team Code #:	16		Team Code #:	17	
Prop Speaker #1	Chou	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Day	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Kim	pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Shah.	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: CHOU
- clear, passionate voice
- over-reliance on moral argument
- mult historical examples good.
- law argument sounded like morality

Prop 2: KIM
- need to develop - economic benefits to small communal minority pts.
- overreliance on moral argument.

Opp 1: ~~BRIAN~~ DAY
- UN option interesting - but could have been further explained.
- Unpredictability of ~~inaction or~~ action (to accept refugees) could have been better developed.

Opp 2: ~~DAY~~ SHAH.
- improve eye contact.
- elaborate on accepting refugees not always have predictable results.
- German leader is female (Merkel)

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

REASON FOR DECISION: 17

Topic: High school should value science, technology, engineering & math over liberal arts & humanities.

PARLI Debate

Cathy Aguilera (*15)
Round 3A 1:30pm E4
Gov: 10 Pandit - Mandal
Opp: 25 Stephens - Flanagan
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Cathy Aguilera

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte.

PROP			OPP		
Team Code #:	10		Team Code #:	25	
Prop Speaker #1	Pandt	pts 30	Opp Speaker #1	Stephens	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Mandal	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Flanagan	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

1) Benefits majority high school key to choosing your major 2) M interested in STEM

Net benefits

College prefer those STEM

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

U Penn STEM ↑ $ & jobs arts poor

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

Prop 1: Pandt
A- great analysis
E- good evidence
A- Very good argumentation
P- NO POIS X
D- Delivery good tone, projection & eye contact & hand gestures
C- good hand gesture, voice tone

1) benefit society as whole ↑ jobs ↑ educ based
2) more important modern tech/prob.
3) students forced to take liberal arts. benefit 4) better standard of living
SAT/ACT-STEM Based
emphasizing STEM in high school
students more choices better society
Keep "um" out

Prop 2: Mandal
very good analysis
E- good evidence.
A- Arguementation - very good
P-
D- good hard gesture, tone, don't rock back & forth.
C- good

Opp 1: Stephens
A- good
E- good
A- good
P- NO POIS X
D- good delivery
C- good

1) gov pow china = ↑ suicide rate due to STEM test
2) More $ in STEM & NOT enough in high school hurt students NOT good in STEM ↑ stress/suicide liberal art students
3) ableism developmental disabilities
4) discourages debate, politics & law degrees.

Opp 2: Flanagan
A- good
E- good
A- good
P- good
D- good eye contact, tone
C- good & voice & hand gesture

specific to high school
good knowledge base
ignored ↑ $ jobs in law & gov.
varying capabilities.
-humanities shouldn't be undervalued.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

good evidence on both parts but Prop delivery, analysis & arguementation was impressive

Topic: Wealthy countries have a moral obligation to accept refugees from war zones.

PARLI Debate

Cathy Aguilera (*15)
Round 3B 1:30pm E4
Gov: 25 Hassan - Goody
Opp: 10 Shingwekar - Vichare
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Cathy Aguilera

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	25	Team Code #:	10
Prop Speaker #1 Goody (Hassan)	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Shingwekar	pts 30
Prop Speaker #2 Hassan (Goody)	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 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

Syria Europe Germany Fact v policy. character of

1) societal welfare
2) citizen votes

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

Prop 1: Goody (Hassan)
very A - good analysis
E - great evidence
A - excellent argumentation
P
D - good eye, tone & hand gestures
C - good

1) human lives matter
2) economy benefit Germany 3% Japan
3) racial diversity
4) better world relations improved communications prevent future wars diplomatically
5) sharing is caring build human character

Opp 1: Shingwekar
evidence excellent
A excellent analysis
E excellent
A Argumentation
P - NO POIs
D - great tone, voice, eye contact & hand gestures.
C - good courtesy

prop limited countries Germany & Japan

1) wealthy have choice of refugees is unfair.
2) over population ↓jobs, ↓homes = bad
3) refugees treated poorly
4) sharing not when resources are limited

all refugees war zones

Prop 2: Goody Hassan
A - very good analysis
E - good evidence
A - excellent argumentation
P - NO POI
D - good eye contact, hand gestures & tone & volume
C - good

moral obligation mind set over population not a factor.

Opp 2: Vichare.
A -
E - excellent evidence
A - excellent argumentation
P - NO POI
D - good eye contact & tone
C - good.

1) social contract w/ their own citizens regard values opinions of own citizens first - economy nothing do w/ moral obligation
2) financial military aid as alternative

went over but ok grace period.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

very strong debate, excellent argumentation on both sides, More evidence on opposition. Great job both teams

PARLI Debate

Sophia Burshteyn (*3)
Round 3A 1:30pm G2
Gov: 14 Kwong - Tan
Opp: 10 Yang - Ho
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Sophia BURSHTEYN

Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	10
Prop Speaker #1	Tan pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	HO pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Kwong pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Yang pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: good speaker consistent plan with relevant evidences

Opp 1: outstanding speaker, strong & contentious, good evidences

Prop 2: full, strong argument

Opp 2: relevant POI, strong flow and support for partner.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
strong case

PARLI Debate

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

Judge's Name: SOPHIA BURSHTEYN

Judge's School Affiliation: BENILEYN

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	15	Team Code #:	21
Prop Speaker #1	Deng pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Fields pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Barbir pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Gersh 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 presentation, solid contentions and impacts

Opp 1: good speaker

Prop 2: strong partner support

Opp 2: good communication; partner support

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

strong case and rebutting relevant impacts and arguments that were convincing more than neg arguments.

PARLI Debate

Cindy Bulger (*23)
Round 3A 1:30pm I1
Gov: 11 Tong - fung
Opp: 14 Stroumza - Chen
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Fung pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Chen pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Tong pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Stroumza 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: You repeated a few of your points several times. This time could have been better spent developing the ideas or adding new information.

Opp 1: Good use of examples and nice speaker's style.

Prop 2: I don't mind a fast speaker but make sure your points are well thought out and not hard to follow

Opp 2: Show a little more confidence you had some good points.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
With a value proposition of successfulness of the students tied to the new frontier of jobs in the biotech and related fields as well as the increased equality between men & women in the work force I felt the Aff position on increased emphasis on the STEM fields was better supported.

PARLI Debate

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

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	10	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Randeria pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Huang pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Dara 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: Good speaking style but use your full of your time to make your points

Opp 1: You made some very good points. Try and project a bit more confidence into your speaking style

Prop 2: Great use of time and very effective use of body language and vocal cadence while making your points

Opp 2: Nice speaking style. You were able to refute most of what they said in the time allotted.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
This is a big topic to tackle in 20 minutes of study time and I commend both sides on a job well done. The AFF won because with their value prop being societal welfare it is hard to argue that refugees should be left in their home countries which have turned into war zones. Both sides have been said - Teams did a great job

High School education should focus on science, technology + engineering + Mathematics at expense of Liberal Arts + humanities. - Value debate

PARLI Debate

Montgomery Judge 1 (*17)
Round 3A 1:30pm I2
Gov: 11 Nour - Kuo
Opp: 24 Lacombe - Appel
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Dana Kranacke

Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomery

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 11		Team Code #: 24	
Prop Speaker #1 Kuo	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Lacombe	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Nour	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Appel	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: Work on eye contact if possible
Avoid disrespectful language if possible

Prop 2: Emphatic + Persuasive without undo emotionalism

Opp 1: Very polite, good eye contact, tempo + modulation. Poised, suggestive of leadership skills + potential.

Opp 2: Avoid disrespectful tone of voice / language - or interpretation of such. Excellent presentation skills + communication style.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Soooo close. Opp had slightly more developed positions.

Wealthy countries have the moral obligation to accept refugees from war zones.

PARLI Debate

Montgomery Judge 1 (*17)
Round 3B 1:30pm I2
Gov: 23 Carver - Garcia
Opp: 14 Lee - Fairchild
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Diane Kleinsteuber

Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomery

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Carver	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Fairchild	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Garcia	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Lee	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: Avoid checking notes as much as possible (occurred mostly in conclusion) Good skills

Opp 1: Good presentation skills eye contact / temp / use of hands for emphasis, etc.

Prop 2: Avoid being overly casual, Maintain a professional demeanor the entire time you are in the room.

Opp 2: Slow down a bit + strive for a smoother presentation.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Procedurally strong, compelling arguments, solid delivery.

PARLI Debate

Susan Stephan (*15)
Round 4A 3:30pm E2
Gov: 14 Bernstein - Jarmel-Schneider
Opp: ~~25 Hassan - Goody~~ 11 Nour-Kuo
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Stephan

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	Jarmel-Schneider pts 29+	Opp Speaker #1	Nour pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Bernstein pts 29+	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

Excellent job - keep it up! ☺

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

Prop 1: Jarmel-Schneider
great pace & tone
great wrap-up

Opp 1: Nour
very good pacing & eye contact -
an improvement would be to ~~not~~ focus more on judge & not look at opponents or out window

Prop 2: Bernstein
great pace & tone
Excellent job outlining refutations & reiterating Prop side points.
Do not say something like stepping stone to ... I could spark a ... - this weakens case.

Opp 2: Kuo
great pace & tone
really good organization
great call on Poo

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Very well laid out arguments, Stronger arguments, excellent organization.

PARLI Debate

Susan Stephan (*15)
Round 4B 3:30pm E2
Gov: 6 Bonet - Stankus
Opp: 23 Carver ~~Garcia~~ (only)
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Stephan

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	6	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	S. Bonet pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	G. Carver pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	S. Stankus pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	G. Carver pts

yes, only 1 opp speaker

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: all fairly good organization, improvement in organization will improve case

Prop 1: Bonet
- very good pacing, & you do want to remember to be watch your intonation as this can seem not as respectful as should be.

Prop 2: Stankus
- very good pacing

Opp 1: Carver
- good speed & eye contact
- use care in expanding your topic - adding the HS component was a little confusing
- if opponent has weird sounding argument like [redacted] "employers won't hire you if you have too much student debt, so you can't get a job" then call them on it

Opp 2:

Excellent for 1 speaker very tough job - done graciously.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Better arguments & organization.

PARLI Debate

Evan Hubinger (*3)
Round 4A 3:30pm G4
Gov: 21 Fields - Gersh
Opp: 5 Johnson - Murphy
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Evan Hubinger

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 21		Team Code #: 5	
Prop Speaker #1 Noah Gersh	pts 27.5	Opp Speaker #1 Magdeleine Murphy	pts 29.5
Prop Speaker #2 Brandon Fields	pts 26.5	Opp Speaker #2 Maia Johnson	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good job realizing that the OPP's interpretation of the resolution was flawed! I think, however, that both of you while very good speakers, just need to have more arguments. Together;

Prop 2:

Opp 1: Really good job recognizing when an argument was conceded, and very strong impact analysis and framing. Just keep in mind the wording of the resolution.

Opp 2: Very strong arguments and refutations, and good strategic vision and attention to the flow. Also remember to keep in mind the wording of the resolution.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop only argument about copycats is not enough, given OPP's refutations, to constitute a "serious" threat to national security.

PARLI Debate

Evan Hubinger (*3)
Round 4B 3:30pm G4
Gov: 23 Campagna - Mortensen
Opp: 14 Tran - Vainberg
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Evan Hubinger

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Mortenson	pts 28.5	Opp Speaker #1 TRAN	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Campagna	pts 27.5	Opp Speaker #2 VAINBERG	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 strategic thinking to focus on crime and poverty cycles, and very strong argumentation and refutation.

Prop 2: Good job of responding to the counter-plan, they can be very tricky. Next time try arguing to do both the resolution and the counter-plan.

Both:

Opp 1: I really like the counter-plan — it was a good strategic choice, it just needed to be linked back to the other prop points.

Opp 2: 1st OPP very good speaking style + refutations! Strong ⓘ calculus.

2nd OPP Good argumentation, analysis, + refutations

I think you need a better answer to cost + trough.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop wins on their external ⓘs of crime and breaking the poverty cycle, which outweigh the net benefit to opp's secondary edu counter-plan, which is the same as the other benefits of high edu.

PARLI Debate

Emma Sutton (*12)
Round 4A 3:30pm I2
Gov: 15 Steinberg - Zhou
Opp: 16 Chou - Kim
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: E. Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: JSHS (12)

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	15	Team Code #:	16
Prop Speaker #1	Steinberg pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Chou pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Zhou pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Kim 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: Need to get your facts straight, but good job anyway. Excellent use of POI to question credibility of Pandy statement

Prop 2: Liked the Star Wars analogy, but you dropped a lot. Be more wary in PoIs, be careful what you say

Opp 1: You were somewhat dismissive of aff case based on size (only 17 pp). Argument that because no violence has happened yet = none will happen is illogical. Unclear when "a few deaths" crosses into "national security risk."

Opp 2: Good job highlighting dropped arguments, copy cat argument.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Aff had some facts wrong, and dropped the self-limiting (lack of supplies) argument. Still, they carried question of potential for bloodshed - if peaceful, why are they armed? Also carried argument that danger/risk = national security threat

PARLI Debate

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: JSHS (12)

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	Huang pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Fung pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Luc pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Tong pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Nice delivery & pacing. Need to explaining judging criteria. Wonderful last speech!

Opp 1: Lots of great points, but somewhat disjointed. Need to explain better how points apply to rez.

Prop 2: Dropped some critical issues. There is always something to say in response! Did not address issue of access & cost the round.

Opp 2: Good job hitting all points & highlighting when aff dropped.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Negative, you came across as elitist snobs. Only rich people can get into college anyway, so who cares about money. But - aff dropped it! Aff, you could have made them look horrible. Aff also dropped constitutionality argument (outside the realm of the USFG)

I would not use Scalia comment - often considered racist.

Neg ↗

PARLI Debate

Matt Petruska (*27)
Round 4A 3:30pm G2
Gov: 24 Lacombe - Appel
Opp: 14 Eng - Morgenstein
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Matt Petruska

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High School

PROP			OPP		
Team Code #:	24		Team Code #:	14	
Prop Speaker #1	Lacombe	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Morgenstein	pts 28.5
Prop Speaker #2	Appel	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Eng	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: excelent delivery, very (+) concise & clear.

Opp 1: (+) very persuasive in contentions and with arguments. This especially came through in rebuttal. Courteous. Clear & concise delivery. Great speaker

Prop 2: (+) cont Argumentation continued debate and bringing persuasive contention to OPP 1

Opp 2: ~~Excel~~ (+) Good presentation of evidence

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

This was a very close debate.

PARLI Debate

Matt Petruska (*27)
Round 4B 3:30pm G2
Gov: 14 Lee - Fairchild
Opp: 10 Dara - Randeria
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Matt Petruska

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	10
Prop Speaker #1	Lee pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Randeriq pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Fairchild pts 28	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:
(+) Courteous & clear

Opp 1:
(+) Delivery was clear and concise. Persuasive rebuttal. Courteous

Prop 2: Best speaker, very Articulate
(+) Excellent use of Argumentation responding to contentions & refutations during debate of rpp 1. very Clear & concise delivery. Very Persuasive

Opp 2:
(+) A good & direct response to debaters Prop 2 & Prop 1 ~~[illegible]~~ continuing debate through argumentation. Good analysis of topic in continuing debate. Excelent delivery.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The OPP refuted the contentions strong and they were more prepared for their specific arguements. Good persuasive & clear Arguements

The Stand off in Oregon is a serious threat to national security

PARLI Debate

Yuyun Shang (*6)
Round 4A 3:30pm G3
Gov: 14 Liu - Fu
Opp: 23 Vawter - Olson
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Yun Shang

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	Liu pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Olsen pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Fu pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Vawter 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:
* Cleady organized contentions
* Rebuttal could address "what if" refute opp's had

Opp 1:
* Cleady illustrated contentions
* Strong rebuttal on not a priority issue for US government

Prop 2:
* Good evidance of peaceful protest became violant
* Could add more evidance to support contentions

Opp 2:
* Strong refute on Prop's points used based on "what if" projections
* Strong refute on this issue is not as serious as North Korean bombs and ZSLS

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp's refuted prop's points better.

The WSFG Should Guarantee Citizens to Free Higher Education

PARLI Debate

Yuyun Shang (*6)
Round 4B 3:30pm G3
Gov: 23 Woerner - Miner
Opp: ~~11 Nour - Kuo~~ 25 Hassan-Goody
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Yun Shang

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	25
Prop Speaker #1	Woerner pts____	Opp Speaker #1	Goody pts____
Prop Speaker #2	Miner pts____	Opp Speaker #2	Hassan pts____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: * Clearly explained contentions (Elaboration of contentions sounded not necessary - repetitative)

Prop 2: * Strong rebuttal on uncleardy explained Counter plan by opp's team
* Refuted all the points in Opp's contention
* Could have refute the "Counter plan" too

Opp 1: * Great in pointing out $230 is not enough
* Could state net benefits of the Counter Plan proposed
* Strong rebuttal

Opp 2: * Great point people may pay more tax to get the free education
* Good catch that WSFG $ is still free tax
* Could elaborate the Counter plan

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Slightly stronger rebuttal

Really enjoyed this debate with great refute! Fabulous speakers!

PARLI Debate

Katrina Fehring (*21)
Round 4A 3:30pm I3
Gov: 10 Yang - Ho
Opp: 23 Nearon - VonSosen
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Dr JAYDEEP SINHA

Judge's School Affiliation: # 13

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	# 10	Team Code #:	# 23
Prop Speaker #1	HO pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	VONSOSEN pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	YANG - pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	NEARON pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Excellent delivery. ~~Some~~ Some of the information not relevant and ambiguous

Opp 1: Very clear and well organized. Great rebuttal. Effective argument

Prop 2: Excellent delivery. Passionate. Supporting argument not sustainable.

Opp 2: Good delivery and effective analysis

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Effective argument with relevant supporting materials. Organized

PARLI Debate

Katrina Fehring (*21)
Round 4B 3:30pm I3
Gov: 14 Stroumza - Chen
Opp: 19 Rahman - Zhou
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Dr. JAYDEEP SINHA

Judge's School Affiliation: # 13

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 19	
Prop Speaker #1 Chen	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Rahman	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Stroumza	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Zhou	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 delivery
Point of information sometime self contradictory

Prop 2:
Great delivery. Clear messaging and argument

Opp 1:
Good start and initial arguments.
Inconsistent after getting distracted by the partner with supporting information

Opp 2:
Good delivery. Good point of information
Lacked courtesy and avoided questions
&

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Clarity in delivery and argument

PARLI Debate

~~Jesse MacKinnon (*5)~~
Round 4A 3:30pm E4
Gov: 15 Lin - Hu
Opp: 14 Kwong - Tan
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: John Bouchard

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	15	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Lin pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Kwong pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Hu pts 26	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: Good job providing background. Could have benefitted from one more contention. Nice finish — especially talking about # of 9/11 hijackers.

Prop 2: Good emphasis on quote from Thomas. Would benefit from concrete examples from past

Opp 1: Could benefit from more direct eye contact with judge. Great arguments to refute level of threat. Good to focus attention on protest vs. rebellion.

Opp 2: Effective + lively argument style. Arguments about not bringing food and water were great!

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp had better arguments that this is more like protest rather than threat to national security.

PARLI Debate

~~Jesse MacKinnon (*5)~~
Round 4B 3:30pm E4
Gov: 3 Brogan - Modi
Opp: 27 Lavell - Cohen
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: John Bouhard

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 Brogan	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Cohen	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Modi	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: Great eye contact. Well organized and direct arguments.

Opp 1: Great constitutional arguments - very creative. Arguments could use more organization.

Prop 2: Good job thinking key points, especially equal opportunity and income inequality.

Opp 2: Nice job on scholarship arguments. Delivery needs more organization - comes off as a bit nervous

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Better arguments for net benefits.

PARLI Debate

Robert Lustig (*14)
Round 4A 3:30pm E5
Gov: 25 Stephens - Flanagan
Opp: 5 Jayasuriya - Schulz
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: LUSTIG

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 25		Team Code #: ✓	
Prop Speaker #1 Flanagan	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Jayasuriya	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Stephens	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Schultz	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: Only reason this could be a Threat to Natl Security is if Gov't interferes, someone dies, and then there are copycats if this took place on non-gov't property

Prop 2: gov't would interfere to uphold. This is a "threat" for that to Natl Security The Race Issue & comparing this to the Boston Riots was a specious argument.

Opp 1: Agree this is not a real time — and agree this is of real importance but not a threat to Natl Security. However this is not about 2nd amendment rights: & They have transgressed the law by occupying Gov't property. Scale - doesn't matter - lot's of protests block traffic - that's not the definition of a Threat to Natl Sec.

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Unfortunately, the Aff did not prove its case as to why this was a Threat to Natl Security - Natl importance yes. In fact the possibility of escalation is the only threat, & that was brought up by the Negative.

PARLI Debate

Robert Lustig (*14)
Round 4B 3:30pm E5
Gov: 27 Manni - Brown
Opp: 10 Pandit - Mandal
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: LUSTIG

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	27.	Team Code #:	10.
Prop Speaker #1	Manni pts 28.	Opp Speaker #1	Pandit pts 29.
Prop Speaker #2	Brown pts 27.	Opp Speaker #2	Mandal. 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: Your 4 voters sounded good. BUT CAUSE AND EFFECT IS NOT THE SAME! Is it that college causes health less addiction, or less addicted people go to college?

Prop 2: It would be $1B, it would be hundreds of billions - Melody does it have it.

Opp 1: Slippery slope argument is correct. And yes, free tuition means less money to colleges, & lower faculty salaries, which cause decline in quality.

Opp 2: College does NOT cost 20K, & only 1% of the population makes 200K. Homeless with credentials - good argument.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The Aff doesn't deal with the money, or the slippery slope that the Neg brings up. And the cause & effect question is not at all clear.

UDAY

~~Alka~~ **Shingwekar (*10)**
Round 4A 3:30pm E3
Gov: 17 Day - Shah
Opp: 15 Barbir - Deng
JV Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: UDAY SHINGWEKAR

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HIGH

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 17		Team Code #: 15	
Prop Speaker #1 SHAH	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Deng	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 DAY	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Barbir	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:
Define topic clearly
slow down

Opp 1:
Nice coherent speech

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Succesfully made own points and refuted all Prop points

UDAY
~~Alka~~ Shingwekar (*10)
Round 4B 3:30pm E3
Gov: 23 Crenshaw - Bulger
Opp: 14 Vaisse - Scott
JV Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: UDAY SHINGWEKAR

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HIGH

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Bulger	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Scott	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Crenshaw	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: Make eye contact

Opp 1: - Good challenge to definition,
- Make your own points instead of arguing the ~~Prop~~ challenge

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Nanny Tunnell (*16)
Round 4A 3:30pm I1
Gov: 13 Jung - Houck
Opp: 14 Rettenmaier - Pineda
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell

Judge's School Affiliation: MHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	13	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Houck pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Rettenmaier pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Jung pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Pineda pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: Real standoff in Oregon is a serious threat to National security.

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: Houck (27)
- well organized contentions & analysis was sufficient
- good speech pace & projection
- Evidence was well used
- Ending with question was original
- good job connecting terrorism to National security

Prop 2: Jung (27)
- well organized speech & rebuttal
- need to reduce body swaying but voice projection is good
- okay eye contact but could hold it a little longer

Opp 1: Rettenmaier (26)
- Handled POI well
- Confidence was high but analysis seem insufficient
- opening should be given along with evidence to strengthen position
- need slightly stronger voice projection

Opp 2: Pineda (26)
- Careful use of language moved & helped instead of harming own position
- Did not address all the contentions
- Good speech pace & sound level
- Good at taking POI's.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Stronger analysis and evidence provided
- Well organized and addressed all the opposing teams contentions strongly

PARLI Debate

Nanny Tunnell (*16)
Round 4B 3:30pm I1
Gov: 14 Bystrom - Gast
Opp: 23 Bodisco - Ransweiler
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell

Judge's School Affiliation: MUHS

PROP			OPP		
Team Code #:	14		Team Code #:	23	
Prop Speaker #1	Bystrom	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Bodisco	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Gast	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Ransweiler	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

Resolution: USFG guarantee access to free higher educ

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: Bystrom (27)
- good closing speech
- very organized speech
- very persuasive style but need to work on a little more formal style
- good speech pace + projection
- need more background and analysis on topic concepts

Prop 2: (Gast) (26)
- contention address was not accurate, need to take better notes
- need to also make eye contact w judge
- Good delivery pace + sound level

Opp 1: Bodisco (29)
- organized speech + addressed contentions
- good use of examples ie jobs etc.
- strong analysis created a strong foundation for all their arguments
- Easy to follow speech style

Opp 2: Ransweilor (28)
- organized contention rebuttals
- expanded own contentions well
- good breath of analysis
- good eye contact
- reduce shifting own clothes to create higher sense of confidence.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Better and stronger analysis on subject matter
- Opinions are supported by evidence
- Better overall delivery

PARLI Debate

Tai Phan (*19)
Round 4A 3:30pm G5
Gov: 10 Wang - Lin
Opp: 15 Lee - Peled
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: TAI PHAN .H

Judge's School Affiliation: P.V.H.S

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 10	29	Team Code #: 15	29
Prop Speaker #1 Lin	28 → pts	Opp Speaker #1 peled	29 → pts
Prop Speaker #2 WANG	29 → pts	Opp Speaker #2 lee	29 → pts

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
* Solve & analysis good.
* Home work: good. & evidence: good.
* good rebuttal of the topic.
* Solve how FBI control.....
* Moving to mines during speak.

Prop 2:
* Very good speak, clear & good analysis, good act, good evidence
* bring the points of information good
* Delivery / courtesy : clear, good. Respectful.
* good questions.

Opp 1:
* good analysis good speak, good act.
* evidence: good.
* fact: Speaker try to prove under what circumstances the topic
* Delivery / courtesy: good / respectful.

Opp 2:
* good home work, & analysis topic.
* Solve the point of information - really good.
* fact. prove the point of analysis
* Delivery / courtesy good.
*

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both speaker good, but I choose team code (15)

PARLI Debate

Tai Phan (*19)
Round 4B 3:30pm G5
Gov: 10 Shingwekar - Vichare
Opp: 23 Banks - Corbett
JV Parli Debate

Judge's Name: TAI PHAN . H

Judge's School Affiliation: P.V.H.S.

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 10	Team Code #: 23
Prop Speaker #1 Vichare : pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Banks : pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Shingwekar : pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Corbett : 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:
- ANALYSIS - good Analysis. Have points of information.
- EVIDENCE. Solve, good Speak about evidence. good Home Work.
- good act, impact evidence.
- good rebuttal
- Delivery / courtesy: respectful

Prop 2: very good analysis the points of topic good act to Solve the points of evidence.
Delivery: Clear & organized.
courtesy: respectful. clear.
- good Home Work.

Opp 1:
- Analysis: very good but need more information about evidence, more detail about topic EVIDENCE
- Delivery / courtesy: good and respectful.

Opp 2: good Speak.
- Should bring evidence, Ex: number, -%
- Points of information need more detail
-

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Good Speaker, and teem Work, I Pick the team code (10)