Topic: Mandatory Minimum Se	entencing Laws are unjust. PARLI Debate
Cathy Aguilera (*15) Round 1A 9:00am C4 Gov: 14 Yan - Shponko	untencing Laws are unjust. PARLI Debate Judge's Name: Cathy Aguilera
Opp: 13 Banas - Cummings Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Miramonte</u>
Team Code #: 14	OPP Team Code #: 13
	Opp Speaker #1 Bana5pts_28
Prop Speaker #2 <u></u>	Opp Speaker #2 Cumming 5pts 27
	= Outstanding 28 = Very Good
$27 = Good (but possibly not g)$ $26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Ju	Idging Criteria
-	vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
<ul> <li>offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and eff</li> </ul>	iciently the debaters support arguments with
· · · · ·	nd references to authority as well as general knowledge
	fectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
<ul> <li>by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant</li> </ul>	and effective were the questions and the answers
	k/in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• <b>Courtesy:</b> How courteous and respec	tful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Cime Using the above criteria, please offer co	empliments and/or suggestions for improvement to ///00P
each debater: Chiminals can be reharing	A LAND NOT A LAND HOLES
different to working since work lever acco	dees a contract in the indivisit (just in the indivisit (just in the indivisit (just in the indivisit))
A aced analysis ican work roady	A Small Utolerane polity
E-goodevidence	nal Fill good analys Safety Austrilia Rate
P- NO POI in rebuttal accord	A Very good Argument Net benifits V Gase is more fail.
numeral unice long eque contact.	- he good tong hand allow he had at
C= good Vinc, sone reces	sand C- about people Not wanted of
mccountedie Prop 2: 5h ponko / learn from minor	Opp 2: <u>cumming</u> 3strike law = felonies
	13- Aood judge value intersion was
reputer F and publicate	F - gast just -
A- hetter eye worther	Affluenza team p- good tone, voice, better cye contact broke in juily
P- moel voices tone, Need termer us	c-good
	e DVP wins this debate. Overflowing jails better
REASON FOR DECISION:	thun on
Evidence ? anguentation b	etter on opp but punished accurately
good evidence on both	teams I wopholes unfailed

Topic: Retribution has no place in a modern criminal justice system. PARLI Debate

Cathy Aguilera (*1 Round 1B 9:00am C4	5)	Judge's Name: Cathy	Aquilera
Gov: 10 Vijay - Cramer Opp: 3 Duong - Kopeler Novice Parli Debate		Judge's Name: <u>Cotthy</u> Judge's School Affiliation:	Micamonte.
	1984 M. 1994, The Colombia Management and the State State State Structure and State State State State State Sta		
Team Code #:	PROP	OPP Team Code #:	b
Prop Speaker #1_	Vijav pts 28 Cramer pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 During	pts_26
Prop Speaker #2_	<u>CrameR</u> . pts 27	Opp Speaker #2Kopekvi	ch. pts 26
Please award	each speaker points based o	<b>n the following scale:</b> Sutstanding <b>28</b> = Very Good	
,	30 - Perfect 29 - C 27 = Good (but possibly not good)	- /.	on rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair	24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or	-
	Judg	ging Criteria	
	How reasonably and effective ring the debate	ly the debaters analyze the top	bic and the arguments
	How appropriately and efficient	ently the debaters support arg	uments with
	-which may include facts and		
	tation: How directly and effect	tively the debaters respond to	the arguments made
by the other Points of l	er side	d affective were the question	s and the answers
	How well the debaters speak i		
	understandable		
• Courtesy:	How courteous and respectful	the debaters were to oppone	nts and judges
<b>X 1</b> (1 1		<b>.</b>	
equilence. Using the abo	ve criteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions	ong descried purish ment
Retribution vexact A-	Vijay	Analysi3-	Zdays law V
$V_{\rm e}$ $h_{\rm e}$ $h_{\rm$	lood	Opp 1: E-good eviden	ce deter crimes v
	ng good ankumentation	A_	
Neg. impact on p-x Neg. impact on p-x	ind the pup contact unlie	P-×	Comminity of tozather
	od the eye contact, voice		gestures, tone voice punion
Ik theef dosing have C-g	eca	L- good	
Ik theef doesn't have (-g) the money to give back (-g)	<u>lvamer</u> .	1 /1	<u>selevich</u> retributions
	good analysis	Opp 2: E- good evid	ence hasplace
eye for eye.	Elgood angumentation	A-	punishment V descrived
support to the A		P-X	1
No coursenv ~	bod fone, hand gestures i)	D-good han	d gestures steal IK =
inetficine Univ (-b)	ood vergevalle	<sup>C-</sup> good	pay lk dela, reachd
unjust model unjust model NED. Impact on TEAM CODE		PUP wine this dehate	deter repeated orime v =
SOUTO REASON FOR		wins this debate.	Nommunity service
<b>GOV</b> REASON FOR			-
Veru	y good angumentation	N on Prop good e	uidence on
		both t	eams.

<b>John Brouhard (*6)</b> Round 1A 9:00am D102 Gov: 14 Chan - Foley	Judge's Name: John Bronhard
Opp: 17 Raven - Sweeney Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: (4mpol)
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #: 0PP
Prop Speaker #1pts	17 Opp Speaker #1 Sweeney pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Foley pts_	
Please award each speaker points ba 30 = Perfect	used on the following scale: 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:

TEAM CODE #: 17 on the <u>Jpp</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: Julicity die groß job clarifying resolution and personatively arguing determine and unitermity.

John Brounard (*6) Round 1B 9:00am D102 Gov: 14 Holwitz - Kay Opp: 19 Byrne - Nguyen Novice Parli Debate		Judge's Name: Joh B Judge's School Affiliation: (1	ronhard impolisto
PRO	P		lan ya kutoka
Team Code #:		Team Code #: 9	
Prop Speaker #1	Holwitz 4 pts 28	Opp Speaker #1yr~C	pts3
Prop Speaker #2	ypts_ <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #2	pts_26
Please award each		on the following scale:	ar can an ann an
	30 = Perfect  29 = 0	Outstanding <b>28</b> = Very Good	
27 = 0	ood (but possibly not go	od enough to qualify for elimination ro	ounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair	<b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inap	propriate behavior

J

#### **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:

Cindy Bulger (*23) Round 1A 9:00am C3 Gov: 3 Brown - Helms Opp: 19 Mart - Moran Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>Cinay Bulge</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>San Ramon Vall</u>	еу
PROP Team Code #:3	OPP Team Code #:1 2	•
Prop Speaker #1_Bow	pts_24 Opp Speaker #1_Martpts_28	
Prop Speaker #2HelmS	pts 28 Opp Speaker #2 Hovan pts 29	

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

С

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good

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

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

#### **Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: Opp 1: you have a very nice speaking His flow to your speech, Effe contact could be mue direct. Sometimus E felt you styll, easy to follow were looking out the winding Prop 2: Opp 2: good eye contact Very organized Recullent speaker Very easy to understand/ speed of speech excilent **TEAM CODE #:** on the Opp wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) **REASON FOR DECISION:** The oppositions point man mandthy lows prevent racial profiling by equalizing the punishment for the crime and the strong argument that knowing the punishment in advance could deter some me from committing the crime Were stronger arguments than the APF's position of due processo

<b>Cindy Bulger (*23)</b> Round 1B 9:00am C3 Gov: 19 Andola - Pareja Opp: 5 Pashman - Ralston Novice Parli Debate		Judge's Name: <u>Cindy Bulge</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>San F</u>	
PROP Team Code #:	n off officing of \$10 non-constant of the source of the so	Team Code #:	State and an operation of the second
Prop Speaker #1 Andola	pts	Opp Speaker #1 Ralston	pts_22
Prop Speaker #2_ Pashman	pts_29	Opp Speaker #2	pts_29
Please award each speaker pe	oints based	on the following scale:	MITALITYMINA •••••

> 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

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

#### **Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: Opp 1: Good eve contact Good strong speaking shyle Goud Timing on your Souch. Prop 2: string and organized style little fast but believes you were so organized it was easy to follow Opp 2: Very organized and clear easy to fillion. 19 on the <u>AFP</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) **TEAM CODE #:** AFF stood by their definition of retribution involving vencounce and personal taxas in the modern criminal justice system. Alig. ded not refute the thea of modern and in the IN rebuiltant actorally agreed that the resolution " Cleanly states - modern " Apps examples that compared up vs modern better supported their position



## 

		PARLI Deba	ite
Tai Phan (*19) Round 1A 9:00am D103 Gov: 13 Garcia - Acosta		Judge's Name: <b>7</b>	TI PHAN.H
Opp: 25 Green - Nichols Novice Parli Debate		Judge's School Affilia	tion: <u>PHS</u>
PROP Team Code #:	n - C C C Congrad (Congrad Congrad Cong	Team Code #:	0PP 25
Prop Speaker #1 Acosh	<u>Z</u> 8 pts	_ Opp Speaker #1_N <sup>i</sup> che  s_	2. \$ pts
Prop Speaker #2 <u>Grace</u>	<u>28</u> pts	_ Opp Speaker #2 <u>Grezn</u>	28pts
	30 = Perfect 29	ed on the following scale: = Outstanding 28 = Very	
	(but possibly not 24-20 = Poor	good enough to qualify for eli $<20 = Reserved$ for m	mination rounds) de or inappropriate behavior
$20-25 = 1^{\circ} an$	24-20 - 1 001		
		udging ¢riteria	
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasons offered during the descent statement of the descent statement</li></ul>	•	tively the debaters analyze t	the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How app	ropriately and ef	ficiently the debaters suppo	
• Argumentation: Ho		and references to authority a ffectively the debaters response	as well as general knowledge ond to the arguments made
<ul><li>by the other side</li><li>Points of Information</li></ul>	on: How releva	t and effective were the que	estions and the answers
	the debaters spe		nicative style that is pleasant
•	1	etful the debaters were to op	ponents and judges
Using the above criteri each debater:	a, please offer o	ompliments and/or sugges	stions for improvement to
	/	1	
Prop 1: - Good Work - - Delivery =	Team Work	- Opp 1: - Little & hard - Need mo	in confusion Home of Home vo

**,**...

 $\sim$ Opp 2: Talk confident. Prop 2: - good work. Prip ß 14 TEAM CODE #:\_ on the SON FOR DECISION: (Prop or Opp) Team code (13)isbetter Feancode \_wins this debate. **REASON FOR DECISION:** 25

.

<b>Tai Phan (*19)</b> Round 1B 9:00am D103	Judge's Name: TAI PHAN.H
Gov. 14 I vons - Wyszynski	
Opp: 12 Santana) Jenes BAZILE Novice Parli Debate Fores	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>PHS</u>
PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 14	Team Code #:12
Prop Speaker #1 WySzynSKi 29 pts	Opp Speaker #1         BAZILe         2.8 pts           Opp Speaker #2         Jones         2.8 pts
Prop Speaker #2 12 on S. 30 pts	Opp Speaker #2_Jones 28_pts
Please award each speaker points based 30 = Perfect 29 =	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	bood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair <b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
In	dging Criteria
	vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	bely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
•	ciently the debaters support arguments with
	d references to authority as well as general knowledge
	ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	and effective were the questions and the answers
	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	ful the debaters were to opponents and judges
• Courtesy: now courteous and respect.	tur the debaters were to opponents and judges
	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
Prop 1: • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Creat I HW O LEARING	- enderce need more information
- very grad station job - grad Analysis : - Crime job money prov	- ENderce: netamprove - ENderce: netamprove - come, job, jail Drug money, - TeamWork
money - Dru	- come job jail my money,
-cond Delivery Emones	- countwork
-Good Delivery = money - Good Countersy.	
- Good Courteron. Jail Prop 2: - Very good speak: Crimes gyten - good Solve problem - good Solve problem - Good Solve problem	
Prop 2: peak: Crime 1	Opp 2: - good speak.
- Very & live problem	- good spert
- H.W. teem Work very good.	- good coulerry.
and contering	
- good conterny - good Delivery.	l
TEAM CODE #: 14 on the	<u>Prop</u> wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION	Prop or Opp)
P T I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	wood Home Works & Jean Works
The learn under 14: - very	good Home Ubaks & Team Works Jonking hard about this Topic.
They th	I and some of this Tome Deliver.
- They	newe good for the line and
6000	have good points of this Tope perveny 1. Nothing to say more (it's very good )

Round 1/ Gov: 19 Opp: 14	<b>s Rangwala (</b> A 9:00am D105 9 Alcantra - Thor 4 Kerr-Stein - Da Parli Debate	mpson		Judge's Name: <u>433</u> Judge's School Affiliation:	AS RANGWALA DV175	
	And a second	PROP	r – soopen gran manga¥rstyndenneresjeng, je –	OPI	el bela de la companya de la constructiva de la construcción de la del Construcción de desta de la construcción P	
	Team Code #:	19		Team Code #:	<u>i4</u>	
	Prop Speaker #1_	ALCANTR A	pts2&	Opp Speaker #1 KERR - St	TEIN pts 30	
	Prop Speaker #2	THOMPSON	pts8	Opp Speaker #2 <b>\D_\Co</b>	ntpts_29	
		30 = Pe	erfect $29 = 0$	n the following scale: outstanding 28 = Very Good		
		• •	• •	d enough to qualify for elimin		
	<b>26-25</b> = Fair	24-20 =	Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude of	or inappropriate behavior	
			Inde	ging Criteria		
	• Analysis.	How reasonably	-	ly the debaters analyze the t	tonic and the arguments	
	-	ring the debate		ly the debaters analyze the t	opic and the arguments	
		Ų	elv and efficie	ently the debaters support a	rouments with	
				references to authority as w		
				tively the debaters respond		
	by the oth				to the albuments made	
	•		w relevant an	d effective were the question	ons and the answers	
				n an organized, communica		
		understandable			1	
	•		and respectful	the debaters were to oppoi	nents and judges	
	v		• /	11	, ,	
	Using the abo each debater:	ove criteria, plea SCALE	se offer com : i- 5	pliments and/or suggestion 5 BEING EXCELLE	ns for improvement to wi)(1- AverAGE)	
	Duen 1. Al		3	1		. Ø
	Prop 1: AL	CANTRA	/ -		CON EYFIDNITACI	
ANALYSIS -	_ 3.5	-GOOD PRB	ABIT MUR	AWALYSIS 5 EVINIANCI 5	WITI LTRUITURED A	RGVNIENI-
EVIDENCE -	- 3.5	- MISSED LOL	KTESY TO		- GOOD COURTEOUS A	PPRVACH
ARGUM	- 4	OPP PARTY.	FOCUSMORE	ARGUM - 5 FOI - 5	1001	
POJ	_ 'N/A	4	28	DEWNERY - 5	30	
DELIVERY -	_ 4	//-	x of	COURTESY- 5		
COURTESY -	- 4 Prop 2: Тно	MACON	•	Opp 2: DAVID	SON	<b>A</b>
		MAKE BETTERE	HE KONTAG		- GOOD EYE LONTACT	Ŧ
ANA		A MARKE	POILEVONI	ATNA. 5	AN WAATOK LAN BE	
EVI	3.5 3.5	YOU DO NOT WAN	TTO ALLOW	EV1 REARG 4	STRUCTURED BETTER	•
ARG,		FOLUS UN CONN	- Al	POI N/A	3//////	
POI DEL	3.5 (TRY 1	O MARE EVE CON	TACI)	DEL 4	\ <b>2</b> 9	
COV	TEAM CODE	#:/4+	on the			
				op or Opp)		

REASON FOR DECISION: OPP BUILT A LOGICAL CASE, BENGAGEMENT WAS PROFESSIONAL & CONTRATEOUS CONGRATULATIONS!

PROP TEAM DID A GOOD JOB BUT MISSED BUT ON KEY POINTS OF OPP. TRY TO FOCUS MORE ON KEY POINTS & RATIONALLY ARGUE. ONE GOOD REBUTTAL IS BETTER THAN MANY. OVERALL, STRUCTURE YOUR POINTS MORE CRISPLY. GREAT TRY & WIGH YOU BEST ! ALMOST THERE!!

Round 1 Gov: 1 Opp: 1	<b>s Rangwala (*</b> B 9:00am D105 9 Le - Rather 4 Masuda-Thaya Parli Debate			Judge's Name: <u>ABBAS RANGWALA</u> Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS
TNOVICE		and the second secon	an an an the state of the state	
	Team Code #:	prop 19		OPP Team Code #:14
		LE		
	Prop Speaker #2_	RATHER	pts8	Opp Speaker #2 MASUDA -THAYA pts 29
		30 = Pe	erfect $29 =$	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	<b>26-25</b> = Fair	•	Poor	
			Juć	Iging Criteria
	<ul> <li>offered dur</li> <li>Evidence: evidence-</li> <li>Argument: by the othe</li> <li>Points of It</li> <li>Delivery: Hand easily to</li> <li>Courtesy:</li> </ul>	ing the debate How appropriate which may inclu- ation: How dire r side <b>nformation:</b> Ho low well the del understandable How courteous a	ely and effic ude facts and ctly and effe ow relevant a baters speak and respectf	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments iently the debaters support arguments with d references to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges
	Using the above each debater:			npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Beirg Excellent, I being AveRAGE)
HTK LD'	5 STAR N/A HAVE 5 GOID 5 GOID	CONTENTION & T, THEN LOST TO USE ALL TI E UR CASE COURTES Y, & O	ME/IF U +	ARG 5 - OVERALL TIED VP UR CASE NICELY POI 5 DEL 4.5 CUV 4.5
AR6 3 Pol 3	Prop 2: RATHI - WORE MORE - MORE - MARE - MORE - M	CON ARGUMEN , LOGICALLY GR DID JUMPING FI E A BIT MORE	ROM PIS TO F EVE 60NTA	DEL-4 -FOCUS ABIT MORE ON COURTEST COU 5
	DEAGONEOD	<b>DROM</b>	`	· · · · · ·

OPP: WON BECAUSE THEY WERE ABLE TO KEEP THEIR CONTENTIONS CRISP & LOBICAL . CONGRATULATIONS CRISP & LOBICAL & LOBICA

PROP: STARTED VERY STRONG & THEN FOCUS WANED. WAS HARD BECAME HARD TO KEEP TRACK OVERALL, GOD DELIVERY, LOGIC, JUST TIDY IT VA A BIT MORE. ALMOST THERE !! GOD LUCK!

Nanny Tunnell (*16) Round 1A 9:00am D109 Gov: 5 Figueroa - Thomas Opp: 21 Burrous - Griggy Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS
PROP	OPP/
Team Code #: 5	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Thomas pts 2-7	Opp Speaker #1 Burners pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 Figure pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Burrows pts 25 Opp Speaker #2 briggy pts 28
<ul> <li>Please award each speaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = 0 27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor</li> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficite evidence—which may include facts and</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effective offered side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant at Delivery: How well the debates</li> </ul>	on the following scale: 42: minimum sentence unjust Dutstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
each debater: Prop 1: - good eye contact - good wrbul pace - contentions needs to be better originized to expendent Prop 2: - parsimate delivery - good analysis & nospendent well to other's contenting - hed clearer separation of point TEAM CODE #: 21 on the (P	Opp 2: - very courteons - need to present to judge + not to the other lide - used examples well to set points achurs - brod argumentation Opp wins this debate. Prop or Opp) ence and argumentation.

Nanny Lunell n e la Santa a Santa 27 Burnerus 25 2. Constant Gragy 25

Thomas I hours

الحين وي فارك بالاحجاجية، المراقب المراقب المحتوية المحتوي المراجب المحتوية، ومحتوية المراجب المحتوية المراجب الحين المحتوية المحتو المحتوية الم

n. Regentige two met de la Regentifie d'alla de la construction de la construcción de la construcción de la constru La construcción de la construcción d

o esta (estate de la subsectar de la conserve estate de la subsectar de la seguiera de la seguiera de la secon La seguiera de la subsectar de l La seguiera de la subsectar de

ان المَعْلَقِ اللَّهِ اللَّهِ المَعَانِ العَلَيْ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ وَالَّالَّةُ وَالْحَدَّةُ اللَّهُ وَ المَا الْعَانَةُ عَلَيْ اللَّهُ عَلَيْ اللَّهُ عَلَيْ اللَّهُ عَلَيْتَ اللَّهُ وَاللَّهُ عَلَيْتَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ عَلَيْ اللَّهُ عَلَيْ اللَّهُ عَلَيْ اللَّهُ عَلَيْتَ اللَّهُ وَاللَّهُ عَلَيْتَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ عَلَيْ اللَّهُ عَلَيْ اللَّهُ عَلَيْ اللَّهُ عَلَيْتَ اللَّهُ وَاللَّهُ عَلَيْ اللَّهُ وَاللَّهُ

CAP

1. A set of a se

2-1

.

Nanny Tunnell (*16) Round 1B 9:00am D109 Gov: 3 Lisy - Forman Opp: 13 Karim - Kerstetter	Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnel)
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: MUTS
PROP ( い∪ ) Team Code #:	OPP     Team Code #:   13
Prop Speaker #1 hisy pts 2.5	Opp Speaker #1_l@sktkr pts_29
Prop Speaker #2 Pornum pts 25	Opp Speaker #2 Karim pts 25
	on the following scale: Retribution has no place Dutstanding 28 = Very Good in a modern criminal od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) Joshiu cystem <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: $-\frac{1}{2}$

Sophia Burshteyn (*3) Round 1A 9:00am C6 Gov: 19 Phan - Phan	Judge's Name: SOPHIA BURSHIEYN	
Opp: 23 Barton - Madsen Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>SOPHIA</u> BURSHIE'SM Judge's School Affiliation: <u>BENILEY</u>	
PROP		
Team Code #:	Team Code #: <u>25</u>	
Prop Speaker #1_Phan_1		
Prop Speaker #2 Phan Col	herine pts 28 Opp Speaker #2 Madel pts 27	
	r points based on the following scale:	
	= Perfect <b>29</b> = Outstanding <b>28</b> = Very Good	
	It possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 20 = Poor $< 20 = Reserved$ for rude or inappropriate behavior	
	Judging Criteria	
•	bly and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments	
<ul> <li>offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriate</li> </ul>	riately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with	
	include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge	
—	directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made	
by the other side	How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers	
	e debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant	
and easily understandab		
• <b>Courtesy:</b> How courted	ous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges	
each debater.	please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to	
Prop 1: 9000 del 9000 origumen contotations o 406 ject mi original production	ght jup we could by,	
ALCONT MARGON VO	were clearly Opp 2: effectively 2 upported or Cellow of the portien and or Cellow of the portien and	
Prop 2:	ther man opp 2: effectively 2, offectively and	
Day got ante	er collar a portructed togueste	Λ.
very good spea supported parts verponded to	vier clearly Opp 2: effectively & opported er clearly opp 2: effectively & opported a partner and desponded ponents opponduts.	fg.
TEAM CODE #:	on the wins this debate.	
<b>REASON FOR DECISION:</b>	(Prop or Opp)	
	terong care. all term	
	whitten whitten and meanuredly, but heg team	
all all all	id not connect it.	

Sophia Burshteyn Round 1B 9:00am C6 Gov: 6 Kang - Yolasan	(*3) Judge's Name: Sophito Buruhteyn
Opp: 21 Harris - Marr Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley
Team Code #:	PROP         OPP         OPP           Team Code #:         21
Prop Speaker #1	Kang pts 27 Opp Speaker #1 Harris pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	<u>Yolasan pts 71</u> Opp Speaker #2 Mary pts 27
	each speaker points based on the following scale:30 = Perfect29 = Outstanding28 = Very Good7 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
<ul> <li>offered du</li> <li>Evidence: evidence-</li> <li>Argument by the other Points of D</li> <li>Delivery: and easily</li> <li>Courtesy:</li> <li>Using the about the state of the stat</li></ul>	Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant understandable How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges ve criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	fruitions to follow the Opp 1: defined coodmap clearly good contour tran points auguments extented vegements strong to partner extented opp 2: good portner support
TEAM CODE	#: 6 on the PROP wins this debate.
REASON FOR	DECISION:
	effictive and clean 3 pearches and strong case, was not reberthed.

.•

MArida for Tim Satence laces are unjust. PARLI Debate

Alex Shvartsman (*14) Round 1A 9:00am C5 Gov: 10 Khurana - Darukhanawalla Opp: 22 Keshav - Wei Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>Alex M. Shvartsman</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Cowell</u>
PROP Team Code #: 10	OPP 
Prop Speaker #1_Malcola pts_	28 Opp Speaker#1_NACMA_ pts_25
	26 Opp Speaker #2 <u>Agena</u> 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  $\neq 20$  = 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 debater's 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:

Unfortunately one of the Off team dida't show or which clearly impacted their score did a soul in their

Retribtion has a place in a m driminal Notice system. Alex Shvartsman (*14)	1 1 1 1
Round 1B 9:00am C5 Gov: 3 McDonald - Thani	Judge's Name: ELEX FL: NUAD to have
Opp: 10 Lee - Wang	
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell
PROP Team Code #:7	OPP
	Team Code #:/ひ
Prop Speaker #1_ <u>Hollan9</u> pts <u>29</u>	Opp Speaker #1 Ryen pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Zahid pts 23	2 Opp Speaker #2 JAmes . pts 27
Please award each speaker points base	- /
	= Outstanding <b>28</b> = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not g 26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
$20-25 - Fait \qquad 24-20 - Foot$	<20 – Reserved for fude of mappropriate behavior
Jı	udging Criteria
• Analysis: How reasonably and effect	ively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
	ficiently the debaters support arguments with
	nd references to authority as well as general knowledge ffectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	meetively me depaters respond to me arguments made
•	t and effective were the questions and the answers
- Denvery. now wen the debaters spea	ak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	ak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	ak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant atful the debaters were to opponents and judges
<ul><li>and easily understandable</li><li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectively</li></ul>	etful the debaters were to opponents and judges
<ul> <li>and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectively</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respec</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer coeach debater:</li> </ul>	etful the debaters were to opponents and judges ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
<ul> <li>and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respec</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer content of the statement of the</li></ul>	Opp 1:. Spoke clearly but weak crownt
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1:.speaks lowed + Clear.	Opp 1: Spoke clearly but weak crownt of continents and/or suggestions for improvement to
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1: speaks lough + Clear. • clearly stated argument and	Opp 1: Spoke clearly but weak crownt of continents and/or suggestions for improvement to
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1: Speaks lough + Clear. • cleady stated argument and	Opp 1: Spoke clearly but weak crownt sare control needed to penaliz properly? controlations - needs to be employed but fattenals?
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1: Speaks loud + Clear	Opp 1: Spoke clearly but weak crownt sare control needed to penaliz properly? controlations - needs to be employed but fattenals?
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1:.speaks lowel + Clear. • clearly stated argument and roints drorf: good resuttal. defined punishment vs versame.	opp 1: Spone clearly but weak crownt score control needed to pendic properly? controlations - needs to be employed but rationale? . did y distinguish between retribution + punchant. implied they are the server.
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1:.speaks lowel + Clear. • clearly stated argument and roints drorf: good resuttal. defined punishment vs versame.	opp 1: Spone clearly but weak crownt score control needed to pendic properly? controlations - needs to be employed but rationale? . did y distinguish between retribution + punchant. implied they are the server.
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1: Speaks loogl + Clear. • clearly stated argument and roints iror1: good resultate defined punishment vs versame. Prop 2: needs to practice not says 'UM, Wh' so much.	etful the debaters were to opponents and judges ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1:. Spoke clearly bud weak crownt escre constrain needed to penalize properly? contraditions - needed to penalize properly? contraditions - needs to be emotioned but rationale? . did u't distinguish between retribution + punchant. implied they are the server. Opp 2: needs to practice speed to steep on yount
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1: Speaks loogl + Clear. • clearly stated argument and roints iror1: good resultate defined punishment vs versame. Prop 2: needs to practice not says 'UM, Wh' so much.	opp 1: Spoke clearly but weak crownt sare control needed to penaliz properly? contraditions - needed to penaliz properly? contraditions - needs to be emotioned but rationals? . did u't distinguish between retribution + punchant. implied they are the serve. Opp 2: needs to practice speed to stay byolke would t clear. mede som your
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1: speaks lowel + Clear. • cleady statel argument and roints frorf: good resuttal. defind punishment vs versame. Prop 2: needs to prachaptor says 'Um, whi so much. · lats of long paysos secone lost.	opp 1: Spoke clearly but weak crownt sare control needed to penaliz properly? contraditions - needed to penaliz properly? contraditions - needs to be emotioned but rationals? . did u't distinguish between retribution + punchant. implied they are the serve. Opp 2: needs to practice speed to stay byolke would t clear. mede som your
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1:•Speaks loosel + Clear. • cleady statel argument and roints Broef: good resultated argument prop 2: needs to practice not says 'Um, whi so much. · lats of long paysos-secone lost. • literally no offeer argument.	extru the debaters were to opponents and judges ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1:. Spoke clearly but weak crownt escret constrain needed to penalize properly? contraditions - needs to be emotioned but rationale? . did it distinguish between retribution t punchmut. implied they are the some. Opp 2: needs to practice speed to step by olke houd t clear. mode some good points. not really following the argument about diff. between retribution and just
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1: Speaks loosel + Clear. • cleady statel argument and roints groef: good rebuttal. defend punishment vs versame. Prop 2: needs to practice not says 'Um, wh' so much. · lats of long paysos - seeme lost. • literally no offeer argument. TEAM CODE #: 10 on the	ettul the debaters were to opponents and judges ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1:. Spoke clearly but weak cryunt escre constrain needed to sendly properly? contraditions - needs to be emotioned but rationale? . did of distinguish between retribution t pourshamet. implied they are the serve. Opp 2: needs to practice speech to stay by your Syrolke loud t clear. mede some yood points. not really tollowing the argument about dift. between relatives and just
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1: Speaks lood + Clear. • cleady statel ergement and roints Broef: good resuttate definit punishment vs versame. Prop 2: needs to prachast says 'UM, Wh' so much. · lats of long payson second lost. • literally no alear arguant. TEAM CODE #: O on the	oppliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1:. Syron c clearly but weak cryumt escret constrain necded to penclic properly? contraditions - needed to penclic properly? ourse of a choice speed to stry on yount Syrolke would t clear. medic some your points. not really following the argument about diff. between retalization and wath e <u>Opp</u> wins this debate. Man yourshand. Seem (Prop or Opp) Their argument doesn to
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1: Speaks loosel + Clear. • cleady statel argument offer roints Irord: yood resuttate defined punishment vs versame. Prop 2: needs to practice not says 'UM, wh' so much. · lats of long payson second lost. • literally no drear argument. TEAM CODE #: O on the REASON FOR DECISION:	etful the debaters were to opponents and judges ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1:. Spoke clearly but weak cryumt escre constrain needed to penalize properly? contraditions - needs to be emotioned but rationale? . did o't distinguish between retribution t punchant. implied they are the serve. Opp 2: needs to practice speed to stay Swolke would telear. medie some good points. not really following the argument about diff. between retribution and just e <u>Opp</u> wins this debate. Name yourshoul. Second (Prop or Opp) their argument doesn the
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1:.speaks loogl + Clear. • cleady stable argument and roints Iror1: good rebuttal. defend punishment vs versame. Prop 2: needs to prachemot says 'UM, Wh' so much. · lats of long paysos seems lost. • literally no atear argument. TEAM CODE #: 10 on the REASON FOR DECISION: Combin & soores were instant. both	etful the debaters were to opponents and judges ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1:, Spoke clearly but weak cryonant esciele constrain needed to penalize properly? contraditions - needed to penalize properly? contraditions - needed to penalize properly? contraditions - needes to be emotioned but rationale? . diver & distinguish between retribution + punishmet. implied they are the serve. Opp 2: needs to practice speed to stay by olke would telear. mede some your points. not really following the argument about diff. betweent retailistion and with e opp wins this debate. I'm your humat. Second (Prop or Opp) their argument doesn to of 21. clearly cofine it.
and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respec Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater: Prop 1: Speaks loosel + Clear. • cleady statel argument off roints Brop 1: good resultate argument off prop 2: needs to practice not says 'UM, Wh' so much. • lots of long payson second lost. • literally no offeer argument. TEAM CODE #: on the REASON FOR DECISION:	etful the debaters were to opponents and judges ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1:, Spoke clearly but weak cryund escret constrain needed to penalize properly? contraditions - needed to penalize properly? contraditions - needed to enotional but rationale? . diver & distinguish between retribution + punishmet. implied they are the server. Opp 2: needs to practice speed to stry Svolke wood & clear. mede some your points. not really following the argument about diff. betweent retailistion and just e opp wins this debate. I'm yourthmet. Second (Prop or Opp) their argument doesn to 0/2 1. clearly cofin it.

Lori-Jill Seltzer (*5) Round 1A 9:00am C1 Gov: 3 Lanzone - Hubinger Opp: 19 Fong - Ligutan Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name Ori-Jill Seltzer Judge's School Affiliation: BOD
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 - Lobine _ pts	$29$ Opp Speaker #1 $\overline{E000}$ pts $25$
Prop Speaker #2 $\underline{(202)}$ pts	28 Opp Speaker #2 $\frac{19}{19}$
Please award each speaker points b	ased on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding / 28 = Very Good27 = 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 Griteria

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

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

Opp 1: Covered Prop 1: Clearly Stated e frop 1 stater Doin and P 00) JCa DOINTS -manners; responded Prop 2: Opp 2:0 lear delin **TEAM CODE #:** on the Tra wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) **REASON FOR DECISION:** JUDACI

Lori-Jill Seltzer (*5) Round 1B 9:00am C1 Gov: 12 Murdock - Bazile Opp: 14 Dickerman - Millar Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: LOF'FJII SCITZEF Judge's School Affiliation: BOD
• <b>PROP</b> Team Code #:	OPP
Mindont	pts 27 Opp Speaker #1 Dictornan pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 Murdoct	pts27 Opp Speaker #2_Millar_pts25
. <b>The state of the state of th</b>	

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good27 = 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: (), lear Opp 1 anize Oſ Prop 2 Opp 2: 00X ant **TEAM CODE #:** on the  $\int O Q Q$  wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) an bolk roles **REASON FOR DECISION:** evidence a COVER  $\alpha$ 

Upp 1: Sub 2. Alargy       Judge's School Affiliation: If ying the High         Newice Paul Debate       If the property of the pro	Winnie Wang (*10 Round 1A 9:00am D108 Gov: 27 Little - Wagner		Judge's Name: Winnie	Wang
Team Code #: <u>14</u> Prop Speaker #1 <u>Little</u> pts <u>2</u> Opp Speaker #1 <u>Situ</u> pts <u>2</u> ?7 Prop Speaker #2 <u>Wag new</u> pts <u>2</u> Opp Speaker #1 <u>Situ</u> pts <u>2</u> ?7 Prop Speaker #2 <u>Wag new</u> pts <u>2</u> Opp Speaker #1 <u>Situ</u> pts <u>2</u> ?7 Prop Speaker #2 <u>Wag new</u> pts <u>2</u> Opp Speaker #1 <u>Situ</u> pts <u>2</u> ?7 Prop Speaker #2 <u>Wag new</u> pts <u>2</u> Opp Speaker #1 <u>Situ</u> pts <u>2</u> ?7 Prop Speaker #2 <u>Wag new</u> pts <u>2</u> Opp Speaker #1 <u>Situ</u> pts <u>2</u> ?7 Prop Speaker #2 <u>Wag new</u> pts <u>2</u> ? Prop Speaker #2 <u>Wag new</u> pts <u>2</u> ? Prop Speaker #2 <u>30</u> = Perfect <u>29</u> = Outstanding <u>28</u> = V/ry Good 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair <u>24-20</u> = Poor < <u>20</u> = Reserver for rude or inappropriate behavior Judging Criteria • Analysis: How reasonably and effectively 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 on organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable • Courtesy: How well the debaters speak in on organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable • Delivery: How well the debaters speak in on organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable • Delivery: 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 widenue - good analysis ff topic Prop 2: - good wargumentution - delivery information well * - cleary speach * - may has good Support for the Main idea and	Opp: 14 Situ - Zhang Novice Parli Debate		Judge's School Affiliation:	Irivgton High
Prop Speaker #2       Way new       pts 2       Opp Speaker #2       Plase 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 effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge         • Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge         • Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge         • Analysis: 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 Skill of interpretation         - good graphice for the profect       - move confident on the speaking falle         - good graphysis ff topic       - move con		27		
Please award each speaker points based on the following scale 30 = Perfect 29 - Outstanding 28 = V/ry Good 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserver for rule or inappropriate behavior Judging Criteria 4. Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge 4. Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side 9. Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers 9. Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable 9. 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 skill of interpretation - deliver information well: - clear speech TEAM CODE #: - clear speech TEAM CODE #: - from the ago of Support for the main idea and	Prop Speaker #1	Little pts 28	Opp Speaker #1_Situ	pts 27
30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good         27 = Good (but possibly not good encupt to qualify for elimination rounds)         26-25 = Fair       24-20 = Poor       <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior         Judging Criteria         4       Analysis: How reasonably and efficiently the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate         5       Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge         6       Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side         9       Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers         9       Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable         0       Courtesy: How courteous and respective 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 widence         - good skill of interpretation       - will be perfect         - good analyzis ff topic       - more eye conful on the speath         - good variagumentation       - wery courteous         - deliver information well.       - good variagumentation of tone & voccal         - deliver	Prop Speaker #2_	Wagner pts 29	Opp Speaker #2_2hang	pts = 2/
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 effectively 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 emidence - good skill of interpretation - deliver information well: * - clear speech TEAM CODE #: on the on the or d support REASON FOR DECISION: The team has good Support for the main idea and	Please award			in the second
26-25 = Fair       24-20 = Poor       <20 = Reserved for rule 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 emidence         - good skill of interpretation       - more eye contact on the audience         - more confident on the speath       - more confident on the speath         - good windence       - more confident on the speath         - good analysis of topic       - more confident on the speath         - good variation       - good variation         - deliver information       - good variation         * - clear speach       - good variation       of tone & vocal <td< th=""><th>2</th><th>27 = Good (but possibly not g</th><th>ood enough to qualify for eliminati</th><th>on rounds)</th></td<>	2	27 = Good (but possibly not g	ood enough to qualify for eliminati	on rounds)
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:</li> <li>Prop 1: <ul> <li>good emidence</li> <li>good skill of interpretation</li> <li>more eye contact on the audience</li> <li>will be perfect</li> <li>move confident on the speath</li> <li>will be excellent</li> <li>opp 2: <ul> <li>good analysis of topic</li> <li>good variation well.</li> <li>delivery information well.</li> <li>delivery information well.</li> <li>team code the speach</li> <li>clear speech</li> <li>clear speech</li> <li>clear speech</li> <li>team code the speach on the speace.</li> </ul> </li> <li>REASON FOR DECISION:</li> <li>The prop team has good support for the main idea and</li> </ul></li></ul>	<b>26-25</b> = Fair			
<ul> <li>offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers</li> <li>Delivery: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:</li> <li>Prop 1: <ul> <li>good evidence</li> <li>good evidence</li> <li>good analysis off topic</li> <li>Prop 2: <ul> <li>good analysis off topic</li> <li>Prop 2: <ul> <li>good analysis off topic</li> <li>Good varyumentation well</li> <li>deliver information well</li> <li>deliver information well</li> <li>more confidente</li> <li>good varyumentation</li> <li>deliver information well</li> <li>more opport on the very courteous</li> </ul> </li> <li>TEAM CODE #:</li></ul></li></ul></li></ul>		Ju	dging Criteria	
<ul> <li>evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:</li> <li>Prop 1: <ul> <li>good evidence</li> <li>good skill of interpretation</li> <li>deliver information well</li> <li>deliver information well</li> <li>t - clear speech</li> <li>TEAM CODE #: on the profermines this debate.</li> </ul> </li> <li>REASON FOR DECISION:</li> </ul>			vely the debaters analyze the top	vic and the arguments
<ul> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:</li> <li>Prop 1: <ul> <li>good emiderie</li> <li>good skill of interpretation</li> <li>good skill of interpretation</li> <li>good analysis off topic</li> <li>good vargumentation well</li> <li>to clear speech</li> <li>clear speech</li> <li>good Variation of tone &amp; Vocal emphazis</li> <li>Good Support for the main idea and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	• Evidence:	How appropriately and effi	ciently the debaters support argu	uments with
<ul> <li>by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:</li> <li>Prop 1: <ul> <li>good enidence</li> <li>good skill of interpretation</li> <li>taking poI well</li> <li>faking poI well</li> <li>good analysis of topic</li> <li>good analysis of topic</li> <li>good analysis of topic</li> <li>good variation well</li> <li>deliver information well</li> <li>to clear speech</li> <li>clear speech</li> <li>clear speech</li> <li>the properties on the good support for the main idea and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:</li> <li>Prop 1: <ul> <li>good evidence</li> <li>good skill of interpretation</li> <li>faking poI well</li> <li>good analysis off topic</li> <li>good vergumentation</li> <li>deliver information well.</li> <li>clear speech</li> <li>clear speech</li> <li>clear speech</li> <li>clear speech</li> <li>family on the prophysis this debate.</li> <li>(Prophor Opp)</li> </ul> </li> <li>REASON FOR DECISION:</li> <li>The Prop.</li> </ul>			lectively the debaters respond to	the arguments made
<ul> <li>and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:</li> <li>Prop 1: <ul> <li>good envidence</li> <li>good skill of interpretation</li> <li>taking poI well</li> <li>for good analysis off topic</li> <li>good variation of tone &amp; vocal</li> <li>good variation of tone &amp; vocal</li> <li>good very courteous</li> </ul> </li> <li>Reason FOR DECISION:</li> <li>The Prop. team has good support for the main idea and</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:</li> <li>Prop 1: <ul> <li>good emidence</li> <li>good skill of interpretation</li> <li>taking pot well</li> <li>good analysis of topic</li> <li>prop 2:</li> <li>good analysis of topic</li> <li>good variation of tone &amp; vocal</li> <li>enclear speech</li> <li>good variation of tone &amp; vocal</li> <li>enclear speech</li> <li>good variation of tone &amp; vocal</li> <li>enclear speech</li> <li>good support for the main idea and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			k in an organized, communicativ	e style that is pleasant
Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: - good evidence - good skill of interpretation - good skill of interpretation - good analysis of topic Prop 2: - good analysis of topic - good analysis of topic - good analysis of topic - good variation well. - deliver information well. - clear speech TEAM CODE #: <u>27</u> on the <u>proprint</u> to <u>curteous</u> REASON FOR DECISION: The prop team has good support for the main idea and	•		ful the debaters were to opponer	nts and judges
each debater: Prop 1: - good evidence - good skill of interpretation - good skill of interpretation - good analysis of topic Prop 2: - good analysis of topic - good analysis of topic - good analysis of topic - good variation - deliver information well * - clear speech TEAM CODE #: on the proper for the main idea and REASON FOR DECISION: The proper team has good support for the main idea and				
- good skill of interpretation will be perfect - taking POI well - taking POI well - taking POI well - good analysis of topic - good analysis of topic - good analysis of topic - good analysis of topic - good variation of tone & vocal - deliver information well. - deliver information well. - clear speech TEAM CODE #: on the property courteous TEAM CODE #: on the property for the main idea and	Using the abo each debater:	ve criteria, please offer co		
- good skill of interpretation will be perfect - taking POI well - taking POI well - taking POI well - good analysis of topic - good analysis of topic - good analysis of topic - good analysis of topic - good variation of tone & vocal - deliver information well. - deliver information well. - clear speech TEAM CODE #: on the property courteous TEAM CODE #: on the property for the main idea and	_	/	1 and lund	o speaking tate
- good skill of interpretation will be perfect - taking POI well - taking POI well - taking POI well - good analysis of topic - good analysis of topic - good analysis of topic - good analysis of topic - good variation of tone & vocal - deliver information well. - deliver information well. - clear speech TEAM CODE #: on the property courteous TEAM CODE #: on the property for the main idea and	Prop 1:		Opp 1: - good volume	it on the audience
- deliver information well - clear speech TEAM CODE #: on the good Support for the main idea and			- more eye cont	4
- deliver information well - clear speech - clear speech TEAM CODE #: on the on the profiving this debate. REASON FOR DECISION: The prop team has good support for the main idea and	-good	skill of interpreta	lion will be perfe	
- John good analysis of topic Prop 2: - good argumentation - deliver information well. - clear speech TEAM CODE #: on the Prophins this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: The prop team has good support for the main idea and	COLAR -	taking DOT well	- more confide	ent on the speech
Prop 2: - very polite - good agrigumentation - deliver information well. *- clear speech TEAM CODE #: on the profiving this debate. REASON FOR DECISION: The prop team has good support for the main idea and	- Turker a	paking post ton:	, will be exc	ellent
- good variation - deliver information well. *- clear speech TEAM CODE #: on the Prophysins this debate. REASON FOR DECISION: The prophysical courter of the main idea and	Prop 2:	analysis gi ropin	Opp 2: - very pol	ite
- deriver information     - deriver	- and an	raumentation	and variation	of tone & vocal
*- clear speech TEAM CODE #: on the profiving this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: The prop team has good support for the main idea and	Jalive	r information well	amphazis	
TEAM CODE #: on the properties this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: The prop team has good support for the main idea and		- nog ch	•	
(Prop dr Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: The prop team has good support for the main idea and		Speccre	Harman Dia Dia Very Col	hrteous
The prop team has good support for the main idea and	IEAM CODE	#: on the	Prop or Opp	
		DECISION:	· · · · · ·	
	The prop	team has good	d support for th	e main idea and

Winnie Wang (*10) Round 1B 9:00am D108 Gov: 27 Campanella - Petruska Opp: 3 Greenwall - DuPuy	Judge's Name: Winnie Wang Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Irvington Hig</u> h
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>ITY Ingloin</u>
<b>PROP</b> Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
	Dpp Speaker #1 Greenwall pts 2/5
Prop Speaker #2 Petruska pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Dupuy pts >8
27 = Good (but possibly not good	the following scale: itstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judgi	ng Criteria
<ul> <li>offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and respective of the other side</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effective by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful</li> </ul>	the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments the debaters support arguments with eferences to authority as well as general knowledge ively the debaters respond to the arguments made d effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges <b>liments and/or suggestions for improvement to</b>
each debater:	
- nouve - evidence will be TEAM CODE #: <u>OPP</u> on the (Pro REASON FOR DECISION: OPP provided more facts	Opp 1: - good poI - logic arguments - strong & firm attitude - good conclusion Opp 2: perfect eye contact - Orgazined information well - can be better taking poI <u>3</u> wins this debate. - por Opp) has accellent - support and persuasive
Style,	

Arna Katewa (*21) Round 1A 9:00am C2 Gov: 12 Green - Madison Opp: 14 Lee - Duan		Judge's Name: <u>ARNA</u>	KATEWA	
Novice Parli Debate		Judge's School Affiliation;	SAN MARIN HIGH .	
PROP Team Code #: 12	Manazar e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	Team Code #:	14	
Prop Speaker #1 Madis	on pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Opp Speaker #2 Duan	pts_ <b>_29</b>	
Prop Speaker #2 <u>Green</u>	pts_27	Opp Speaker #2 Duan	<u>, pts_29</u> .	
	$0 = \operatorname{Perfect} 29 = \operatorname{Out}$	utstanding <b>28</b> = Very Goo		
		enough to qualify for elimina <20 = Reserved for rude o		
	Judgi	ng Criteria		
• Analysis: How reaso offered during the de		the debaters analyze the to	opic and the arguments	
		the debaters support ar		
• Argumentation: Ho	-	eferences to authority as we were the second s		
by the other side • Points of Information	n. How relevant and	l effective were the questio	ns and the answers	
	the debaters speak/in	an organized, communicat		
•		the debaters were to oppon	ents and judges	
Using the above criteria each debater:	a, please offer/comp	liments and/or suggestion	-	
Prop 1: Madison -	Good start and	Opp 1: Lee: good ey	e contact, confident	15
had good conter	rtions, feeded	speaking and back her conte	good me of suidence wicon. Good contention	م
more enidence the argument.	to back up	with evidence.	when the I Tated clearly	y
(ONLY SUGGESTION - MA	RE EYE CONTACT)		rebuttal Tated clearly, other learn and how	
Prop 2: finish the a	rgument you starte	Opp 2: Suan - C	good enidence & argume fident and great eye	
Green: Good eye co	nlact, started	contact. Picked	up on the opponent's p	socals
of well and ha	d some great	& argued very nic	up on the opponents p ely about their content	lions.
points to argue the	e opposition,	stronger than h	why this contentions the opponent team.	m
TEAM CODE #: <u> 4</u>	• on the	<u>OPP</u> . wins this debate.	·	
REASON FOR DECISION	1: Bolti leans	por Opp) inere , very counteous . They	+ stated their convention	~
and arguments,	but the oppo	sition team was	more assertine abou	Ŵ
their arguments	and clearly	, stated why m	more assertine abor andatory minimum	
security cans	are just.	•		

Arna Katewa (*21) Round 1B 9:00am C2	Judge's Name: ARNA KATEWA
Gov: 14 Luk - Tserennamid	Judge's Name: ANNA KALEVA
Opp: 3 Dovichi - Vetterli Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP	OPP
Team Code #:14	Team Code #: <u>3</u> ,
Prop Speaker #1 Luk pts 29	Opp Speaker #1_Vetterlipts_28 Opp Speaker #2Dorrichipts_30
Prop Speaker #2 Trerennamid pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Donich pts 30
Please award each speaker points based	
	Outstanding <b>28</b> = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	Iging Criteria
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectiv offered during the debate</li> </ul>	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
•	iently the debaters support arguments with
	I references to authority as well as general knowledge
•	ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	and effective were the questions and the answers
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
<ul> <li>and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectf</li> </ul>	ul the depaters were to opponents and judges
	in the deputers were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	have in a start through have
Prop 1: huk - Good and confident	Opp 1: Vetterli Good start. Should have
avation. Clearly stated contensit	as backed up your contentions inter examples.
with examples and arguments f Nice decivery.	
Patiental view clear & also know	ed Rebuttal - Needed to elaborate to to discuss the issue more.
how the opposition team's argumen differed from there's . Made a storger co Drop 2. Kerry parend - You had som	ce. discuss the issue more.
	1 Onn ? Dorrichi - Great start and argument
great arguments, also good we	Vory good use of examples to back
of your parmers comment.	the contentions. Very assertive in
colding an to them further a	the contentions. Very assertine in the arguments you made.
make your case stronger.	
TEAM CODE #:AA on the	PROPwins this debate.
	Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	Top Mongener great use of examples,
Both leans did a GREAT	TOB. Mowever, great use of examples, ting out how they defter from their
arguments at well as poin	ting out how they differ from their
opponent gave PROP" the	advantage. They came up inté good stronger.
arguments & made lie case	suronger.

-Wendy Young (*27) Round 1A 9:00am D101 Gov: 3 Hemerling - Barnett Opp: 14 Woo - Melman Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Young, Marlon Judge's School Affiliation: Wind Sof
PROP Team Code #:3	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1_ <u>Hemerling</u> pt	s_28 Opp Speaker #1 Melman pts_27
Prop Speaker #2_ Barnet pt	s 27 Opp Speaker #2 $V i D$ pts 27.5
27 = Good (but possibly	based on the following scale:29 = Outstanding28 = Very Goody not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)r<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
<ul> <li>offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately an evidence—which may include fate and the other side</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly a by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How refate and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and refate a</li></ul>	effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments and efficiently the debaters support arguments with acts and references to authority as well as general knowledge and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made levant and effective were the questions and the answers s speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges <b>Fier compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to</b>
each debater:	
Prop 1: Hemerling - Will tone, Dictation, Pace: Good F Speake - Make Pursaire Argumet, M a Bit off Topic. Not quite a	host - missed Contins one point: Constitution issue - missed Contins one point: Constitution issue - Had-Raised 3 good points - on point
Prop 2: Barnett: - Mainly Restated Sume into, I on Portners Points R. Cureful or oppearing which	nto Opp 2: WOO Build - Kept the Feam focus very well
Be Coneful of appearond which SP TEAMI CODE #: 14 REASON FOR DECISION: Ac a team hard a Reflec	on the <u>OPP</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) theore and fours. Had 3 Key issues that

Round Gov: 1 Opp: 6	64 <b>dy Young (*27</b> 18 9:00am D101 14 Fong - Geller 5 Brouhard - Weld e Parli Debate			Judge's Name: Young, Judge's School Affiliation:_	Marlon Windsor
	Team Code #:	PROP 1년		OPP Team Code #:	6
	Prop Speaker #1_	Fong	pts7	Opp Speaker #1_Welch	pts_27
	Prop Speaker #2_	Geller	pts	Opp Speaker #2_ <u>B10Vho</u> 1	0 pts 26
_		30 = Pe 27 = Good (but po	erfect <b>29</b> = ( ssibly not goo	on the following scale: Dutstanding 28 = Very Good of enough to qualify for eliminat <20 = Reserved for rude or	tion roupds)
1tu +				ging Criteria	
Pwin	<ul> <li>offered dut</li> <li>Evidence: evidence-</li> <li>Argument by the other Points of I</li> <li>Delivery: and easily</li> </ul>	ring the debate How appropriate -which may inclu tation: How direct er side Information: Ho How well the deb understandable	ely and effici ide facts and ctly and effe w relevant a baters speak	ely the debaters analyze the to ently the debaters support arg references to authority as we ctively the debaters respond to nd effective were the question in an organized, communicati al the debaters were to oppone	guments with Il as general knowledge to the arguments made as and the answers ve style that is pleasant
	Using the abo each debater:		se offer com	pliments and/or suggestions	s for improvement to
	Prop 1: fong	٢.		Opp 1: Welch .	
<i>Ц</i> рат	play of Re	trobution fre	nch Dev. nkie America CH-K		Conten ut weed's to
	Prop 2: Gell-	e / :		Opp 2: Brordhard:	be Juship Sytem - mit
Good `	theme - Ju	ustice Must E	ge Blind		Perdet-
6 6 1	TEAM CODE REASON FOR Ood "Pin onlen Poin and Docisi	DECISION	(P L & 600 Match,	<u>off</u> wins this debate. rop or Opp) d Debating Buck & Whe a Boxing Match on Boints.	Forth - Point & . Good Sparin

	PARLI Debate
David Duncan (*25) Round 1A 9:00am D107 Gov: 21 Sundararaman - Elmhirst Opp: 6 Goldblatt - McKinney Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: DAVIO P. DJNCAN Judge's School Affiliation: SCMMAAC.
<b>PROP</b> Team Code #: 2/	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 ElmLiest pts 29	8 Opp Speaker #1 6010 b/A H pts 27-
Prop Speaker #2 SundAmmmAnpts 2	9 Opp Speaker #2 McKnowney pts 29.
	9 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good of good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and evidence—which may include facts</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevations</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters spand easily understandable</li> </ul>	Judging Criteria actively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments $\begin{matrix} \upsilon \\ \upsilon $
Using the above criteria, please offer each debater:	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Used Zmin of 2 28 in 1st speech - tooth - tooth	7 Opp 1: Eye contact 26/-sec speech much better 27-passion @ 15 yr was strong - be confident, yow can.
29 Used 3:49/7 Min	Opp 2: 29 4:45/7 MM well spoken & mode pars
TEAM CODE #: on	the wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION: Prop Oropped 2 Addresseel in both Prop dro not use for Stayled on SAN	(Prop or Opp) ARQUMENTS of opp white opp spearches Phop points. Ime which (ou to have helped mc 2 points white plenty of time for more in

Ney AFF #I Goldblat #Z Mckinney #I Elmlinst #Z SUNDA PAOP MANDAtory Min sentancing thus And UNjust.

#1 <u>#1</u> Def min j'Ail for certian crome Net bene fact debah (cost I situations vany greatly -min sentance way not be value debate contral society welfance Cond # I lqua/sty diversity of views made "qual by Min sentancy Cont & pun not bit the nume la judges. HZ BRIDARY CAN ENSUE if NO MIN sentance UNjust Not PAPR. ND potesAmple NSEC ZMIN impart, - dec equality. #2 50% of people in jAil Ane repet 80 - Dec, Safety on #3 what people want. opp coult - becausing A judge 15 hand. downards night. 2 - briberry - does not happen +4 deterent. take on NDASAN example. #2 Attack and mid Oropped - congress - stalngth vary greatly # 2 Attack opp cont - overly harsh - ND ex AMP 3:49 Again Cent I you read an ultimat to let people know pour, for cent 2 overly htrish - been voted on, nous Picked up nig process to beeme rebut - if ne take away sent hibes would happen sury, both cent Addressel ? Newpoint. ¥ Ajudge, -dec cumustating 2:30. rebuttal - greatest soc we broc- only

David Duncan (*25) Round 1B 9:00am D107 Gov: 23 Scott - Ambrose Opp: 10 Mao - Tong-Seely Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: DAUTCL DUNCAW Judge's School Affiliation: SONCMA AC.
<b>PROP</b> Team Code #: <u>23</u>	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 $5coff$ pts $29$	Opp Speaker #1 Tong Seely pts 30
Prop Speaker #AMblosepts_78	Opp Speaker #2 MAO pts28_
27 = Good (but possibly not go 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	Outstanding <b>28</b> = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) < <b>20</b> = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficiency evidence—which may include facts and</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effective by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant a</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable</li> </ul>	<b>Iging Criteria</b> ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments inently the debaters support arguments with d references to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant will the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
· Prop 1: Very hell spoken work onlyg contract 1:45 en 1st spet	Very well spoken 2 poised A Dropped 2 pts After saying you would take them on
Prop 2: 28 USE FIME	Opp 2: Well done
	Prop_wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION: Both KAMAS did, we AFAS CONT & fine	Propor Opp) Il but Neg dropping 7 d +( Ang q Aff won 17.

Neg #I Tong Seely 30 #Z MAO 28 #1 Scott 79 execontrat. #2 Ammose 28 Retrobution has no place in a modern Criminal justice system Prop. Neg\_1-does have place dof - pop spurly kyst AFF/ # 1 retrib is the basis of craminal just sys. - crime right austrise Keep CURRENT SYSTEM #1-present in gov to day 8th Amendment - No reason to chang # 2 cont love in cancersta 10B on justics y stim #2-protects on freedoms #3 balance - pour are weighted to crime. - consequences # 3 HSS bIAS example Les coup in To - deffernt. - soc safety. 1:45 Mm Atteg Aff 2 3!22\_\_\_\_ dropped # 2 - 0 # 3 - ARUP. Neg 2 Neg 2 CRIM leann from pun - No reasen to change is NOT Right pun too servous ba lots of armes. - tag linning points. Support court # 2 - nore sensible, tess with # 2 - nore sensible, tess with ref #I -holds back cis to put inplace # Z judge / Air # 3 bAlance · but holds back crijs on pun 2:30 # 3 - more (Arr. Her CAUSES. TAXES to be the causes. Final Reduit. OPP Arcepted deb 6 plan # 2 - " voinfernation that # 3 WAS more Parts Voter issues , have to bave pon for comme

an Phan	PARLI Debate
em Alam (*19) A 11:00am C6 3 Karim - Kerstetter 4 Holwitz - Kay Parli Debate	Judge's Name: $VIVIAn$ Pham Judge's School Affiliation: $PVIFS$
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Kerstetter pts 5	Opp Speaker #1 Holwitz pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Kann pts 20	
	utstanding <b>28</b> = Very Good
$27 = Good (but possibly not good)$ $26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and r</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compleach debater:</li> <li>Prop 1: wde. discorderors</li> <li>He alare the size offer of the size of the</li></ul>	ing Criteria y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ntly the debaters support arguments with eferences to authority as well as general knowledge ively the debaters respond to the arguments made d effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges liments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: Very Conflivening offerch. Mear points, Mreat eye
Prop 2: Easily inderstandable. · Clilled pen the whole TEAM CODE #: 14 on the _	Contact. Opp 2: inreat job analyzing. Valid evidence and very organized. correous. Circat eye contact pothere.
	A 11:00am C8         3 Karim - Kerstetter         4 Holwitz - Kay         Parli Debate         Prop Speaker #1         Year Ode #:         Year Ode #:

an pham	N		PARLI Debate	
28 11:00am C6 12 Santana - Bazile 14 Yan - Shponko e Parli Debate			Judge's Name: <u>VV</u>	
DT		de antigene d'ar a sur a sur a que deserve a	OP	V RESEALS
PF Team Code #:	η L		Team Code #:	
		pts6	Opp Speaker #1 <u>YAn</u> Opp Speaker #2 <u>Shpon</u>	pts <u>25</u>
Prop Speaker #2	antana	pts_24	Opp Speaker #2 <u>Shpon</u>	<u>Ko pts 22</u>
		Jud	ging Criteria	
• Analysis: Ho	w reasonably		<b>ging Criteria</b> ely the debaters analyze the	topic and the arguments
offered during	•	1 1 00	• • • • • • • •	
		•	iently the debaters support a l references to authority as v	-
	•		ctively the debaters respond	-
by the other s		ing and one	entery and accurcits respond	me argamente made
-		ow relevant a	nd effective were the questi	ions and the answers
	w well the de		in an organized, communic	
• Courtesy: Ho	w courteous	and respectfi	al the debaters were to oppo	onents and judges
<b></b>				• • • • • • • •
	criteria, plea	ase offer con	pliments and/or suggestic	ons for improvement to
each debater:				
D				

Prop 1: Opp 1: tone. hile posture or d Very respectful and Courteous. Organized points. Nice pouture and easily understandable. Prop 2: Opp 2: WILC respectfor and conferred 2 on the <u>prop</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) TEAM CODE #: **REASON FOR DECISION:** organized points

Elizabeth Murphy (*5) Round 2A 11:00am D105 Gov: 3 Dovichi - Vetterli Opp: 27 Campanella - Petruska Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>Elizabeth Murphy</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Bishop O'Dow</u> d H.S.
PROP Team Code #:3	OPP Team Code #: 27
Prop Speaker #1 VeHerli pts 24	Opp Speaker #1 Campanalla pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 Dovichi pts 24	Opp Speaker #2 Detruska pts 26
Please award each speaker points based o 30 = Perfect 29 = 0	on the following scale: Dutstanding 28 = Very Good
	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair <b>24-20</b> = Poor	
Jud	ging Criteria
	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and effici- evidence—which may include facts and	references to authority as well as general knowledge
by the other side	ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers
	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
•	l the debaters were to opponents and judges
each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: . Introduce Nume Good summary of contentions	- Opp 1: Good introduction of self. - Should clearly state issue @ outself then present proposed solution liounler plan
Clear Need to improve rebuttal.	Good tone of voice not too loud & lachnie consistent
Good tone of voice - not too loud + cadence consisten" Prop 2:	ladunce consistent
Prop 2: L'an improve organization of	
Man alote & arguinagia trition	contentions is while not to budit
too loud & caclinle consistent	good tone of voice not too bud + cudunce consisten-1
TEAM CODE #: on the	OPPwins this debate.       rop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION	
Opp did a bitler job é	of identifying & describing counterplan
Provo needs to improve	I identifying & describing counterplan as was the optimum of 2 proposals, analysis and presentation of more organization and thought.
delivery - Just requires	more organization and thought.

<b>Elizabeth Murphy (*5)</b> Round 2B 11:00am D105 Gov: 10 Lee - Wang Opp: 19 Andola - Pareja Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>Elizabeth Murphy</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Bishop O'Do</u> wd H.S.
PROP Team Code #: 10	OPP Team Code #:19
Prop Speaker #1 Ryan Lee pts 27	
Prop Speaker #2 James Warg pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Andola pts 25
	= Outstanding <b>28</b> = Very Good good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
Jı	udging Criteria
<ul> <li>offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and effective evidence—which may include facts at</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effective by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters spear and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respective</li> </ul>	ively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments iciently the debaters support arguments with nd references to authority as well as general knowledge fectively the debaters respond to the arguments made t and effective were the questions and the answers at in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant tful the debaters were to opponents and judges ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
Prop 1: Introduce First + Last M Very articulate speak Lower voicet slow down Increase eye contact good reference to soft power in rebuttal. Prop 2: Intro 1st + last name good Eye contact Articulate but can improv tone of voice => do not need to be loved.	Did not undustand link between sin contention + how it countersacts Prop's good rebuttal. Use time more efficiently Opp 2: Introduced Need to better organize counter- Need to better organize counter- agaments. She jum ped chound a lot. Just takes practice + greater focus on organization. Good tone + into nation.
TEAM CODE #: on the	e <u> </u>
REASON FOR DECISION: Prop very effec Did not very againents in su Did not relate 3101 Contentio	tive at laying out their contentions and pport. good job:

Mr Olson (*23) Round 2A 11:00am C5	Judge's Name: ROBGRT OLSEN
Gov: 14 Lee - Duan	
Opp: 6 Kang - Yolasan Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: 23
PROP.	
Team Code #:14	Team Code #:6/
Prop Speaker #1 DUAN pts X	Dep Speaker #1KAV6pts_28
Prop Speaker #2pts	6+ Opp Speaker #2 101-9-59- pts 28
Please award each speaker points bas	ed on the following scale: = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	t good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	
	Judging Criteria
• Analysis: How reasonably and effect	ctively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
	fficiently the debaters support arguments with and references to authority as well as general knowledge
•	effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	int and effective were the questions and the answers
	eak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
•	ectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
each debater:	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	0 1 A MAR AND A MAR AND A MARKED AND A MARKE
Prop 1: GOOD OPANING, PRATTY SMOTTH, HAD FXT	Dep 1: A LATTLE CHOPY OF & NO, BATTHE WHAN COT RULLING.
LOOD TYE CONTACT. FELT TESTING WAS INHWAS	AINE. TO POINTS, GOOD CLASING, JUST CHOPPY, SUST NEEDS
COD QUESTIONEMPIFITY. ADDRESSED CARD PSINTS, REALLY PASONATE	#3
AND PARSUASING. RACOVARED WELL AFTAR SL	IP 4
CLOSED OURSTANDING .	
Prop 2: 6000 ReBUTTAL TO OPENING, 600 DEVE CONTA	Opp 2: - LOOD POINTS OF INVESTOR FEARS AWAY FROM ANIMAL TESTING. BECAME PASSONATE AS WENT ALONG, GROOT !
KUNUK TOPIC, PASSIONATE. REALLY GOOD SUD,	LAND MAINNIL ON FROM OLASTION, SUPPORT FACTS, CODD DEPOSE
Sour A LITTLE PABT. CREMT BOINTS.	of POINTS, JUST NERDED TO OREANDED LATTE MORE, GROD
	OTHEREWISE WOD CLOSE.
TEAM CODE #: 14 on t	the <u><u>PRUF</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)</u>
REASON FOR DECISION:	
PROP WAS JUST BARRAR OF	ZEANIZED, BOTH REAMS HAD GOOD FACTS BUT
222 WAL ROTTER ORGANIZED, I 1411	NE OFF (1)GHT HAVE WON IF (427 AAD Britte TURNE
AND DELIVERY, GREAT NOVIC	E THAMS & AS GOOD AS SOME JUS.

<b>Mr Olson (*23)</b> Round 2B 11:00am C5 Gov: 19 Mart - Moran Opp: 5 Figueroa - Thomas Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>ROBGR7 OLSE</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>23</u>	
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:	
Prop Speaker #1 MORTON pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 THOMAS pts 29	
Prop Speaker #2 pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 FIGUEROA pts 28	
$27 = Good (but possibly not good)$ $26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior ing Criteria	
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer complements and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:</li> </ul>		
Prop 1: · 6000 Of which & Openhand 1000 1600 EVE CONTRACT, LOOD OF WHICH & OPENHAND 1000 1600 EVE CONTRACT, LOOD OF WHICH & OPENHAND 1000 1000 FOR ROLING LATER, LOOPT OR PRIME BETCH, LOT ROLING LATER, LOOPT OR PRIME BETCH, LOT ROLING LATER, LOOPT OF POINTS - PRIMES TARGEN, CLEARED POSITIONS WILL, TOP 2: 6000 CONTRACT OF POINTS, VERY CLEAR & STRADY. WELL DEL WHEND, COLL WISH MORE FACTS. NOW US. IN THE FUTTING, COOD ANE CONTRACT, VARY SHOREN & NICE DELLVARY. CONTRACT, VARY SHOREN & NICE DELLVARY.		
TEAM CODE #: <u>5</u> on the <u>OPP</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: HARD TWPIC FOR GRANT. OPP. HAD BY MAR FACTS & WARG BATTER DRAANDED. R THOUGHT PARD TWPIC FOR GRANT. OPP. HAD BY MAR FACTS & WARG BATTER DRAANDED. R THOUGHT PARD TWPIC FOR GRANT. OPP. HAD BY MAR FACTS & WARG BATTER DRAANDED. R THOUGHT PRO DID WELL BUT TRIED TO COVER A LOT & JUMPED ROOM TOPES, THEY MADE A DULL TOAL EXCITING & WARG NERRY GOOD TOMMS.		

Bill Holt (*3) Round 2A 11:00am C3	Judge's Name: <u>Jinny Holf</u>	
Gov: 6 Goldblatt - McKinney Opp: 19 Alcantra - Thompson	Judge's Walle. J (TITY 1-01+	
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Bentley</u>	
Team Code #:	OPP 1 9	
Prop Speaker #1 60101444 pts 28.5		
Prop Speaker #2 <u>MCKINNPY</u> pts <del>28</del>	Opp Speaker #2pts27.5	
	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior	
bul.	ging Criteria	
<ul> <li>Judging Criteria</li> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:</li> </ul>		
Prop 1: and plano I like the 10 yr transition proposul except analysis, try umentation delivily.	Opp 1: Graut points for your case. good evidence, well laid out,	
Prop 2: good afgumentation- Ving clean a	Opp 2: good attack points! just expand a bit. good evidence (SF state study!)	
TEAM CODE #: <u>POP</u> on the (P REASON FOR DECISION: BEHEL arywel -> both Sid evidence, PROP argument	taticn was strunger,	

Bill Holt (*3) Round 2B 11:00am C3 Gov: 14 Kerr-Stein - Davidson Opp: 12 Green - Madison Novice Parli Debate				Judge's Name: JINNY Holf Judge's School Affiliation: <u>BenHey</u>			
	PR Team Code #:	OPIL	ang ng n	Team Coo	opp 12	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	
	Prop Speaker #1 <u>Ker</u>	r. stein	_pts29_	Opp Speaker #1	Gran	pts_入]	
	Prop Speaker #1 <u>ker</u> Prop Speaker #2 <u></u>	avidsin	_pts_d&	Opp Speaker #2_	Madison	pts 2	
	<b>26-25</b> = Fair	<b>30</b> = Per Good (but pos <b>24-20</b> =	fect <b>29</b> = C sibly not goo Poor <b>Jud</b>	Outstanding 28 = d enough to qualif <20 = Reserve ging Criteria		propriate behavior	
×,	<ul> <li>offered during</li> <li>Evidence: Ho evidence—wh</li> <li>Argumentation</li> <li>by the other si</li> <li>Points of Info</li> <li>Delivery: How and easily und</li> <li>Courtesy: How Creat!, All</li> </ul>	the debate w appropriated ich may includ on: How direc de <b>rmation:</b> How w well the deb lerstandable w courteous at	ly and efficient de facts and tly and effect w relevant and aters speak ind respectfu	ently the debater references to aut ctively the debate and effective were in an organized. I the debaters we pliments and/or	s support argument thority as well as get ers respond to the a the questions and communicative sty ere to opponents ar <b>suggestions for i</b>	ats with general knowledge arguments made the answers vie that is pleasant and judges <b>mprovement to</b>	
	Prop 1: Outstan Well Kind Q QNULLISTS, Prop 2: good CL Sime Points arguments, TEAM CODE #:_ REASON FOR DE Drop hu butty d	ut oryun Deliven lanificutio s and good <u>14</u> cision: d a stre	nents, f fantastr n of 1 on the (P	points into into points points points opp 2: point var opp 2: point var opp 2: var var opp 2: points var opp 2: points v	nud good so Turn yu fact statem k sense! /v t was great nt of popu y good p>good pom it out a lit this debate. re evidence	ur opinions ents ble Me juur Me Qinala t./ ilation grav ts/argument tle Mure cle	ls m

<b>Ken Stone (*16)</b> Round 2A 11:00am D101 Gov: 5 Pashman - Ralston Opp: 21 Sundararaman - Elmhirst Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>Kln Schnlidly</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>LOWELL</u>
PROP Team Code #:5	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 28 Palhmanpts 28	
Prop Speaker #2_2=Ralita_pts_27	Opp Speaker #2 27
$27 = Good (but possibly not good)$ $26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	the following scale: itstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior ing Criteria
<ul> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful</li> </ul>	eferences to authority as well as general knowledge ively the debaters respond to the arguments made a effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges
each debater:	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: hade an interesting and Cogent Grasment but hid not present supporting endence, ind. have computer modely bell wed successfully to develop tharm- centrely Aris a bit control at start of rebutted Prop 2: very control strong retutation of . Opp's contentions, gave	exiting drugs were developed with
story cost for immorphity of 0 pp's position. Paint Good Pol. Could improve ene contact. TEAM CODE #: on the (Pro REASON FOR DECISION: A close contest OPP get	

Kon-Stone (*16) Round 2B 11:00am D101 Gov: 21 Burrous - Griggy Opp: 3 Brown - Helms	Judge's Name: Ker Schneider Judge's School Affiliation: Lovell
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>CO VA (]</u>
PROP Team Code #:	OPP           Team Code #:         3
Prop Speaker #1Brrrs.s_pts_28	Opp Speaker #1ZFByowpts_27
Prop Speaker #2 27 brigg pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 27 Heling pts 27
Please award each speaker points based o 30 = Perfect, $20 = C$	<b>n the following scale:</b> Dutstanding <b>28</b> = Very Good
	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Juď	ging Criteria
	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
e	ently the debaters support arguments with
evidence—which may include facts and	references to authority as well as general knowledge
	ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
<ul><li>by the other side</li><li>Points of Information: How relevant at</li></ul>	nd effective were the questions and the answers
	n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and respectfu	l the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer com each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	la contration of economics
Prop 1: Argunent made in rebutted	Opp 1: four environation of economics, alt to four fuels, goud relatation,
wirdstrongen than in 2st speecht i world have liked to have heard	good POI, offered good alternatives
then earlier. Explained plan yell	in rebuttal (protecting working class
(2090 in 5 year), concerns flout	
environment, unger, etc.	ages, water offe and improve eye contact, and became distracted. Will be an excellent debater it he Opp 2: Can address -
Prop 2: Clearly stated positions	Opp 2: Can address -
of PROPARD OPI. Lappreciated to Thome analogy but it was	offered good alternatives, particularly to property suggestion of re-allocating morey
imperfect. Responded year to POI	to education. Very resourceful and
Strong close, suggested re-allocating	clearl.
The caulation is a	PROPwins this debate.
(Р	rop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION: A (LOS CALL. PROPY STA	ing rebuttal clarited their position
I To To Pick AL	$\left[ \left( $
1 LAC CLIPI Anna II	
ca- be grite bland. All	were very collegial and generous

12:30	)	PARL	I Debate
Jesse MacKinnon Round 2B 11:00am D109 Gov: 17 Raven - Sweer	ney	-	ne: Nadeem Alam
Opp: 14 Luk - Tserenna Novice Parli Debate	amid	Judge's Scho	ool Affiliation: Pmole Valley
Team Code #:	PROP 17	Team Co	OPP ode #:14
Prop Speaker #1	Raven pts 2	-9 Opp Speaker #1_	Luk pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Sweeney_pts_	Opp Speaker #2	Tserepramid pts 28
		29 = Outstanding $28$	= Very Good
2 <b>6-25</b> = Fair	27 = Good (but possibly no 24-20 = Poor		fy for elimination rounds) ed for rude or inappropriate behavior
		Judging Criteria	
<ul> <li>offered du</li> <li>Evidence-</li> <li>Argumen</li> <li>by the oth</li> <li>Points of</li> <li>Delivery: and easily</li> </ul>	ring the debate How appropriately and -which may include fact tation: How directly and er side Information: How relev How well the debaters sp understandable	efficiently the debaters s and references to au effectively the debat ant and effective were beak in an organized,	analyze the topic and the arguments rs support arguments with athority as well as general knowledge ers respond to the arguments made e the questions and the answers communicative style that is pleasant ere to opponents and judges
Using the abo each debater:		· compliments and/o	r suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: F	went ade valid points	• Opp 1: C	on't say sorry a mistake. More eye cartact
Prop 2:	resentable	Opp 2:	frescutable

TEAM CODE #: <u>17</u> on the <u>Prop</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: It was a colore good debate, Team 14 did not assured a Cocyple of challenges.

Vincent Banas (*13) Round 2A 11:00am D108 Gov: 21 Harris - Marr Opp: 3 McDonald - Thani Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>Jaydeep Smha</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>#13</u>
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #: 3
Prop Speaker #1_HARR15	pts 26 Opp Speaker #1 Mc DONALD pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	_pts_26 Opp Speaker #1 <u>Mc DONALD</u> pts_28 _pts_2 <b>8</b> Opp Speaker #2 <u>THAN 1</u> pts_28
30 = Per 27 = Good (but post) 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = 1	ints based on the following scale:         fect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good         ssibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)         Poor       <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
<ul> <li>offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriatel evidence—which may include</li> <li>Argumentation: How direct by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debat and easily understandable</li> </ul>	ly and efficiently the debaters support arguments with de facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge tly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made w relevant and effective were the questions and the answers aters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant nd respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please each debater:	e offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Idee time properly Ont used in initial propos Speech .	Oleccord of
Prop 2: Good deliverp of the Good eye contact	Advination Opp 2: Good arguments : Points of informations were valid and relevants : Good rebuttal
TEAM CODE #: <u>3</u> REASON FOR DECISION: Better arguments	on the OPP wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) and effective communications.

utan eller		MPTP2 (1913) 2010 Automation of the second	Judge's Name Judge's School	: <u>Taydeep</u> Affiliation: <u></u>	<u>Sinha</u> † 13
			Team Code	<b>OPP</b> #:14.	
er #2	FONG	_pts_ <u>27</u>	Opp Speaker #2	FONG	pts_ <i>27</i>
27	<b>30</b> = Per = Good (but pos	fect <b>29</b> = 0 sibly not goo Poor	Dutstanding 28 = ad enough to qualify <20 = Reserved	Very Good for elimination rou	
d durin ence: H mcew mentat e other a s of Inf ery: H asily ur tesy: H e above	ng the debate low appropriated which may includ tion: How direct side formation: How ow well the deba nderstandable low courteous an	y and effici le facts and tly and effect v relevant and aters speak nd respectfu	ently the debaters references to auth ctively the debater nd effective were in an organized, co al the debaters wer	support argument nority as well as go respond to the a the questions and ommunicative sty re to opponents an	ts with eneral knowledge rguments made the answers le that is pleasant d judges
e ru	lf the all sed. /		0nn 2:	v	
ODE #:	ECISION:	on the(P	wins tl	his debate.	
	108         gutan         eller         te         P         ser #1         ter #1         ter #2         ward ea         27         Fair         ysis: He         ed durin         ence         ysis: He         ed durin         ence         ward ea         ysis: He         ed durin         erone         mentate         e other         ts of In:         resy: He         asily un         tesy: He         asily un         tesy: He         ater:         af cla         an         an	108 gutan eller te PROP #: <u>19</u> eff: 19 $eff: 19 eff: 19eff: 19 eff: 19eff: 19 eff: 19eff: 19 eff: 2000000000000000000000000000000000000$	108 gutan eller te PROP #:	108       Judge's Name         putan       Judge's Name         te       Judge's Schoo         PROP       Team Code         err #1       1.1GUTAN pts 26, Opp Speaker #1         ter #2       FONG       pts 27         vard each speaker points based on the following s       30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 =         27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify         Fair       24-20 = Poor       <20 = Reserved         Judging Criteria         ysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters and ed during the debate         ence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters and ed during the debate         ence: Which may include facts and references to auth         mentation: How relevant and effective wree         eabove criteria, please offer compliments and/or asily understandable         teses of Loo of the debaters were         e above criteria, please offer compliments and/or asily understandable         te waked.       Opp 1:         Clauity       Corg and apreech         an org and add apreech       Opp 2:         an org and add apreech       Anyum         pownts unit the       on the         pownts unit the       on the         powere post s	10a       Judge's Name:/Qyleep         putan       Judge's School Affiliation:

Dan Fishlow (*15) Round 2A 11:00am D102 Gov: 13 Banas - Cummings Opp: 14 Chan - Foley Novice Parli Debate		Judge's Name:	Mirmonte
PR Team Code #:	OP >	Team Code #:	P
	anas pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	pts 2.7
Prop Speaker #2	mings pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Fdoy	pts <u>28</u>
Please award each	h speaker points based $30 = Perfect 29 = 0$	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Go	od
27 = 0	Good (but possibly not go	od enough to qualify for elimin	nation rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair	<b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude	or inappropriate behavior

#### **Judging Criteria**

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

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

Opp 1: Good sreener, ong suggestion would be to organge phosphots just a little bethe would ... Solid. Prop 1: Speakers, passinuse Prop 2: Opp 2 very strong, did a goed job of honey in m points to refute. Way to con Sackets The points \_\_\_\_\_ on the <u>DPP</u> wins this debate. **TEAM CODE #:** (Prop or Opp) **REASON FOR DECISION:** Very, very close. At the end of the day the argument about total lives us the worth of an ancunal ide us that of human. The wet Benefit was the lives saves and cost and Polentuly less medicine 6 testing. Good de bate

<b>Dan Fishlow (*15)</b> Round 2B 11:00am D102 Gov: 14 Situ - Zhang Opp: 12 Murdock - Novice Parli Debate			ne:	ish low Muramonte
PR Team Code #:	<b>ОР</b>	Team Co	<b>OPP</b> ode #: 12	
Prop Speaker #1	itu pts Z	6 Opp Speaker #1_	Murduck	pts_26
Prop Speaker #2	hang pts 2	S Opp Speaker #2		pts
<ul> <li>26-25 = Fair</li> <li>Analysis: How offered during</li> <li>Evidence: How evidence—wh</li> <li>Argumentation by the other side</li> <li>Points of Info</li> <li>Delivery: How and easily und</li> <li>Courtesy: How</li> </ul>	Good (but possibly no 24-20 = Poor v reasonably and effer the debate w appropriately and e ich may include facts on: How directly and de rmation: How relevant v well the debaters sp erstandable w courteous and resp	Judging Criteria ctively the debaters a efficiently the debater and references to au effectively the debat ant and effective were eak in an organized, ectful the debaters w	ify for elimination ed for rude or ina analyze the topic rs support argum thority as well a ers respond to th e the questions a communicative ere to opponents	and the arguments ents with s general knowledge e arguments made nd the answers style that is pleasant and judges
each debater:		compliments and/o		-
Goud jon to ce	vo. Goud intro. - Here de argumen Manje tono.		2 de sate.	. E food jer
TEAM CODE #:_ REASON FOR DEC Very close. The UPP of Setter. Neither I	[2 on CISION: Hubes it as her point	the <u>OR</u> wins (Prop or Opp) An har to defi	ette issue,	Abo laid out points

Scott Gast (*14) Round 2A 11:00am C1 Gov: 6 Brouhard - Welch	Judge's Name: Scott Gast
Opp: 19 Le - Rather Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell
PROP	OPP 14
Team Code #:6	Team Code #: 10
Prop Speaker #1 Browhard	pts 27 Opp Speaker #1 Rather pts 28
Prop Speaker #2Welch	pts <u>25</u> Opp Speaker #2 <u>LC</u> pts <u>27</u>

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:/

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good

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

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

#### Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: good points, good evidence, fairly good/emotional appeal, eye contact needed more, good delivery Prop 2: had almost zero eye contact, needed to tolk mire expansively about contentions, had good vebuttals Prop 1: excellent preparation and delivery good emotional appeal appeal with firefigth example, stated opportunts and rebutted effectively jumped too much b/w contentions and vebuttals, good eye contact Opp 2: organized and used evidence emotional appeal good bot could be mere compelling good eye contact and delivery, sometimes confused about his notes (Prop or Opp) evidence Team # 19 give overall better fact-based and straightforword logic. Team 19 also used emotional arguments effectively. Their points were clear. Team #6 was very loud during their opponents' talking. Their points warent as clear as Team #9. on the Opp wins this debate.

Scott Gast (*14) Round 2B 11:00am C1	Scatt Gast
Gov: 3 Duong - Kopelevich	Judge's Name: <u>JCS // CCC</u>
Opp: 23 Scott - Ambrose Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Scott Gast Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell
PROP 3	OPP 5 7 A
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 $DU079$ pts $25$	Opp Speaker #1 $5coH$ pts $27$
Prop Speaker #1 DU049 pts 25 Prop Speaker #2 Kupple vie h pts 25	Opp Speaker #2AMbvosCpts_26
Please award each speaker points based on	11 (22) 1 ( )
	enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
Judg	ing Criteria
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate</li> </ul>	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficie	
	eferences to authority as well as general knowledge
• Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side	ively the debaters respond to the arguments made
•	d effective were the questions and the answers
	an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• <b>Courtesy:</b> How courteous and respectful	the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer comp each debater:	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: comfortable with spraking	Opp 1: very clear/organized, refuted athe
low eye contact, Merded to talk	teams contentions well, low eye contact,
more about contentions with	delivery could be a little softer
more about contentions with evidence, needed to use the	(in terms of volume), gave evidence.
clock more	C 644 + C 0 - S
Prop 2: was clear about what	Opp 2: clear about what has was going to Bay, good age contact, moved two
she was going to sky, mainly restated cartier contentions w/o	Bay, good eye contact, moved too
restated torlier contentions w/o	
additional appeal not successful	to sound more excited
additional appeal, net successful in refuting Opp's cantentions, distracted	
TEAM CODE #: 23 on the	<u>Opp</u> wins this debate.
(Pro	<u>Opp</u> wins this debate. op or Opp) , gave clear contentions, offective rebuttak
Team 23 way very clear organized	gave clear contentions, official reactions
and some evidence. Team 3 was	not as clear and didn't generate
- Hulive evidence or rationales for	their contentions; their minimal use
of time also did not help them	not as clear and didn't generate their contentions; their minimal use

7			ſ	AKLI	Debate	
<b>a Shingwekar (*10)</b> d 2A 11:00am C2 25 Green - Nichols : 3 Lisy - Forman ce Parli Debate			Judge's Name: UDAY SHINGWEKH			
		Judge's School Affiliation: <u>IRVINGTON</u> H				
Team Code #:	PROP 25	анца Хулаан (94) (93) (93) (93) (93) (93) (93) (93) (93	т.	eam Cod	<b>OPP</b> e #: 3	
	Nicholu					pts_25
Prop Speaker #2_	Gyeen	_pts <u>24</u>	Opp Spea	ıker #2	Forman	pts_26
	each speaker poi 30 = Per 27 = Good (but pos	fect $29 =$	Outstandin	g <b>28</b> =	= Very Good	n rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair	· · · ·	Poor				appropriate behav
		Jud	lging Crite	eria		
<ul> <li>Argument by the other</li> <li>Points of I</li> <li>Delivery: and easily</li> <li>Courtesy:</li> </ul>	tation: How directer side (Information: How How well the debunderstandable How courteous at	tly and effe w relevant a aters speak nd respectf	ectively the and effective in an organ all the deba	debates ve were nized, c ters we	rs respond to t the questions communicative re to opponent	e style that is pleas
	/	the out im	Opp 1:	Sl con M ac	A speed	d you ti
Prop 2: Provi	de classity		Opp 2:	Jo bal	od con lanced,	peed.
TEAM CODE	#:3		Prop or Opp		his debate.	
<b>REASON FOR</b>	DECISION:	(	. op or opp	,		

dear

•

UPAY
Alka Shingwekar (*10)
Round 2B 11:00am C2
Gov: 23 Barton - Madsen
Opp. 3 Lanzone - Hubinger

Opp: 3 Lanzone - Hubinger Novice Parli Debate Judge's Name: UDAY 5HINGWERAR

Judge's School Affiliation:	TRUNG(ON	HIGH
-		_ ·

PROP Team Code #: 23	OPP Team Code #: <u>3</u>
Prop Speaker #1 Bouton pts 26	Opp Speaker #1_ Hubinger_ pts_28
Prop Speaker #2 Madren pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 <u>Lanzone</u> pts <u>2</u> G

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good

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

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

#### **Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1:	Opp 1: dear speech
Prop 2:	Opp 2:
TEAM CODE #:3	on the <u></u> wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	(Prop or Opp)

rlear

Bonnie Hayne (*25) Round 2A 11:00am D103 Gov: 14 Woo - Melman	Judge's Name: BUMME HAINE	
Opp: 13 Garcia - Acosta Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Soutom Academy	
PROP Team Code #:	<b>OPP</b> Team Code #: <u>15</u>	
Prop Speaker #1	pts_28 Opp Speaker #1ACOSTApts_29	
Prop Speaker #2000	pts <u>27</u> Opp Speaker #2 <i>&amp;AFL1A</i> pts <u>28</u>	
Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)		
26-25 = Fair 24-20		
Judging Criteria		
• Analysis: How reasonably offered during the debate	and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments	
	tely and efficiently the debaters support arguments with lude 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: Mice fuidety Work on pige contact Windpe Gord une of envertion - really Gord official of individual forms. Gord refetation of individual forms. Gord prefetation of individual forms. Gord Mility & allution of envert point. Confidure will Conce beginning TEAM CODE #: 14 you we the beginning REASON FOR DECISION: Opp 1: Opp 1: Gord eige contact - very mix free envert Gord refetation of individual (Propor Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: Prop 1: Opp 1: Prop 2: **TEAM CODE #:**<sup>0</sup> 14 **REASON FOR DECISION:** Ney dedict address the app's play so most of it anied. The Ney team had a gon more pland delivery but my under-Standing is that the plans points have to be addressed or buy got doned

Bonnie Hayne (*25) Round 2B 11:00am D103 Gov: 22 Keshav - Wei Opp: 3 Hemerling - Barnett Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>SONNIE</u> HAMM Judge's School Affiliation: <u>SONOMA ACADE</u> MM
<b>PROP</b> Team Code #:	<b>OPP</b> Team Code #:
	Opp Speaker #1
Prop Speaker #2pts	Opp Speaker #2_ <u>BARNET</u> _pts <u>38</u>
	d on the following scale: = Outstanding 28 = Very Good good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effection offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and efficient by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters spear and easily understandable</li> </ul>	adging Criteria ively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments iciently the debaters support arguments with and references to authority as well as general knowledge fectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers ak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant tful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater:	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: KEStHAV Yau stayed calmunt were of due ful in dealing with set backs you have a los of potential inst need to work on preshing deprotoment, & clinity with fortention Prop 2: WEI Know where The room is to the to everyone you begin in a drie your bo will. Good beginning are contact TEAM CODE #: <u>3</u> on the REASON FOR DECISION: May addressed M of My My addressed M of My	ind Exclusion or or building & rowersoning of forms is it mink you those are ready for Opp 2: BASNETT Unsity. Nice pace & delineation of what you were going to cover. Continue to work on providing tetuls (Prop or Opp) You wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) You wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) You wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) You wins this debate.

### USFG should ban pharma testing on animals. PARLI Debate

<b>Teresa Skarr (*27)</b> Round 2A 11:00am D107 Gov: 14 Dickerman - Millar Opp: 10 Khurana - Darukhanawalla Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>Tevesa Skarr</u> Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS	
<b>PROP</b> Team Code #:4	Team Code #:	
S Prop Speaker #1 MillAt pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Khur ana pts 265	
NHe: 12 Prop Speaker #2 Dickerman pts 28	Opp Speaker #2_Darukhanawapts26.5	
TownPlease award each speaker points based on the following scale: $30 = Perfect$ $29 = Outstanding$ $28 = Very Good$ $4V = 20$ $27 = Good$ (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) $26-25 = Fair$ $24-20 = Poor$ $<20 = Reserved for rule or inappropriate behavior$		
$26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior	

### Judging Criteria

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

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

Opp 1: Khurana + clear organized Prop 1: Millar , engasing + good clear speaker to favor you - novi ngai mpacts nlan sers and hty mpacts Ben Nalla Opp 2: Dam Prop 2: ur valu onina 2000 Bu good refi throug WOK MO? yed went them tena + Come back wins this debate. **TEAM CODE #**: on the (Prop)or Opp) The Prop side provided reasoning for their value criterion and more effective reputations of the Neg's contentions and CounterPlan. Well done, all I Keep up the good work ! **REASON FOR DECISION:** 

USFG should significantly reduce agricultural subsidies. PARLI Debate

<b>Teresa Skarr (*27)</b> Round 2B 11:00am D107 Gov: 14 Masuda-Thaya - Sun Opp: 10 Vijay - Cramer Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>Teresa Skarr</u> Judge's School Affiliation: Winds or HS
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 # SUD pts 27	Opp Speaker #1_Vijaypts27
Prop Speaker #2 Masuda-Thypes 25	Opp Speaker #2 <u>Oramerpts</u> 26, 5
	Outstanding <b>28</b> = Very Good ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
Ju Ju MANALYSIS: How reasonably and effective	ldging Criteria
Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate	adging Criteria vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and effi	ciently the debaters support arguments with ad references to authority as well as general knowledge
	fectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
• <b>Points of Information:</b> How relevant	and effective were the questions and the answers k in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
	ful the debaters were to opponents and judges
each debater:	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: <u>Sun</u> + Clear, persuasive speaker + good endence - be more clear re judging criteri E didn't hear us - Negs countriplanewas a change - Work on higher better, for the suttal. + good responding to Nig mess about a point out Nig dropped your - print out Nig dropped your - 2nd contention - dropped Negs Istand 2nd point	Opp 1: Vijay + clear weel organized, engaging + good answer to POI + good answer to POI - more clearly refute AH 2nd cantation - more clearly refute AH 2nd cantation - work on higher level comments - work on higher level comments.
+ good respondent to Nig pes about	A Opp 2: Cramer
- point out Neg dropped your	- Mork on organization + go in
- dropped Negs Istand 2nd point	5 - point ant that All dropped your first
<b>TEAM CODE #:</b> on the	+ good press on Aff to specify badget + good press on Aff to specify badget - work on organization + go in orden - point out that Aff dropped your first - point out that Aff dropped your first (Prop or Opp) + wins this debate Work on Sharper refutar. + waste point Aff#2
Even though the Neg side of	tropped Aff's 2nd contention in their fute it in their 2nd speech, the Aff ted the counterplan and also entime therefore, Neg won towever shared all work on refutations thoroughous

12:30. -/ 20 Sibar -4

Harde Subasta	PARLI Debate
James Nerny (*6)	
Round 2B 11:00am C4	Judge's Name: Catherine Dimestach
Gov: 3 Greenwall - DuPuy Opp: 27 Little - Wagner	
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP	OBE,
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Pts_2	9 Opp Speaker #1 Little pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 <u>15PUY</u> pts <u></u>	8 Opp Speaker #2 WAGNEN pts 28
Please award each speaker points bas	- /
	9 = Outstanding $28 = $ Very Good
	t good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair <b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
	ctively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
•	efficiently the debaters support arguments with
evidence—which may include facts	and references to authority as well as general knowledge
	effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	ant and effective were the questions and the answers
• <b>Delivery:</b> How well the debaters sp and easily understandable	eak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
•	ectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
	contai and accurcity work to opponionity and Jauget
each debater:	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Governt Eye contract mojection & confide	
THOP I AND FUE CONTACT	- Opp 1: Very all done
Govan	m /
nojection & confin	
	What ppp 2: well done, confid speaking keep eye content.
Prop 2:	Mart pp 2: Well Utill, In the
Very gogy 2/2 c	Keep eye contin.
6 DOINTS.	
2	
TEAM CODE #: on t	the <u>(nop</u> wins this debate.
	(Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	research w/ No IN FERRER AT NISSUE.
Very your verier,	the (NOP wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) NESLARCH W/NO INTERVET AN ISSUE. 19 NEDUTAL.
Aff wins IN Astron	19 resound.
rvu	

#1 Green Wal 29 #2 Du Ruy 28 #1 Lottle \$27 # 2 WAYNER 28 Prop. Fed Gou. sig reduce Ag subsid TATO Rebut Alot. Ney -10m wontharm big corps. - never refitel 90%. 50bs. AFF #1 Big Amount AFA has to move s'y benef Is Trhe Away If # 90% CORN granta Sibt & 90% CORN by loweng. more harm than good. No source Refute 1. blobal warm Cont / Globa WARM 2 Feed ANIMA Is ford 3 1% helped Most. 2. Stanmoton vs School for tax payer # 4 obesity 3. 1% Angument leads - Can's EAT com make methans - e Coli 90% more chance Neg Const 1.14B - Need subs to Keep food 2. Phice spikes. - Obessty - food is cheap. # Econy bro - spending & on whong thing. Ed, Radds. - burning conv for too much 347% d'Antisubs for cours #5 Lobbying wwg. Monsanton #2 pefos then Neg CASE. refu batron., n #2 oppon on burdend proof harms out weigh beneft #10m, -sub not only one indet - Nameel Whent producer. - No onlings team database. - QUALIBY of life is > con Kniving business. - Weigh mech Ed vs foul -Not A point in this debate. - cows Naturally make we thank -1% to 2 mode up. - obesity Antificial products cont # I have system. - waters tuneded, - stanue & die - not true - NO MOVITSE fael PROP - NO MOVITSE fael PROP - Billions of # in subs. nom - Price spites of Ano pred by Affer - price spites of Ane they solving? - Tich Richer, - græs fed - higher benefit, Prebut voters 1. Food 16 Ag a væd. læv vs 60. "Rebut voters 1. Food 16 Ag a væd. læv som to sport

Karima Rebendullor #16

Jesse MacKinnon (*5) Round 2A 11:00am D109 Gov: 10 Mao - Tong-Seely Opp: 19 Phan - Phan Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Karlan Rehenstulla Judge's School Affiliation: 16
Team Code #:	Team Code #: $9$
Prop Speaker #1 <u>VIV</u> <u>5009</u> pts <u>50</u> Prop Speaker #2 <u>Ma0</u> pts <u>21</u>	Opp Speaker #1     Vhan     V     II     pts     29       Opp Speaker #2     Phan     II     pts     28
	n the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficience-which may include facts and a side</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effectively the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful</li> </ul>	and Criteria by the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made d effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Excellent Speaker, clear Effective. Great eye contact. and Jopic knowladde	- Great speaked
Prop 2: Bood speaker, avoid Using ununul. Have converdance	Opp 2: Good Speaker, Make More ege contact. Have ConFiclance
TEAM CODE #: on the	prop_wins this debate. Top or Opp) Well researched 1 onents arguments.

OT Lass Alger Alas

82 A

• •

alert they algorith and specific the second and a second and a second a secon And the second second water of the second of a contraction of the Aurola сана страна При страна ст При страна ст the second second and the second · I want be want of the second Contractor Mas. Strong ienia di

•

Marine Maneheeller

and a second and the second defines of a specific second and the second second second second second second sec A second A second 

Sophie BURGHTEIN

JA / WILL ID WILL IN THE PARTY	
James Nerny (*6) Round 2A 11:00am C4	SOPHER BURSHITE YN
Gov: 19 Byrne - Nguyen	Judge's Name:
Opp: 14 Lyons - Wyszynski Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: SOPHEA BURSHIE SN Judge's School Affiliation: BENILES
PROP 10	OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 By Me pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 40ns pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 <u>Nguen</u> pts <u>26</u>	Opp Speaker #1 <u>UPNS</u> pts <u>29</u> Opp Speaker #2 <u>WYSZYNSKi pts 27</u>
Please award each speaker points based	on the following scale:
30 = Perfect  29 =	
	Outstanding $28 = \text{Very Good}$ ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
<b>26-25</b> = Fair <b>24-20</b> = Poor	$<20$ = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior $f_{ij}$
T.,	dging Criteria
	vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	very the debaders analyze the topic and the arguments
0	ciently the debaters support arguments with
	d references to authority as well as general knowledge
-	ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	and effective were the questions and the answers
	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	/ 
• <b>Courtesy:</b> How courteous and respect	ful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer co	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
	ve ve
Prop 1:	Opp 1: overflent & pearly and
great greaver very t	epces contant out
queat apearer verift	sterring applements
areaver, very to	ve object it
queat splanter finit	stroug case or that front
queat speaker very t	need more pouving water no margater
	ve etcome ease or policy, it need noise ponvinstrue that it Opp 2: I flow and responses. good rebuttal arepunants.
Prop 2: Good flow	apod Jaw the arequirents.
	good rebutton
	$l^{\circ}$
/	
19	PROP wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	(Prop or Opp)
ALARA M COLO	presented ous on moren
ytown	Dent wood und loobut ted
debal	e puis when the the steller
PIPPu 1	hour fulled to gtarte the
	(Prop or Opp) presented out on more of e fluont wore not reebert fed houg triled to grate the pliont it wore a policy.