Topic: Mandatory Minimum Sentencing Laws are unjust.

# PARLI Debate

**Cathy Aguilera (*15)**
Round 1A 9:00am C4
Gov: 14 Yan - Shponko
Opp: 13 Banas - Cummings
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Cathy Aguilera

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 14 | Team Code #: | 13 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Yan pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 | Banas pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Shponko pts 26 | Opp Speaker #2 | Cummings pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Yan
A- good analysis
E- good evidence
A- good argument
P- NO POI in rebuttal accepted
D- good voice, tone & eye contact.
C- good

Prop 2: Shponko
A- good analysis
E- good evidence
A-
P-
D- good voice, tone, need better eye contact
C- ✓

Opp 1: Banas
A- very good analysis
E- very good evidence
A- very good Argument
P- X
D- good tone, hand gestures & eye contact
C- good

Opp 2: Cummings
A- good
E- good
A- very good Argument
P- X
D- good tone, voice, better eye contact
C- good

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Evidence & arguementation better on opp but good evidence on both teams

continue crime ✓ different crime levels unjust = unfair
criminals can be rehabilitated ✓
Jail overflow people won't learn learn what to do ✓ accident ✓ intensional crime
10% previous offenders
consider circumstances ✓ loopholes are necessary
learn from minor crime
3 strike law ✓
overcrowded jails
70% repeat offenders
safety ✓
punishment = not on street
NO variability
loop holes ✓
unjust/just ✓
value debate
Net benifits ✓
Australia crime rate ✓
Net benifits ✓
case is more fair.
people not wanting to do crime limits crimes ✓
3 strike law = felonies ✓
judge value intensions not just ✓
Affluenza team probation broke in jail ✓
overflowing jails better than on street ✓
✓ punished accurately
✓ loopholes unfair
✓ safety

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

# PARLI Debate

**Cathy Aguilera (*15)**
Round 1B 9:00am C4
Gov: 10 Vijay - Cramer
Opp: 3 Duong - Kopelevich
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Cathy Aguilera

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte.

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 10 | Team Code #: | 3 |
| Prop Speaker #1 Vijay | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 Duong | pts 26 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Cramer. | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 Kopelevich. | pts 26 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Vijay

Prop 1: A- very good analysis
E- good
A- very good argumentation
P- x
D- good tone, eye contact, voice & hand gestures good
C- good

Cramer.

Prop 2: A- good analysis
E- good evidence.
A- very good argumentation
P- x
D- very good tone, hand gestures & voice
C- good

Duong

Opp 1: Analysis- E- good evidence
A-
P- x
D- good hand gestures, tone & voice
C- good

Kopelevich

Opp 2: A-
E- good evidence
A-
P- x
D- good hand gestures
C- good

equals violence. Retribution ✓ exact
R06 crimes ✓ murder
50% manslaughter.
Neg. impact on society ✓
lk thief doesn't have the money to give back
eye for eye ✓
support to enact crime on own. ✓
No exact retribution
inefficient system ✓
unjust murder ✓
Neg. impact on society

deserved punishment ✓
2 days law ✓
deter crimes ✓
stop repeat of crimes ✓
community of togetherness
inforce harsh punishment ✓
retribution has place
punishment ✓ deserved
steal lk = pay lk ✓
deter repeated crime ✓ = ✓ community service

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

very good argumentation on Prop good evidence on both teams.

# PARLI Debate

**John Brouhard (*6)**
Round 1A 9:00am D102
Gov: 14 Chan - Foley
Opp: 17 Raven - Sweeney
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: John Brouhard

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 14 | Team Code #: | 17 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Chan pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 | Sweeney pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Foley pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 | Raven pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good passion - especially in rebuttal. Avoid conversational language ("tons of people"). Good job capitalizing on opposition concessions. Great argument clearly overcoming the privacy rights.

Prop 2: Great passion. Good arguments re drug offenders and addiction. Better if statistics attributed to source.

Opp 1: Very well spoken. Good job clarifying resolution. Good arguments re deterrence. Efficient polarity on where opponents' arguments went too much on emotion.

Opp 2: Great eye contact. Avoid conversational language ("you guys" - "perp"). Maybe conceded too much with DVD theft case being unjust.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opposition did good job clarifying resolution and persuasively arguing deterrence and uniformity.

# PARLI Debate

**John Brouhard (*6)**
Round 1B 9:00am D102
Gov: 14 Holwitz - Kay
Opp: 19 Byrne - Nguyen
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: John Brouhard

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 14 | Team Code #: | 19 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Holwitz (Kay) pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | Byrne pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Kay pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 | Nguyen pts 26 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

low point win

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

Prop 1: Very well spoken. Eye contact could be more focused. Great point about Resolution not limited to U.S. Great passion, especially at end. POIs got too messy. Nice focus on Chicago example

Prop 2: Nice introduction - setting road map very well spoken. Great examples from ancient times. Good focus on ~~topic~~ emotional justice. POIs got too messy.

Opp 1: Great job bringing argument back to the resolution. Great eye contact. Focus on government rather than individuals was good.

Opp 2: Good focus on "modern" in resolution. Try to start story - better organized first point. Avoid conversational tone, "morals and stuff"

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opposition stayed focused on the resolution and made stronger arguments regarding governmental authority and punishment.

# PARLI Debate

**Cindy Bulger (*23)**
Round 1A 9:00am C3
Gov: 3 Brown - Helms
Opp: 19 Mart - Moran
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 3 | | Team Code #: 19 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Brown | pts 26 | Opp Speaker #1 Mart | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Helms | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 Moran | pts 29 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Nice flow to your speech.
Eye contact could be more direct. Sometimes I felt you were looking out the window.

Prop 2:
Very easy to understand
speed of speech excellent

Opp 1:
You have a very nice speaking style.
easy to follow

Opp 2:
good eye contact
very organized
Excellent speaker

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The opposition's point that mandatory laws prevent racial profiling by equalizing the punishment for the crime and the strong argument that knowing the punishment in advance could deter someone from committing the crime were stronger arguments than the AFF's position of due process

# PARLI Debate

**Cindy Bulger (*23)**
Round 1B 9:00am C3
Gov: 19 Andola - Pareja
Opp: 5 Pashman - Ralston
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 19 | | Team Code #: 5 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Andola | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 Ralston | pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Pashman | pts 29 | Opp Speaker #2 Pashman | pts 29 |

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

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

low point win

## 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 Timing on your speech.

Opp 1:
Good eye contact
Good strong speaking style

Prop 2:
Very organized and clear & easy to follow.

Opp 2:
strong and organized style little fast but because you were so organized it was easy to follow

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Aff stood by their definition of retribution involving vengeance and personal bias in the modern criminal justice system. Neg. did not refute the idea of modern and in the 1N rebuttal actually agreed that the resolution "clearly states - modern" Aff's examples that compared old vs modern better supported their position

# PARLI Debate

**Tai Phan (*19)**
Round 1A 9:00am D103
Gov: 13 Garcia - Acosta
Opp: 25 Green - Nichols
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: TAI PHAN . H

Judge's School Affiliation: PHS

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 13 | Team Code #: | 25 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Acosta 28 pts | Opp Speaker #1 | Nichols 25 pts |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Garcia 28 pts | Opp Speaker #2 | Green 28 pts |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
- Good Work - Team Work
- Delivery < Drug Crime money

Opp 1:
- little shaky, confusing
- Need more prave & Homwork

Prop 2:
- Good Work.

Opp 2:
- good ~~Speech~~ Talk. confident..

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Team code (13) is better Teamcode (25)

# PARLI Debate

**Tai Phan (*19)**
Round 1B 9:00am D103
Gov: 14 Lyons - Wyszynski
Opp: 12 ~~Santana~~ - ~~Jones~~ BAZILE
Novice Parli Debate ~~Jones~~

Judge's Name: TAI PHAN.H

Judge's School Affiliation: PHS

| PROP | OPP |
|---|---|
| Team Code #: 14 | Team Code #: 12 |
| Prop Speaker #1 Wyszynski 29 pts | Opp Speaker #1 BAZile 28 pts |
| Prop Speaker #2 Lyons. 30 pts | Opp Speaker #2 Jones 28 pts |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
- Very good speak / H.W & Teamwork
- good Analysis : -crime job
  - fat
  - money
  - crime
  - Drug
- Good Delivery : = money
  - jail
- Good Courtesy.

Prop 2:
- very good speak : crime system
- good Solve problem
- H.W teamWork very good.
- good courtesy
- good Delivery.

Opp 1:
- good Work. need more information
- Evidence: ~~need more~~
- crime, job, jail, Drug, money.
- TeamWork.

Opp 2:
- good speak.
- good courtesy.
-

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The Team Code 14 :- Very good Home Works & Team Work.
They Working hard about this topic.
- They have good points of this Topic. Delivery ~~Good~~. Nothing to say more (it's very good)

# PARLI Debate

**Abbas Rangwala (*8)**
Round 1A 9:00am D105
Gov: 19 Alcantra - Thompson
Opp: 14 Kerr-Stein - Davidson
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ABBAS RANGWALA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 19 | Team Code #: | 14 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | ALCANTRA pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | KERR-STEIN pts 30 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | THOMPSON pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 | DAVIDSON pts 29 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

**Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:** SCALE: 1-5 (5 BEING EXCELLENT) (1- AVERAGE)

Prop 1: ALCANTRA ③

ANALYSIS — 3.5
EVIDENCE — 3.5
ARGUM. — 4
POI. — N/A
DELIVERY — 4
COURTESY — 4

- GOOD PRESENCE REFINE IT A BIT MORE
- MISSED COURTESY TO OPP PARTY. FOCUS MORE

28

Prop 2: THOMPSON ④

ANA. — 3.5
EVI. — 3.5
ARG. — 3.5
POI. — 3
DEL. — 3.5 (TRY TO MAKE EYE CONTACT)
COU. — 4

- MAKE BETTER EYE CONTACT
- ACKNOWLEDGE POI EVEN IF YOU DO NOT WANT TO ALLOW
- FOCUS ON COURTESY A BIT MORE

28

Opp 1: KERR-STEIN ①

ANALYSIS — 5
EVIDENCE — 5
ARGUM — 5
POI — 5
DELIVERY — 5
COURTESY — 5

- GOOD EYE CONTACT
- WELL STRUCTURED ARGUMENTS
- GOOD COURTEOUS APPROACH

30

Opp 2: DAVIDSON ②

ANA. — 4
EVI. — 5
ARG. — 4
POI. — N/A
DEL. — 4
COU. — 5

- GOOD EYE CONTACT
- ARGUMENTS CAN BE STRUCTURED BETTER

29

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP BUILT A LOGICAL CASE, ENGAGEMENT WAS PROFESSIONAL & COURTEOUS. CONGRATULATIONS!

PROP TEAM DID A GOOD JOB BUT MISSED OUT 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 & WISH YOU BEST! ALMOST THERE!!

# PARLI Debate

**Abbas Rangwala (*8)**
Round 1B 9:00am D105
Gov: 19 Le - Rather
Opp: 14 Masuda-Thaya - Sun
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ABBAS RANGWALA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 19 | Team Code #: | 14 |
| Prop Speaker #1 LE | pts 30 | Opp Speaker #1 SUN | pts 30 |
| Prop Speaker #2 RATHER | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 MASUDA-THAYA | pts 29 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

**Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:** (SCALE: 1-5, 5 Being EXCELLENT, 1 being AVERAGE)

Prop 1: LE

ANA. – 4.5
EVI. – 4.5
ARG. – 5
POI. – N/A
DEL. – 5
COU. – 5

- GOOD CONTENTION & DELIVERY TO START, THEN LOST FOCUS. DO NOT HAVE TO USE ALL TIME IF U HAVE MADE UR CASE
- GOOD COURTESY, & DELIVERY

Prop 2: RATHER

ANA. – 4
EVI. – 3.5
ARG. – 3
POI. – 3.5
DEL. – 4
COU. – 3.5

- WORK ON ARGUMENTS A BIT MORE, LOGICALLY GROUP THEM
- ~~AVOID~~ AVOID JUMPING FROM PTS TO PTS
- MAKE A BIT MORE EYE CONTACT

Opp 1: SUN

ANA. – 5
EVI. – 5
ARG. – 5
POI. – 5
DEL. – 4.5
COU. – 4.5

- GOOD CONTENTION, A BIT WEAK ON REBUTTAL
- OVERALL TIED UP UR CASE NICELY

Opp 2: MASUDA

ANA. – 4.5
EVI. – 4.5
ARG. – 4
POI. – N/A
DEL – 4
COU. – 5

- WEAK REBUTTAL, WORK ON IT A BIT MORE
- STRUCTURE UR THOUGHTS A BIT MORE
- FOCUS A BIT MORE ON COURTESY

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP: WON BECAUSE THEY WERE ABLE TO KEEP THEIR CONTENTIONS CRISP & LOGICAL - CONGRATULATIONS
[[BOTH TEAMS CAN WORK ON COURTESY A BIT MORE]]

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

# PARLI Debate

**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 #: 21 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Thomas | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 Burrows | pts 25 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Figueroa | pts 26 | Opp Speaker #2 Griggy | pts 28 |

**Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:** re: minimum sentence unjust

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
- good eye contact
- good verbal pace
- contentions needs to be better organized & separated

Prop 2:
- passionate delivery
- good analysis & responded well to other's contentions
- need clearer separation of points presented

Opp 1:
- need better separation of arguements
- need to be careful of restating government position
- need to show more courtesy
- good use of point of information
- good pace and voice projection

Opp 2:
- very courteous
- need to present to judge & not to the other side
- used examples well to set points across
- good argumentation

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Better delivery of evidence and argumentation.
- The analysis was clearer

Henry Tunnell

Wills

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Thomas | 27 | Thomas | 25 |
| Henry | 24 | Henry | 25 |

# PARLI Debate

**Nanny Tunnell (*16)**
Round 1B 9:00am D109
Gov: 3 Lisy - Forman
Opp: 13 Karim - Kerstetter
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell

Judge's School Affiliation: Mutts

| PROP (Gov) | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 3 | | Team Code #: 13 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Lisy | pts 25 | Opp Speaker #1 Kerstetter | pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Forman | pts 25 | Opp Speaker #2 Karim | pts 25 |

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

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

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

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

Retribution has no place in a modern criminal justice system.

## 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: (Lisy) 25
- local delivery of definition
- need to develope contentions more deeply
- too short of delivery
- good hand gestures

Prop 2: (Forman) 25
- too short + not acknowledged all contentions
- need to better connect examples and points to specific contentions
- good verbal place + voice projection

Opp 1: (Kerstetter) 29
- passionate delivery
- good connection between retribution as part of punishment
- should not ask for time during own speech
- good analysis + contentions points seem strong - ending was too abrupt

Opp 2: (Karim) (25)
- good distinction between retribution, vengeance and punishment
- need better organization b/c delivery seemed to jump around
- nice eye contact

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
- better analysis + contention delivery
- better summary delivery of all points presented.

# PARLI Debate

**Sophia Burshteyn (*3)**
Round 1A 9:00am C6
Gov: 19 Phan - Phan
Opp: 23 Barton - Madsen
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: SOPHIA BURSHTEYN

Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEY

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 19 | Team Code #: | 23 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Phan Kenny pts 26 | Opp Speaker #1 | Barton pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Phan Catherine pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 | Madsen pts 27 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: good definitions, good arguments, evidence contentions are on the subject. might improve speaking more clearly

Opp 1: good flow, stated definit correctly;

Prop 2: very good speaker, supported partner, responded to opponents.

Opp 2: effectively supported partner and responded to opponents arguments

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

REASON FOR DECISION: strong case.

comment: topic was written on the board incorrectly, by Aff team but neg team did not correct it.

# PARLI Debate

**Sophia Burshteyn (*3)**
Round 1B 9:00am C6
Gov: 6 Kang - Yolasan
Opp: 21 Harris - Marr
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Sophia Burshteyn

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 6 | Team Code #: | 21 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Kang pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 | Harris pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Yolasan pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 | Marr pts 27 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: good definitions
easy to follow the flow, extended arguments

Opp 1: defined roadmap clearly
good contention points

Prop 2: good arguments, strong support for partner

Opp 2: good partner support

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

REASON FOR DECISION: effective and clear speeches and strong case, was not rebutted.

Mandatory Min Sentence laws 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: Alex M. Shvartsman

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 10 | Team Code #: | 22 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Malcolm pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | Naena pts 25 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Rishaan pts 26 | Opp Speaker #2 | Naena pts 27 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: Spoke clearly but mispron a few words. good overall

with practice can be a very strong orator.

Opp 1: Rambled a bit. but made some good points.
no end to speech? just walked off?

Prop 2: Brought up Opp argument but didn't really rebut it
- Needs a lot of practice.
- Lost track several times.

Opp 2: Good rebuttal. Hit all the Prop 2 points.
Needs to slow down and breathe.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Better prepared. Speaker 1 was most effective.

Unfortunately one of the Opp teams didn't show up which clearly impacted their score. Naena did a good job though.

Retribution has no place in a modern criminal justice system.

**Alex Shvartsman (*14)**
Round 1B 9:00am C5
Gov: 3 McDonald - Thani
Opp: 10 Lee - Wang
Novice Parli Debate

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Alex M. Shvartsman

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 3 | Team Code #: | 10 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Holland pts 29 | Opp Speaker #1 | Ryan pts 26 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Zahid pts 23 | Opp Speaker #2 | James. pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: speaks loud + clear.
- clearly stated argument and points

prop 1: good rebuttal. defined punishment vs vengeance.

Prop 2: needs to practice not saying 'um, uh' so much.
- lots of long pauses. seemed lost.
- literally no clear argument.

Opp 1: spoke clearly but weak argument
- need emotion needed to penalize properly?
- contradictions - needs to be emotional but rationale?
- didn't distinguish between retribution + punishment. implied they are the same.

Opp 2: needs to practice speed to stay on point
spoke loud + clear. made some good points. not really following the argument about diff. between retaliation and just plain punishment. seems their argument doesn't clearly define it.

Opp 1:
- reaffirmed points.
- rambled a bit.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Combined scores were higher. both speakers for Opp did well although speaker 1 for prop did better.

# PARLI Debate

**Lori-Jill Seltzer (*5)**
Round 1A 9:00am C1
Gov: 3 Lanzone - Hubinger
Opp: 19 Fong - Ligutan
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Lori-Jill Seltzer

Judge's School Affiliation: BOD

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 3 | Team Code #: | 19 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Hubinger pts 29 | Opp Speaker #1 | Fong pts 25 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Lanzone pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 | Ligutan pts 26 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Clearly stated points and gave back-up information. Great eye contact. Clearly refuted opp. points.

Prop 2: Effective arguments and evidence. Organized delivery.

Opp 1: Covered all of the points that the Prop 1 stated. Very courteous to opponents & judge.

Opp 2: Good manners; responded to points stated. Clear speaker.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Clearly made points for their position and had supportive evidence; effectively refuted arguments made by other side.

# PARLI Debate

**Lori-Jill Seltzer (*5)**
Round 1B 9:00am C1
Gov: 12 Murdock - Bazile
Opp: 14 Dickerman - Millar
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Lori-Jill Seltzer

Judge's School Affiliation: BAD

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 12 | | Team Code #: 14 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Murdock | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 Dickerman | pts 25 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Murdock | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 Millar | pts 25 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Clearly stated points well organized

Opp 1: Used facts; clearly defined topic use more eye contact

Prop 2: Addressed all points of opposition and restated own point

Opp 2: Needed to more clearly refute points but great effort!

**TEAM CODE #:** 12 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Both on both roles and had sufficient evidence and covered all points.

# PARLI Debate

**Winnie Wang (*10)**
Round 1A 9:00am D108
Gov: 27 Little - Wagner
Opp: 14 Situ - Zhang
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Winnie Wang

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 27 | | Team Code #: 14 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Little | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 Situ | pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Wagner | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 Zhang | pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
- good evidence
- good skill of interpretation
- [redacted] taking POI well
- [redacted] good analysis of topic

Prop 2:
- good argumentation
- deliver information well.
- * - clear speech

Opp 1: - good volume & speaking rate
- more eye contact on the audience will be perfect
- more confident on the speech will be excellent

Opp 2: - very polite
- good variation of tone & vocal emphasis
- [redacted] very courteous

**TEAM CODE #:** [redacted] 27 **on the** [redacted] prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The [redacted] prop team has good support for the main idea and also has the confident and polished presentation.

# PARLI Debate

**Winnie Wang (*10)**
Round 1B 9:00am D108
Gov: 27 Campanella - Petruska
Opp: 3 Greenwall - DuPuy
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Winnie Wang

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 27 | | Team Code #: 3 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Campanella | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 Greenwall | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Petruska | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 DuPuy | pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
- good eye contact and presentation skill
- more supports of main ideas will be good

Prop 2:
- good examples
- very confident
- more evidence will ~~be~~ be better

Opp 1:
- good POI
- logic arguments
- strong & firm attitude
- good conclusion

Opp 2:
- perfect eye contact
- orgazined information well
- can be better taking POI

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp provided more facts support and ~~has~~ have excellent persuasive style.

# PARLI Debate

**Arna Katewa (*21)**
Round 1A 9:00am C2
Gov: 12 Green - Madison
Opp: 14 Lee - Duan
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ARNA KATEWA

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN HIGH.

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 12 | | Team Code #: 14 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Madison | pts 26 | Opp Speaker #1 Lee | pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Green | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 Duan | pts 29 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Madison - Good start, and had good contentions, needed more evidence to back up the argument.
(ONLY SUGGESTION - MAKE EYE CONTACT)
Rebuttal - needed to be more assertive & finish the argument you started.

Prop 2: Green: Good eye contact, started off well and had some great points to argue the opposition.

Opp 1: Lee: Good eye contact, confident speaking and good use of evidence to back her contention. Good contentions with evidence.
Rebuttle - Great rebuttal, stated clearly the points of the other team and how they differ with good evidence & arguments.

Opp 2: Duan - Confident and great eye contact. Picked up on the opponents points & argued very nicely about their contentions. Also pointed out why their contentions are stronger than the opponent team.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Both teams were very courteous. They stated their contentions and arguments, but the opposition team was more assertive about their arguments and clearly stated why mandatory minimum sentencing laws are just.

# PARLI Debate

**Arna Katewa (*21)**
Round 1B 9:00am C2
Gov: 14 Luk - Tserennamid
Opp: 3 Dovichi - Vetterli
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ARNA KATEWA

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

| PROP | OPP |
|---|---|
| Team Code #: 14 | Team Code #: 3 |
| Prop Speaker #1 Luk pts 29 | Opp Speaker #1 Vetterli pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Tserennamid pts 29 | Opp Speaker #2 Dovichi pts 30 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Luk - Good and confident oration. Clearly stated contentions with examples and arguments. Nice delivery.

Rebuttal - Very clear & also showed how the opposition team's arguments differed from their's. Made a stronger case.

Prop 2: Tserennamid - You had some great arguments, also good use of your partner's comments & adding on to them further to make your case stronger.

Opp 1: Vetterli - Good start. Should have backed up your contentions with examples.

Rebuttal - Needed to elaborate & discuss the issue more.

Opp 2: Dovichi - Great start and arguments. Very good use of examples to back the contentions. Very assertive in the arguments you made.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both teams did a GREAT JOB. However, great use of examples, arguments as well as pointing out how they differs from their opponents gave "PROP" the advantage. They came up with good arguments & made the case stronger.

# PARLI Debate

~~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: Windsor

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 3 | | Team Code #: 14 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Hemerling | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 Melman | pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Barnett | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 WOO | pts 27.5 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

low point win

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

Prop 1: Hemerling
- Nice tone, Dictation, Pace: Good flow Speaking
- Make Persuasive Argument, just a bit off Topic. Not quite as for

Prop 2: Barnett:
- Mainly Restated same info, Build on Partners Point, Learn to Be Careful of appearance while Partner Speaks

Opp 1: Melman
- great job outlining & Arguing their Point 1. Effec. 2. Equal Playing 3. obey-predict
- missed Counter one point: Constitution issue
- Had-Raised 3 good points - on Point

Opp 2: WOO
- Kept the Team focus very well and
- Good Counter Point,

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

As a team, had a Better theme and focus. Had 3 Key issues that all Made Sense & Logical argument. Stayed on Topic Best. Team #3 Was not able to Counter 3 good Points Raised, Because they were very Strong Arguments. Team #3 Had "Polish" on presentation But not as Good focus on Points

# PARLI Debate

Marlon
~~Wendy~~ Young (*27)
Round 1B 9:00am D101
Gov: 14 Fong - Geller
Opp: 6 Brouhard - Welch
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Young, Marlon

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 14 | | Team Code #: 6 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Fong | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 Welch | pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Geller | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 Brouhard | pts 26 |

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

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

low point win

**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: Fong :

Examples of Retribution French Rev. Native Amer. KKK

Opp 1: Welch :

Good Counter, Justice must be ~~fair~~

Good job Countering up

Prop 2: Geller :

Good Theme - Justice must be Blind

Opp 2: Brouhard :

needs to be Justice System - not open Retribution

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Good "Ping Pong" match & Good Debating Back & forth - Point & Counter Point. Close Match. Like a Boxing match. Good Sparring Hard Decision Because close on points.

# PARLI Debate

**David Duncan (*25)**
Round 1A 9:00am D107
Gov: 21 Sundararaman - Elmhirst
Opp: 6 Goldblatt - McKinney
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: DAVID R. DUNCAN

Judge's School Affiliation: SONOMA AC.

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 21 | | Team Code #: 6 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Elmhirst | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 Goldblatt | pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 SUNDARARAMAN | pts 29 | Opp Speaker #2 McKinney | pts 29 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

low point win

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

Prop 1: used 2 min of 7
28 in 1st speech
- ~~both~~ 1st

Opp 1: Eye contact
26 - sec speech much better
27 - passion @ 15yr was strong
- be confident, you can.

Prop 2:
29 used 3:49 // 7 min

Opp 2:
29 4:45 / 7 min
well spoken & made points

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop dropped 2 arguments of opp while opp addressed in both speeches Prop points.
Prop did not use time which could have helped. Stayed on same 2 points while plenty of time for more.

AFF

#1 Elmlirst
#2 Sunda

Neg

#1 Goldblat
#2 McKinney.

Prop Mandatory min sentencing laws are unjust.

#1

Def min jail for certain crime
Net bene of act debate
Cont 1 situations vary greatly
- min sentence may not be
Cont 2 pun not fit the crime
ND pot example
used 2 min

#2

opp cont
1 - equality - becoming a judge is hard. do what's right.
2 - bribery - does not happen

dropped - congress
- deterrent

- strength vary greatly
- overly harsh - ND example again

3:49

rebut - if we take away sent bribes would happen - jury
both cont addressed? new point.
2:30.

#1

Value debate
cont val society welfare
Cont #1 equality
diversity of views made equal by min sentencing for judges.

#2 bribery can ensue if no min sentence unjust not fair.

impact - dec equality.
50% of people in jail are repeat offenders - dec safety for public

#3 - what people want.
- voted on again & again

#4 - deterrent. take on ND as an example.

#2 Attack opp cont
Cont 1 you need an element to let people know pun fair
* Cont 2 overly harsh - been voted on. errors
Picked up rig process to become a judge. - dec circumstantially

rebuttal - greatest soc welfare. only 2 cont

# PARLI Debate

**David Duncan (*25)**
Round 1B 9:00am D107
Gov: 23 Scott - Ambrose
Opp: 10 Mao - Tong-Seely
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: David Duncan

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Ac.

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 23 | Team Code #: | 10 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Scott pts 29 | Opp Speaker #1 | Tong Seely pts 30 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Ambrose pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 | MAO pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

low point win

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

Prop 1: Very well spoken / work on eye contact / 1:45 on 1st speech?

Opp 1: Very well spoken + poised dropped 2 pts after saying you would take them on

Prop 2: 28 use time

Opp 2: well done

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both teams did well but Neg dropping ⅔ of Aff Cont & final Arg of Aff won it.

# Aff

#1 Scott 29 exp control.
#2 Ambrose 28

# Neg

#1 Tong Seely 30
#2 Mao 28

Prop. Retribution has no place in a modern criminal justice system

Aff 1
def - prop & purely legal
Keep current system
#1 - present in gov to say
8th Amendment
- no reason to change
#2 - protects our freedoms
#3 less bias
example Les coup into
1:45 mon

Aff 2
dropped #2 & #3 - 4 rev.
ref #1 - holds back cjs
to put in place
#2 judge fair
#3 balance - but holds back
cjs on pun
2:30

Final Rebut:
Opp accepted def & plan
no information that #3 was wrong.

Neg 1 - does have place
refute Aff
#1 retrib is the basis
of criminal just sys.
- crime rights civil rise
#2 cont lower incarceration
/OB on justice system
#3 balance - pun are
weighted to crime.
- consequences
- deterrent.
- soc safety.
3:22

Neg 2
crim learn from pun
- no reason to change is
not right pun too serious
for lots of crimes.
- tag living points.
support cont
#1 - Defer crime / fit pun
#2 - more sensible, less
#3 - more fair.
taxes to better causes.

Rebut: Voter issues
have to have pun for crime

Vivian Pham

~~Nadeem Alam~~ (*19)
Round 2A 11:00am C6
Gov: 13 Karim - Kerstetter
Opp: 14 Holwitz - Kay
Novice Parli Debate

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Vivian Pham

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

| PROP | OPP |
|---|---|
| Team Code #: 13 | Team Code #: 14 |
| Prop Speaker #1 kerstetter pts 15 | Opp Speaker #1 Holwitz pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Karim pts 20 | Opp Speaker #2 Kay pts 30 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: rude. discourteous. Allowed the alarm to ring the whole time. Laughed at opponent.

Opp 1: very captivating speech. clear points, great eye contact.

Prop 2: Easily understandable. Rude. PA clicked pen the whole time.

Opp 2: great job analyzing. valid evidence and very organized. courteous. Great eye contact posture.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

clear analysis

Vivian pham

~~Nadeem Alam (*19)~~

Round 2B 11:00am C6
Gov: 12 Santana - Bazile
Opp: 14 Yan - Shponko
Novice Parli Debate

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Vivian pham

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 12 | | Team Code #: 14 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 bazile | pts 26 | Opp Speaker #1 yan | pts 25 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Santana | pts 24 | Opp Speaker #2 Shponko | pts 22 |

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

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

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
very respectful and courteous. Organized points. Nice posture and easily understandable.

Prop 2:
respectful and courteous

Opp 1: nice posture and tone.

Opp 2: nice posture and tone

**TEAM CODE #:** 12 **on the** prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
organized points

# PARLI Debate

**Elizabeth Murphy (*5)**
Round 2A 11:00am D105
Gov: 3 Dovichi - Vetterli
Opp: 27 Campanella - Petruska
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Elizabeth Murphy

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

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 3 | Team Code #: | 27 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Vetterli pts 24 | Opp Speaker #1 | Campanella pts 25 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Dovichi pts 24 | Opp Speaker #2 | Petruska pts 26 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: .Introduce Name
Good summary of contentions - Clear
Need to improve rebuttal.
Good tone of voice - not too loud + cadence consistent

Prop 2:
can improve organization of thoughts + argumentation
Good tone of voice - not too loud + cadence consistent

Opp 1: Good introduction of self. Should clearly state issue @ outset + then present proposed solution/counter plan
Good tone of voice - not too loud + cadence consistent

Opp 2: Introduce Name
good job at refuting / addressing Prop's contentions
good tone of voice - not too loud + cadence consistent

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp did a better job of identifying + describing counterplan and reasons why theirs was the optimum of 2 proposals. Prop needs to improve analysis and ~~presentation of~~ delivery - just requires more organization and thought.

# PARLI Debate

**Elizabeth Murphy (*5)**
Round 2B 11:00am D105
Gov: 10 Lee - Wang
Opp: 19 Andola - Pareja
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Elizabeth Murphy

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

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 10 | Team Code #: | 19 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Ryan Lee pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 | Pareja pts 25 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | James Wang pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 | Andola pts 25 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: Introduce First + Last Name
Very articulate speaker
Lower voice/slow down
Increase eye contact
good reference to soft power in rebuttal.

Prop 2: Intro 1st + last name
good Eye contact
Articulate but can improve tone of voice → do not need to be loud.

Opp 1:
Did not understand link between 3rd contention + how it counteracts Prop's proposal - Analysis needs to be strengthened
good rebuttal.
Use time more efficiently

Opp 2: ~~Introduction~~
Need to better organize counter-arguments. She jumped around a lot. Just takes practice + greater focus on organization. good tone + intonation.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Did not use Prop very effective at laying out their contentions and arguments in support. good job!
Did not refute 3rd contention of Prop.
Did not understand Opp's arguments regarding vaccinations. Need to provide a link to issue. Spell it out.

# PARLI Debate

**Mr Olson (*23)**
Round 2A 11:00am C5
Gov: 14 Lee - Duan
Opp: 6 Kang - Yolasan
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ROBERT OLSEN

Judge's School Affiliation: 23

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 14 | | Team Code #: 6 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 DUAN | pts 28+ | Opp Speaker #1 KANG | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 LEE | pts 28+ | Opp Speaker #2 YOLASAN | pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
GOOD OPENING, PRETTY SMOOTH, HAD EXTRA TIME. GOOD EYE CONTACT. FELT TESTING WAS INHUMANE. GOOD QUESTION/CLARIFY.
ADDRESSED OPP POINTS, REALLY PASSIONATE ENDING AND PERSUASIVE. RECOVERED WELL AFTER SLIP & CLOSED OUTSTANDING.

Prop 2:
GOOD REBUTTAL TO OPENING, GOOD EYE CONTACT KNOWS TOPIC. PASSIONATE. REALLY GOOD JOB, JUST A LITTLE FAST. GREAT POINTS.

Opp 1: A LITTLE CHOPPY OPENING, BETTER WHEN GOT ROLLING. GOOD POINTS, COSTS WERE MADE CLEAR. GOOD REBUTTAL TO POINTS, GOOD CLOSING, JUST CHOPPY. JUST NEEDS TO HAMMER POINT MORE, GETTING IT AT CLOSE.

Opp 2: - GOOD POINTS OF INVESTOR FEARS AWAY FROM ANIMAL TESTING. BECAME PASSIONATE AS WENT ALONG, GREAT! GOOD MOVING ON FROM QUESTION. SUPPORT FACTS, GOOD DEFENSE OF POINTS. JUST NEEDED TO ORGANIZE A LITTLE MORE, GOOD OTHERWISE. GOOD CLOSE.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
PROP WAS JUST BETTER ORGANIZED, BOTH TEAMS HAD GOOD FACTS BUT PRO WAS BETTER ORGANIZED. I THINK OPP MIGHT HAVE WON IF THEY HAD BETTER EVIDENCE AND DELIVERY. GREAT NOVICE TEAMS & AS GOOD AS SOME JV'S.

# PARLI Debate

**Mr Olson (*23)**
Round 2B 11:00am C5
Gov: 19 Mart - Moran
Opp: 5 Figueroa - Thomas
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ROBERT OLSEN

Judge's School Affiliation: 23

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 19 | | Team Code #: 5 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 MORAN | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 THOMAS | pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 MART | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 FIGUEROA | pts 29 |

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

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

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: - GOOD OPENING & ORGANIZATION, GOOD EYE CONTACT, GOOD REASONING FOR ENDING SUBSIDIES. GOOD POINTS, JUST ORGANIZE A LITTLE BETTER. GOT ROLLING LATER, GREAT POINTS -
→ POINTS TAKEN, CLASSIFIED POSITIONS WELL, SLIGHTLY UNCLEAR ON PRICING.

Prop 2: GOOD CONTRAST TO OPP'S POINTS, VERY CLEAR & STEADY. WELL DELIVERED, COULD USE MORE FACTS. NOW VS. IN THE FUTURE, GOOD EYE CONTACT, VARY SPEECH & NICE DELIVERY.

Opp 1: - GOOD OPENING AS WELL. A LITTLE CHOPPY IN THE BEGINNING GOT ROLLING AS WELL. GOOD POINTS. EXCELLENT ABOUT BIG FARMS SURVIVING/CONSUMPTION. REFUTED WELL, COUNTERED WELL, GOOD EYE CONTACT, HAVE GOOD POINTS.
GOOD REASONING FOR OPP. FINISH. GOOD CLOSING ALL AROUND, SEEMED TO WANT TO SAY MORE ON DIET/CORPORATE FARMING.

Opp 2: BENEFITS TO SOCIETY, A BIT FAST. WORK ON EYE CONTACT, KNOWS TOPIC WANTED TO SAY A LOT IN A LITTLE TIME, HAMPERED EXPRESSION AND REALLY GOT GOING LATER. IF HE HAD MORE PRACTICE COULD BE OUTSTANDING. GOT PASSIONATE LATER. GOOD! ANSWERED PROPS POINTS WELL. EMOTIVE!

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

HARD TOPIC FOR CROWD. OPP. HAD BETTER FACTS & WERE BETTER ORGANIZED. I THOUGHT PRO DID WELL BUT TRIED TO COVER A LOT & JUMPED FROM FACTS TO FACTS. THEY MADE A DULL TOPIC EXCITING & WERE VERY GOOD TEAMS.

# PARLI Debate

**Bill Holt (*3)**
Round 2A 11:00am C3
Gov: 6 Goldblatt - McKinney
Opp: 19 Alcantra - Thompson
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Jinny Holt

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 6 | | Team Code #: 19 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Goldblatt | pts 28.5 | Opp Speaker #1 Alcantra | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 McKinney | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 Thumpson | pts 27.5 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: Great layout of debate, and plan. I like the 10 yr transition proposal excellent analysis, argumentation, delivery.

Prop 2: good argumentation- very clear.

Opp 1: Great points for your case. good evidence, well laid out.

Opp 2: good attack points!. just expand a bit.
good evidence (SF state study!)

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Better argued → both sides had exellent points and evidence; PROP argumentation was stronger.

# PARLI Debate

**Bill Holt (*3)**
Round 2B 11:00am C3
Gov: 14 Kerr-Stein - Davidson
Opp: 12 Green - Madison
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Jenny Holt

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

| PROP 14 | | OPP 12 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prop Speaker #1 Kerr-Stein | pts 29 | Opp Speaker #1 Green | pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Davidson | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 Madison | pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

Great! All!

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

Prop 1: outstanding speaker. Well laid out arguments, analysis. Delivery fantastic.

Prop 2: good clarification of some points and good arguments.

Opp 1: you had good solid logical points. Turn your opinions into fact statements b/c they make sense! / Your McDonalds point was great. /

Opp 2: point of population growth very good.

overall opp > good points/arguments just lay it out a little more clearly

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
prop had a stronger argument, more evidence, better delivery.

# PARLI Debate

~~Ken Stone~~ (*16)
Round 2A 11:00am D101
Gov: 5 Pashman - Ralston
Opp: 21 Sundararaman - Elmhirst
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ken Schneider

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 5 | Team Code #: | 21 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | ~~28~~ Pashman pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | ~~27~~ Elmhirst pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | ~~27~~ Ralston pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 | 28 Sundararaman pts ~~28~~ 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: made an interesting and cogent argument but did not present supporting evidence, i.e., have computer models been used successfully to develop pharmaceuticals?
Also a bit confused at start of rebuttal

Prop 2:
very confident, strong refutation of Opp's contentions. ~~gave~~ strong case for immorality of Opp's position. Raised good POI. Could improve eye contact.

Opp 1: Once he settled in, made a good case. Strong finish with mask metaphor and statement that existing drugs were developed with animal testing.

Opp 2: Reasonable refutation of Aff's contentions, although I would have liked a little more supporting evidence.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
A close contest. OPP gets the nod because they clearly articulated their contentions and cast doubt on those of the PROP.

# PARLI Debate

~~Ken Stone~~ (*16)
Round 2B 11:00am D101
Gov: 21 Burrous - Griggy
Opp: 3 Brown - Helms
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ken Schneider

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 21 | Team Code #: | 3 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | ~~28~~ Burrous pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | ~~27~~ Brown pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | ~~27~~ Griggy pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 | ~~27~~ Helms pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Arguments made in rebuttal were stronger than in 1st speech. I would have liked to have heard them earlier. Explained plan well (2090 in 5 years), concerns about environment, wages, etc.

Prop 2: Clearly stated positions of PROP and OPP. I appreciated the iPhone analogy, but it was imperfect. Responded well to POI strong close, suggested re-allocating $ to education.

Opp 1: Good explanation of economics, att. to fossil fuels, good rebuttal, good POI, offered good alternatives in rebuttal (protecting working class wages, water use). Could improve eye contact, and became distracted. Will be an excellent debater if he can address.

Opp 2: offered good alternatives, particularly to PROP's suggestion of re-allocating money to education. Very resourceful and clear.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
A close call. PROP's strong rebuttal clarified their position and gave them the edge, although OPP gets points for offering real alternatives ~~Arot very~~ well done, in a subject area that can be quite bland. All were very collegial and generous

12:30

# PARLI Debate

~~Jesse MacKinnon (*5)~~
Round 2B 11:00am D109
Gov: 17 Raven - Sweeney
Opp: 14 Luk - Tserennamid
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Nadeem Alam

Judge's School Affiliation: Pmole Valley

| PROP | | | OPP | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 17 | | Team Code #: | 14 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Raven | pts 29 | Opp Speaker #1 | Luk | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Sweeney | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 | Tserennamid | pts 28 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prop 1: | Fluent<br>Made valid points | Opp 1: | Don't say sorry a mistake<br>more eye contact |
| Prop 2: | Presentable | Opp 2: | Presentable |

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

It was a ~~close~~ good debate, Team 14 did not answer a couple of challenges.

# PARLI Debate

**Vincent Banas (*13)**
Round 2A 11:00am D108
Gov: 21 Harris - Marr
Opp: 3 McDonald - Thani
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Jaydeep Sinha

Judge's School Affiliation: #13

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: # 21 | | Team Code #: # 3 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 HARRIS | pts 26 | Opp Speaker #1 McDONALD | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 MARR | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 THANI | pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Use time properly. Only 2 mins used in initial proposition speech.

Prop 2:
Good delivery of information. Good eye contact

Opp 1:
Good reasoning and effective communication. Good eye contact and organized delivery of information.

Opp 2:
Good arguments. Points of information were valid and relevant. Good rebuttal

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Better arguments and effective communication.

# PARLI Debate

**Vincent Banas (*13)**
Round 2B 11:00am D108
Gov: 19 Fong - Ligutan
Opp: 14 Fong - Geller
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Jaydeep Sinha

Judge's School Affiliation: #13

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 19 | | Team Code #: 14 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 LIGUTAN | pts 26 | Opp Speaker #1 GELLER | pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 FONG | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 FONG | pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Lacked clarity.
Only half the allotted time used.

Opp 1:
Excellent delivery.
Arguments relevant and organized very well.

Prop 2:
Not an organized speech.
Several points in the argument were not relevant.

Opp 2:
~~Good~~ Clarity in delivery.
Argument points not organized

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Very well organized delivery of arguments

# PARLI Debate

**Dan Fishlow (*15)**
Round 2A 11:00am D102
Gov: 13 Banas - Cummings
Opp: 14 Chan - Foley
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Dan Fishlow

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 13 | | Team Code #: 14 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Banas | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 Chan | pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Cummings | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 Foley | pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
very good; well organized & forceful speaker. passionate

Opp 1: Good speaker. Only suggestion would be to organize thoughts just a little better overall... solid.

Prop 2:
Good job. Nice start to intro yourself way to come back to the points

Opp 2:
very strong; did a good job of honing in on points to refute.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very, very close. At the end of the day the argument about total lives vs. the worth of an animal life vs that of human. The net benefit was the lives saves and cost and potentially less medicine & testing. Good debate

# PARLI Debate

**Dan Fishlow (*15)**
Round 2B 11:00am D102
Gov: 14 Situ - Zhang
Opp: 12 Murdock -
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Dan Fishlow

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 14 | | Team Code #: 12 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Situ | pts 26 | Opp Speaker #1 Murdock | pts 26 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Zhang | pts 25 | Opp Speaker #2 | pts |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Nice job. Good intro. Good job to re-iterate argument.

Opp 1: Good strong voice. Good job framing debate.

Prop 2: Good job; remember to make eye contact, change tone.

Opp 2:

**TEAM CODE #:** 12 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very close. The OPP takes it as her point on how to define the issue. Also laid out points better. Neither team seemed comfortable with the topic.

# PARLI Debate

**Scott Gast (*14)**
Round 2A 11:00am C1
Gov: 6 Brouhard - Welch
Opp: 19 Le - Rather
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Scott Gast

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 6 | | Team Code #: 19 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Brouhard | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 Rather | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Welch | pts 25 | Opp Speaker #2 Le | pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: good points, good evidence, fairly good emotional appeal, eye contact needed more, good delivery

Prop 2: had almost zero eye contact, needed to talk more expansively about contentions, had good rebuttals

Opp 1: excellent preparation and delivery, good emotional appeal with firefighter example, stated opponents and rebutted effectively, jumped too much b/w contentions and rebuttals, good eye contact

Opp 2: organized and used evidence, emotional appeal good but could be more compelling, good eye contact and delivery, sometimes confused about his notes

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Team #19 gave overall better fact-based evidence and straightforward logic. Team 19 also used emotional arguments effectively. Their points were clear. Team #6 was very loud during their opponents' talking. Their points weren't as clear as Team #19.

# PARLI Debate

**Scott Gast (*14)**
Round 2B 11:00am C1
Gov: 3 Duong - Kopelevich
Opp: 23 Scott - Ambrose
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Scott Gast

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 3 | Team Code #: | 23 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Duong pts 25 | Opp Speaker #1 | Scott pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Kopelevich pts 25 | Opp Speaker #2 | Ambrose pts 26 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: comfortable with speaking, low eye contact, needed to talk more about contentions with evidence, needed to use the clock more

Prop 2: was clear about what she was going to say, mainly restated earlier contentions w/o additional appeal, not successful in refuting Opp's contentions, seemed distracted

Opp 1: very clear/organized, refuted other team's contentions well, low eye contact, delivery could be a little softer (in terms of volume), gave evidence, courteous

Opp 2: clear about what he was going to say, good eye contact, moved too quickly through points, delivery needed to sound more excited

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Team 23 was very clear, organized, gave clear contentions, effective rebuttals and some evidence. Team 3 was not as clear and didn't generate effective evidence or rationales for their contentions; their minimal use of time also did not help them.

UDAY

~~Allen~~ Shingwekar (*10)
Round 2A 11:00am C2
Gov: 25 Green - Nichols
Opp: 3 Lisy - Forman
Novice Parli Debate

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: UDAY SHINGWEKAR

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HIGH

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 25 | | Team Code #: 3 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Nichols | pts 23 | Opp Speaker #1 Lisy | pts 25 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Green | pts 24 | Opp Speaker #2 Forman | pts 26 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Slow down a little
make full use of your time

Opp 1:
Short speech
Make use of your time

Prop 2:
Provide clarity

Opp 2:
good counter
balanced speech.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Clear

UDAY

~~Alka~~ **Shingwekar (*10)**
Round 2B 11:00am C2
Gov: 23 Barton - Madsen
Opp: 3 Lanzone - Hubinger
Novice Parli Debate

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: UDAY SHINGWEKAR

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HIGH

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 23 | | Team Code #: 3 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Barton | pts 26 | Opp Speaker #1 Hubinger | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Madsen | pts 26 | Opp Speaker #2 Lanzone | pts 26 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Opp 1: clear speech

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

clear

# PARLI Debate

**Bonnie Hayne (*25)**
Round 2A 11:00am D103
Gov: 14 Woo - Melman
Opp: 13 Garcia - Acosta
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: BONNIE HAYNE

Judge's School Affiliation: SONOMA ACADEMY

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 14 | | Team Code #: 13 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 MELMAN | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 ACOSTA | pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 WOO | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 GARCIA | pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Nice fluidity
Work on eye contact w/ judge
Good use of emotion - really got rolling at the end

Prop 2:
Good refutation of individual points.
Good fluidity & addressing of each point. Confidence will come - you have the beginning

Opp 1:
Good eye contact - very nice presence & Grace w/ mistakes (it gets going out)
A lot of potential as a developing speaker, too bad didn't address the Aff plan.

Opp 2: Nice plan but needed to address the Aff.
Nice acknowledgements
Also good potential as a speaker

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg didn't address the aff's plan so most of it carried. The Neg team had a ~~gun~~ more fluid delivery but my understanding is that the plans points have to be addressed or they get carried

# PARLI Debate

**Bonnie Hayne (*25)**
Round 2B 11:00am D103
Gov: 22 Keshav - Wei
Opp: 3 Hemerling - Barnett
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: BONNIE HAYNE

Judge's School Affiliation: SONOMA ACADEMY

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 22 | | Team Code #: 3 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 KESHAV | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 HEMERLING | pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 WEI | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 BARNETT | pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: KESHAV
You stayed calm & were graceful in dealing with setbacks
You have a lot of potential — just need to work on grasping out definitions & clarity with contentions

Prop 2: WEI
Knew where the room was & it happens to everyone!
You leaped in & did your best will.
Good beginning eye contact

Opp 1: HEMERLING
Great fluidity command & presence
Mention your name every time
Excellent vocabulary & addressing of points
I think you two are ready for Varsity.

Opp 2: BARNETT
Nice pace & delineation of what you were going to cover.
Continue to work on providing details
You two will develop as a good team

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp addressed all of Aff's contentions & built a stronger, more detailed case

USFG should ban pharma testing on animals.

**PARLI Debate**

**Teresa Skarr (*27)**
Round 2A 11:00am D107
Gov: 14 Dickerman - Millar
Opp: 10 Khurana - Darukhanawalla
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Teresa Skarr

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 14 | Team Code #: | 10 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Millar pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | Khurana pts 26.5 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Dickerman pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 | Darukhanawalla pts 26.5 |

Note: I don't "curve" for novices Well-done!

**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: Millar
+ good clear speaker, engaging
+ good organization
+ well thought out plan
+ good refutations
– work on better examples and explanations of weighty impacts

Prop 2: Dickerman
+ good defense of your value criterion
+ good refutations but would be better if you went through them in order
– come back to judging criteria @ end.

Opp 1: Khurana
+ clear, organized
– provide reasoning to favor your value criterion
– provide more reasoning + impacts for your contentions
– refute 1st Aff's points / dropped term.
– Be Aff's-level in rebuttal is: restating case

Opp 2: Darukhanawalla
+ good comments on framework and Aff Plan.
– work on organization + quality of refutations.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The Prop side provided reasoning for their value criterion and more effective refutations of the Neg's contentions and CounterPlan. Well done, all! Keep up the good work!

USFG should significantly reduce agricultural subsidies.

# PARLI Debate

**Teresa Skarr (*27)**
Round 2B 11:00am D107
Gov: 14 Masuda-Thaya - Sun
Opp: 10 Vijay - Cramer
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Teresa Skarr

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 14 | Team Code #: | 10 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | ~~#~~ Sun pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 | Vijay pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Masuda-Thaya pts 25 | Opp Speaker #2 | Cramer pts 26.5 |

Note: I don't "curve" speaker points for Novices. Well done

**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: Sun
+ Clear, persuasive speaker
+ Good evidence
- Be more clear re judging criteria
- Neg's counterplan was a change I didn't hear us work on higher level for rebuttal.

Prop 2: Masuda-Thaya
+ good responding to Neg press about specifying budget
- point out Neg dropped your 2nd contention
- dropped Neg's 1st and 2nd points

Opp 1: Vijay
+ clear, well organized, engaging
+ good answer to POI
- more clearly refute Aff 2nd contention (dropped)
- work on higher level comments during rebuttal.

Opp 2: Cramer
+ good press on Aff to specify budget
- work on organization + go in order
- point out that Aff dropped your first 2 points.
- work on stronger refutation to waste point Aff #2

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Even though the Neg side dropped Aff's 2nd contention in their first speech and didn't refute it in their 2nd speech, the Aff side dropped and mis-stated the counterplan and also dropped Neg's first 2 contentions. Therefore, Neg won. However you should 'all work' on refutations throughout

12:30.

~~Catherine Singstad~~

**James Nerny (*6)**
Round 2B 11:00am C4
Gov: 3 Greenwall - DuPuy
Opp: 27 Little - Wagner
Novice Parli Debate

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: ~~Catherine Singstad~~

Judge's School Affiliation: ~~Lowell~~

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 3 | | Team Code #: 27 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Greenwal | pts 29 | Opp Speaker #1 Little | pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 DuPuy | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 Wagner | pts 28 |

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

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

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Great eye contact projection & confidence

Opp 1: Very well done

Prop 2: Very good eye contact & points.

Opp 2: well done, confid speaking keep eye contact.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Very good debate, research w/ no internet ANissue. Aff wins IN A strong rebuttal.

#1 Green Wal 29
#2 Du Puy 28

#1 Little 27
#2 Wagner 28

Prop. Fed Gov. sig reduce Ag subsid

Aff Rebut
- $10m is a lot.
- 10m won't harm big corps.
- never refuted 90% subs.

## AFF

#1 Big Amount
Take away grants gift of $ 90% corn
Cont 1 Global Warm
2 Feed Animals is food
3 1% helped most.
4 Obesity
- Cows Eat corn make methane
- eColi 90% more chance
- Obesity - food is cheap.

#4 Economy bad - spending $ on wrong thing. Ed, roads.
- burning corn for too much
#5 Lobbying arms. Monsanto

#2 oppon on burden of proof harms outweigh benefit
- $10m
- quality of life is > corn farming business.
- weigh mech Ed vs food - not a point in this debate.
- Excess unneeded.
- starve & die - not true
- rich richer.
- grass fed - higher benefit.

Rebut: voters 1. Food basic need. food vs Ed. 2. can't starve. 3. 10m too small 4. sources be verified

## Neg

#1
Aff has to prove sig benefits by lowering more harm than good. NO source
Refute
1. Global Warm
2. Starvation vs School for taxpayer $
3. 1% argument leads to starvation

Neg Cont
1. $4B - need subs to keep food.
2. Price spikes.
3. 47% of Anti subs for corn subs

#2 Refute Neg case.
refutation.
- sub not only one, indust
- named Wheat producer.
- no online team database.
- cows naturally make methane
- 1% to 2 made up.
- obesity Artificial products
- complex system.

cont #1
- no promise food prod
- Billions of $ in subs. $10m dropped by Aff
- price spikes - what are they solving?

Karima Rehemtulla #16

~~Jesse MacKinnon (*5)~~
Round 2A 11:00am D109
Gov: 10 Mao - Tong-Seely
Opp: 19 Phan - Phan
Novice Parli Debate

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Karima Rehemtulla

Judge's School Affiliation: 16

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 10 | Team Code #: | 19 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Tong Seely pts 30 | Opp Speaker #1 | Phan. K 19 pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Mao pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 | Phan 19 pts 28 |

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

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

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Prop 1: Excellent speaker, clear effective. Great eye contact. and topic knowledge | Opp 1: Good Strong arguments clear - Great speaker |
| Prop 2: Good speaker, avoid using ummm! Have confidance | Opp 2: Good speaker, Make more eye contact. Have confidance |

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Excellent arguments, well researched, they dealt with opponents arguments. Outstanding !!

Sophia BURSHTEYN

~~James Nerny (*6)~~
Round 2A 11:00am C4
Gov: 19 Byrne - Nguyen
Opp: 14 Lyons - Wyszynski
Novice Parli Debate

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: SOPHIA BURSHTEYN

Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEY

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 19 | Team Code #: | 14 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Byrne pts 29 | Opp Speaker #1 | Lyons pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Nguen pts 26 | Opp Speaker #2 | Wyszynski pts 27 |

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

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

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

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

low point win

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: strong case, good arguments great speaker, respond well very constructive

Prop 2: good flow

Opp 1: excellent speech strong contentions, and strong arguments strong case on policy, it need more convincing work that it was not enough debate

Opp 2: good flow and responses. good rebuttal arguments.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

strong case, presented as a moral debate that was not rebutted even though tried to state ~~argued~~ that it was on policy.