Linda Brandt (19) Ashok Vijay (*10) Round 3A 1:30pm C2 Gov: 6 Brouhard - Welch Opp: 21 Burrous - Griggy Novice Parli Debate

A 1:30pm C2 Brouhard - Welch	Judge's Name: Linda Brand+
1 Burrous - Griggy Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP Team Code #:_ \(\begin{align*} \to \text{\text{\$\limbda}} \\ \text{\text{\$\limbda}} \\ \text{\text{\$\limbda}} \\ \text{\$\limbda} \\ \text{\text{\$\limbda}} \\ \tex	OPP Team Code #: 2
Prop Speaker #1 Welch pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Bylan Bylan Bylan
Prop Speaker #2 <u>browhard</u> pts <u>27</u>	Opp Speaker #2 GY 199 upts 28
Please award each speaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = 6	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Yery Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
20-23 - Faii 24-20 - F00i	20 – Reserved for rude of mappropriate behavior
	ging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate 	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
•	iently the debaters support arguments with
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
• Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side	ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	nd effective were the questions and the answers
• Delivery: How well the debaters speak	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	1 de de la transcrio de la compansa de la decar
• Courtesy: How courteous and respectful	al the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Prop 1:	Opp 1: great poise, very good Comments & arguments
you made some good points re: stem education good poise, fluency could be wetter overall good job.	1 Comments & arguments
good poise,	and countering of statements.
Fluency could be believ	
Prop 2: you were good at	Opp 2: You did a good job of
CP-1+0 Vating INOUY CONTENTU	15 presenting universaline.
but did unintentionally change one. Your overall presentation was well do	presenting your endence. Liked your use of analogy Refutations were well done
change one. your overall	Refutations were well done
TEAM CODE #: 21 on the	
REASON FOR DECISION:	Prop'of Opp)
	maer araumant for their
contentions	onger argument for their
comen 1015	

Sam Roberson (*1 Round 3A 1:30pm C4 Gov: 3 Dovichi - Vetterl Opp: 22 Keshav - Wei Novice Parli Debate	•			Judge's Name: VIVI an Pham Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS
Team Code #:	PROP	3	Advisory of the second	Team Code #: 22
Prop Speaker #1	vett	erli	pts	Opp Speaker #1pts
Prop Speaker #2	Dov	ichi	pts	Opp Speaker #1 Nei pts Opp Speaker #2 Fesh av pts
	_	30 = Pc od (but po	erfect 29	sed on the following scale: 9 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good ot good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
				Judging Criteria
offered du Evidence: evidence- evidence- Argumen by the oth- Points of Delivery: and easily Courtesy: Using the aboreach debater	ring the How ap —which is tation: It er side Informa How we understa How co	debate opropriated and debate	ely and e ude facts octly and ow releva baters spe and respe	efficiently the debaters support arguments with and references to authority as well as general knowledge effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made ant and effective were the questions and the answers beak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant sectful the debaters were to opponents and judges compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: ver in deasily und meal job expla is pectful.	y ore lent lining	anizuardak the "	ed plea lg.	and opp 1: Great Job directly responding to or guments. Please refrain from raying and stuff."
Prop 2: mon	e eg	e from	tact	please. Opp 2: very ee great tone and easily underst and able. Great dob paying extention to opp points please refrain from vaying " or whater
TEAM CODE	#:	3 ON:	on t	the <u>prop</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) response to opp. organized.

div	ian pha	m		PARL	I Debate	
Round 3B Gov: 14	1:30pm C4 Woo - Melman Lee - Wang	9)		Judge's Nam	e:Vivian	pham
	Parli Debate			Judge's Scho	ol Affiliation: P	VHS
•	Геат Code #:	PROP 14	e er bildini semi i veli i i	Team Coo	OPP de #:0	A STATE OF THE STA
]	Prop Speaker #1_	melman	_ pts	Opp Speaker #1	lel	pts
1	Prop Speaker #2_	N00	_ pts	Opp Speaker #2_	nkul	pts
1		each speaker poi 30 = Peri 27 = Good (but poss 24-20 = F	fect 29 = Or sibly not good	utstanding 28 = enough to qualif	= Very Good fy for elimination re	ounds) propriate behavior
						•
	• Analysis	How reasonably as	_	ing Criteria	naluza the tania a	and the organizate
	 Evidence: evidence— Argument by the othe Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: 	ring the debate How appropriately—which may include tation: How directer side Information: How How well the debaunderstandable How courteous are twe criteria, please	y and efficie le facts and r ly and effect relevant and aters speak in and respectful	ntly the debater eferences to aud ively the debate d effective were an organized, the debaters we	s support argume thority as well as ers respond to the the questions and communicative st ere to opponents a	nts with general knowledge arguments made d the answers cyle that is pleasant and judges
eje c	wataut	please. please. Jewaster our mater d distract	- bottle	Opp 1: ver example Wie ex	y organize J. Easily Je contact	d.presents clear understandable.
ven or	Prop 2:	, nice eye Landable.	cortet	directly corent		great job rg to opporgreat. tact ; utyle.
,	TEAM CODE	#:		wins	this debate.	
	REASON FOR	DECISION:	(Pro	op or Opp)		
	lack	of evid	lence	from	other +	-eam

Doug Barton (*23) Round 3A 1:30pm D108 Gov: 10 Khurana - Darukhanawalla	Judge's Name: DOUB BARTON
Opp: 19 Andola - Pareja Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 KHURANA pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Avnova pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 PARETA pts 28
Please award each speaker points based o	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ging Criterja
·	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	ently the debaters support arguments with
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	and office time account the account and also appropriate
	nd effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	yr an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
,	ll the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer com each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Clear speaker Good use of citations in opening	Opp 1: Nue clear voice. Keep argument a lit simpler or less repetitive. bood improvement on closing.
very good logic in closing regiment - using specific gramples	bood improvement on closing.
syument - using specific in my es.	1 1 Donales
Prop 2: Strong speaker and	Opp 2: Strone Speakers. (6000 speakers) Supple
Prop 2: Strong speaker and logical arguments	Opp 2: Strone Speakers. Good Specific learples (gun control, terrosiom) suppo position
TEAM CODE #: on the	PROP wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	rop or Opp)
A chose debate. Prop min	is with a stronger closing argument
nd Citations supporting Med	ponton.

Doug Barton (*23) Round 3B 1:30pm D108 Gov: 14 Masuda-Thaya - Sun Opp: 13 Garcia - Acosta	Judge's Name: DOUS BARTON Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: JAN NAMON VALLE
PROP Team Code #: 14	Team Code #: /3
Prop Speaker #1 SUN pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 ACCOSTA pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 MASUDA - THAYA pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 GARCTA pts 28
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Ju	dging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate 	vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
evidence—which may include facts an	d references to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
• Points of Information: How relevant	and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer coneach debater:	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Clear, Confident speakers.	Opp 1: a strong speaker with good longles to support position.
Very good Closing statement that logically exposed the opposition	The closing was a bit short.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Prop 2: Good speaker. Don't dismiss opp's points speaker.	Opp 2: Very good speaker. Strong, specific rebutted,
Consider Off & Journal of	Specific ravious
TEAM CODE #: on the	Prop or Opp) wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	I the PROP team had made more
I very close deliate. In the	Prop or Opp) and, the PROP team had made more and that isolated a few of OPP's
rguments and had a strong c weaknesses.	

Ted Appel (*24) Round 3A 1:30pm D109 Gov: 14 Yan - Shponko Opp: 12 Green - Madiso Novice Parli Debate	on		Judge's Name:	Ten Apper	Ta Rosa HS	
	The Mill Pilling of the North Commonweal and the second se	~ 0.000 #0.000	, em result sin analytic entreprise the entreprise the entreprise and a consequence of the entreprise of the entreprise the entreprise of		andy 45 years and a business and a second and	
Team Code #:			Team Code		<u> </u>	
Prop Speaker #1_	Yan Shpunho	pts_ <u>2-8</u>	Opp Speaker #1	Nadisux	pts_ <u>27</u>	
Prop Speaker #2_	Shpunho	pts <u>26</u>	Opp Speaker #2	Green	pts_ <u>}</u>	
	each speaker point 30 = Perint 7 = Good (but poss 24-20 = F	fect 29 = Osibly not good	utstanding 28 =/ I enough to qualify	Very Good		
		Judg	ing Criteria			
offered dur Evidence: evidence— evidence Argument by the othe Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: Using the aboreach debater:	Information: How How well the debaunderstandable How courteous are	y and efficientle facts and it relevant and respectful offer comp	ently the debaters are ferences to authorized the debaters of an organized, conthe debaters were the debaters were the debaters were debaters and/or solutions.	support arguments ority as well as gets respond to the arche questions and tommunicative style to opponents and suggestions for in	es with eneral knowledge rguments made the answers le that is pleasant d judges	-+ ~l~.
OPP 2: Garage 2: Good Rye	dies et colone un rel centect.	lne onto	Po 2: Cons	Roberce n.11 Que non	nache (m)	points
TEAM CODE REASON FOR	#:		Op or Opp)	is debate.		
derred temes		res cla	cse. Prov	vivs b	secuse Pl	clearly

Ted Appel (*24)Round 3B 1:30pm D109

Ted Appel (*24) Round 3B 1:30pm D109 Gov: 14 Dickerman - Millar	Judge's Name: TEn APPEL
Opp: 19 Fong - Ligutan Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: SANTA RUSA
PROP	OPP Team Code #:9
Prop Speaker #1 Milw	pts 27 Opp Speaker #1 Fonc pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 D-cherma	pts 29 Opp Speaker #2 Liquitan pts 27
Please award each speaker point	,
	ct 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good oly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	or <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and offered during the debate 	l effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	and efficiently the debaters support arguments with
	facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
	and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	relevant and effective were the questions and the answers ers speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	is speak in alvorganized, communicative style that is pleasant
——————————————————————————————————————	respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please of each debater:	offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Vez shut openy are	oft. Opp 1: Ver struction that clearly focused a worldblightens and
Missel aportuite to mile cise, though you derived cleate. Burred brief	hour formal an worl doll to a soll
ase thich you dering	I feng (steel)
cleol. Burred brey	(cur costs (and rests) to bost count
cluse? /	`
Prop 2: You arguery carrie	ed Opp 2: 1 1th sor in made case that
the day. You make it cl	ev that there is no moral ablaction to be a
though class from I de	ed Opp 2: Not see on made cose that ever that there is no never obligation, people who haven't below.
rotecononic benefits.	
TEAM CODE #: 14	on the Prop or Opp) wins this debate.
	(Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	1 Page 12 Page 14
Wis one was	close. Trop was vecesse they
Nept aguants for	close. Prop wins because they

Catherine Singstad (*14) Round 3A 1:30pm C3	Judge's Name: Catherine, Singstad
Gov: 3 McDonald - Thani	sauge s Hame. Col 10711 17 17 12 12
Opp: 19 Le - Rather	Indon's Sahari Assissant D. C. C.
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 3	Team Code #:
1. 11. 2. 15	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Prop Speaker #1 Holland McDorpts 27	Opp Speaker#1 Rosald Rether pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Zabrid Manipts 27	Opp Speaker #2 On Le pts 28
Please award each speaker points based	
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not g	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Ju	dging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effect? 	vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
• Evidence: How appropriately and effi	ciently the debaters support arguments with
	nd references to authority as well as general knowledge
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	fectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
•	and effective were the questions and the answers
,	k in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer co	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
Prop 1: Nice When you stopped re	141 Opp 1: Greateno, contact tisostunice -
ing on notes & made impressioned summ	and some vem natural single in a voto.
at and with one contra, great refue of	Weller & effective as successful your
and a coment and hash leaving	impassioned thesis. Excellent clanity of
our world. could imprive by oving m	aroment. Your aroments were clear.
concrete examples of what and has	Could have used more endence, otherwise
STEM contributes to improve society of	tion, an excellent delivery, points, analysis.
deal with publishes. Needed stronger introduced and Prop 2: Good Gut I sussest you	
work on appearing more passionate. You analysis needed examples how & why is	Opp 2: Great paring & eye contact.
and why is	and the same of th
In heral arts not necessary ? Too Seneral	, pont reference some some some some some some some som
Claim that I als fart doesn't benefit s	io-and making a better society.
ciety needed to be broked up. Good effort!	
TEAM CODE #: C on the	OPC wins this debate.
	(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Catherine Singstad (*14) Round 3B 1:30pm C3	Judge's Name: Catherine Sinstan
Gov: 19 Phan - Phan Opp: 10 Vijay - Cramer Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
received and Debate	The second secon
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #: OPP
Prop Speaker #1 Kony Phar	V
Prop Speaker #2 Katheine Pha	1 pts 29 Opp Speaker #2 Channe pts 26.5
	ints based on the following scale: rfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	ssibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 =	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Judging Criteria
·	and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	ly and afficiently the dehators summent arguments with
	ely and efficiently the debaters support arguments with added facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
=	ctly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	thy and effectivery the debaters respond to the arguments made
•	w relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
	paters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	aters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please each debater:	se offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
(Δ	good job Opp.1: Very strong presentation style
Prop 1: Du did a very	good it Opp.1: Very Strong presentation 31916
stating your Gase with supp	of of int 1000 in the LE costum no Voice 100
evidence Excellent point à l	To all all of themas is
saving lives-cucial to your	ponte a natural & you a your
You could work on being mo	recteal purpose are a great team. Good up
and passionate, otherwise good j	ob! of general knowledge & evidence.
Prop 2: Good presentation lower your voice a little (1) 5 arguing skills with great suppor	(you could Opp 2: Impassion el, strong delivery ne
arming skills with a get know	trong Excellent example of Chira being ting das overpopulated though wealthy. Great
regarding wealthy countries Ako	overpopulated though wealing, Great
regarding wealthy countries Aso. Clarification of what delpte is	sport ion wealth being not only fector -
Great work!	clear & easy to understand, Nice!
TEAM CODE #:/_	on the OPC wins this debate.
	(Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	

Opher Peled (*15) Round 3A 1:30pm C1 Gov: 6 Kang - Yolasan Opp: 19 Byrne - Nguyen Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Ones Portes Judge's School Affiliation: Wyonname
DDOD	O. D.
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:
	Opp Speaker #1 Brian Naugen pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Grant Yolasan pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Proc. pts 28
Please award each speaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = 0	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	ging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate 	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
<u> </u>	iently the debaters support arguments with
evidence—which may include facts and	references to authority as well as general knowledge
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	nd offective views the avections and the engineer
	nd effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	in an organized, communicative style that is picasant
	al the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please/offer comeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
cacii debater.	
Prop 1:	Opp 1: It I not unlessantle fish morres
Prop 1: Made similer 3 po-13 - Technology Improves life : card have been	cool initial point that subjects is should be treated equally, but I dis not understand how humanities is
inproves the . Carlo North	Good into Point West in ble to
firther.	should be treeted equally, on
	not undestread has humanities is
/	about human peetings/1000
Prop 2: Good clear points-vell done.	Opp 2: Made a great point that everyone that stem have a choice. Net sure that stem
Good Clear Low Bring	made a great point that est stem
	have a choice. Not sure that
	People" hore less social skills than likeral arts huminities students.
,	
	Prof. wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	Prop or Opp)
M Co - 1 1 commont	Prop or Opp) That STEM should be mendetey opposition
did not make counter chin	
did not make counter chin	- \

Opher Peled (*15) Round 3B 1:30pm C1 Gov: 14 Fong - Geller Opp. 10 Mag. Tong Sock	Judge's Name: Ophor Peles.
Opp: 10 Mao - Tong-Seely Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP Team Code #: 나	OPP Team Code #: \C
	Opp Speaker #1 Jasmine Tong-See pts 30
Prop Speaker #2 Soutia Gelor pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 KEVIN Na 0 pts 28
	utstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	l enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ing Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate 	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficie	
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
by the other side	tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
• Points of Information: How relevant and	d effective were the questions and the answers
	n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
 and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful 	the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer compeased debater:	oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Plan Kilexinitions. A	Opp 1: Great Job. clear points regards That nearth should not be determined
little confustion extension. Provided good facts from Time magazine	terter alone.
Prop 2: Wicely stressed that This will sove hors.	Opp 2: Good sob- met sure That public opinion structule the fle criteria
(Pro	Of C wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	ents was not contere effectively
by the prop team. Best do	bite so for !!!

Danica Tanquilut (*11) Round 3A 1:30pm D103 Gov: 14 Lyons - Wyszynski	Judge's Name: Margah Turner
Opp: 17 Raven - Sweeney Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: JLHS
PROP	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1	zynypts 27 Opp Speaker #1 Sweening pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 hyons	pts 26 Opp Speaker #2 Paren pts 26
30 =	points based on the following scale: Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20	= Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
 Evidence: How approprievidence—which may ince Argumentation: How disby the other side Points of Information: How disby the other side Delivery: How well the cand easily understandable Courtesy: How courteout Using the above criteria, pleach debater: 	ately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with clude facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge rectly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made. How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant as and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges ease offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: - delavery was cl concase, word I fund	
-aside: you have a gr Prop 2: - could have spoke	Opp 2:
TEAM CODE #:	on the OPP wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)
	While the Prop gave many reasons for why
Sufficient Columns	the teaching of STEM is Herefulal in (general, they did not prove that the skins yound in STEM should be propertized at the
Criterion r	Neh school level.

Danica Tanquilut (*11) Round 3B 1:30pm D103	Judge's Name: Marian Tirner
Gov: 21 Sundararaman - Elmhirst Opp: 3 Duong - Kopelevich	
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: J L L
PROP Team Code #: 2\	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Elmherst pts 25	Opp Speaker #1 Dung pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 Vopelens pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Sindonaramon pts 2	7 Opp Speaker #2 Vopelever pts 27
	ed on the following scale: = Outstanding 28 = Very Good good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	Judging Criteria
	tively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	fficiently the debaters support arguments with
 Argumentation: How directly and e 	and references to authority as well as general knowledge effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side Points of Information: How relevan	nt and effective were the questions and the answers
	eak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ctful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer of each debater:	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1:	Opp/1:
- could have more points to	
_	
- suayong during speech	- Sign posting is helpful for organiting
Prop 2:	Opp 2:
-good coverage of opp's por	it is beneficial to refute your opponents' contentions with unique points, not
	Just with your own case
TEAM CODE #: Whip 21 on the	
_ ,	(Prop or Opp) howed that wealthy contres have the
capai	rty to ard refigees
(2) Prop	has most the saved

Resolution	: HS. edue	cation should e	upha size STEM over LA&H. PARLI Debate
Round 3A 1:3	Fehring (*21) BOpm D105 enwall - DuPuy	2:10 pm	Judge's Name: Katrina Fehring
Opp: 23 Sc Novice Parl	ott - Ambrose li Debate		Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin
Tea	PR(m Code #:	^{OP} 3	Team Code #: 23
Prop	p Speaker #1 <u></u> Gre		Opp Speaker #1 Anbrose pts 29
Proj	p Speaker #2	Pny pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Scott pts 29
Ple	ease award each	speaker points based of $30 = Perfect$ $29 = 0$	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
26	27 = (6-25 = Fair	Good (but possibly not goo 24-20 = Poor	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
		Jud	ging Criteria
•	Analysis: How	reasonably and effective	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
_	offered during t		
•			ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge
•			ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
	by the other sid		
			nd effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
•	and easily unde	-	man organized, communicative style that is pleasant
•	•		ll the debaters were to opponents and judges
	ing the above co	riteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Pro	op 1: Didn + 5	eem kundedge abl	e Opp 1: Conduction fraction of resolution
note log laboration	sout what	STEM is Good	and has a see so hot end
siche a lo	nd speaking	voice watch grajovenows".	Did a good job pointing out errors
1 m x .	and Summe	& but finish fully	Did a good job pointing out errors on made by Aff, especially lack of plan liked presentation style.
while the be	fore walking	& gray.	Liked presentation style.
Pro	pp 2: Good de	anticution of	Opp 2: kill confidence in speaking.
rosol	ation em	shasizin STEM	I do not take Al.
not	eliminati	ne - Could have Thow critical	Contentions. Could have expanded on role of humanities further
exp	anaeq why	I how contreat	on role of humanities further
70.0	AM CODE "	23	Oppinis this debate.
I E	AM CODE #:	on the On the	rop or Opp)
RE.	ASON FOR DEC	ICIONI.	
(Opp. had	their conten	fions less related than Aff. Aff.
(sailed to	dentify plan 60,	I implement of the proposed resolution. I their contentions.
	and did n	ot fully defer	d their contentions.

Le solution: Atmosacion succession succession PARI Debate
Resolution: House satisfies have moral obligation to accept refugees from Katrina Febring (*21) war zones
Katrina Fehring (*21) war zones
Round 3B 1:30pm D105 Gov: 13 Karim - Kerstetter Judge's Name: Karim - tenring
Opp: 14 Luk - Tserennamid
Novice Parli Debate Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP 107
Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 <u>Lers + ctter pts 28</u> Opp Speaker #1 <u>Luk</u> pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Karim pts 29 Opp Speaker #2 Tserennamid 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/on engagetions for improvement to
Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:
7 Propt: Good presence. Nife Opp 1: (great delivery Organized
1 100) [Assume distance of the Astronomy
responses to contentions & convincing. Would have
Land to charm the first to the factor was
on your pts. a not getting impact on other courtres inpact
I smayed away distracted. Good facts a citations.
Prop. Z. Initial speech not as Opp 2: Intelligent & Calm demeasur
but did excellent job of that job reforms of contentions and in rebuttal. Good friendly ofering alternatives Good faels &
_demeanor, great peace of atators
TEAM CODE #: on the wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION:
Excellent data to the last to an with Prop because most closely
anound to be some Give not recall time - so heres from were
The specific of the specific vorsus required
Excellent debate that to go with Prop. because most closely argned to the specifics of resolution - refugees from war Zones versus engine and moral obligation versus required to do bound means.
CLIC MEA MANAGEMENT WAS A CARD Server

Emma Sutton (*12) BONNIE + PLWE Round 3A 1:30pm D107 Gov: 5 Figueroa - Thomas Opp: 14 Situ - Zhang Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: BONNIE HAYNE Judge's School Affiliation: SONNA ACADEMY
PROP Team Code #: 5	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 THomas pts 7	Opp Speaker #1 2HAM pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 FIGNER-CA pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 517/1 pts 27.5
	Outstanding 28 + Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	ging Criteria
	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
evidence—which may include facts and	ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
 Points of Information: How relevant a Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable 	nd effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer comeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: THANAS	Opp 1: 2HANG
Lots of great points theres - Good feeding and of growth	duclair acknowledgements
les uns, likes & other interjection	och pace a delivery.
Good like controll whee bout to	Took gestines of board channe
Prop 2: 1 (GUEHOT) Miles my) Opp 2: フケ (
Gad regulation of speaker	The of hes sure but but
TEAM CODE #: 5 on the g	Mo ocknowledgements The off hess sure but built we stern to story finish with lig contact entired wins this debate. Trop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION.	
AFF from had now for	was wat carrell.

	PARLI Debate
Emma Sutton (*12) BUNNIE HAJIK Round 3B 1:30pm D107	
Round 3B 1:30pm D107	Judge's Name: BONNE HAINE
Gov: 23 Barton - Madsen	sudge s wante. por total (1)
Opp: 3 Brown - Helms Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Sown Agnemy
Novice Faili Debate	Judge's School Attituation. School Judge Society
PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 23	Team Code #:
0 - 2 - 22 1/2	
Prop Speaker #1 BACTUN pts 30	Opp Speaker #1 DROW
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1/20
Prop Speaker #2ptspts	Opp Speaker #2
$\textbf{Big}_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) = 0.0000000000000000000000000000000000$	тельный при
Please award each speaker points based	,
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
_	/
	lging Criteria
	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
	iently the depaters support arguments with
	d references to authority as well as general knowledge
	ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	and effective were the questions and the answers
	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
 Courtesy: How courteous and respectf 	the debaters were to opponents and judges
/	/
- ,	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
Prop 1: BAKTON	10 1 10 11
Prop 1:	Opp 1: OROWN Cord differentiation of other teams definitions
Charay reknowledgement for sale	Good defferentiation of the
and ene contact	de smitiois
Sure mull mid a lot of good	1 1 th 1 m 10 di m m to toda dita
Anna I challent swhman,	Work on reducing informating
Spoke rapidly but a lot of good plints + excellent sommany, regulation at the end	Cocoller Bacoundy, 1117 Coco as which seld
Prom 2: 1/1 1 a C.M	Bocollers ottobulary, I ntelled shows that liok or carrying kleiner, hunny equipment ready
Prop 2: MADSEN	1 Opp 2. P1 1 1/1 C
-differentia remifales of	Close comon lebelment good statement of
-differentie reuniders of	Clusty comordedgement good statement of tellent presence, our contract returned
Good Statement of plan	for the property of control of the
Thank you for Hisking on y TEAM CODE #: 2 on the	Abra Minmuse your Statements - Keep the
TEAM CODE # 1 2 2 2 20 4h	feet of wine this debate
on the	Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	тор от Орр)
1/1	Marched & Wet and All The Hother
Had wor bounts carried 1	mough + vefiled all The other
terrs. Thanks for	A good delate, tames.
V	1

Matt Petruska (*27 Round 3A 1:30pm D101 Gov: 12 Murdock - Opp: 14 Lee - Duan			Judge's Name	. Mott 1	Petroska Jindsy High	_
Novice Parli Debate			Judge's School	ol Affiliation: W	lucky HISH	Schou'
Team Code #.	PROP 12	(RO) Догу сторова спородина стой с стой объектов в вой стой стой объектов в вой стой стой объектов в вой стой о	Team Cod	OPP	Miller and the first sections of the self-section in the section of the section o	AP
Prop Speaker #1_	Murclock pt	s <u>77</u> Opp	Speaker #1	Duan/	pts	
Prop Speaker #2_	<u>Murdock</u> pt	s Op	p Speaker #2_	leg	pts_25	•
		29 = Outsta	anding 28 =	Very Good	The second and the se	
26-25 = Fair	27 = Good (but possibly $24-20 = Poo$	-	, .	•	rounds) appropriate behav	vior
		Judging	Criteria			
 Evidence: evidence- Argument by the other Points of It Delivery: and easily 	How reasonably and oring the debate How appropriately and e-which may include for tation: How directly are side Information: How re How well the debater understandable How courteous and reference in the courteous and reference in the debater.	nd efficiently acts and refer and effective levant and ef s speak in an	the debaters rences to aut ly the debate fective were organized, o	s support argum hority as well a rs respond to th the questions a communicative	nents with s general knowle ne arguments mad and the answers style that is pleas	edge de
Using the aboreach debater:	ove criteria, please of	fer complim	ents and/or	suggestions fo	r improvement	to
- like how yo	estive and clear established to relax. was good for	speaker	pp 1: (t) Vey Was w Le lieu	ell pot tus	rect and evi	dence elent
Prop 2:	was good for oppi. Rebetal was mutation	C 100 c)pp 2: (+) A	sad Suppu	+ - Analys	to of
	. Was very short very a tre second				d with can	tentin
TEAM CODE	#:	on the Prop o	wins t	his debate.		
REASON FOR	DECISION: strong and with 1. Finished	7USUES	ive as	nemnt av	nd rafutati	17
in rel	uttalo finished	Hrong	and h	and sood	delivery.	

Matt Petruska (*27) Round 3B 1:30pm D101 Gov: 3 Hemerling - Barnett	Judge's Name: Matt Retruska Judge's School Affiliation: Windsa Hish Sch
Opp: 25 Green - Nichols Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: WindSar High Sch
PROP 3	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Helley 1995 pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Nichol 5 pts 7
Prop Speaker #1 Hewey ling pts 28 Prop Speaker #2 Barne #4 pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Green pts 27
27 = Good (but possibly not good	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	lging Criteria
 Evidence: How appropriately and effice evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant a Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectified 	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments siently the debaters support arguments with direferences to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant full the debaters were to opponents and judges appliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: (+) Very strong rebutted with a thoughful analysis. Clear and persuasive delivery. Restall was the	Opp 1: (+) Good perparation of evidence Argument was personsive (-) A little rushed with delivey
REASON FOR DECISION: This was a very close deba	OPP wins this debate. Prop or Opp) the in which the OPP clearly when defining is a Value round. event with clear and persuajue

17 yy server Education sieura Emp	PARLI Debate
Yuyun Shang (*6) Round 3A 1:30pm C6	Judge's Name: Yun Shang
Gov: 27 Campanella - Petruska Opp: 3 Lisy - Forman Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo 18. HS
PROP Team Code #: 2 7	OPP Team Code #: 3
Prop Speaker #1 Campanella pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Lisy pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Petruska pts 29	<i>,</i>
	utstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ing Criteria
 Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak if and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful 	ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made deffective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: * Clear organized contentions	Opp 1: * Stronger rebutted speech than for speech
+ Could use more feridance and time + Could elaborate the voting	* Could reduce repeating points in Contentions
Prop 2: # Good point of clarification * Could Strengthen the case by more evidence # Good catch of print of order TEAM CODE #:	Opp 2: * good point of clarification of "National well-being" * Could refute Aff's point of "Emphasize STEM # Zliminete Libral Arts and Humanities" Prop_wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	op or Opp)
Slightly stronger refute.	
Did a great job considering	new to lebote!

/un Shang (*6) ld 3B 1:30pm C6 :: 27 Little - Wagner :: 3 Lanzone - Hubing	ner			e:Yun			
ice Parli Debate	JC 1		Judge's School	ol Affiliation: <u>(</u>	ampo lind	o HS	
Team Code #:	PROP >J	and the state of t		OPP le #:	3		
			Team Coo	ie #:			
Prop Speaker #1_	Zittle	pts <i>_28</i>	Opp Speaker #1	Hubinger	p	ts / 2	
Prop Speaker #2_	Wagnel	pts <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #2_	Lanzone		pts28	
			on the following			en extra s. C	
			Outstanding 28	• ,			
			ood enough to qualif				_
26-25 = Fair	24-20 =	- Poor	<20 = Reserve	a for ruge or	ınapproprı	ate benavior	[
		Jud	dging Criteria				
•	_	and effectiv	ely the debaters a	valyze the top	oic and the	arguments	
• Evidence:		•	ciently the debater				a
 Evidence: levidence Argumenta by the other 	How appropriat which may incl ation: How dire	ude facts and ectly and effe	d references to aut ectively the debate	hority as well rs respond to	l as genera the argun	al knowledge nents made	e
 Evidence: levidence Argumenta by the other Points of Ir Delivery: It and easily to 	How appropriate which may include the direct of the direct of the direct of the desired th	ude facts and ectly and effe ow relevant a baters speak	d references to autectively the debate and effective were in an organized, o	hority as well ars respond to the questions communicative	l as genera the argum s and the a we style tha	al knowledge nents made answers at is pleasan	
 Evidence: levidence Argumenta by the other Points of Ir Delivery: It and easily to 	How appropriate which may include the direct of the direct of the direct of the desired th	ude facts and ectly and effe ow relevant a baters speak	d references to aut ectively the debate and effective were	hority as well ars respond to the questions communicative	l as genera the argum s and the a we style tha	al knowledge nents made answers at is pleasan	
 Evidence: levidence Argumenta by the other Points of Ir Delivery: If and easily use Courtesy: Ir 	How appropriate which may include the formation: How direct the formation: How well the desinderstandable thow courteous	ude facts and effectly and effect ow relevant a baters speak and respectf	d references to autectively the debate and effective were in an organized, o	hority as well are respond to the questions communicative are to opponer	l as general the argumes and the ave style that the arguments and jud	al knowledge nents made inswers at is pleasant	
 Evidence: levidence— Argumenta by the other Points of Ir Delivery: If and easily used to courtesy: It Using the above each debater: 	How appropriate which may included in the direct side after the defendence of the de	ude facts and ectly and effective relevant a baters speak and respectf	d references to autocctively the debate and effective were in an organized, of the debaters we	the questions communicative re to opponer	l as general the argument of t	al knowledge nents made inswers at is pleasant lges	t (Case
 Evidence: levidence— Argumenta by the other Points of Ir Delivery: If and easily using the above each debater: Prop 1: * Cleville	How appropriate which may included in the direct side after the defendence of the de	ude facts and ectly and effective relevant a baters speak and respectf	d references to autectively the debate and effective were in an organized, of the debaters we in pliments and/or	the questions communicative re to opponer	l as general the argumes and the ave style that the arguments and judants and	al knowledgenents made inswers at is pleasant liges overent to	t (Case
 Evidence: levidence— Argumenta by the other Points of Ir Delivery: If and easily to Courtesy: If the above each debater: Prop 1: * Clean Courtesy: If the above each debater:	How appropriate which may included in the direct side aformation: How well the definderstandable How courteous we criteria, please difinitions	ude facts and ectly and effective relevant a baters speak and respectf	d references to autectively the debate and effective were in an organized, of the debaters we in pliments and/or	the questions communication to opponent suggestions	l as general the argumes and the ave style that the arguments and judants and	al knowledgenents made inswers at is pleasant liges overent to	t (Case
 Evidence: levidence— Argumenta by the other Points of Ir Delivery: land easily ue Courtesy: land easily ue Courtesy: land each debater: Prop 1: * Clean * Chean * The	How appropriate which may included in the distribution: How direct the desired inderstandable How courteous we criteria, please of finitions the desired in	ude facts and ectly and effect ow relevant a baters speak and respectf ase offer con	d references to autectively the debate and effective were in an organized, of the debaters we in the debaters we in pliments and/or	the questions communication to opponent suggestions	l as general the argumes and the ave style that the arguments and judants and	al knowledgenents made inswers at is pleasant liges overent to	t (Case
 Evidence: levidence— Argumenta by the other Points of Ir Delivery: Ir and easily ur Courtesy: Ir Using the above each debater: Prop 1: * Clean * The Prop 2: Speece 	How appropriate which may included in the distribution: How direct the desired inderstandable How courteous we criteria, please of finitions the desired in	ude facts and ectly and effect ow relevant a baters speak and respectf ase offer con	d references to autectively the debate and effective were in an organized, of the debaters we in an organized of the debaters we in pliments and/or and organized. Opp 1: *	the questions communication to opponent suggestions	l as general the argumes and the ave style that the arguments and judants and judants and judants and judants and judants arguments argu	al knowledgenents made inswers at is pleasant liges overent to	t (Caso Case
 Evidence: levidence— Argumenta by the other Points of Ir Delivery: Ir and easily to Courtesy: Ir Using the above each debater: Prop 1: * Cle * The Prop 2: Speed not contain the prop 2: Speed not contain t	How appropriate which may included in the distribution: How direct in the desiration with the desiration of the courteous of the courte in the	wide facts and ectly and effect ow relevant a baters speak and respectfuse offer con and judg	oreferences to autectively the debate and effective were in an organized, or the debaters we in pliments and/or Opp 1:	the questions communicative to opponent suggestions the the north properties to the properties of the	l as general the argumes and the argumes and the arguments and judents and jud	al knowledgenents made inswers at is pleasant liges overent to	t (Caso Case
 Evidence: levidence— Argumenta by the other Points of Ir Delivery: Ir and easily ur Courtesy: Ir Using the above each debater: Prop 1: * Cle Critical Argumenta Argu	How appropriate which may included in the distribution: How direct side information: How well the definderstandable How courteous we criteria, please of diffinitions that point in far voting clear to me.	wide facts and ectly and effect ow relevant a baters speak and respectfuse offer con and judg	oreferences to autectively the debate and effective were in an organized, of the debaters we in an organized or the debaters we in pliments and/or opp 1: *	the questions communication to opponent suggestions	l as general the argumes and the argumes and the arguments and jude for improvements and jude fo	al knowledgenents made inswers at is pleasant liges ovement to introduced lance	t (Case Case

Res: Wealty Courties	PARLI Debate
Nadia Whitmore (*5) Round 3B 1:30pm D102	hadia Whitmore
Gov: 19 Mart - Moran Opp: 6 Goldblatt - McKinney	Judge's Name: //blud ////////////////////////////////////
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 HART pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Goldblatt pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 HORAN pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 W/light / CK/Nets 9
Please award each speaker points based or 30 = Perfect 29 = O	n the following scale: outstanding 28 = Very Good
	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ging Criteria
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	and the debatement and a second and the
Evidence: How appropriately and efficience—which may include facts and the series are the series and the series are the s	references to authority as well as general knowledge
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	d effective were the questions and the answers
Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable	n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
,	the debaters were to opponents and judges
each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
- Prop 1: Great oral delivery	Opp 1:
1.1. III ODADINI JOSE SIMBLE CONSTITUTION	Орр 1.
- clearly olefuned the Format.	
a viallant not a what is the hasis	
thou whealty country have the also to do both Acceptosure and pident Prop 2 their pun citizen.	/4G
to do both Accep rofugee and pided	Onn 2:
Hop 2. Their pun citizen -	Opp 2: _
man Hear by Made by	-Should use facts to Negate opposition arquineits for a contention
	Contents - 1012 & Contention
and the second of the second o	- Good Job on Identifying Tenerist west
Volue Pouts, in FRANC, The ATTACK was TEAM CODE #: 4 France, Delgiou, and on the	- Good job on identifying Terrorist were opp wins this debate.
Migrauls Not rejuge (Pr	op or Opp)
the perfection has success	July argue that morally oldes
t alter	TI and citizen or leverlare.
Not supported me saying of	opp wins this debate. July orque that morality closs 11:5 own citizen or levery are.

(3pm)	PARLI Debate
Ashok Vijay (*10) Round 3B 1:30pm C2 Gov: 19 Alcantra - Thompson	Judge's Name: Vincent Banas
Opp: 14 Chan - Foley Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
	opp Speaker #1 A / cartya pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Foley pts	Opp Speaker #2 Thomson pts 28
	based on the following scale: 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
$26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	
	Judging Criteria
offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately an evidence—which may include fa Argumentation: How directly a by the other side Points of Information: How rel Delivery: How well the debaters and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and rel Using the above criteria, please off each debater: Prop 1: Stanted with a get a courte grand of the cou	contentions (oncisely- contentions) Good job addressing Aff contentions I sterned to Aff contentions I sterned to Aff contentions I sterned to Aff contentions I and speech / shutt-quite fast should one of time about one of Affs (ontentions) on the Opp wins this debate.
Aff case. Oppmas able Contentions. It was close at the end of the dobat	(Prop or Opp) nade a stronger case to oppose the nade a stronger case to oppose the to refute at least one of the frop to refute at least one of the frop so but Opp had more points standing
a real constants	

Novice Parli Rd3 FH. B Single flight Room L2 Gov: 14 Kerr-Stein-Davidson Opp: 13 Banas-Cummings PROP Team Code #: 14	PARLI Debate Judge's Name: Van Raes feld Judge's School Affiliation: Schoon Academy OPP Team Code #: 13
Prop Speaker #1 <u>DavidSon</u> pts <u>27.25</u>	
Prop Speaker #2 Kerr-Stein pts 27.75	Opp Speaker #2 Cumphing pts 27.5
27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor Jud	Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior ging Criteria
 Evidence: How appropriately and efficience evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant a Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful 	iently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges
each debater: Prop 1: + eye Contact, pleasant start, fried to remain Calm - good job! You elid not need to accuse them of lying and stoop to that level, your Calm demeasor spake was a better tactic	Opp 1: good start with smile but went negative with accusation of lying a bit too
Prop 2: texcellent sportmanship & padience offering to argue under both definition t good Cadence, correct level of emotion good job TEAM CODE #: 14 on the	opp 2: t best argument against definition t throng intro, manual seem a bit tired so not as good in eye contact Prop wins this debate. Prop or Opp)

Round 3/	Hubinger (*3) A 1:30pm C5 2 Santana - Bazil		Judge's Name: Eva	n Hubinger
Opp: 14	2 Santaria - Bazii 4 Holwitz - Kay Parli Debate	e e	Judge's School Affiliation	: Bentley
	Team Code #:	PROP 12	OP Team Code #:니나	P
	Prop Speaker #1_	Bazile pts 27.	Opp Speaker #1 Holwity	/pts_Z8,S
	Prop Speaker #2	Santana pro 27	Opp Speaker #2 kay	pts_ <u>7</u> 8
			Outstanding 28 Very Go	
	26-25 = Fair	7 = Good (but possibly not go 24-20 = Poor		nation rounds) or inappropriate behavior
		Juc	lging Criteria	
	-	How reasonably and effectiv ring the debate	ely the debaters analyze the	topic and the arguments
	• Evidence: evidence—	How appropriately and effice-which may include facts and tation: How directly and effect.	l references to authority as v	well as general knowledge
	• Points of I	Information: How relevant a	-	
	-	How well the debaters speak understandable	in an organized, communic	ative style that is pleasant
	• Courtesy:	How courteous and respectf	ul the debaters were to oppo	onents and judges
	Using the abo	ve criteria, please offer con	apliments and/or suggestic	ons for improvement to
good	Prop 1: (50	ting, but I	Opp 1: Very My	pressive style! Your
TYVIII	- 40U	VERD HOURD	111111111111111111111111111111111111111	you hard by work a
on He	our ima	reef calculus	your strete	117 VISION SO WOU
and 8	Sufagiz	my capitalize on your apprents	y can see m	you need to work of 17 vision so you gon a contradiction might contradiction might contradiction of the contradict
Whose SI	Prop 2:	o capitalite on	I Opp 2. (N atol) 0	ent to accusive turn
CONCHIANE A	N/R (xoo	gow a povents	appl should	n was really strong-
vefuterti	W 1.7	Cas of you	h with mariety	y lost you to dolor
1 < 1 = 01 04 -	TEAM CODE	#:	Pro D wins this debate	n new really strong- nts style—lest you nost you he delad (low-point win)
•	REASON FOR	DECISION:	but nost	trafes won't see it
the	4	nted l	argues theet	they saw More
lives	and	thet sour	ry lives is	seed, which
Mean	s aft	Firmative 13	-upen'or	bed, unah

Round 3	Hubinger (*3) 3 1:30pm C5		Judge's Name: Fever	Julinear
Opp: 5	l Harris - Marr Pashman - Ralston Parli Debate		Judge's School Affiliation:	200 free
	PROP	В как и се нетемпера в Серварија как на се се се се са старишњи извида висе се с	OPP	Steament main
	Team Code #: Z	. 1 . Harrid pts 26.5	Team Code #: 5	Pashnay 70 G
		in Mam pts 27		pts 28,5
	The man and an analysis of the NORMACON CONTRACT AND A SHAPE SERVICE AND A SHAPE SERVI	peaker points based on	Nadia.	Ralston
	_	30 = Perfect 29 = Ot	atstanding 28 = Very Good	
	27 = God 26-25 = Fair		<pre>enough to qualify for eliminatio <20 = Reserved for rude or in</pre>	
		_	ing Criteria	
	 Analysis: How rea offered during the 	•	y the debaters analyze the topi	c and the arguments
	• Evidence: How ap evidence—which	opropriately and efficient may include facts and r	ntly the debaters support argumeters to authority as well	as general knowledge
	by the other side	·	ively the debaters respond to	_
	• Delivery: How we	ell the debaters speak in	d effective were the questions an organized, communicative	
	and easily understanceCourtesy: How contains		the debaters were to opponen	ts and judges
	Using the above crite each debater:	ria, please offer comp	liments and/or suggestions f	for improvement to
4 1	Prop 1:		Opp 1: Really exce	ellent impact
Try to	work on i	18thy More	cerdysis, -it	shows a lot of
and the	ur tire Ar	More/	strategiz Vis	500 - which 13
devel	oppent, This 1	More/ 3 probably a 1 CP/1351/e.	I can't believe	you're in novice
	ic .1	. K U/	I rem (hopor)	onywenketrn an
ou (1,121	3 con reco	Mery glock More deutop	refutation, as	s vell as stutegic
+ Vet	Julyon.	E A	focus.	
~ .	TEAM CODE #:	on the (Pro	wins this debate.	
	wins the	the city	zerre and vet	rusces would be
beste	r off w	rithaut acc	eptone from v	ealthy controls.
8C \$349 \	only prout	ves defers	me answers.	

DOUL BARTON PARLI Debate DOUG BARTON Round 4A 3:30pm D103 Gov: 14 Luk - Tserennamid Opp: 6 Kang - Yolasan Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMIN VALIFI Novice Parli Debate **PROP OPP** Team Code #: Team Code #: Kypto Luk pts 29 Prop Speaker #1 Opp Speaker #1 Prop Speaker #2 Opp Speaker #2 Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding/28 = Very Good27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair24-20 = Poor<20 =/Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior Judging Criteria Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate • Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge • Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side • Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Good specific enjoyples used Opp 1: Clear voice. Solid argumentation. # but repetitive Opp 2: Nice opeating style. Good point by point refulations Prop 2: Stropy, Clear speaker

TEAM CODE #: 4 on the PROP wins this debate.

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Efficient argumentation for the Prop wins the clebrate.

Efficient argumentation for the Prop wins the clebrate.

Strong, specific evidence combined with personal examples added to their effort.

Nadoem Alam (*19) Round 4B 3:30pm D103 Gov: 3 Brown - Helms Opp: 21 Sundararaman - B Novice Parli Debate

Nadeem Alam (*19)	
Round 4B 3:30pm D103	Judge's Name: DOUL BARTON
Gov: 3 Brown - Helms Opp: 21 Sundararaman - Elmhirst	•
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY
	stage o sensor minutes. Sylly figure 4 the second
PROP	OPP 2/
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 <i> SRoWA </i>	pts Opp Speaker #1 <u>FLMIRST</u> pts 30
HELMS	APPATO 30
Prop Speaker #2	pts 28 Opp Speaker #2 SUND ARAMAN pts 27
Please eward each speaker	points based on the following scale:
	Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	• /
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20	= Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
•	Judging Criteria
	y and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
• Evidence: How appropria	tely and efficiently the debaters support arguments with
evidence—which may inc	lude facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
•	ectly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	oosly and officent only the decaders respond to the digaments made
•	low relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	ebaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	,
• Courtesy: How courteou	s and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, plo	ase offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
- 11	Opp 1: Nice, animated speaking Clelivery
Prop 1: Jean-mouse, T	y to Opp 1: Nece, animal got
be a lit less fidgety.	mount of +1 it assumes and counter.
fre a ver see paying	Great logical organist II on the un continued
improved closing sta	Imon execution especially on the wife
A server opposite	It to to the topice: Good thinking
improved closing star	Much Sreat logical arguments and counter- front arguments - especially on the importance of competitor to the topice! Good thinking of your feet"
1/4 1/	him luk your feet." use of
Prop 2: affairle , lyge ?	pear of safe Opp 2:
1.4. Love	speakingslyk. Opp 2: Good eye contact Nice & personal
Like you pussed the	under Story. Sold arguments
argument. Not rapour	
Prop 2: Affable Nyle & Like you passion Good arguments. Not raptled pressure.	
TEAM CODE #: 2 h	on the <i>OPP</i> wins this debate.
	on the \mathcal{O} / wind this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	to a manufaction Followed
an I sied a	efention of topic, and any unentation Followed or.
Clearer, more roque a	games /
I wish assumentation	
by logical wagner-	
U U	

Standoff in Oregon is a serio	PARLI Debate Counity
Eszter Erdelyi (*14) Round 4A 3:30pm C2 Gov: 10 Lee - Wang	Judge's Name: E ERDE'LY /
Opp: 12 Santana - Bazile Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 LEE pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 BATILE pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 WANG pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 SANTANA pts 28
	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rade or inappropriate behavior
Juo	dging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate 	rely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
evidence—which may include facts and	ciently the debaters support arguments with d references to authority as well as general knowledge
by the other side	ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
 Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable 	and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
• Courtesy: How courteous and respect	al the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer coreach debater:	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: VERY CLEAR ORGANIZATI	Opp 1: EXCELLENT VOTER SPEECH
GOOD RESPONSE OT POIS	VERY GOOD EASY TO FOLLOW ORGANI-
	QUESTION. FOWERFUL PHOTHORICAR QUESTION. GOOD POIL BEACTION
	WORLING. GOOD TO PONOTION
Prop 2: UPPLY GOOD ANALYSIS	Opp 2: UERY GOOD HANDLING POIS
3 DIFFERENT STRENG ANALYS LINES SUPPORTING THE CONTENTOR	S (N ADVANCE IN HOPE DETITIL WHAT IN
THE DEPINITION OF THE US AS A SA	PLE GOINGTO SAY, USE "SHOULD" LESS AS THAT IS YOUR OWN FUDGEMENT NOT PLOT wins this debate. A FACT/EVIDENCE
•	Prop or Oppi
REASON FOR DECISION: THE MAN	J CONTENTION OF PRECEDENT
COST THE THAT I	FUTED EXFECTIVELY BY THE OPP MOLENCE HAS NOT HAPPENED YET
MIN MINI THAT ITIS	UNITERS TO HATTPEN DOES 1001
TARE AWAY FROM THE	POINT THAT PRECEDENT LIKE THIS IS A

Eszter Erdelyi (*14)

Round 4B 3:30pm C2 Gov: 12 Green - Madison Opp: 21 Harris - Marr Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ESTER ERDE'MI

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWE

Team Code #:	Team Code #:	
Prop Speaker #1 GUDEN pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 HARRIS	_pts_29
Prop Speaker #2 MAD (SON pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 HARR	pts <u>29</u>

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good

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

26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor

<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

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

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

Opp 1: 6000 ORGAN (ZATION - 600D Prop 1: PERY COINCISE SPEECTY BUT ALITTLE BELLET HAY I SUGGEST LIST OF ARGUMENTS. THE ONE STATEMENT LAMING OUT THE ARGUMENTS /A ABOUT SCHOLARSHIPS WAS NOT LITTLE MORE-SUPPORT EACHWITH SUPPCRIED - "CAN YOU REALLY GET ENOUGH EXAMPLE (FACT/EXPAND TO ALL STUDENTS NOT FUST THEONES WITH MEED Prop 2: 400 HIT UPON THE \$ TO GEADUATE JUST ON HARD WARK? Opp 2: MOST EVIDENCE AND GOOD BEST ARGUMENT: OPPORTUPITY IS EXFECTIVE RESPONSE TO PROP CONTENTIONS ABOUT "PEOPLE ARE NOT GETTING A DEGREEF. IF YOU SYSTE-MATICALLY EXPLORED THAT THAT LAZY" GOOD PELIVERY COULD HAVE BOON VORY STRONG on the OPP wins this debate.

TEAM CODE #:

REASON FOR DECISION: THE PROP SIDE FOCUSED ON A SUBGROUP OF THE POPULATION IN QUESTION, THE NEG SIDE HAD ARGUED SEVERAL MACRO ECONOMIC CONFORMENCES (COST, TEACHING QUALITY) WHICH WERE NOT REFUTED

(Prop or Opp)

ovor o granca	Junion String	ms access to free higher education PARLI Debate
Pauline Honaryar (Round 4B 3:30pm C4 Gov: 19 Le - Rather		Judge's Name: Pauline Honaryar
Opp: 3 Hemerling - Barr Novice Parli Debate	nett	Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte
Team Code #:	PROP ₁ 9	Team Code #: 3
Prop Speaker #1_	Le pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Hemerlina pts 29
Prop Speaker #2_	Rather pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Barnatt pts 28
Please award	each speaker points based	o /
2		Outstanding 28 = Very Good ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Ju	ldging Criteria
	How reasonably and effecti	vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	ring the debate	signate, the debetons symment encomments with
		ciently the debaters support arguments with nd references to authority as well as general knowledge
		feetively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the othe	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	/
	,	and effective were the questions and the answers
-	7	k in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
∀	understandable How courteous and respect	tful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the abo	ve criteria, nlease/offer co	empliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	/ control in, promsy oner co	mp.monto una ou ouggettone for militare to
	gob presenting the	Opp 1: Shong analysis overall. good pickup on lack of key points
good pic	lemp of the ineffect	iveness produced with the opportunts care
of person	al evidence great te	excellent argumentation and
by oppore	ent + oftoday's std.	MARGANIA DOS AFRICAS
Prop 2: Saf-4	- cula speakes:	Opp 2: Op
pleasant	- calm speaker;	-good atempt bringing personal
good deli	very; response to	evidence
Šocialis r	n/argument effects	vegood overal voice à delivery.
TEAM CODE		e Opp wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR	DECISION:	
Strong	debate j mainle	y because the opponent disjouted
the reso	Tutron as worded	y because the opponent disputed and insisted on their verbal
modifica	ation understander	a & limitations
	•	1 U

Cindy Bulger (*23) Round 4B 3:30pm D107 Gov: 17 Raven - Sweeney	Judge's Name: Undy Bulger Judge's School Affiliation: San Raum Valley
Opp: 14 Kerr-Stein - Davidson Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Sen Ramni Valley
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Sweeney pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Verr . Seein pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Raven pts 21	Opp Speaker #2 Day A Sov pts 21
	utstanding 28 = Very Good
	l enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ing Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate 	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Argumentation: How directly and effect	references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
 Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable 	d effective were the questions and the answers n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer compeased debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: You have a very new speaking style but your opening speech was use than It minutes. Spend much that developing you intak	Opp 1: Faceturnt speaking style. Well organized points. I think that the issue for me was the benefit to us. citizens Vs. us given ment extre spending
Prop 2: Arguments material well against the regiments.	Opp 2: The presentation of Your Annights was a but knowganized but wer all a good job
	wins this debate. op or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	s utizens and neg orguesa more
about the impact on the le	•

Ritu Khurana (*10) Round 4B 3:30pm C5 Gov: 14 Chan - Foley Opp: 13 Karim - Kerstetter	Judge's Name: Ash Khukong
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Injustion His Sund
PROP Team Code #:\	OPP Team Code #: \3
Prop Speaker #1 to pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Kerstetter pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Foley pts 29	Opp Speaker #2pts27
Please award each speaker points based of $30 = Perfect$ $29 = C$	n the following scale: outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate 	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficient	ently the debaters support arguments with
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
• Argumentation: How directly and effect	tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
• Points of Information: How relevant ar	d effective were the questions and the answers
	n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	• •
Courtesy: How courteous and respectful	the debaters were to opponents and judges
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1:•	Opp 1:
Prop 2:	Opp 2:
TEAM CODE #: \\ \(\frac{\frac{1}{\finn{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\finn{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\fric}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\	
•	op or Opp)
Very lose debate. Outside	of valus is Policy discussions, most
agrimments was combonable. Q	As won on Desentation.

Ritu Khurana (*10) Round 4A 3:30pm C5 Gov: 3 Lanzone - Hubing Opp: 19 Mart - Moran Novice Parli Debate	er	Judge's Name: Advish Khurana Judge's School Affiliation: Trungton H. Sheck	for
Team Code #:	PROP	Team Code #: 19	
Prop Speaker #1_	Hubries pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Moran pts 27	
Prop Speaker #2_	Langone pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Mast pts 27	
		Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)	
•	Jud	Iging Criteria	
 Evidence: evidence- evidence- by the other Points of It Delivery: It and easily to Courtesy: 	ing the debate How appropriately and effice which may include facts and ation: How directly and effect is side information: How relevant a How well the debaters speak anderstandable How courteous and respect	iently the debaters support arguments with a references to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges appliments and/or suggestions for improvement to	
Prop 1:		Opp 1:	
Prop 2:	f. 3	Opp 2:	
TEAM CODE: REASON FOR: The main a terboli the key	a	Prop or Opp) Prop or Opp) Prop the about key characteristics Ling that to current standoff is ven the debate.	Se

Cindy Bulger (*23) Round 4A 3:30pm D107 Gov: 19 Byrne - Nguyen Opp: 14 Woo - Melman Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Cindy Bul gw Judge's School Affiliation: San Pamon Valley
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #2 N guyes pts 28 Prop Speaker #2 N guyes pts 21	Opp Speaker #1 Melman pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 N guyen pts 21	Opp Speaker #2 W 00 pts 2
27 = Good (but possibly not good	ststanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
8	ng Criteria
 offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and reside Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful Using the above criteria, please offer compleach debater: 	eferences to authority as well as general knowledge lively the debaters respond to the arguments made defective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges diments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: NILL Summary of Points as the debate world along. I used what you wad a good understanding of your pants and Positions so that you varely used your notes Prop 2: Hu summary of presentation	Opp 1: You had extra time at the end. Could have been that the end to your position. I also will an port of your presentation. It does get the Judges Opp 2: assentation. It does get the Judges Opp 2: assentation. You spent a lot of time answering more than one question by the APF. You need to take
(Pro REASON FOR DECISION:	eg wins this debate. p or Opp) ring link between the ovegon Security.

he stand off in Oregon is a ser	PARLI Debate
Pauline Honaryar (*15) Round 4A 3:30pm C4 Gov: 10 Mao - Tong-Seely	Judge's Name: Pauline Honanyar
Opp: 14 Masuda-Thaya - Sun Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte.
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #: 1-
Prop Speaker #1 Tong - Seely pts 20	Opp Speaker #1 Sun pts 29 Opp Speaker #2 Masuda-Thay a pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Mao pts 2	7 Opp Speaker #2 Masuda-Thay of pts 27
Please award each speaker points base 30 = Perfect 29	ed on the following scale: = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
J	udging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effect offered during the debate 	tively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	ficiently the debaters support arguments with
	and references to authority as well as general knowledge
	ffectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	at and effective were the questions and the answers
	ak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandableCourtesy: How courteous and respect	etful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer ceach debater:	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Strong delivery	Opp 1: Excellent argumentation of
very dear analysis,	du opponent's evidence.
speaking with great convi	chor - clear delivery and very easy to
and authority.	- excellent use of subtle personal jahon
	of evidence.
Prop 2: Analysis used vast	Opp 2: very direct responses to the
reached perhaps work or	opponents evidence.
improving evidence presen	the state of the s
char speaking voice!	keep the interest strong.
TEAM CODE #: On th	ne <u>Prop</u> wins this debate. (Prop of Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
wegically or note	posedeniarion o voices:
both had quat	presentation overall. Speaking voices

Kathleen von Raesfeld (*25) Round 4A 3:30pm C3 Gov: 6 Goldblatt - McKinney Opp: 19 Phan - Phan Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Von Rasfeld Judge's School Affiliation: Seroma a Cadeny
Team Code #: Coldblatt	Team Code #: 19
Prop Speaker #1 Which Wattherne pts 27.5	Opp Speaker #1 Phan Katherine pts 28.75
Prop Speaker #2 Phan Kinney pts 27.25	Opp Speaker #2 Phan, Kenny pts 27.5
	the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good denough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
.Judo	ging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and exidence—which may include facts and exidence to the other side Points of Information: How relevant and easily understandable 	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: 4 good job on a challenging - remember to pause for an case! important point showing this is the paint impact on your case	Opp 1: texcellent pace, Clear case presented + fluid speeches are compelling - when your partner pointed out their mistake C Oregon vs Washington you should not point it out again seems petly
Prop 2: + professional appearance + good job thinking on your feet to establish that many people identify with the farmers plight - try not to sway TEAM CODE #: 19 on the	
(Pr REASON FOR DECISION:	op or Opp)
Did Not prove Sian	ificance/magnitude

Round 4B 3:30pm C3	Va - Page [all
Gov: 5 Pashman - Ralston	Judge's Name: Von Kaesteld
Opp: 27 Campanella - Petruska Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy
Novice I alli Debate	Judge's School Allination. Cot 1011 to All Querra
PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 5	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Ralston pts28.75	Opp Speaker #1 Campanella pts 28.75
Prop Speaker #2 Pashman pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Petruska pts 29
Please award each speaker points based of	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	- , , ,
	To reconven for randy imappropriate community
Jud	ging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate 	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	ently the debaters support arguments with
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
 Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side 	ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
•	nd effective were the questions and the answers
• Delivery: How well the debaters speak	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and respectfu	ll the debaters were to opponents and judges
Train = 4h a share anidania anlara affar anna	
each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
h	/.
Pron 1. + good definitions time line zexand	PROpp 1: + like your attack to solvenay, Strong
	points airen to arous case
acim as a spearer is in your vary.	points given to argue case
	+ perfect balance of passion 3 fact - mid speech is a good-time to pause for impact 7
# Using a pause shows confidence /	power stance, strong parts show confidence
. And TAIM WOULD VE ALL U. A.	
school - wish it was said earlier school - wish it was said earlier of cur Prop 2: + good point about affordability office remined remember not to start with a negative former vs other team	Opp 2: + like calm style, like pointing out Germany as a new success, excellent topic knowledge.
illied remember not to start with a regative	as a new success, excellent topic Knowledge
or had be also the	t strongest point was VIP - Howdo we pay for this?
	well done " Loud in " power
Harted Keep papers organized solyar are ready	- swaying is compelling but try to stend in "power stance" - for just a littlehiter
TEAM CODE #: 27	
TEAM CODE #: On the	rop or Opp) wins this debate. The . 1+ 3 hows confidence
REASON FOR DECISION:	-117
Did not Solve for i	nherency - good benefits
hat Ilan a	
W HOW (lo we get there?

THE STAM OFF IN	PARLI Debate
Mark Cabasino (*13) Round 4A 3:30pm C6 Gov: 21 Burrous - Griggy Opp: 3 Greenwall - DuPuy Novice Parli Debate WATTUMAL SECURITY	Judge's Name: ABASINO Judge's School Affiliation: 13
Team Code #: 21	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 B URROUS pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 6REEMALL pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 GRIGGT pts 27	/
27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	outstanding 28 = Very Good denough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
 Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficiency evidence—which may include facts and exidence—which may include facts and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and easily understandable 	the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ontly the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made of effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater: (Sory, wote	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to wang boxes, my bad ~
Prop 1: Good) she explaining go text of dangers of armad protestors. Good recup in speech 3 with explains on "implicit" threat and good andogy (example about not manday to deal a loved one to the park. Placed points about not harm yet, good definition of "levious threat," good definition of throughout and why the int april . Be done to have contenting in feech 1. TEAM CODE #: 3 on the	off wins this debate.
(Pr	op or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Though the debate had areas of weakness and sports for improvement on both sides, which off had the more convincing arguments, due to definitions ("serious") and fack is hypothesicals, as newly compare lossess it argument to troism.

shorld gowantee	PARLI Debate
to free higher education.	Judge's Name: ABAS NO Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP (22)	Team Code #:
WE pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 $\gamma A \sim pts 2$
KESHAV pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 SHPONKO pts 27
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	lging Criteria
which may include facts and ation: How directly and effer side information: How relevant a How well the debaters speak anderstandable How courteous and respectful to the standard of the spectful to the second of the spectful to the second of the second o	d references to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges appliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
of disnovertages to to work on specific	Opp 1: Good bit it reasons as to why this iden isn't feasible — IC on costs, and ZC on how everyone would want in on this free elucation. 3C (redirect funts) and 4C (dilute value of degree) were iss Opp 2: Strong Good discussion of scholarships the in speech 3. Cood Richo of points in your case (quilty of education, not enough teachers, inversed taxes) to prove why this plan Opp wins this debate. Won't work. Prop or Opp) this potential plan. ics of venting a plan. when to use more of your time.
H - e 7 lift and lift v a company	pts 26 KESHAV pts 26 Rach speaker points based 30 = Perfect 29 = 2 = Good (but possibly not go 24-20 = Poor Jud Iow reasonably and effective ing the debate How appropriately and effective ing the debate How appropriately and effective ing the debaters speak Indicate the debaters speak Independent of correct And Jis some potential from free education from free education

Is the standoff in Oregon a serious threat? PARLI Debate

Kimiko Cheng (*21) Round 4A 3:30pm D101 Gov: 23 Scott - Ambrose Opp: 12 Murdock - Novice Parli Debate			_	e: K. Cly	
P	ROP o	. 100 404000 00000000000000000000000000000	, a company of the second production of the second	OPP	A COMPANY OF THE STATE OF THE S
Team Code #:	ROP 23		Team Cod		2
Prop Speaker #1	Scott	_pts_28_	Opp Speaker #1	Murdock	pts_26
Prop Speaker #2	Ambrose	_pts_27	Opp Speaker #2	/ same	pts_26
	30 = Per	fect $29 = 0$ sibly not goo			
 Evidence: Hevidence—we evidence—we have a represented by the other selection. Points of Information Delivery: He and easily units. 	ng the debate flow appropriately which may includation: How direct side formation: How ow well the debat aderstandable	nd effective by and effici de facts and tly and effe v relevant a aters speak	tently the debaters references to autoctively the debate and effective were in an organized, o	nalyze the topic and support argument thority as well as going respond to the action and communicative sty	ts with eneral knowledge rguments made the answers le that is pleasant
	/	-		suggestions for in	
Prop 1: Wave More than 1	aretherts			"serious"	definition
Prop 2: Worl con More on	vincing that	Neg m Neg	Opp 2:		
TEAM CODE #: REASON FOR D (YM) Which	ECISION:	(P	Prop wins 1 Prop or Opp)		

APC !

- gun law causing harm

1stimt. Yacism

This is a "white wort"

I'm cont. These people occupy fed & bldg

3rd court - Gort is slow in taking actions

Neg. 1

· Hood pts in mentioning

this is not about your law

or racism

- "Small" contained intident

1 st Cort - This is "Contained". Not notionwide threat

2nd cont. - no death

AC+ 2

- Blacks man protest tractions of police

Neg. 2

Gavi très not to localeto The USFG Should gharantee gree higher ed.

PARLI Debate

Kimiko Cheng (*21) Round 4B 3:30pm D101 Gov: 14 Holwitz - Kay Opp: 6 Brouhard - Welch Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: K. Cherg Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin
PROP	OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Holwitz 29	2011
Prop Speaker #1 pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 17000 (arc pts 26)
Prop Speaker #2 pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Prowhard pts 26 Opp Speaker #2 Welch pts 36
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Ind	ging Criteria
	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
 Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant at Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable 	ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer com each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Hand eye contact Possed Methodical In presenting arguments	Opp 1: Contract own Atatoment. Disonganized.
Prop 2: How at presenting contention d'arguments.	Opp 2: More coherent arguments needed.
TEAM CODE #: 4 on the (P	wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	

plans debute, net benefit or not

Afr!

2. + PGA or higher

agents - Dept of ed

2017

More minorities enrolled

Citing Canada as onidence

APF 5

- Hood pt raised re: GPA regnet

- only free for students who work hand in high school reguless the race

2rd Cont-encourge racial diversity actually helps veg. Neg 1

- Counterplan - tonly for families w/ incomes less than \$250,000

- Decreese weelth grap

Elfute -

Ny 2

Bill Holt (*3) Round 4A 3:30pm D105 Gov: 13 Banas - Cummings	Judge's Name:
Opp: 14 Lyons - Wyszynski Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 <u>Rana</u> pts <u>8</u>	
Prop Speaker #2 Cummrn pts 27.8	Opp Speaker #2 Wyszynski pts 08
Please award each speaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = Compared to 27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor 24-2	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good denough to goalify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior ong Criteria by the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge stively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers on an organized, communicative style that is pleasant of the debaters were to opponents and judges pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Clearly laid aut	Opp 1: You mad it seem truely laughable.
up great points.	Opp 2: good support of opp 1 and good argumentation
TEAM CODE #: on the	
prop did a great jub but in their facts enough that was hard	end I felt opp argued against to believe it doubt be a
"Serious threat to rational sounity	16

Bill Holt (*3) Round 4B 3:30pm D105 Gov: 13 Garcia - Acosta Opp: 14 Dickerman - Millar Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Hother Jenny Judge's School Affiliation: Bently
Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 ACOSTU pts 28.5	Opp Speaker #1 Diciuman prs 28
Prop Speaker #2 GOVCIA pts3807	Opp Speaker #2 Millar pts $\partial \delta$
	utstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ing Criteria
	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
 Evidence: How appropriately and efficie evidence—which may include facts and n 	ntly the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
 Points of Information: How relevant an Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable 	d effective were the questions and the answers an an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	/ diments and/or suggestions for improvement to
· Prop 1: great job a laying	Opp 1: Very good opening
rut debate - very dear	Cust was good point - just
	Opp 1: Very good opening Cost was good point - just hudiel a bit more analysis/pridence.
Prop 2: excellent	Opp 2: Millar: nice jub!
argumentation/hit	ho issues,
politing Extendi	
\ I = T	wins this debate.
DEACON FOR DECISION	
overall better argumentation Stronger hold sedlent deliv	en e

Peter Brown (*27) Round 4A 3:30pm C1 Gov: 3 Duong - Kopelevich Opp: 23 Barton - Madsen	Judge's Name: Peter Bran
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Www.xsって
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #: 23
Prop Speaker #1 Dong	ots Zle Opp Speaker #1 Bardon pts Z8
Prop Speaker #2 Kofe Tevel p	ots 71. Opp Speaker #2 1 Marken pts 27
	s based on the following scale: ct 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good ly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Pool$	
	Judging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and offered during the debate 	effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
 Evidence: How appropriately a evidence—which may include 	and efficiently the debaters support arguments with facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
 Points of Information: How red Delivery: How well the debate and easily understandable 	elevant and effective were the questions and the answers ers speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please each debater:	offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: 1:59/1:02 Very briefly sail talking ! Next to use more true of a to strengthe points	Opp 1: Good againstation Refuted all points Good Selivery Good was of time
No reflexues or citation	10:48 / 5:09
Prop 2: 1:51 Need to use tike allowed refute and strengthen argument	Opp 2: Stray voice. God andere
No references or estations	4:18
TEAM CODE #:_ 23	on the Opp. wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION: The co Refital all points in make gr	opp wins because: The agreets and had good voter points

			I ARLI Debate	
Peter Brown (*27) Round 4B 3:30pm C1 Gov: 10 Vijay - Cramer	USFA CHIZENS OF	Should gave	Judge's Name: Teter Brown Judge's School Affiliation:	
Opp: 14 Fong - Geller Novice Parli Debate	elviota		Judge's School Affiliation:	j.n95=r
MAMERINO SPIRSPOSTO (MODALINA CITTURA)	PROP	ere e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	OPP	Constitution in the the author of the constitution of the constitu
Team Code #:	- 1		Team Code #:	
Prop Speaker #1	Vijay	pts	Opp Speaker #1 Galler	pts_ <u>7%</u>
Prop Speaker #2	Craw	pts_ <u>ZV</u>	Opp Speaker #2 Fay	pts 27
	30 = F $27 = Good (but property)$	Perfect $29 = 0$	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good d enough to qualify for eliminatio <20 = Reserved for rude or in	
		Jud	ging Criteria	
 Evidence: evidence- Argumen by the oth Points of Delivery: and easily Courtesy: 	ring the debate How appropria -which may inc tation: How dir er side Information: H How well the d understandable How courteous	Itely and efficilude facts and rectly and effective for relevant are baters speak is and respectful	ently the debaters analyze the topic ently the debaters support argument references to authority as well ctively the debaters respond to the defective were the questions in an organized, communicative all the debaters were to opponent pliments and/or suggestions for the debaters and/or suggestions and debaters and/or suggestions for the debaters and/or suggestions and debaters and/or suggestions and debaters and/or suggestions and debaters an	ments with as general knowledge the arguments made and the answers e style that is pleasant as and judges
_	short Could ray then case	Love fixed	Opp 1: (700 e use of five D. In') give any refere into. Neel to be more confide	nces or citations for
Prop 2: Strong voice Reported Op	. Speaks clar pic punt. Siss-	r. l vscoft"	Opp 2: God agreeta	tx.
TEAM CODE	DECISION:	he prop succ	Prof wins this debate. rop or Opp) sefully refull the opps co	se The opp

	PARLI Debate					
Abbas Rangwala (*8) Round 4A 3:30pm D108 Gov: 25 Green - Nichols Opp: 3 McDonald - Thani		Judge's Name: ARBAS RANGWALA				
	e Parli Debate			Judge's Scho	ool Affiliation: Dy	<u>HS</u>
	Team Code #:	PROP 25		Team Co	OPP	3
	Prop Speaker #1_	NICHOLS	pts <u>27-</u> 5	Opp Speaker #1_	MeBUNALD	pts_27.5
	Prop Speaker #2_	GREEN	pts <u>28</u> _	Opp Speaker #2	THANI	pts_27.5
			rfect $29 = 0$	Outstanding 28	•	ounds)
	26-25 = Fair		Poor			propriate behavior
			Jud	ging Criteria		
	 Evidence: evidence— Argument by the othe Points of I Delivery: I and easily to the evidence— 	which may incluation: How direct raide nformation: How well the delunderstandable	ide facts and only and effect wrelevant and oaters speak i	references to au stively the debate and effective were an an organized,	ers respond to the	general knowledge arguments made d the answers yle that is pleasant
	Using the abo each debater:	/ · -	se offer com	pliments and/o	r suggestions for	improvement to
ANA — EVI — COU ANA — LEVI — COU ANA — COU ANA — COU ANA — COU	Prop 1: NICH 3 3 N/A Prop 2: GRE 3 3 3 5 N/A TEAM CODE	<u>=N</u>	on the <u>f</u>	ANA — EVI — ARE— POI — DEL— COV —	DONALD 3 3 5 N/A 4 3.5 PSSENT " N/A this debate.	
				rop or Opp)	·	

REASON FOR DECISION:

IT SEEMS BOTH TEAMS STRUGGLED BUITE A BIT TO PRESENT COGENT ARGUMENTS. AND OPP WAS AT A DISADVANTAGE BECAUSE OF PARTICIPANT ABSENT. TOUGH CALL BUT TEAM PROP DID A TINY BIT BETTER. BOTH TEAMS NEEDS A LOT MORE PRACTICE. GOOD LUCK!

Abbas Rangwala (*8)

Round 4B 3:30pm D108 Gov: 19 Andola - Pareja Opp: 5 Figueroa - Thomas Novice Parli Debate Judge's Name: ABBAS RANGWALA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVH3.

Team Code #: PROP)PP 5
Prop Speaker #1 PAREJA pts	28 Opp Speaker #1 THOM	1AS pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 ANDOLA pts	27 Opp Speaker #2 FiGU	EROA pts 29
26 BORRESSECTER CONTROL CONTRO	AND THE STANDARD CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR AND	PROTECTION OF THE ARMST ACTION AS THE PROTECTION OF THE PROPERTY AND ARMST ARROWS AND ARMST AREA AREA.

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:

ANA -3 - GOOD PRESENTATION	Opp 1: THO MAS ANA - 3.5 EVI - 3 ARG - 3.5
ARG — 3 - TRY TO AVOID READING & POI — 4 MAKE EYE CONTACT DEL — 4 - BE MORE ASSERTIVE COU — Prop 2: ANDOLA	POI — 3 DEL — 4 COV — 4 Opp 2: FIGUERDA
ANA -25 EVI - 3 - WORK ON PRESENTATION A GIT ARG -2.5 - MAKE CRISP ARGUMENTS. POI - 4 DEL -3 COU - 4	/
TEAM CODE #: on the	p or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

TEAM OPP WINS BECAUSE OF BETTER DELIVERY & CRISPER ARGUMENTS. COMPARTATIVELY,
BOTH TEAM NEEDS MORE PRACTICE & FOCUS ON CRISPER, MORE LOCAL ARGUMENTS.

John Brouhard (*6) Round 4A 3:30pm D109		Judge's Name: Cold	host use
Gov: 3 Lisy - Forman		Judge's Haine.	
Opp: 27 Little - Wagner Novice Parli Debate		Judge's School Affiliation:_	Lowell:
P	ROP 7	OPP	~ 7
Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	2/
Prop Speaker #1		Opp Speaker #1	pts_28, 5
Prop Speaker #2	forman. pts 28.	Opp Speaker #2 Wagn	ex pts 29
Please award ea	ach speaker points based on 30 = Perfect 29 = Or	the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good	
27	= Good (but possibly not good		
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or	
	Judg	ing Criteria	
• Analysis: He	ow reasonably and effectively	y the debaters analyze the to	ppic and the arguments
offered durin	g the debate		-
	low appropriately and efficient	, , , ,	
	which may include facts and r		
	tion: How directly and effect	ively the debaters respond t	o the arguments made
by the other	side formation: How relevant and	d affortive were the question	ng and the engineer
	ow well the debaters speak in	<u>-</u>	
	nderstandable	an organized, communicat	ive style that is pleasant
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	low courteous and respectful	the debaters were to oppone	ents and judges
Using the above each debater:	e criteria, please offer comp	liments and/or suggestion	s for improvement to
each devater:			- / / /
Prop 1:	1 points bringty up	Opp 1: Good Sum	may of situation at its
The Potentie	il of setting precedence	Current state	·
If can cite	a specific example can		
help the tea	in to lim.		
Prop 2:	a spicifi example can in to liral delivery overall. essing the hate its.	Onn 2:	I wateral small
Grand try	essing the hote sto	Very good	Expeller of huser from
relate to s	ocial proler & satisfical	All the points	made clearly.
insecurity, wel	be great succen if very	argunets as	e very strong.
specific the ample	. Can of Juan.	'	
' TEAM CODE #:	on the	wins this debate.	made clearly. Le very strong. Albertuyer 1/10/16.
REASON FOR D	ECISION:	эр ол <i>Орр)</i>	
Good ana	lyin of sokodin over	rall and presente	d better argument,
Prop tean	Les some ruce pe	oints but argument	not as sound due to
lach of	- evidence of violence	e already existing	•

- i). political sercinty. > socialorder with set a precedence. thread will esalate.
- 3) Why is keing deboted allow comby if only a party. Hey have gum. If only a party. This not peneful.

 Police working on vian for avvist.

 Social order disrupt > ...

 Tench visolitic started if Late.
- b). Police seewidy tunnium notarion security sevolution.

- 2) More like a Fag party.
 Party out of curtrol? No violence.
 No compaison to ISIS.
 Lach of excultion.
 There is no arrest!
 - 4). Little food. No escalation since 7 days?
 Noce wrap up
 natural speaker.
 - 5). No gun aere fried:

 2 ud ambenit alloing owing a gun.

 When is the volence

 fading out of a news
 provided a good Comparis a h
 ZSIS. Nothing to beer found.

 Cannot Exculate.

John Brouhard (*6) Round 4B 3:30pm D109	A	Judge's Name: albert wee.
Gov: 19 Fong - Ligutan Opp: 3 Dovichi - Vetterli		
Novice Parli Debate		Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell -
PI Team Code #:	ROP 19.	OPP 3
	1-6 07	1/4 0= 27
Prop Speaker #1	/ igulan pts 2/	Opp Speaker #1 Vellevic pts 2
Prop Speaker #2	Fing. pts 2	Opp Speaker #2 Dov7chi pts 2
Please award ea	ch speaker points based of $30 = Perfect$ $20 = 0$	n the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 =		d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judş	ging Criteria
 Analysis: Ho offered during 		ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ently the debaters support arguments with
		references to authority as well as general knowledge
• Argumentate by the other s		tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
•		nd effective were the questions and the answers
		n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily un		1 the deleter were to surrought and indeed
• Courtesy: ric	ow courteous and respective	I the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above each debater:	criteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Point	s made don't	Opp 1: Shold Lave proposeda.
divitly	support the need	better plan than the resolution
1 · 1	free higher	of allowing GPA 30 to go for the
education.	11 abrance	I de timet be availed to
Prop 2: Could	be a stronger the A-solidats	Opp 2 inly the best must be guarateed to have free access will sell better Good efforts every one.
argumen of say	1 The Maria	Lavetree access which
must be Her		Good efforts every he.
	$\not a$	1-10-1k
TEAM CODE #:	on the (P)	op of Opp) wins this debate.
REANDINEDRIN	-1 1 N 1 C 1 N 1 ·	▲
Opp tea	n is overall stro	nger in their argument,

- 1). Standof liny, Congretai, culyone a chance. -B-avs?
- 3) Many benufte future? Sit a vole model for others. It meren global competitu.

Why no one mentin elevetir ust is too ligh. free -> B?

6). No counter plan offered.

- 2). Elimite lower/working class.

 funding?

 College is a goal to achiel

 B-avy may withe good enough.
 - 4).

5). Need balence of society.

Need a lot of funding!

Something to strave for.

Elizabeth Murphy (* Round 4A 3:30pm D102 Gov: 14 Lee - Duan Opp: 10 Khurana - Daruk Novice Parli Debate	·			me: <u>[lizobe</u>] nool Affiliation: <u>Bis</u>	. (' .	N.S.
Team Code #:	PROP	14	Team C	ode #: OPP		
Prop Speaker #1_	Duan	pts_ <u>25</u>	Opp Speaker #1_	Khprana	pts_ <u></u> ZS	
Prop Speaker #2_	Lee	pts_ <u>75</u>	Opp Speaker #2	2 Davkhanau	valla pts 25	
	7 = Good (b)	er points based of a Perfect 29 = 0 out possibly not good 20 = Poor	Outstanding 28 od enough to qua	_	•	
 Evidence: levidence Argumentate by the other Points of Ir Delivery: It and easily under the content of the cont	ing the debathow appropries which may ation: Howerside and the ation well the anderstands	ably and effective ate oriately and effic- include facts and directly and effe the How relevant a e debaters speak ble	iently the debate I references to a ctively the deba and effective we in an organized	ters respond to the	nts with general knowledge arguments made d the answers yle that is pleasant	
•		/-		or suggestions for		
Prop 1: Good USE OF Nud butle Organization Sweet + OF Prop 2: Good but Vicile luid	on. espectfi	/ ul,	Seemed	ubutlal. d to lose social pl	focus a bi	¥,
TEAM CODE # REASON FOR I Argument for group in Or have phovid in effection	ECISION: L Propled mo	was a vere few fackque in Oreq	orists unclosured or on (on fec	ear, and I du their 1 Stand-off lear land);	Did not production, le how lo	ove thus could ing been

Elizabeth	Murphy	(*5)
-----------	--------	------

Round 4B 3:30pm D102 Gov: 14 Situ - Zhang

Opp: 19 Alcantra - Thompson

Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Elizabeth Murphy

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

Team Code #:	4 14	Team Code #: 19
Prop Speaker #1 Zh	ang pts 25	Opp Speaker #1 Alcantra pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 514	<u>u</u> pts <u>25</u>	Opp Speaker #2 Thompson pts 24
Please award each spe	-	n the following scale: outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 - Goo		d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judg	ging Criteria
• Analysis: How rea	sonably and effectivel	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the	debate	
<u>-</u> .	•	ently the debaters support arguments with
		references to authority as well as general knowledge
_	low directly and effect	tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	tion. How relevant on	d effective were the questions and the answers
		n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understa		ir alyoigamized, communicative style that is pleasant
₹		the debaters were to opponents and judges
·	• /	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	ria, please offer comj	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:		
Duan 1.		0 1.
Prop 1:	1 2/20/201	Opp 1: Can tell she was prepared but tough to angue Z.S. G.P.A. means a student is average. Would not generalize so much because could be misinterpreted. Articulate.
trgument well	- orgary eech	Can Tell she was prepared
resontation a	a bit/,	to argue 2.5 GPH means a strough
anotitive.	Best to state	average would not generalize so much
rayments once	rather than	because could be misinterpreted.
ing same oug	jument over t	Articulate.
Prop 2: Good lev	outfal over	Opp 2:
J		Need to do more preparation to
		organize thoughts.
,	/	voice at appropriate tone.
/		1 voice at appropri
TEAM CODE #:	14 on the	Prop wins this debate.
		rop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION	ON:	
See above	21	