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

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Linda Brandt

Judge's School Affiliation: 19

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 6 | | Team Code #: 21 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Welch | pts 29 | Opp Speaker #1 Brian Burrous | pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Brouhard | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 Griggy | pts 28 |

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

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

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: you made some good points re: stem education good poise, fluency could be better overall good job.

Prop 2: you were good at re-iterating your contentions, but did unintentionally change one. Your overall presentation was well done

Opp 1: great poise, very good comments & arguments and countering of statements.

Opp 2: You did a good job of presenting your evidence. Liked your use of analogy Refutations were well done

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp made a stronger argument for their contentions.

# PARLI Debate

**Sam Roberson (*19)**
Round 3A 1:30pm C4
Gov: 3 Dovichi - Vetterli
Opp: 22 Keshav - Wei
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Vivian Pham

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 3 | Team Code #: | 22 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Vetterli pts____ | Opp Speaker #1 | Wei pts____ |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Dovichi pts____ | Opp Speaker #2 | Keshav pts____ |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: very organized, pleasant and easily understandable. Great job explaining the "gray area" Respectful. ~~Please~~

Opp 1: Great job directly responding to arguments. Please refrain from saying "and stuff."

Prop 2: more eye contact please.

Opp 2: ~~Voice~~ great tone and easily understandable. Great job paying attention to opp. points Please refrain from saying "or whatever!"

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

direct and effective response to opp. argument.

vivian pham

~~Sam Peterson~~ (*19)

Round 3B 1:30pm C4

Gov: 14 Woo - Melman

Opp: 10 Lee - Wang

Novice Parli Debate

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Vivian pham

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 14 | Team Code #: | 10 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Melman pts____ | Opp Speaker #1 | Lee pts____ |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Woo pts____ | Opp Speaker #2 | Wang pts____ |

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

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

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: easily understandable. eye contact please. ~~[illegible]~~ playing with your water bottle is very loud and distracting

Prop 2: very organized, nice eye contact and easily understandable.

Opp 1: very organized. presents clear examples. Easily understandable. Nice eye contact.

Opp 2: ~~very organized~~ great job directly responding to opp argument. Great eye contact + communicative style.

**TEAM CODE #:** 10 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

lack of evidence from other team

# PARLI Debate

**Doug Barton (*23)**
Round 3A 1:30pm D108
Gov: 10 Khurana - Darukhanawalla
Opp: 19 Andola - Pareja
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: DOUG BARTON

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 10 | | Team Code #: 19 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 KHURANA DARUKHANAWALLA | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 ANDOLA | pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 [redacted] | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 PAREJA | pts 28 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: Clear speaker. Good use of citations in opening. Very good logic in closing argument - using specific examples.

Prop 2: Strong speaker and ~~Good~~ logical arguments

Opp 1: Nice, clear voice. Keep arguments a bit simpler or less repetitive. Good improvement on closing.

Opp 2: Strong speakers. Good specific examples (gun control, terrorism) supporting position

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

A close debate. Prop wins with a stronger closing argument and citations supporting their position.

# PARLI Debate

**Doug Barton (*23)**
Round 3B 1:30pm D108
Gov: 14 Masuda-Thaya - Sun
Opp: 13 Garcia - Acosta
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: DOUG BARTON

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 14 | Team Code #: | 13 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | SUN pts 29 | Opp Speaker #1 | ACCOSTA pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | MASUDA-THAYA pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 | GARCIA pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Clear, confident speaker. Very good closing statement that logically exposed the opposition

Prop 2: Good speaker. Don't dismiss opp's points so easily.

Opp 1: a strong speaker with good examples to support position. The closing was a bit short.

Opp 2: Very good speaker. Strong, specific rebuttal.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

A very close debate. In the end, the PROP team had made more arguments and had a strong close that isolated a few of OPP's weaknesses.

# PARLI Debate

**Ted Appel (*24)**
Round 3A 1:30pm D109
Gov: 14 Yan - Shponko
Opp: 12 Green - Madison
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ted Appel

Judge's School Affiliation: Santa Rosa HS

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 14 | Team Code #: | 12 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Yan pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | Madison pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Shponko pts 26 | Opp Speaker #2 | Green pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Opp
~~Prop~~ 1: Nice job of addressing Prop arguments and summarizing your case.

Pro
~~Opp~~ 1: Strong clear voice. Smart move to define terms narrowly.

Opp
~~Prop~~ 2: Good job of calling out omissions in rebuttal. Good eye contact.

Pro
~~Opp~~ 2: Confidence will make your points stand out more

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

This one was very close. Prop wins because PI clearly defined terms and made case for economic and social benefits.

# PARLI Debate

**Ted Appel (*24)**
Round 3B 1:30pm D109
Gov: 14 Dickerman - Millar
Opp: 19 Fong - Ligutan
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: TED APPEL

Judge's School Affiliation: SANTA ROSA HS

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 14 | | Team Code #: 19 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Millar | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 Fong | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Dickerman | pts 29 | Opp Speaker #2 Ligutan | pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Very short opening argument. Missed opportunity to make your case, though you defined terms clearly. Buried body in your close.

Prop 2: Your argument carried the day. You made it clear that this was about moral obligation, not economic benefits.

Opp 1: Very strong finish that clearly focused on moral obligations and costs (and risks) to both countries.

Opp 2: Not sure you made case that there is no moral obligation to help people who haven't helped you.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
This one was close. Prop wins because they kept arguments focused on moral obligation.

# PARLI Debate

**Catherine Singstad (*14)**
Round 3A 1:30pm C3
Gov: 3 McDonald - Thani
Opp: 19 Le - Rather
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Catherine Singstad

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 3 | Team Code #: | 19 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Holland McDonald pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 | Ronald Rather pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Zahid Thani pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 | An Le pts 28 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: Nice when you stopped relying on notes & made impassioned summary at end with eye contact. Great refute of opps argument citing harsh reality of our world. Could improve by giving more concrete examples of what and how STEM contributes to improve society & deal with problems. Needed stronger introduction.

Prop 2: Good but I suggest you work on appearing more passionate. Your analysis needed examples- how & why is liberal arts not necessary? Too general. Claim that l. arts & art doesn't benefit society needed to be backed up. Good effort!

Opp 1: Great eye contact & gesturing - seems very natural. Einstein quote relevant & effective as support to your impassioned thesis. Excellent clarity of argument. Your arguments were clear. Could have used more evidence, otherwise an excellent delivery, points, analysis.

Opp 2: Great pacing & eye contact. You did a good job with arguing point regarding fighting world's problems and making a better society.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

# PARLI Debate

**Catherine Singstad (*14)**
Round 3B 1:30pm C3
Gov: 19 Phan - Phan
Opp: 10 Vijay - Cramer
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Catherine Singstad

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 19 | | Team Code #: 10 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Kenny Phan | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 Vijay | pts 28.5 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Katherine Phan | pts 29 | Opp Speaker #2 Cramer | pts 28.5 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: You did a very good job stating your case with supporting evidence. Excellent point about saving lives—crucial to your point. You could work on being more clear and passionate, otherwise good job!

Prop 2: Very Good presentation (you could lower your voice a little :)) Strong arguing skills with great supporting ideas regarding wealthy countries. Also great clarification of what debate is about. Great work!

Opp 1: Very strong presentation style. Eye contact & gesturing - v. good job! Powerful argumentation — confident & clear. You're a natural - & you & your partner are a great team. Good use of general knowledge & evidence.

Opp 2: Impassioned, strong delivery :) Excellent example of China being overpopulated though wealthy. Great ... on wealth being not only factor ... Clear & easy to understand. Nice!

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

# PARLI Debate

**Opher Peled (*15)**
Round 3A 1:30pm C1
Gov: 6 Kang - Yolasan
Opp: 19 Byrne - Nguyen
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Opher Peled

Judge's School Affiliation: Monmouth

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 6 | | Team Code #: 19 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Tony Kang | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 Brian Nguyen | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Grant Yolasan | pts 29 | Opp Speaker #2 Hailey Byrne | pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Made similar 3 points - "Technology improves lives": could have gone further.

Prop 2:
Good clear points - well done!

Opp 1: Did not understand the fish/mouse analogy. Good initial point that subjects should be treated equally, but I did not understand how humanities is about human feelings/love.

Opp 2:
Made a great point that everyone should have a choice. Not sure that "STEM People" have less social skills than liberal arts/humanities students.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Made, rebuttal the arguments that STEM should be mandatory. Opposition did not make counter claim.

# PARLI Debate

**Opher Peled (*15)**
Round 3B 1:30pm C1
Gov: 14 Fong - Geller
Opp: 10 Mao - Tong-Seely
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Opher Peled.

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 14 | | Team Code #: 10 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Natalie Fong | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 Jasmine Tong-Seely | pts 30 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Sofia Geller | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 Kevin Mao | pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Did well on definitions. A little confusion afterwards. Provided good facts from Time magazine.

Prop 2: Nicely stressed that this will save lives.

Opp 1: Great job. clear points regarding that wealth should not be determining factor alone.

Opp 2: Good job - not sure that public opinion should be the criteria.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Excellent analysis and arguments. Was not countered effectively by the prop team. Best debate so far !!!

# PARLI Debate

**Danica Tanquilut (*11)**
Round 3A 1:30pm D103
Gov: 14 Lyons - Wyszynski
Opp: 17 Raven - Sweeney
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Mariah Turner

Judge's School Affiliation: JLHS

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 14 | Team Code #: | 17 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Wyszynski pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 | Sweeney pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Lyons pts 26 | Opp Speaker #2 | Raven pts 26 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
- delivery was clear and concise, could be more fluid

-aside: you have a great hand shake

Prop 2:
- could have spoken louder

Opp 1:
- clear and directive tone

Opp 2:
- good interjection of humor
- could organize points so they are easy to follow

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

REASON FOR DECISION: While the Prop gave many reasons for why the teaching of STEM is beneficial in general, they did not prove that the skills gained in STEM should be prioritized at the high school level.

aside: "the world" is not a sufficient value criterion

# PARLI Debate

**Danica Tanquilut (*11)**
Round 3B 1:30pm D103
Gov: 21 Sundararaman - Elmhirst
Opp: 3 Duong - Kopelevich
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Mariah Turner

Judge's School Affiliation: JLHS

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 21 | | Team Code #: 3 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Elmhirst | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 Duong | pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Sundararaman | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 Kopelevich | pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
- could have more points to take up more time on the first speech
- swaying during speech is distracting

Prop 2:
- good coverage of opp's points

Opp 1:
- sign posting is helpful for organizing your arguments orally

Opp 2:
It is beneficial to refute your opponents' contentions with unique points, not just with your own case

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

REASON FOR DECISION: (1) Prop showed that wealthy countries have the capacity to aid refugees
(2) Prop has most lives saved

Resolution: HS. education should emphasize STEM over LA & H.

**PARLI Debate**

**Katrina Fehring (*21)**
Round 3A 1:30pm D105
Gov: 3 Greenwall - DuPuy
Opp: 23 Scott - Ambrose
Novice Parli Debate

2:10 pm

Judge's Name: Katrina Fehring

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 3 | Team Code #: | 23 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Greenwall pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 | Ambrose pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | DuPuy pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 | Scott pts 29 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: Didn't seem knowledgeable about what STEM is. Good loud speaking voice. Watch out for "um's" & "you knows". Good summary but finish fully before walking away.

note: psychology is a STEM subject.

Prop 2: Good clarification of resolution emphasizing STEM not eliminating. Could have expanded why/how critical thinking plays out in STEM vs LA/H.

Opp 1: ~~Good clarification of resolution emphasizing STEM, not eliminating~~ Did a good job pointing out errors made by Aff, especially lack of plan. Liked presentation style.

Opp 2: Liked confidence in speaking. Excellent job refuting Aff. Contentions. Could have expanded on role of humanities further in critical thinking.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp. had their contentions less refuted than Aff. Aff. failed to identify plan for implementing the proposed resolution. and did not fully defend their contentions.

Resolution: ~~[illegible]~~ Wealthy countries have moral obligation to accept refugees from war zones.

**PARLI Debate**

**Katrina Fehring (*21)**
Round 3B 1:30pm D105
Gov: 13 Karim - Kerstetter
Opp: 14 Luk - Tserennamid
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Katrina Fehring

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 13 | Team Code #: | 14 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Kerstetter pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | Luk 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/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:**

Prop 1: Good presence. Nice job laying out ~~contentions~~ responses to contentions. Good job staying focused on your pts. & not getting swayed away/distracted.

Prop 2: Initial speech not as strong, could have knocked out opp. contentions sooner but did excellent job of that in rebuttal. Good friendly demeanor, great speaker.

Opp 1: Great delivery. Organized & convincing. Would have liked to have seen more about impact on other countries. Good facts & citations.

Opp 2: Intelligent & calm demeanor & great smile. Did a great job refocusing contentions and offering alternatives. Good facts & citations

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Excellent debate. Had to go with Prop. because most closely argued to the specifics of resolution — refugees from war zones versus everyone and moral obligation versus required to do beyond means.

# PARLI Debate

~~Emma Sutton (*12)~~ BONNIE HAYNE
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: SONOMA ACADEMY

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 5 | Team Code #: | 14 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | THOMAS pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 | ZHANG pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | FIGUEROA pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 | SITU pts 27.5 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: THOMAS
Lots of good points + ideas
- Good flowing out of points
less ums, likes + other injections
Good eye contact
+ You lost a whole speaker point for bikini models
Nice try 2

Prop 2: FIGUEROA
Good roadmap + acknowledgements
Good refutation of speaker points - point by point
Looked down, poking your self while other speaker up - look engaged

Opp 1: ZHANG
Included acknowledgements
Good pace + delivery.
Strong summary
Good gestures + good closing

Opp 2: SITU
Nice acknowledgements
Started off less sure, but built
Strong finish with eye contact to

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both team had more points that carried.

# PARLI Debate

~~Emma Sutton ('12)~~ BONNIE HAYNE
Round 3B 1:30pm D107
Gov: 23 Barton - Madsen
Opp: 3 Brown - Helms
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: BONNIE HAYNE

Judge's School Affiliation: SONORA ACADEMY

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 23 | | Team Code #: 3 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 BARTON | pts 30 | Opp Speaker #1 BROWN | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 MADSEN | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 HELMS | pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: BARTON
Classy acknowledgment for asst
Good eye contact
Spoke rapidly but a lot of good points + excellent summary, refutation at the end

Prop 2: MADSEN
-diplomatic reminders of protocol - well done
Good statement of plan
Thank you for speaking at a good pace - good thinking on your feet

Opp 1: BROWN
Good differentiation of other teams definitions
Work on reducing information
Excellent vocabulary, intellect shows through
Work on carrying kleenex, having equipment ready

Opp 2: HELMS
Classy acknowledgment, good statement of plan
Excellent presence, eye contact + gestures
Work minimize your statements - keep them strong

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Had more points carried through + refuted all the other teams. Thanks for a good debate, teams!

# PARLI Debate

**Matt Petruska (*27)**
Round 3A 1:30pm D101
Gov: 12 Murdock -
Opp: 14 Lee - Duan
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Matt Petruska

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High School

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 12 | | Team Code #: 14 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Murdock | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 Duan | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Murdock | pts ____ | Opp Speaker #2 Lee | pts 25 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1:
(+) Very persuasive and clear speaker
I like how you took a deep breath before you started to relax.
Your delivery was good for the
refute to opp 1. Rebuttal used
Prop 2:
good argumentation

(-) First speech was very short 2:30
Nice recovery on the second rebuttal

Opp 1:
(+) Very well prepared and evidence was well put together. Excelent delivery.

Opp 2:
(+) A good support - Analysis to opp 1

(-) A little confused with contention

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop ~~had~~ a strong and persuasive argument and refutation in rebuttal. Finished strong and had good delivery.

# PARLI Debate

**Matt Petruska (*27)**
Round 3B 1:30pm D101
Gov: 3 Hemerling - Barnett
Opp: 25 Green - Nichols
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Matt Petruska

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High School

| PROP | | | OPP | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 3 | | Team Code #: | 25 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Hemerling | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | Nichols | pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Barnett | pts 26 | Opp Speaker #2 | Green | pts 27 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1:
(+) Very strong rebuttal with a thoughtful analysis. Clear and persuasive delivery. Rebuttal was the

Prop 2:
(+) thoughtful analysis that encouraged parli debate. Courtesy

Opp 1:
(+) Good perpetration of evidence Argument was persuasive

(-) A little rushed with delivery

Opp 2:
(+) Excelent delivery & cartesy.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
This was a very close debate in which the OPP clearly outlined the net benefits when defining as a value round. Their analysis for this argument was clear and persuasive

High School Education Should Emphasize STEM over Liberal Arts and Humanities

# PARLI Debate

**Yuyun Shang (*6)**
Round 3A 1:30pm C6
Gov: 27 Campanella - Petruska
Opp: 3 Lisy - Forman
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Yun Shang

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo [redacted] HS

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 27 | Team Code #: | 3 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Campanella pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | Lisy pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Petruska pts 29 | Opp Speaker #2 | Forman pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: * Clear organized contentions
* Could use more evidance and time
* Could elaborate the voting issues by adding explanations

Prop 2:
* Good point of clarification
* Could strengthen the case by more evidence
* Good catch of point of order

Opp 1: * Stronger rebuttal speech than first speech
* Could reduce repeating points in contentions

Opp 2: * good point of clarification of "National well-being"
* Could refute Aff's point of "Emphasize STEM ≠ Eliminate Libral Arts and Humanities"

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Slightly stronger refute.

Did a great job considering new to debate!

Wealthy Countries have a moral obligation to accept refuges from war zones.

# PARLI Debate

**Yuyun Shang (*6)**
Round 3B 1:30pm C6
Gov: 27 Little - Wagner
Opp: 3 Lanzone - Hubinger
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Yun Shang

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo HS

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 27 | | Team Code #: 3 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Little | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 Hubinger | pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Wagner | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 Lanzone | pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: * Clear difinitions and judging Criteria
* Clear contentions
* The 4th point in the rebuttal speech for voting issue was not clear to me.

Prop 2: * Great clarification on "space"
* Great refute on "China" example
* Could refute opp's counter plan better

Opp 1: * like the new plan introduced (case-by case)
* Could use more evidence

Opp 2: * Spoke very clearly (great speaker)
* Like the new plan (country).
* Refute points could be organized more logically

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

REASON FOR DECISION: slightly stronger rebuttal.

All kids are great speakers!

Res: Wealthy Countries

**Nadia Whitmore (*5)**
Round 3B 1:30pm D102
Gov: 19 Mart - Moran
Opp: 6 Goldblatt - McKinney
Novice Parli Debate

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Nadia Whitmore

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 19 | | Team Code #: 6 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 MART | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 Goldblatt | pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 MORAN | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 William McKinney | pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Great oral delivery
- Well organized and concise
- clearly defined the format.
- excellent POI: what is the basis that Wealthy country have the ability to do both Accept refugee and protect their own citizen.

Prop 2:
- improvement can be made by providing ~~better~~ additional evidence To support counter value points, in FRANCE, The ATTACK was by French, Belgian, and immigrants not refugees

Opp 1:

Opp 2: -
- Should use facts to negate opposition arguments FOR a contention
- Good job on identifying Terrorist were citizen and NOT Refugee

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
the opposition has succesfully argue that morality does NOT supperseed the safety of it's own citizen or Welfare.

3pm

~~Ashok Vijay (*10)~~ (13)
Round 3B 1:30pm C2
Gov: 19 Alcantra - Thompson
Opp: 14 Chan - Foley
Novice Parli Debate

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Vincent Banas

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

Team Code #: ~~[illegible]~~ Neg. 14 ⟷ Team Code #: ~~[illegible]~~ Aff 19

Prop Speaker #1 Chan pts 27 Opp Speaker #1 Alcantra pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Foley pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 Thompson pts 28

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

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

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
- started with a good case - showed confidence
- spoke clearly and was courteous
- Didn't use all of the time available.
- seemed to lose some passion and confidence in last Rebutt.

Prop 2:
- Good job citing specific evidence.
- Need to work to strengthen partners case in speech.
- Good delivery - clear and concise.

Opp 1:
- Good assertive delivery
- May slow down and deliver contentions/rebutts clearly + concisely.
- Good job addressing Aff contentions - listening to Aff contentions
- 2nd speech/rebutt - quite fast showed use time wisely

Opp 2:
- very clear and concise.
- Assertive delivery - showed confidence
- Made a good case for Neg. - able to refute one of Affs contentions

Changes in this were confirmed by judge!!

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp made a stronger case to oppose the Aff case. Opp was able to refute at least one of the Prop Contentions. It was close but Opp had more points standing at the end of the debate.

Novice Parli
Rd 3 Flt. B single flight
Room L2
Gov: 14 Kerr-Stein - Davidson
Opp: 13 Banas - Cummings

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Van Raesfeld

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 14 | | Team Code #: 13 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Davidson | pts 27.25 | Opp Speaker #1 Banas | pts 27.25 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Kerr-Stein | pts 27.75 | Opp Speaker #2 Cummings | pts 27.5 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: + eye contact, pleasant start, tried to remain calm - good job! you did not need to accuse them of lying and stoop to that level, your calm demeanor ~~spoke~~ was a better tactic

Prop 2:
+ excellent sportmanship & patience offering to argue under both definitions
+ good cadence, correct level of emotion good job

Opp 1: good start with smile but went negative with accusation of lying a bit too fast and furious.
- did not address refugees in 1st speech
+ good passion, just don't go to frantic tone

Opp 2:
+ best argument against definition
+ strong intro, ~~must~~
- seem a bit tired so not as good in eye contact

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Topicality - aff case was supported

# PARLI Debate

**Evan Hubinger (*3)**
Round 3A 1:30pm C5
Gov: 12 Santana - Bazile
Opp: 14 Holwitz - Kay
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Evan Hubinger

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

| PROP | | | OPP | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 12 | | Team Code #: | 14 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Bazile | pts 27.5 | Opp Speaker #1 | Holwitz | pts 28.5 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Santana | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 | Kay | pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good arguments, good refutations, but I think you need to work on your impact calculus and strategic thinking—learn to capitalize on your opponents mistakes both as above,

Prop 2: strong arguments, good refutations, but see ~~of you~~ in this round I did my

Opp 1: Very impressive style! Your arguments and speaking is really strong, but you need to work on your strategic vision so you can see when a contradiction might cost you

Opp 2: Watch out for double turns! Your speech was really strong—good arguments, style—but your contradiction lost you the debate, (low-point win) for you, but most judges won't see it.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

the ~~negative~~ affirmative both argues that they save more lives and that saving lives is bad, which means affirmative is superior.

# PARLI Debate

**Evan Hubinger (*3)**
Round 3B 1:30pm C5
Gov: 21 Harris - Marr
Opp: 5 Pashman - Ralston
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Evan Hubinger

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 21 | Team Code #: | 5 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Timmy Harris pts 26.5 | Opp Speaker #1 | Ella Pashman pts 29.5 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Austin Marr pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 | Nadia Ralston pts 28.5 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1:
Try to work on using more of your time. Arguments are solid, but need more development. This is probably a prep issue.

Prop 2:
Same as above, good arguments, but need more development + refutation.

Opp 1: Really excellent impact analysis — it shows a lot of strategic vision — which is the key to winning debates. I can't believe you're in novice.

Opp 2:
Very good argumentation and refutation, as well as strategic focus.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp wins that the citizens and refugees would be better off without acceptance from wealthy countries. Prop only provides defensive answers.

DOUG BARTON

~~Nadeem Alam ('19)~~

Round 4A 3:30pm D103

Gov: 14 Luk - Tserennamid

Opp: 6 Kang - Yolasan

Novice Parli Debate

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: DOUG BARTON

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 14 | Team Code #: | 6 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | ~~KYANG~~ LUK pts 29 | Opp Speaker #1 | ~~LUK~~ KANG pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | ~~YOLASAN~~ ~~TSER~~ TSERENNAMID pts 29 | Opp Speaker #2 | ~~TSERENNAMID~~ YOLASAN pts 28 |

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

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

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Strong, animated delivery
Good, specific examples used in arguments.
Good closing

Prop 2: Strong, clear speaker
Efficient summary of arguments
Go

Opp 1: Clear voice. Solid argumentation.
A bit repetitive.

Opp 2: Nice speaking style. Good point by point refutations

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Efficient argumentation for the Prop wins the debate.
Strong, specific evidence combined with personal examples added to their effort.

DOUG BARTON
~~Nadeem Alam (*19)~~
Round 4B 3:30pm D103
Gov: 3 Brown - Helms
Opp: 21 Sundararaman - Elmhirst
Novice Parli Debate

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: DOUG BARTON

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 3 | | Team Code #: 21 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 BROWN | pts ~~28~~ 27 | Opp Speaker #1 ELMHIRST | pts 30 |
| Prop Speaker #2 ~~SUNDARARAMAN~~ HELMS | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 SUNDARAMAN | pts ~~28~~ 27 |

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

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

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Clear voice. Try to be a bit less fidgety. Much improved closing statement versus opening!

Prop 2: Affable. Nice speaking style. Like your passion. Good counter-arguments. Not rattled under pressure.

Opp 1: Nice, animated speaking delivery. Great logical arguments and counter-arguments — especially on the importance of competitor to the topic! Good "thinking on your feet."

Opp 2: Good eye contact. Nice use of personal story. Solid arguments

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Clearer, more logical definition of topic, ~~and argumentation~~ Followed by logical argumentation.

Standoff in Oregon is a serious threat to national security

**PARLI Debate**

**Eszter Erdelyi (*14)**
Round 4A 3:30pm C2
Gov: 10 Lee - Wang
Opp: 12 Santana - Bazile
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: E ERDÉLYI

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 10 | Team Code #: | 12 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | LEE pts 29 | Opp Speaker #1 | BAZILE pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | WANG pts 29 | Opp Speaker #2 | SANTANA pts 28 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: VERY CLEAR ORGANIZATION
GOOD RESPONSE OT POIS

Opp 1: EXCELLENT VOICE SPEECH VERY GOOD / EASY TO FOLLOW ORGANIZATION. POWERFUL RHETHORICAL QUESTION. GOOD POI REACTION

Prop 2: VERY GOOD ANALYSIS
3 DIFFERENT STRONG ANALYSIS LINES SUPPORTING THE CONTENTIONS
THE DEFINITION OF THE US AS A SAFE PLACE WAS LESS PRECISE

Opp 2: VERY GOOD HANDLING POIS
MAY I SUGGEST TO TELL THE JUDGE IN ADVANCE IN MORE DETAIL WHAT YOU ARE GOING TO SAY, USE "SHOULD" LESS AS THAT IS YOUR OWN JUDGEMENT NOT A FACT/EVIDENCE

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

REASON FOR DECISION: THE MAIN CONTENTION OF PRECEDENT CREATION WAS NOT REFUTED EFFECTIVELY BY THE OPP SIDE. THE FACT THAT VIOLENCE HAS NOT HAPPENED YET AND EVEN THAT IT IS UNLIKELY TO HAPPEN DOES NOT TAKE AWAY FROM THE POINT THAT PRECEDENT LIKE THIS IS A THREAT

# PARLI Debate

**Eszter Erdelyi (*14)**
Round 4B 3:30pm C2
Gov: 12 Green - Madison
Opp: 21 Harris - Marr
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ESZTER ERDELYI

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 12 | Team Code #: | 21 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | GREEN pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | HARRIS pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | MADISON pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 | MARR pts 29 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: VERY COINCISE SPEECH BUT A LITTLE BRIEF. MAY I SUGGEST LAYING OUT THE ARGUMENTS A LITTLE MORE - SUPPORT EACH WITH EXAMPLE/FACT/EXPAND TO ALL STUDENTS NOT JUST THE ONES WITH NEED

Prop 2: YOU HIT UPON THE BEST ARGUMENT: OPPORTUNITY IS NOT GETTING A DEGREE. IF YOU SYSTEMATICALLY EXPLORED THAT THAT COULD HAVE BEEN VERY STRONG

Opp 1: GOOD ORGANIZATION - GOOD LIST OF ARGUMENTS. THE ONE STATEMENT ABOUT SCHOLARSHIPS WAS NOT SUPPORTED - "CAN YOU REALLY GET ENOUGH $ TO GRADUATE JUST ON HARD WORK?"

Opp 2: MOST EVIDENCE AND GOOD EFFECTIVE RESPONSE TO PROP CONTENTIONS ABOUT "PEOPLE ARE LAZY" GOOD DELIVERY

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

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

The USFG should guarantee citizens access to free higher education

# PARLI Debate

**Pauline Honaryar (*15)**
Round 4B 3:30pm C4
Gov: 19 Le - Rather
Opp: 3 Hemerling - Barnett
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Pauline Honaryar

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

| PROP | | | OPP | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 19 | | Team Code #: | 3 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Le | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | Hemerling | pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Rather | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 | Barnett | pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: good job presenting the topic and contentions; good pickup of the ineffectiveness of personal evidence presented by opponent to today's stds.

Prop 2: soft calm speaker; pleasant speaking voice. good delivery; response to Socialism argument effective.

Opp 1: Strong analysis overall. good pickup on lack of key points presented w/in the opponents case (ie funding & method) excellent argumentation and response breaking down opponents evidence; excellent delivery and communicative response; professional & effective

Opp 2:
- good attempt bringing personal evidence
- good overal voice & delivery.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Strong debate; mainly because the opponent disputed the resolution as worded and insisted on their verbal modification/understanding & limitations

# PARLI Debate

**Cindy Bulger (*23)**
Round 4B 3:30pm D107
Gov: 17 Raven - Sweeney
Opp: 14 Kerr-Stein - Davidson
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley

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

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: You have a very nice speaking style but your opening speech was less than 4 minutes. Spend more time developing your ideas

Prop 2: Arguments matched up well against the neg points.

Opp 1: Excellent speaking style. Well organized points. I think that the issue for me was the benefit to US. citizens vs. US government extra spending

Opp 2: The presentation of your thoughts was a bit unorganized but overall a good job

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Value was not benefit to US citizens and neg argued more about the impact on the US government.

# PARLI Debate

**Ritu Khurana (*10)**
Round 4B 3:30pm C5
Gov: 14 Chan - Foley
Opp: 13 Karim - Kerstetter
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ashish Khurana

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School.

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 14 | | Team Code #: 13 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Chan | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 Kerstetter | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Foley | pts 29 | Opp Speaker #2 Karim | pts 27 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1:

Opp 1:

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Very close debate. Outside of values vs policy discussions, most arguments were comparable. Prop won on presentation.

# PARLI Debate

**Ritu Khurana (*10)**
Round 4A 3:30pm C5
Gov: 3 Lanzone - Hubinger
Opp: 19 Mart - Moran
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ashish Khurana

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 3 | | Team Code #: 19 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Hubinger | pts 29 | Opp Speaker #1 Moran | pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Lanzone | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 Mart | pts 27 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

| Prop 1: | Opp 1: |
|---|---|
| Prop 2: | Opp 2: |

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The main argument from Prop on about key characteristics of a terrorist org and linking that to current standoff was the key reason Prop won the debate.

# PARLI Debate

**Cindy Bulger (*23)**
Round 4A 3:30pm D107
Gov: 19 Byrne - Nguyen
Opp: 14 Woo - Melman
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 19 | Team Code #: | 14 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Byrne pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | Melman pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Nguyen pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 | Woo pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Nice summary of points as the debate moved along.
I liked that you had a good understanding of your points and positions so that you rarely used your notes

Prop 2:
Nice summary & presentation

Opp 1: You had extra time at the end. Could have used that time to add to your position
I did like the way you posed a question as part of your presentation. It does get the judges

Opp 2: attention
You spent a lot of time answering more than one question by the Aff, you need to take

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Just did not see the strong link between the Oregon standoff & the national security.

The Stand off in Oregon is a serious threat to national Security.

# PARLI Debate

**Pauline Honaryar (*15)**
Round 4A 3:30pm C4
Gov: 10 Mao - Tong-Seely
Opp: 14 Masuda-Thaya - Sun
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Pauline Honaryar

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte.

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 10 | Team Code #: | 14 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Tong-Seely pts 29 | Opp Speaker #1 | Sun pts 29 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Mao pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 | Masuda-Thaya pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Strong delivery; very clear analysis; speaking with great conviction and authority.

Prop 2: Analysis used vast jump on conclusions reached; perhaps work on improving evidence presented. Clear speaking voice!

Opp 1: Excellent argumentation of the opponent's evidence.
- clear delivery and very easy to follow logic/reasoning.
- excellent use of subtle personalization of evidence.

Opp 2: very direct responses to the opponent's evidence.
- use changes of tone of speech to keep the interest strong.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

logically simple presentation overall. Both had great speaking voices.

# PARLI Debate

**Kathleen von Raesfeld (*25)**
Round 4A 3:30pm C3
Gov: 6 Goldblatt - McKinney
Opp: 19 Phan - Phan
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: VonRaesfeld

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 6 | Team Code #: | 19 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Phan, Katherine (Goldblatt) pts 27.5 | Opp Speaker #1 | Phan, Katherine pts 28.75 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Phan, Kenny (McKinney) pts 27.25 | Opp Speaker #2 | Phan, Kenny pts 27.5 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: + good job on a challenging case!
- remember to pause for an important point showing this impact on your case

Prop 2: + professional appearance
+ good job thinking on your feet to establish that many people identify with the farmers plight
- try not to sway

Opp 1: + excellent pace, clear case presented
+ fluid speeches are compelling
- when your partner pointed out their mistake @ Oregon vs Washington you should not point it out again - seems petty

Opp 2: - need to stay organized with the opponents flow
+ great job supporting your case, terms, easy to follow cadence

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Did not prove significance/magnitude

# PARLI Debate

**Kathleen von Raesfeld (*25)**
Round 4B 3:30pm C3
Gov: 5 Pashman - Ralston
Opp: 27 Campanella - Petruska
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: VonRaesfeld

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 5 | Team Code #: | 27 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Ralston pts 28.75 | 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 on the following scale:**

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: + good definitions, timeline & example
- OK to pause, don't need to rush b/c good passion as a speaker is in your voice.
+ Using a pause shows confidence
+ good point about working hard to get into best school - wish it was said earlier
Prop 2: + good point about affordability of extra-curriculars
remember not to start with a negative
Fast pace can seem frantic - pause for impact
tone vs other team
+ great presentation style & fluidity once started ... Keep papers organized so you are ready

Opp 1: + like your "attack" to solvency, strong points given to argue case
+ perfect balance of passion & fact
- mid speech is a good time to pause for impact & power stance, strong parts show confidence
Opp 2: + like calm style, like pointing out Germany as a new success, excellent topic knowledge
+ Strongest point was VIP - How do we pay for this?
well done
- swaying is compelling but try to stand in "power stance" for just a little bit of time. It shows confidence

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Did not solve for inherency - good benefits but How do we get there?

THE STANDOFF IN OREGON IS A SERIOUS THREAT TO NATIONAL SECURITY

# PARLI Debate

**Mark Cabasino (*13)**
Round 4A 3:30pm C6
Gov: 21 Burrous - Griggy
Opp: 3 Greenwall - DuPuy
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: CABASINO

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 21 | Team Code #: | 3 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | BURROUS pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 | GREENWALL pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | GRIGGY pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 | DUPUY pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

**Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:** (Sorry, wrote comments in wrong boxes, my bad) ☺

Prop 1: Good job explaining potential dangers of armed protestors. Good recap in speech 3 with emphasis on "implicit" threat and good analogy/example about not wanting to feed a loved one to the pack.

Opp 1: PROP 2 ☺
Good focus on Amendment 1 and good discussion of "implicit threat." Also good discussion of potential harm to Gov't reputation. Try to use more of your time?

OPP 1

Prop 2: Good points about no harm yet, good definition of "serious threat," good discussion of terrorism and why this isn't 9/11. Be sure to have contentions in speech 1.

Opp 2: Good clarification of contentions. Good discussion of Paris and ISIS as not being equal to Oregon's situation. Good emphasis on fact rather than hypothetical

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Though the debate had areas of weakness and spots for improvement on both sides, ultimately OPP had the more convincing arguments, due to definitions ("serious") and facts vs hypothetical, as well as comparisons of Oregon to terrorism.

USFG should guarantee citizens access to free higher education.

**Mark Cabasino (*13)**
Round 4B 3:30pm C6
Gov: 22 Keshav - Wei
Opp: 14 Yan - Shponko
Novice Parli Debate

# PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: CABASINO

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

**PROP** Team Code #: 22

Prop Speaker #1 WEI pts 26

Prop Speaker #2 KESHAV pts 26

**OPP** Team Code #: 14

Opp Speaker #1 YAN pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 SHPONKO pts 27

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

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

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good articulation of current problems and dip some potential benefits from free education. Since this is a policy debate be sure to have a clearer plan of what you'll do — don't wait until speech 3.

Prop 2: Good point about college having more potential impact than elementary school. You said not all colleges would be free, just some — again, clarify plan.

Opp 1: Good list of reasons as to why this idea isn't feasible — 1C on costs, and 2C on how everyone would want in on this free education. 3C (redirect funds) and 4C (dilute value of degree) were also strong. Good discussion of scholarships + loans in speech 3.

Opp 2: Good Rebo of points in your case (quality of education, not enough teachers, increased taxes) to prove why this plan won't work.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Logical list of disadvantages to this potential plan.
AFF needs to work on specifics of creating a plan.
Also work on fleshing out speeches to use more of your time.

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

Judge's Name: K. Cheng

Judge's School Affiliation: San Mateo

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 23 | Team Code #: | 12 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Scott pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | Murdock pts 26 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Ambrose pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 | Same pts 26 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: More eye contact needed
More arguments given than Neg.

Opp 1: Unclear about definition of "serious".

Prop 2: More convincing than Neg. – More organized than Neg

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

(Prop) Much more organized arguments given.

Aff 1

- gun law causing harm

1st cont. - racism

This is a "white man't

2nd cont. - These people occupy fed'l bldg

3rd cont - Govt is slow in taking actions

Aff 2

- Blacks may protest inaction of police

Neg 1

Good pts in mentioning this is not about gun law or racism

- "small" contained incident

1st Cont - This is "contained" Not nationwide threat

2nd cont. - no death

Neg. 2

Govt tries not to escalate

The USFG should guarantee free 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. Cheng

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 14 | Team Code #: | 6 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Holwitz | Opp Speaker #1 | Brouhard |
| pts | 29 | pts | 26 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Kay | Opp Speaker #2 | Welch |
| pts | 29 | pts | 26 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good eye contact. Poised. Methodical in presenting arguments.

Opp 1: Contract own statement. Disorganized.

Prop 2: Good at presenting contentions & arguments.

Opp 2: More coherent arguments needed.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Plans debate, net benefit or not

Aff 1

2.4 PGA or higher

agents – Dept of ed

2017

More minorities enrolled

Citing Canada as evidence

Neg 1

- Counterplan – free only for families w/ income less than $250,000
- Decrease wealth gap

Rebute-

Aff 2

- Had pt raised re: GPA reqmt
- only free for students who work hard in high school regardless the race

2nd Cont – encourage racial diversity actually helps Neg.

Neg 2

# PARLI Debate

**Bill Holt (*3)**
Round 4A 3:30pm D105
Gov: 13 Banas - Cummings
Opp: 14 Lyons - Wyszynski
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Holt

Judge's School Affiliation: Barry

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 13 | Team Code #: | 14 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Banas pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | Lyons pts 28.5 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Cummings pts 27.8 | Opp Speaker #2 | Wyszynski pts 28 |

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

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

Barry a little more background on Oregon & WACO would be great.

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1: clearly laid out excellent speaker

Opp 1: you made it seem truely laughable.

Prop 2: good + clear — brought up great points.

Opp 2: good support of opp1 and good argumentation

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop did a great job but in end I felt opp argued against their facts enough that was hard to believe it could be a "serious threat to national security!"

# PARLI Debate

**Bill Holt (*3)**
Round 4B 3:30pm D105
Gov: 13 Garcia - Acosta
Opp: 14 Dickerman - Millar
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Holt - Jenny

Judge's School Affiliation: Bently

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 13 | | Team Code #: 14 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Acosta | pts 28.5 | Opp Speaker #1 Dickerman | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Garcia | pts 28.7 | Opp Speaker #2 Millar | pts 28 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: great job a laying out debate - very clear

Opp 1: very good opening cost was good point - just needed a bit more analysis/evidence.

Prop 2: excellent argumentation / hit all points clearly

Opp 2: Millar: nice job! no issues.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

overall better argumentation and contentions had stronger hold. excellent delivery.

# PARLI Debate

**Peter Brown (*27)**
Round 4A 3:30pm C1
Gov: 3 Duong - Kopelevich
Opp: 23 Barton - Madsen
Novice Parli Debate

The Stadium in Oregon is a threat to national security

Judge's Name: Peter Brown

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 3 | | Team Code #: 23 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Duong | pts 26 | Opp Speaker #1 Barton | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Kopelevich | pts 26 | Opp Speaker #2 Madsen | pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: 1:59 / 1:02
Very briefly said talking points.
Need to use more time on clock to strengthen points

No references or citations

Prop 2: 1:51
Need to use time allowed to refute and strengthen arguments.
No references or citation

Opp 1: Good organization
Refuted all points
Good delivery
Good use of time

6:48 / 5:09

Opp 2: Stray voice.
Good evidence

4:18

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The Opp wins because:
Refuted all points. made great arguments and had good voter points

# PARLI Debate

**Peter Brown (*27)**
Round 4B 3:30pm C1
Gov: 10 Vijay - Cramer
Opp: 14 Fong - Geller
Novice Parli Debate

USFG should guarantee citizens access to free higher education

Judge's Name: Peter Brown

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

| PROP | | | OPP | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 10 | | Team Code #: | 14 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Vijay | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 | Geller | pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Cramer | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 | Fong | pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Confident speaker.
First speech start could have used more time to strengthen case or provide more points
Good job in rebuttal

Prop 2:
Strong voice. Speaks clear.
Refuted Opp's pnt. Good use of time

Opp 1: Good use of time
Didn't give any references or citations for info.
Need to be more confident.

Opp 2: Good argumentation.
Good delivery.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The prop successfully refuted the opps case. The opp didn't do as well with delivery.

# PARLI Debate

**Abbas Rangwala (*8)**
Round 4A 3:30pm D108
Gov: 25 Green - Nichols
Opp: 3 McDonald - Thani
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ABBAS RANGWALA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS.

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 25 | Team Code #: | 3 |
| Prop Speaker #1 NICHOLS | pts 27.5 | Opp Speaker #1 McDONALD | pts 27.5 |
| Prop Speaker #2 GREEN | pts 28 | Opp Speaker #2 THANI | pts ABSENT |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: NICHOLS
ANA — 3
EVI — 3
ARG — 3
POI — N/A
DEL — ~~3~~ 3.5
COU — 4

Prop 2: GREEN
ANA — 3
EVI — 3
ARG — 3.5
POI — N/A
DEL — 4
COU — 4

Opp 1: McDONALD
ANA — 3
EVI — 3
ARG — 3
POI — N/A
DEL — 4
COU — 3.5

Opp 2: "ABSENT"
ANA —
EVI —
ARG —
POI —
DEL —
COU —
} N/A

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

IT SEEMS BOTH TEAMS STRUGGLED QUITE 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!

# PARLI Debate

**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: DVHS.

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 19 | Team Code #: | 5 |
| Prop Speaker #1 | PAREJA pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | THOMAS pts 28 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | ANDOLA pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 | FIGUEROA pts 29 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: PAREJA

ANA — 3
EVI — 3
ARG — 3
POI — 4
DEL — 4
COU — 4

- GOOD PRESENTATION
- TRY TO AVOID READING & MAKE EYE CONTACT
- BE MORE ASSERTIVE

Prop 2: ANDOLA

ANA — 2.5
EVI — 3
ARG — 2.5
POI — 4
DEL — 3
COU — 4

- WORK ON PRESENTATION A BIT
- MAKE CRISP ARGUMENTS.

Opp 1: THOMAS

ANA — 3.5
EVI — 3
ARG — 3.5
POI — 3
DEL — 4
COU — 4

TRY TO MAKE EYE CONTACTS

Opp 2: FIGUEROA

ANA — 4
EVI — 4
ARG — 4
POI — 2.5
DEL — 4.5
COU — 4

- BE LESS FIDGETY. AVOIDING CHEWING GUM WOULD HELP.
- GOOD DELIVERY & ARGUMENTS.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

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

# PARLI Debate

~~John Brouhard (*6)~~
Round 4A 3:30pm D109
Gov: 3 Lisy - Forman
Opp: 27 Little - Wagner
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Gilbert yee

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell.

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: | 3 | Team Code #: | 27. |
| Prop Speaker #1 | Lisy pts 28 | Opp Speaker #1 | Little pts 28.5 |
| Prop Speaker #2 | Forman. pts 28. | Opp Speaker #2 | Wagner. pts 29 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good points bringing up the potential of setting a precedence. If can cite a specific example can help the team to win. Good delivery overall.

Prop 2: Good try using the tactic relate to social order & political insecurity. Will be great success if very specific example can be given.

Opp 1: Good summary of situation at its current state.

Opp 2: Very good speech → natural speaker. All the points made clearly. Arguments are very strong.

**TEAM CODE #:** 2 **on the** OPP. **wins this debate.** Albert yee 9/10/16.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Good analysis of situation overall and presented better argument, Prop team has some nice points but argument not as sound due to lack of evidence of violence already existing.

1). political security → social order
will set a precedence.
thread will escalate.

2). More like a 'Fag' party.
Party out of control? No violence.
No comparison to ISIS.
Lack of escalation.
There is no arrest!

3). Why is being debated all over country if only a party.
They have guns.
This not peaceful.
Police working on warrant for arrest.
Social order. disrupt → ...
French revolution started w/ Lots.

4). Little food. —
No escalation since 7 days?
Nice wrap up
natural speaker.

5). No gun were fired.
2nd amendment allowing owning a gun.
where is the violence.
fading out of a news.
provided a good comparison to
ISIS. — nothing to be found.
Cannot Escalate.

6). political security → terrorism
Network security → revolution.

# PARLI Debate

~~John Brouhard (*6)~~
Round 4B 3:30pm D109
Gov: 19 Fong - Ligutan
Opp: 3 Dovichi - Vetterli
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Albert Lee.

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell -

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: 19. | | Team Code #: 3 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Ligutan | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #1 Vetterli | pts 27 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Fong. | pts 27 | Opp Speaker #2 Dovichi | pts 27 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Points made don't directly support the need to guarantee free higher education.

Prop 2: Could be a stronger argument if say the A- students must be offered.

Opp 1: Should have proposed a better plan than the resolution of allowing GPA 3.0 to go for free.

Opp 2: only the best must be guaranteed to have free access will sell better - Good efforts everyone.

**TEAM CODE #:** 3 **on the** Opp. **wins this debate.** Albert Lee 1-10-16.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp team is overall stronger in their argument.

1). Standard of living ↓ Competition,

everyone a chance.

B-avg ?

2). Eliminate lower/working class.

- funding ?

College is a goal to achieve

B-avg may not be good enough..

3). Many benefits - future ?

Set a role model for others.

It means global competition.

Why no one mention education cost is too high.

free → B ?

4).

5). Need balance of society.

Need a lot of funding !

Something to strive for.

6). No counter plan offered.

# PARLI Debate

**Elizabeth Murphy (*5)**
Round 4A 3:30pm D102
Gov: 14 Lee - Duan
Opp: 10 Khurana - Darukhanawalla
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Elizabeth Murphy

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

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: ~~Duan~~ 14 | | Team Code #: 10 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Duan | pts 25 | Opp Speaker #1 Khorana | pts 25 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Lee | pts 25 | Opp Speaker #2 Darukhanawalla | pts 25 |

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

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

## Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Good use of time
Need better analysis + organization.
very sweet + respectful.

Prop 2:
good but need to better recite evidence + organization.

Opp 1:
Good rebuttal.
seemed to lose focus a bit.
~~very sweet + polite~~.

Opp 2: good job

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Argument for Prop was a bit unclear, and did not prove that group in Oregon were terrorists under their definition. Could have provided more background on stand-off, i.e. how long been in effect, where in Oregon (on federal land), issues being promoted by group.

# PARLI Debate

**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.

| PROP | | OPP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Team Code #: ~~14~~ 14 | | Team Code #: 19 | |
| Prop Speaker #1 Zhang | pts 25 | Opp Speaker #1 Alcantra | pts 25 |
| Prop Speaker #2 Situ | pts 25 | Opp Speaker #2 Thompson | pts 24 |

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

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

Prop 1:
Argument well-organized. Presentation a bit repetitive. Best to state arguments once rather than making same argument over & over.

Prop 2: Good rebuttal

Opp 1:
Can tell she was prepared but tough to argue 2.5 GPA means a student is average. Would not generalize so much because could be misinterpreted. Articulate.

Opp 2:
Need to do more preparation to organize thoughts. Voice at appropriate tone.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
See above.