

PARLI Debate

Emma Sutton (*12)

Round 1B 9:00am J2
Gov: 14 White - Hall
Opp: 27 Galli - Girimonte
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: E. Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: 12 (JSHS)

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 27

Prop Speaker #1 Hall pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Galli pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 White pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Girivante pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Excellent speeches! Good pacing, well reasoned arguments. Very nice final summary - hit needed points without wasting time.

Opp 1: Very interesting arguments with a very tough topic! Kant argument definitely helped your case, although could easily have gone across as too cold-blooded had debate gone in a different direction.

Prop 2: Good job covering both your & their case. Point on Kant's system of justice was good.

Opp 2: Nice signposting, easy to follow, but you conceded too many points. Couldn't clearly explain why retribution is ~~not~~ needed in order to deter crime.

TEAM CODE #: 14 on the Prop wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: (Prop or Opp) Neg was unable to clearly articulate why retribution was necessary. In final speech, changed definition to reverse, which was a new argument. Aff successfully argued that you cannot quantify suffering, and neg's arguments were muddled & ended up benefiting ~~aff~~.

PARLI Debate

James Nerny (*6)
Round 1A 9:00am D202
Gov: 5 Moser - Murphy
Opp: 14 Chin - Rosenfeld
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: JAMES NERNY
Judge's School Affiliation: _____

Team Code #: PROP 5 Team Code #: OPP 14
Prop Speaker #1 MURPHY pts 28 Opp Speaker #1 CHIN pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 MOSER pts 29 Opp Speaker #2 ROSENFELD pts 30

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
VERY GOOD PREVIEW
OF MAJOR POINTS FOR
PROPOSITION REBUTTAL!

Opp 1:
NEEDED TO IMPROVE
DEFINITION OF
ILLEGITIMATE
GOOD PRESENCE
GOOD USE OF LANGUAGE

Prop 2:
VERY, VERY GOOD
ANALYSIS
SPEAKING WAS
RAPID FIRE

Opp 2:
EXCELLENT PRESENCE!
CLEAR VOCAL DELIVERY!
NEED GREATER DEPTH
OF ANALYSIS

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
WINNING TEAM GAVE A MORE FITTING
DEFINITION OF TERMS AND PRESENTED
RELEVANT EVIDENCE

low point win

PARLI Debate

Karina Giang (*8)

Round 1B 9:00am L1
Gov: 14 Wilcox - Sutton
Opp: 3 Holt - Mizin
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: KARINA GIANG

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 3

Prop Speaker #1 Sutton pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Holt pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Wilcox pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Mizin 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: *Well organized and speech delivered professionally*

Opp 1: *Speech delivered very clearly and stayed calm during the whole debate.*

Prop 2: *Organized and good examples provided.*

Opp 2: *Good job at putting the evidence nicely.*

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

REASON FOR DECISION: *It was a very good debate and both side had done a great job. I enjoyed it very much. 14 won because their points are more clear.*

PARLI Debate

Judge 1 (*17)

Round 1A 9:00am H1
Gov: 25 Greenberg - Kolling
Opp: 8 Sawhney - Giang
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Janet Cooper
Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

Team Code #: PROP 25

Team Code #: OPP 8

Prop Speaker #1 Kolling pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Swahney pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Greenberg pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Giang pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Great POI's!
Delivery was great
Good analysis and responses

Opp 1:

Great response to Prop.
Analysis was good
Evidence was great

Prop 2:

Great POI's
Delivery was great

Opp 2:

- Didn't respond well to the POI's
- Speak slower and clear. - was confusing at times
- Seemed nervous.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Better performance and facts. Great response to POI's and had great POI's to opponents.

PARLI Debate

Judge 1 (*17)

Round 1B 9:00am H1

Gov: 15 Aguilera - Zhou

Opp: 8 Bardalai - Rangwala

Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Janet Cooper

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

Team Code #: PROP 15

Team Code #: OPP 8

Prop Speaker #1 Aguilera pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Bardalai pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Zhou pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Rangwala 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:

- Stated only 1 fact to support Analysis.
- Evidence was weak
- Great response to POI's
- Would like examples of Prop 2: retribution/punishment

Opp 1:

- Great POI's and responses
- Good multiple sources for your Evidence and to support your argument

Opp 2:

- Great POI's
- Great responses to POI's
- Analysis + Evidence was convincing

TEAM CODE #: 8 on the Opp wins this debate.

(Prop) (Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The Evidence and multiple sources for argument were convincing.

PARLI Debate

James Nerny (*6)
Round 1B 9:00am D202
Gov: 15 Baum - Honaryar
Opp: 21 Cao - Gunn
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: JAMES NERNY
Judge's School Affiliation: CAMPOLINO

Team Code #: PROP 15 Team Code #: OPP 21
Prop Speaker #1 HONARYAR pts 29 Opp Speaker #1 CAO pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 BAUM pts 28 Opp Speaker #2 GUNN 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:

<p>Prop 1: -STRONG START WITH GREAT STORY OF ROMAN DAYS -GOOD ORGANIZATION w/ 3 PT PREVIEW -NEED BETTER EVIDENCE</p>	<p>Opp 1: STRONG VOICE! GOOD PREVIEW / GOOD CHARACTERIZATION OF OPPONENTS ARGUMENT</p>
<p>Prop 2: GREAT FLOW OF STRONG ANALYSIS! PERSUASIVE USE OF WORDS 21</p>	<p>Opp 2: GREAT ORGANIZATION -DID GREAT JOB OF ANALYSING OTHER TEAMS ARGUMENT!</p>

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

WINNING TEAM GAVE A MORE FITTING DEFINITION OF TERMS AND USED GOOD EVIDENCE

PARLI Debate

Doug Barton (*23)

Round 1A 9:00am D204
Gov: 15 Kapoor - Berger
Opp: 19 Gil - Kaur
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: DOUG BARTON

Judge's School/Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY

PROP
Team Code #: 15

OPP
Team Code #: 19

Prop Speaker #1 KAPOOR pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 JAGEET KAUR pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 BERGER pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 ANDREA GIL 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: *Well spoken, good eye contact, could keep the opening a bit more simple. After that, good job of outlining the PROP case!*

Prop 2: *Great passion! Strong debate skills. Slow speaking just a bit for enumeration.*

Opp 1: *Great, clear voice. Calm analysis of the resolution. Good use of personal story. Logically refuted the affirmative*

Opp 2: *Good examples of government issues. Good passion!*

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Made more on-point arguments against the affirmative. Had source material to back up arguments, including use of citations. A very close debate!

PARLI Debate

Doug Barton (*23)

Round 1B 9:00am D204
Gov: 14 Dahan - Williams-Baron
Opp: 16 Herman - Sweeney
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: DOUG BARTON

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 16

Prop Speaker #1 BARON pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 HERMAN pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 DAHAN pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 SWEENEY 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: *Affable. Good layout of resolution. Good examples of evidence (Calif, Nordic)*

Prop 2: *Confident. Great, logical POI*

Opp 1: *Great opening and the distinction between general/specific. Clear, strong speaking. Animated! pointed out logical fallacy with affirmations*

Opp 2: *Clear, confident, logical. Good response to POI*

TEAM CODE #: 16 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Solid logic refuted the resolution. Clear argumentation and use of points of information

PARLI Debate

Vincent Banas (*13)

Round 1A 9:00am J3
Gov: 14 Krause - Hwong
Opp: 16 Hsieh - Roy
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Vincent Banas

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 16

Prop Speaker #1 Krause pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Hsieh pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Hwong pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Roy 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: *Spoke with confidence and delivered Evidence with passion*
- was too rushed - spoke very quickly - could slow delivery.

Opp 1: *- started to fast, but slowed pace and became more clear and concise after 1st speech*
- made Good eye contact and delivery case well.

Prop 2: *Clear speaker*
Good confidence

Opp 2: *- Very clear and concise speaker*
- Assertive delivery - confident

TEAM CODE #: 16 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: *more effectively argued to the definition and cited more cases for their position. Prop case required more opinion from the judge - not enough Evidence cited.*

PARLI Debate

Vincent Banas (*13)

Round 1B 9:00am J3
Gov: 8 Yu - Makineni
Opp: 15 Stephen - Miskelley
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Vincent Banas

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

PROP
Team Code #: 8

OPP
Team Code #: 15

Prop Speaker #1 Yu pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Miskelley pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Makineni pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Stephen 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: spoke clearly + conf. distly
- maybe a little rushed.
- good use of facts/Evidence

Opp 1: spoke clearly - could look up more - ~~make~~ more eye contact.
- spoke with confidence and passion.

Prop 2: - Clear + concise
- spoke assertively.

Opp 2: Very clear speaker - made good eye contact and showed confidence

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff/Prop did not fully prove that distribution has **NO** place in the legal system.

PARLI Debate

Opher Peled (*15)

Round 1A 9:00am D203
Gov: 21 Masters - Fehring
Opp: 6 Jia - Jiang
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Opher Peled

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PROP

OPP

Team Code #: _____

Team Code #: _____

Prop Speaker #1 Fehring pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Jiang pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Masters pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Jia pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Great, in line points, well argued.

Opp 1: Jiang, had a good closing statement, cited a number of examples - good job! slow down.

Prop 2:

Opp 2:
slow down

Jiang/Jia

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Provided effective evidence and references.

PARLI Debate

Opher Peled (*15)

Round 1B 9:00am D203

Gov: 8 Su - Her

Opp: 23 He - Bartenetti

Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Opher Peled

Judge's School Affiliation: Mivumante

PROP

OPP

Team Code #: _____

Team Code #: _____

Prop Speaker #1 Su pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 He pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Her pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Bartenetti 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:

could not understand the Singapore example in the context of this debate
slow down

Opp 1:

Some additional facts & references would have been useful.

Prop 2:

slow down.

Opp 2:

Death penalty costs are not dependent on the drug costs (but on the legal process that is undertaken)

TEAM CODE #: 8 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Debaters provided reasonable and effective argument. Provided good evidence.

PARLI Debate

Emma Sutton (*12)

Round 1A 9:00am J2
Gov: 10 Gao - Pareek
Opp: 4 Feinberg - Wolf-Jacobs
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: E. Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: 12 (JSHS)

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 4

Prop Speaker #1 Pareek pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Feinberg pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Gao pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Wolf-Jacobs pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Excellent delivery!
More organization in IAC
could help (label contentions)
In rebuttal, Debt was a new
argument, but ~~it was~~ dreamers were
a logical extension so OK

Prop 2: Good job clarifying AA
position on legitimacy - crucial
point. Next time try to cover
all of neg case, at least
superficially.

Opp 1: Very well-organized ~~the~~ rebuttal.
~~the~~ Good documentation, nicely
organized. Rebuttal was excellent,
good job coming in on crack of
debate.

Opp 2: AA didn't really change def, just
clarified it. I wouldn't bring up
point that most terrorists only kill 5
or fewer ppl (its kind of weak!)
(Opp). Nice speaking style, easy to
follow!

TEAM CODE #: 4 on the Neg wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Debate really comes down to issue
of whether Exec. Orders have been misused, as all sides
conceded that EO's are legal/constitutional. AA tried
to argue that EO's create harm by sparking controversy. Neg
effectively argued that Prez cannot please everyone.

PARLI Debate

Ted Appel (*24)

Round 1A 9:00am K3
Gov: 8 Mehta - Alvarez
Opp: 14 Cohen-Simayof - Drake
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: TED APPEL

Judge's School Affiliation: SANTA ROSA HS

PROP
Team Code #: 8

OPP
Team Code #: 14

Prop Speaker #1 MEHTA pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 COHEN-SIMAYOF pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 ALVAREZ pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 DRAKE 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 summary

(28)

Opp 1: Strong voice = good

(29)

Prop 2:
More arg

(28)

Opp 2:
winning arg-ment: President
has right to issue EO's and Executive
orders.

(28)

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP noted that Executive Orders are within president's rights.
Our background checks do not undermine rights of law-abiding
citizens

PARLI Debate

Ted Appel (*24)

Round 1B 9:00am K3

Gov: 21 Katewa - Colenbrander

Opp: 23 Fulop - Bennett

Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ted Appel

Judge's School Affiliation: SANTA ROSA HS

PROP
Team Code #: 21

OPP
Team Code #: 23

Prop Speaker #1 KATEWA pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 FULOP pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 COLENBRANDER pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 BENNETT 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 good case for alternative forms of justice but did not make strong enough case to abolish retribution

Prop 2: Good word movement

Opp 1: Attached arguments with surgical precision.

Opp 2: Good job summarizing Prop and Opp positions.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Proved that retribution does have a place in criminal justice system, though not an exclusive place.

PARLI Debate

Karina Giang (*8)

Round 1A 9:00am L1
Gov: 13 Sinha - Herman
Opp: 6 Visht - Koshkin
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: KARINA GIANG

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

Team Code #: PROP 13

Team Code #: OPP 6

Prop Speaker #1 HERMAN pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 VISHT pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 SINHA pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 KOSHKIN 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: *Speech was delivered clearly ideas and evidences are organized.*

Opp 1: *Very organized. Nice posture during speech. Acknowledge prop side's politely.*

Prop 2: *Very calm. Speech delivered effectively.*

Opp 2: ~~Very~~ *Well prepared with research. Just be more relaxed during speech.*

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

REASON FOR DECISION: *13 won because they provided more examples and more clear at the opinion. Good job and I enjoyed the debate very much*

PARLI Debate

Svetlana Partzuf (*3)

Round 1A 9:00am H2
Gov: 27 Skarr - Escarcega
Opp: 11 Barnes - Gille
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Erin Aubrey

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

Team Code #: PROP 27

Team Code #: OPP 11

Prop Speaker #1 ESCARCEGA pts 28.5 Opp Speaker #1 Gille pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 SKARR pts 29 Opp Speaker #2 Barnus 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 framing of the debate, focused on the correct pieces, but not quite focused enough - should double-down

Prop 2: on frame more

Very good understanding of what part of the debate is important - wrote speech up on exactly the right points.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop wins framework that legit may is defined by Sawyer case, and proves that executive orders are illegitimate by that definition.

Opp 1:

Good arguments, strong evidence and reasoning, but lack of strategic vision to frame debate properly and really

Opp 2:

Also very good focus on framework, arguments, but lack of strategic vision. Also feel

into for trap of only need executive order if congress doesn't approve

PARLI Debate

Svetlana Partzuf (*3)

Round 1B 9:00am H2
Gov: 5 Carter - Wyatt
Opp: 15 Hardwick - Der
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Even Mubinger

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 15

Prop Speaker #1 Wyatt pts 28 Opp Speaker #1 Der pts 26

Prop Speaker #2 Carter pts 29.5 Opp Speaker #2 Hardwick pts 26.5

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: Very good arguments and reasoning, as well as solid strategic vision and framing of the debate in terms of the cycle of violence.

Prop 2: Excellently refutes all of Opp's arguments and clearly frames the debate in terms of how Opp misunderstands.

Opp 1: I'm going to do this as a whole here — your case made no sense to me, and Opp pointed it out repeatedly. I do not understand how a lack of retribution leads to not considering evidence. It doesn't make any sense to me, and you never explain it.

Opp 2: Opp fails to provide any reasons why Prop's specific proposal would be bad — all arguments are instead about not considering the evidence, which isn't Prop's argument.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp fails to provide any reasons why Prop's specific proposal would be bad — all arguments are instead about not considering the evidence, which isn't Prop's argument.

PARLI Debate

Albert Yee (*14)

Round 1A 9:00am D201

Gov: 10 Kaushik - Ebtikar

Opp: 5 Viviani - Cunningham

Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Albert Yee

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 Kaushik pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Cunningham pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Ebtikar pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Viviani 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: *Citing John Locke's 3 principles a good try but hard to argue. Unable to connect all the dots. Very innovative ideas for the argument but a bit losing track. Great speech.*

Prop 2: *Well speech. Can be a bit more on coherence for the judge to follow whole argument.*

Opp 1: *Well done on analysis - saying Prop team is not arguing on the proposition. Constitution right of the President is key. Topicality issue is good. Great speech.*

Opp 2: *Great argumentation, Easy to follow. Great speech.*

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

Albert Yee
1-10-16.

REASON FOR DECISION:

Topicality almost alone almost entitle the team to win. Great argument throughout.

1 Social contract. 5%. John Locke.
Draft high, U.S. Gov.
Underlying issue.

System racism: a bad call.
Unable to prove the prop.

3 US gov is illegitimate ~~for~~ prop is proof
Not one EO was brought up!

6.

2. Constitution right.
A prior-voting issue.

4 Constitution let President have right to EO.
Great argumentation to both Aff. spk 1 & 2.

5. Topicality.

PARLI Debate

Albert Yee (*14)

Round 1B 9:00am D201
Gov: 25 Kornfein - Raesfeld
Opp: 10 Ganguli - Sanghvi
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Albert Yee.
Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell.

Team Code #: PROP 25 Team Code #: OPP 10
Prop Speaker #1 Raesfeld pts 28 Opp Speaker #1 Ganguli pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Kornfein pts 29 Opp Speaker #2 Sanghvi 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: Good introduction of issue. and quality of evidence.

Opp 1: Good argument leading to the ~~best~~ deterrence using death penalty. Good evidence presented.

Prop 2: Great speech, Easy to follow; Good/comparative analysis given

Opp 2: Good point bringing up the 'human' right of victim. Good speech.

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

Albert Yee.
1-10-16

REASON FOR DECISION:

More cohesive delivery of the points and better argumentation.

1). Human Right Human Capital
Cycle of violence

3). Retribution is not just.
Good comparative analysis.

~~8.~~

2). Argument → ^{benefit of.} death penalty.
Bribery. ^{deterrence} ^{good order.}

4). good argument on human right
of victim:

5)

PARLI Debate

Bonnie Hayne (*25)

Round 1A 9:00am D207
Gov: 6 Hanvey - Moore
Opp: 5 Basrai - Hester
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: BONNIE HAYNE

Judge's School Affiliation: SANDY HILL ACADEMY

PROP
Team Code #: 6

OPP
Team Code #: 5

Prop Speaker #1 PETER MOORE pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 HESTER pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 CANDOR HANVEY pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 BASRAI 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 pre - strong in summation
Good support of arguments
strong in summation

Opp 1:

Excellent tone - connect w/ judge
Consistent initial acknowledgements
Clear outline of intended arguments
Good bringing back to key points

Prop 2:

Excellent eye contact funding
Good delivery
Constitutional is legitimate
Do well when aggressive, not aggressive
Introduced soc security points late - allowed.

Opp 2:

Nice acknowledgements
Blocked other team from clarifying - & this allowed?
Stated our Rodella restaurant - confidence built
good eye contact

TEAM CODE #: 6

on the PROP wins this debate.

(Prop or Opp) PROP

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very hard to decide between two excellent teams
Moore / Hanvey had more points than could as far as I
could tell

PARLI Debate

Bonnie Hayne (*25)

Round 1B 9:00am D207
Gov: 21 Mubarak - Troup
Opp: 27 Ernst - Davis
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: BONNIE HAYNE

Judge's School Affiliation: SONOMA ACADEMY

PROP
Team Code #: 21

OPP
Team Code #: 27

Prop Speaker #1 MUBARACK pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 ERNST pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 TROUP pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 DAVIS 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 intro
Excellent eye contact
Excellent delivery & focus.
Style

Prop 2:
Good delivery of
proposed speech
& addressing points
both speaker - hard to understand
when sped up

Opp 1:
When you put an item on hold - you come back to it - difficult to know when you come back to it
Excellent eye contact - please
& fluidity *remember name (intro)*

Great use of philosophical/historical references
Appreciated calm but attentive delivery
 Opp 2:

Very good points but
lost some clarity as you picked up speed

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Excellent arguments on both sides - had to go with neg

PARLI Debate

Vishal Garg (*22)

Round 1A 9:00am K2
 Gov: 27 Hatcher - Butler
 Opp: 10 Liu - ~~10~~ 400
 Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: VISHAL GARG

Judge's School Affiliation: Monla Vista

Team Code #: PROP 27

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 Butler pts 29 Opp Speaker #1 Liu pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 Hatcher pts 30 Opp Speaker #2 400 pts 30

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Butler

Great work

29

A ★ ★ ★
 E ★ ★ ★
 A ★ ★ ★
 POI ★ ★ ★
 D ★ ★ ★
 C ★ ★ ★

29

Liu

Opp 1:

(44 Secs) overtime
 A ★ ★ ★
 E ★ ★ ★
 A ★ ★ ★
 POI ★ ★ ★
 D ★ ★ ★
 C ★ ★ ★

29

30

★ ★ ★ ★ ★
 ★ ★ ★ ★ ★
 ★ ★ ★ ★ ★
 ★ ★ ★ ★ ★
 ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

30

Prop 2:

Hatcher

E

A
 POI
 D
 C

★ ★ ★ ★ ★
 ★ ★ ★ ★ ★
 ★ ★ ★ ★ ★
 ★ ★ ★ ★ ★
 ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

30

Opp 2:

E ★ ★ ★ ★ ★
 A ★ ★ ★ ★ ★
 POI ★ ★ ★ ★ ★
 D ★ ★ ★ ★ ★
 C ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

TEAM CODE #:

10

on the Opp wins this debate.
 (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Both did an excellent job on the topic, the prop was better on the evidence, however, opp fared well on delivery, ~~and~~ slightly.

PARLI Debate

Vishal Garg (*22)

Round 1B 9:00am K2
Gov: 6 Boozarpour - Li
Opp: 27 Inman - Young
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: VISHAL GARG

Judge's School Affiliation: Monta Vista

Team Code #: PROP 6

Team Code #: OPP 27

Prop Speaker #1 Boozarpour pts 30

Opp Speaker #1 Inman pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 Li pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Young pts 30

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Boozarpour (30)

Opp 1: Inman (30)

Prop 2: Li (29)

Opp 2: Young (30)

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

There were some disagreements on the def, however both fared excellent in their stands,

PARLI Debate

Peter Brown (*27)

Round 1A 9:00am J1

Gov: 15 Banisadr - Weiner

Opp: 8 Vadrevu - Nanda

Varsity Parli Debate

Obama use of executive order is illegitimate

Judge's Name: Peter Brown

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

Team Code #: PROP 15

Team Code #: OPP 8

Prop Speaker #1 Banisadr pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Nanda pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Weiner pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Vadrevu 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 voice.
Confident speaker
Easy to follow.

Opp 1: Speaks clear and easy to follow.
Needs to be more confident. Own it!

Prop 2:
Very compassionate debater
Rebutted all points.
Good POI's.

Opp 2: Good eye contact.
Good points.
speaking from seat while partner is up
is very distracting

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The prop defined and followed topic the entire debate.
The opp ~~conceded~~ conceded the definition. The prop had a better argument and rebuttal.

PARLI Debate

Peter Brown (*27)

Round 1B 9:00am J1

Gov: 3 Rubsamen - Skepner

Opp: 5 DeWitt - Kelley

Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Peter Brown

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

Team Code #: PROP
3

Team Code #: OPP
5

Prop Speaker #1 Rubsamen pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 DeWitt pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Skepner pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Kelley 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
Great delivery.
Good evidence.

Opp 1: Strong voice
Stated references.
Went back to POI at end as promised.

Prop 2: Strong speaker
⊖ Abruptly ended well short of time
41/42.

Opp 2: Good job supporting arguments
⊖ Read straight from notes. No eye contact.
Could do better using clock

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Both teams had strong arguments. During the rebuttal the ~~prop~~ had stronger voting issues.

PARLI Debate

Joel Jacobs (*4)

Round 1A 9:00am K4
Gov: 26 Picchi - Owyang
Opp: 14 Shin - Shevelev
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Berk

Team Code #: PROP 26

Team Code #: OPP 14

Prop Speaker #1 Picchi pts 26

Opp Speaker #1 Shv pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Owyang pts 25

Opp Speaker #2 Shin 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

& IT MATTERS!

DONT AISE ON A POO UNLESS YOU ARE CLEARLY RIGHT!

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

"we defined debate as value & they accepted" - not nec to say in rebuttal.

Wasnt "Gov cant function" new in LOR? Need for EDs was 30 sec @ end, almost an after-thought.

Prop 1:

New Yorker quote is misused: framing & considerations

Might help to discuss what actions prez can take, and distinguish. Be clearer re wh. ur arg's EDs inherently illegit, or as used (gun control). Beware of giving urself two burdens to meet ("unconstitutional and immoral") when u dont need to.

Opp 1: Giving urself a > burden than nec may be unwise, but it's not abusive" or non-topical. If prop proves all EDs are bad, they prove res true.

res PM spoke slowly and made relatively few pts. Hit all of the Oh, you went back to I.B. (King James). Go in order! And what's about III?

Prop 2: Nice, passionate speaking style. Have a clearer sense of organization: going down the flow, or is there some other logical way to approach the args? Seemed random. How do I know what's "too strong"? Work on signposting.

On this res, I wd go opp case first: the args for something go before the args against it. Mt want to drop pt re "Obama used POI: look at wh. Keep it short, dont sit least" after heavily case.

TEAM CODE #: 14 on the Opp (Prop or Opp)

U rely on "Cong can overturn ED" but drop MG response: "Prez Can Veto." Ur Poo was irrelevant: not clear, and nobody explains, sig of wh. ED = "law." wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: This round is v. difficult to decide w/o standards: both teams need to say way more about what specific powers constitution gives to each branch, what "morality" requires, what a good system of govt wd look like, etc. Prop does argue EDs are "undemocratic," but Opp sort of responds w/ Cong overruling isn't Prez elected, unlike King James?) But opp outweighs w/arg that EDs are essential for society to function. Plus, Opp outspoke.

school

Hand

PI

25

10
20

WRE
MRE

25
25

no. 9
proposed

Handwritten notes on the left margin.

Handwritten notes in the middle section, including the word "PROPOSED".

Main body of handwritten notes, appearing as a list or series of entries with various markings and symbols.

Final section of handwritten notes at the bottom of the page.

PARLI Debate

Joel Jacobs (*4)

Round 1B 9:00am K4

Gov: 24 Hansen - Beatie

Opp: 3 Stamm-Kirk - Burshteyn

Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Berk

Team Code #: PROP 24

Team Code #: OPP 3

Prop Speaker #1 Hansen pts 25

Opp Speaker #1 S-K pts 28.5

Prop Speaker #2 Beatie pts 25

Opp Speaker #2 Burshteyn 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:

Opp could have been more comprehensive: explicit about a comprehensive dichotomy; if in a sociopath, rehab ineffective, if or rationally need deterrence

Prop def is pretty vague, and Opp goes w/it: are we talking about whether to put ppl in jail at all?

Prop 1: I think retrib is a little more specific than ur def. "Crime has gone down" is relevant only in cases w/o specific pol at a spec time. U mean "crime is low." Make more comparative args: for @ pt, Rehab obviously works better" - This is your key arg, say why.

1. Retrib looks like —
2. Rehab looks like —
3. Rehab better because

Prop 2: I asked you to tie your args to a clear standard. You give me no standard, and don't tie key disputed issue - take it whether prison is necessary in any way U prove US system is inferior, but we no prisons make it better?

Opp 1: Isn't deterrence different from retrib.? Oh, I guess we are talking about no prison. Not sure whether accepting "no prison" as def of retrib was the right call: it's so obviously wrong, and not 100% clear that's what they meant. Maybe at least a pol in PNC to pin them down? And maybe be more explicit at the top about this funny definitional situation?

Opp 2: You had a pretty complicated roadmap. Can in a round this messy, where it's not even clear what we're talking about, and there are a few key args, consider reorganizing it for me, or at least giving me more overviews, e.g. "Prop stands for no prisons = no deterrence = all criminals on street = explosion in That was basically all u needed to say (the of course crime, heart to hit all of their spec. args) it doesn't

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

REASON FOR DECISION: *For unfathomable reasons, Prop implicitly defines retribution as incarceration. That now creates an indefensible resolution. But Prop forces itself to defend emptying all prisons and letting mass murderers on the streets. That sounds really bad to me.*

school

And

3

100

100

PK

Practical

SD

SD

ST

Practical

Practical

The first part of the course is devoted to the study of the basic principles of the theory of the structure of the atom. This part of the course is divided into two main sections: the first section deals with the structure of the atom and the second section deals with the structure of the nucleus.

In the first section, we shall study the structure of the atom. We shall start with the Rutherford model of the atom, which is based on the following assumptions:

- 1. The atom consists of a central nucleus, which is positively charged.
- 2. The nucleus is surrounded by a cloud of negatively charged electrons.
- 3. The electrons are held in the atom by the attractive force of the nucleus.

According to the Rutherford model, the atom is a small, dense, positively charged nucleus surrounded by a cloud of negatively charged electrons. The nucleus is made up of protons and neutrons. The protons are positively charged and the neutrons are neutral. The electrons are negatively charged and are held in the atom by the attractive force of the nucleus.

The second section of the course deals with the structure of the nucleus. We shall study the structure of the nucleus and the forces that hold it together. We shall also study the properties of the nucleus, such as its size, mass, and charge.

In the third section, we shall study the properties of the nucleus. We shall study the size of the nucleus, its mass, and its charge. We shall also study the forces that hold the nucleus together.

The fourth section of the course deals with the structure of the nucleus. We shall study the structure of the nucleus and the forces that hold it together. We shall also study the properties of the nucleus, such as its size, mass, and charge.

In the fifth section, we shall study the properties of the nucleus. We shall study the size of the nucleus, its mass, and its charge. We shall also study the forces that hold the nucleus together.

The sixth section of the course deals with the structure of the nucleus. We shall study the structure of the nucleus and the forces that hold it together. We shall also study the properties of the nucleus, such as its size, mass, and charge.

In the seventh section, we shall study the properties of the nucleus. We shall study the size of the nucleus, its mass, and its charge. We shall also study the forces that hold the nucleus together.

The eighth section of the course deals with the structure of the nucleus. We shall study the structure of the nucleus and the forces that hold it together. We shall also study the properties of the nucleus, such as its size, mass, and charge.

In the ninth section, we shall study the properties of the nucleus. We shall study the size of the nucleus, its mass, and its charge. We shall also study the forces that hold the nucleus together.

The tenth section of the course deals with the structure of the nucleus. We shall study the structure of the nucleus and the forces that hold it together. We shall also study the properties of the nucleus, such as its size, mass, and charge.

In the eleventh section, we shall study the properties of the nucleus. We shall study the size of the nucleus, its mass, and its charge. We shall also study the forces that hold the nucleus together.

The twelfth section of the course deals with the structure of the nucleus. We shall study the structure of the nucleus and the forces that hold it together. We shall also study the properties of the nucleus, such as its size, mass, and charge.

In the thirteenth section, we shall study the properties of the nucleus. We shall study the size of the nucleus, its mass, and its charge. We shall also study the forces that hold the nucleus together.

The fourteenth section of the course deals with the structure of the nucleus. We shall study the structure of the nucleus and the forces that hold it together. We shall also study the properties of the nucleus, such as its size, mass, and charge.

In the fifteenth section, we shall study the properties of the nucleus. We shall study the size of the nucleus, its mass, and its charge. We shall also study the forces that hold the nucleus together.

The sixteenth section of the course deals with the structure of the nucleus. We shall study the structure of the nucleus and the forces that hold it together. We shall also study the properties of the nucleus, such as its size, mass, and charge.

In the seventeenth section, we shall study the properties of the nucleus. We shall study the size of the nucleus, its mass, and its charge. We shall also study the forces that hold the nucleus together.

The eighteenth section of the course deals with the structure of the nucleus. We shall study the structure of the nucleus and the forces that hold it together. We shall also study the properties of the nucleus, such as its size, mass, and charge.

In the nineteenth section, we shall study the properties of the nucleus. We shall study the size of the nucleus, its mass, and its charge. We shall also study the forces that hold the nucleus together.

The twentieth section of the course deals with the structure of the nucleus. We shall study the structure of the nucleus and the forces that hold it together. We shall also study the properties of the nucleus, such as its size, mass, and charge.

PARLI Debate

Danica Tanquilut (*11)

Round 1A 9:00am D209
Gov: 15 Fishlow - Fishlow
Opp: 21 Cheng - Shifts
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Mariah Turner

Judge's School Affiliation: JLHS

Team Code #: PROP 15

Team Code #: OPP 21

Prop Speaker #1 H. Fishlow pts 28.5 Opp Speaker #1 Shifts pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 O. Fishlow pts 30 Opp Speaker #2 Cheng 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: (also see comments for Prop 2)
try to avoid making concessions in the opening speech that your opponents could use in their case

Prop 2: ex) the orders represent democrats, who are the sign majority of americans

great command of the room & debate; clear ordering of points

Opp 1:

- sign posting could be useful for the judge
- should spend more time in the first speech constructing your case instead of responding to your opponent's arguments

Opp 2:

(clarification: executive orders do not have to be approved by

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Although I disagreed with the Prop's definitions, they were able to better prove that the use of Executive Orders by Obama is outside the generally accepted use; regardless of whether or not he has the legal power to use them. Also legality ≠ legitimacy

PARLI Debate

Danica Tanquilut (*11)

Round 1B 9:00am D209
Gov: 14 Sutton - Moon
Opp: 25 Saxena - Duncan
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Mariah Turner

Judge's School Affiliation: JLHS

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 25

Prop Speaker #1 Moon pts 20

Opp Speaker #1 Duncan pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 Sutton pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Saxena 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:

- Use of tone & volume were properly executed, made for strong delivery
- Can't bring up new points in last speech

Prop 2:

responses to the Opp's points should have been more direct, less generalised

Opp 1:

for ~~more~~ Parent Judges could decrease speed, but I was fine with it. Great speeches overall

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION: ① Opp proved that banks cannot be rehabilitated
② Prop proved that rehab can be useful for drug addicts, but they didn't show that retribution shouldn't be used in any situation

UDAY

PARLI Debate

Uday Shingwekar (*10)

Round 1A 9:00am D208

Gov: 27 Chu - Fraga

Opp: 13 Cummings - Adriano

Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: UDAY SHINGWEKAR

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HIGH

PROP
Team Code #: 27

OPP
Team Code #: 13

Prop Speaker #1 Fraga pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Cummings pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Chu pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Adriano pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good

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

26-25 = Fair

24-20 = Poor

<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Nice & slow speech

Try to enunciate difficult words a little better

Nice use of POIs

Prop 2:

Take POIs. Don't ignore them

Opp 1:

Nice speech

Take POIs

Opp 2:

Acknowledge POIs. Argue ~~if~~ on them.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

UDAY
Alka Shingwekar (*10)
Round 1B 9:00am D208
Gov: 3 Booth - Pracar
Opp: 15 Fogarty - Pister
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: UDAY SHINGWEKAR

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HIGH

Team Code #: 3 **PROP**

Team Code #: 15 **OPP**

Prop Speaker #1 Booth pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Pister pts 25

Prop Speaker #2 Pracar pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Fogarty 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 passionate debate.
Start slow then build up the speech
Very good ^{use of} tone in voice.

Opp 1: Very nice turn around in rebuttal.
composed

Prop 2:
- Passionate.
- keep some room for PO's.

Opp 2:
good speech

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Nadeem Alam (*19)

Round 1A 9:00am K1

Gov: 6 Reyna - Yang

Opp: 15 Ginsburg - Zhou

Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Nadeem Alam

Judge's School Affiliation: Puoke Valley

Team Code #: PROP 6

Team Code #: OPP 15

Prop Speaker #1 Reyna pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Zhou pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Yang pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Ginsburg pts 30

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good

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

26-25 = Fair

24-20 = Poor

<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Nice voice/speech
Good Eye contact
Presentable

Opp 1: Well spoken
Presentable
Fluent
Organized

Prop 2: Nice voice/speech
Good Eye contact
Needs a little fluency

Opp 2: Nice word selection
Presentable
Well spoken
Fluent

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

REASON FOR DECISION: They were able to provide evidence, more confident and fluent in their presentation.

President Obama

PARLI Debate

Nadeem Alam (*19)

Round 1B 9:00am K1
Gov: 5 White - Whitmore
Opp: 4 Cramer - Griffin
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Nadeem Alam

Judge's School Affiliation: Pineole Valley

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 4

Prop Speaker #1 White pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Cramer pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 Whitmore pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Griffin 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: Needs Fluency
Presentable

Opp 1: Presentable / Nice Speech

Prop 2: Presentable
Nice speech

Opp 2: Presentable / Nice speech

TEAM CODE #: 4 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

confident, & fluent

PARLI Debate

Brian Yu
~~Ken Stone~~ (*16)
Round 1A 9:00am D206
Gov: 27 Malfavon - Hulett
Opp: 6 Gong - Li
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Brian Yu

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

PROP
Team Code #: 27

OPP
Team Code #: 6

Prop Speaker #1 Laura Malfavon pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Austin Li pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Cecilia Hulett pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Richard Gong 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:

- You defined illegitimate as "unlawful", but I'm not sure why ineffective actions (as per Concession 1) are unlawful.
- Interesting constitutional analysis, excellent organization of arguments
- I appreciate the specificity of your arguments

Prop 2:

- Great logical reasoning, very persuasive delivery
- Good ideas during responses to Opp's case, but warrants could be deeper

Opp 1:

- Good analysis on checks and balances in Concessions 1 and 2
- Excellent refutations against Prop's case, but avoid repeating yourself. Speaking regarding Obama's orders specifically could be valuable.
- Well organized refutation speech

Opp 2:

- Good job pointing out potential contradictions in Prop's case, and excellent work covering all bases for legitimacy
- Spend more time thoroughly explaining the impacts of your arguments.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote Opp off of three main arguments:

1. The Opp analysis about how the checks and balances system is maintained is well-warranted, and I think it has the most developed link to the resolution's stance that Opp explains goes unrefuted.
2. Supreme Court's constitutional legitimacy is irrelevant for legality.
3. Opp shows me that Gov analysis on effectiveness is irrelevant for legality.

Prop is right that Opp's points are general, but that's insufficient to discount them.

Brian Yu

PARLI Debate

Ken Stone (*16)

Round 1B 9:00am D206

Gov: 6 Deng - Qian

Opp: 27 Amato - Ringstrom

Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Brian Yu

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

Team Code #: PROP 6

Team Code #: OPP 27

Prop Speaker #1 Kevin Deng pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Nicholas Amato pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Ming Qian pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Lucas Ringstrom pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

- Excellent framing of the resolution.
- Some case points (e.g. why proportional punishment is wrong) can have stronger warrants
- Be careful that your advocacy is consistent with the resolution (e.g. fines), advocating percentage doesn't feel like it links well
- The impact is to lower recidivism good.

Prop 2:

- Framework analysis is good
- Avoid repeating yourself, I understand the analysis on why a common practice isn't necessarily a good practice the first time
- Turning their victim closure argument was effective.

Opp 1:

- If you introduce a new judging criteria, I need clarification on how I evaluate the round or which criteria takes precedence
- Great responses to their first contention, but be careful about time management, you were rushed at the end.

Opp 2:

- Good work qualifying that opp defends limited retribution, but that it still has a place
- Organization of the speech is a little bit confusing.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

I come very close to voting Opp on the basis that limited punishment can have some positive consequences, such as deterrence or victim closure. However, Prop gives me more well-warranted analysis as to why replacing punishment with restorative measures would be preferable, out of the Prop's 1st contention. The debate over fines proved irrelevant to me - it was a debate over fixed fines vs. proportional fines, not really about whether retribution itself has a place.

PARLI Debate

Jesse MacKinnon (*5)

Round 1A 9:00am D205
Gov: 27 Rosenthal - Dondero
Opp: 14 Yee - Morrell
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: J. MacKinnon

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

Team Code #: PROP 27

Team Code #: OPP 14

Prop Speaker #1 Dondero pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Morrell pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Rosenthal pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Yee pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Need to be more specific: exactly how do the EO's undermine Congress? In what specific EO's does he do this?
 Few links to any actual harms—also think about how abuse in this administration might lead to a precedent that gives a future bad president too much power.
 Prop 2: Contradicts own definition of "legitimate."
 "Legality of slavery" contention very problematic to take down the rhetoric.

Opp 1: Also keep in mind that EO's are the primary way that the President enforces the laws that Congress has passed.

Opp 2: Good rebuttal speech.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Negation wins on precedent, Aff doesn't prove why Obama's use is uniquely harmful. Neg's harms that Executive orders solve outweigh the largely ephemeral and intangible harms that Aff puts forward.

PARLI Debate

Jesse MacKinnon (*5)

Round 1B 9:00am D205
Gov: 14 Yan - Chu
Opp: 27 Shimizu - McDowell
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: J. MacKinnon

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

Team Code #: **PROP** 14

Team Code #: **OPP** 27

Prop Speaker #1 Yan pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 McDowell pts 26

Prop Speaker #2 Chu pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Shimizu 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:

Recidivism is the word you're looking for.

Opp 1: *Consider using double advocacy in refuting opponent's case.*

Why should the judge not favor the commonly-accepted definition of the word?

Prop 2:

~~Good turn of "retribution"~~
Good turn of "retribution" definition battle

Opp 2:

Disorganized speech.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

AG wins definition, Neg failed to refute Aff's case.

Resolution - Pres. Obama use of executive orders is illegitimate
PARLI Debate

Katrina Fehring (*21)

Round 1 9:00am L2 (single flight)
Gov: 6 Firsov - Kwak
Opp: 14 Lustig - Gerenrot
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Katrina Fehring

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin HS.

Team Code #: PROP 6

Team Code #: OPP 14

Prop Speaker #1 Kwak pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Lustig pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 Firsov pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Gerenrot 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 volume but slow down. It was hard to follow the points being made. Engage with judge more & vary hand motions - Strong rebuttal

Opp 1: very professional presentation, great opening with good focus & emphasis. Addressed all points raised, well. Excellent pace - very engaging.

Prop 2: Good effort at identifying potential impacts but took too long to link back to resolution. Appreciated your courtesy to judge.

Opp 2: Great passion but don't let it quiver your voice - keep it controlled & it will be powerful. Excellent follow-up esp. biz con point - still will be guns.

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

REASON FOR DECISION!

Although Aff. had multiple points, Opp. did well addressing each one in a clear & organized fashion. Arguments were more convincing and followed a consistent messaging not strongly enough refuted by Aff.

Liked the use of "we're fine" to refute opps claim of why Obama should use 200. Also pointing out # of arguments was good.