Susan Steph Round 2A 11:00am	D203		Judge's Name	:_ <u>Stephan</u>	ት	
Gov: 14 Chin - R Opp: 13 Sinha - Varsity Parli Deb	Herman Opp			ol Affiliation:		
Team Co	PROP		Team Cod	opp/3		
Prop Spe	eaker #1 <u>Rosen</u> # eaker #2 <u>Chin</u>	Feld pts 29.8	Opp Speaker #1	Herman		
Prop Spe	aker #2 <u>Chin</u>	pts_29.9	Opp Speaker #2	Sinha	pts 29.8 +	
	27 = Good (t	er points based or = Perfect 29 = O out possibly not good -20 = Poor	utstanding 28 = l enough to qualif	= Very Good y for elimination r	ounds) opropriate behavior	
offe • Evi evi • Arg by • • Poi • Del and	gumentation: How the other side nts of Information	ably and effectively ate priately and efficie include facts and r directly and effect the How relevant and ble	ntly the debaters references to aut tively the debate d effective were n an organized, o	s support argume hority as well as rs respond to the the questions an communicative st	ents with general knowledge arguments made d the answers tyle that is pleasant	
each d Prop 1: goad ont ey Prop 2:	organization	Close fa	Opp 1: Her - better time t to make be Fore Opp 2: Sir	to wait to wait e POL e this i eyent	improvement to POOS during ebut tal phased! For protected ore standing up nt you stord up t but I waynt fiming And Animited Grand for Wait on a	• •
REASC	code #: <u>13</u> on for decision: Didn't Fully omments b	(Pro	op or Oppi animal			

Kathleen von Raesfeld (*25) Round 2B 11:00am H1 Gov: 15 Ginsburg - Zhou Opp: 14 White - Hall Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>NonRaifild</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Sonoma acadomy</u>
PROP Team Code #:15	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Zhou pts 28.25	Opp Speaker #1 White pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 <u>Gins burg</u> pts <u>28.2</u> 5	Opp Speaker #2
27 = Good (but possibly not good	n the following scale: outstanding 28 = Very Good d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ging Criteria
 offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficience-which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effective by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak i and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful 	by the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge trively the debaters respond to the arguments made ad effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant I the debaters were to opponents and judges pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: - Movefurniture BACK # Crase board Speakarpts + clear linking w/ GmO's # obesity and glad you doubled back on this point Prop 2: + excellent Knowledge of topic + compelling argument style perfect pace presentation # aye contact - remember to move furniture BACK TEAM CODE #: 15 on the REASON FOR DECISION: w point Pi Clear plan, Solved harm.	texcellent passion, professional and compelling delivery. + you are an excellent speaker just get had a hickup with clearly presenting terms of counterplan Opp 2: + good Speaker and presentation style but I clid not clearly understand How the Counterplan Would be implemented. the

Joel Jaco Round 2B 11:00 Gov: 27 Ama Opp: 5 Carte Varsity Parli	Dam K4 ato - Ringstrom er - Wyatt	Judge's Judge's	Name: Jacoby School Affiliation: B	<u>rk</u>
Tear		Tear	OPP n Code #:5	
Prop	Speaker #1Angle	ptsOpp Speaker	#1Wycitt	pts_26
Prop	Speaker #2	pts <u>Z(</u> Opp Speake	r#2Garter	pts <u></u>
	30 = P 27 = Good (but p	points based on the followPerfect29 = Outstandingpossibly not good enough to c= Poor<20 = Res	28 = Very Good	
		Judging Criteri	a	
• • •	offered during the debate Evidence: How appropria evidence—which may inc Argumentation: How dir by the other side Points of Information: H Delivery: How well the de and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous	s and respectful the debater	paters support argument to authority as well as g baters respond to the were the questions and ad, communicative sty rs were to opponents and	nts with general knowledge arguments made I the answers yle that is pleasant nd judges
Contentions over Sing More about h (more effic / higher Uistort Mon Ket Pro "Winners and loss more dassical ec fueled by og sto How do site push TEL LOW REA GMOS/ontibiotics	and Ze.g. GMOS, wastered and free market is suppose quality producers thrive) o p 2: Rocking side to -fid. 5, losers get back up" Com onomic terms, the Explan s. Why concede big farms big farms to use GMOS? MI CODE #: 721 POINT WIN ASON FOR DECISION: Proj Cnot clearly explained, but	Sponding V Ho work how subsides Work on Why not i WB is not Opp 2: f You asser deserts, i Jant get sats? Our conte Value organ on the floor (Proptor Opp) Wins formers \$88 for At much colorbach.	Coverage of Prop G in a conterplan to a votes, it's la standar Foud deserts are not to tover and over that eli but u give me very lit nitions, then their respo nization. When u discuss se, and why it's wro vins this debate. Cont ed/healthcare, Spi	improvement to fool desert, ubstantille issues: small bit, where a supprise of the states is unclear. null biz: it's a supprise assortion. ase. Subsidize small farms? of Neither is returnions. und "where gentrification occure." ing ag subs will create food the analysis. nses to our contention " is not a i un contention, tell me their ng. Jist repending or arig tention who their response obes thing. VERY ARTICULATE indive been way better cleanies links to ag subs/ev. Since Opp never responds 6

-

,



Almark i je ma mont and

a provide the second second

Auge Such

F Are (W)

AL AC

A. A. C.

A the product of the second of and the day of a set that had 他们的人对 动动脉系统 计成正常 化分子 in the population that We start when the start of the lest stability to a call of the state the stage well

Assert and you a get and why while and will be atten to atten the arten value examination . Which is dealed in the content teels in the c a product the general fire top according to NTACHY SHA

General of the price in the Thill stand and the legislation of the contestance of the standard of the second standard of the The Artom of The and what what parts got proafter the analy property and and and and

Human and prove the second of the could be proved the second of the seco

MS KNIW THEY WELL

Nanny Tunnell (*16) Round 2A 11:00am D209 Gov: 27 Inman - Young Opp: 5 Moser - Murphy	Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnel/
Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Inman pts 28 Prop Speaker #2 Young pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Muply pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Young pts 27	Opp Speaker #2pts28
30 = Perfect 29 =	on the following scale: hSFb should ban Fuctory Farm, Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Juc	lging Criteria /
 Analysis: How reasonably and effectiv offered during the debate 	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and effic	iently the debaters support arguments with
-	l references to authority as well as general knowledge
	ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	and effective were the questions and the answers
	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	ul the debaters were to opponents and judges
• Courtesy: now courteous and respecti	ur die debaters were to opponents and Judges
Using the above criteria, please offer cone each debater:	/ npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
(more to drems)	consulate none)
Prop 1: (28) Innon	Opp 1: (28) Reter. - PO I's more ine that we - govel evilled - govel road-up - lighten the handshuke
- Indeed in an I we will shall y	- po I's more ine that ine - sincilled - a net road up - lighten the raindshuke
- Trole POZ's well who help and me	en gover road up - lighten the randshill
- Endorus will will in skelch.	-good azument to all fference
-more professione duces mould giv more air of configure	- analysis had no much surver jumps of
- good anlysis work - Corn agricut we defined gace. Prop 2: Young (27) - garsingert	- bord argument oppound - bord argument oppound - bord purcugalisation & eye contact Opp 2: not state overset in speech during rand map part of speech overset pounded + - methan profile's war well pounded + - methan profile's war well pounded + opposity from had to charge their position opposity from had to charge their position
Prop 2: Youn (27) - show clusing	Opp 2: no set 228)
- good passionatt delivery of see	at rand map part of speech will puriled +
- coul ese intent & sestures.	- methane that to change their position
- soul ese intent & gestives - the gloont doom ars wint	- over arzawent and -
- not clear that this team age	es pusition, the hard convert offert
TO OF NOT AGUER TO TO TOTA	her, - book anysis when and cost
TEAM CODE #:5 on the	<u>Opp</u> wins this debate. Is economy.
REASON FOR DECISION:	i a provide
- Better analysis a	d ouder prover,
- ment arennent	approach (ugues but different) approach (ugues but different)
- Retter handle or	apploach l'agree cause + etter.

Nanny Tunnell (*16) Round 2B 11:00am D209 Gov: 27 Shimizu - McDowell Opp: 5 White - Whitmore Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Nanny Tunne V Judge's School Affiliation: MVITS
Team Code #: 27	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 <u>McDowell pts</u> Prop Speaker #2 <u>Shimi24</u> pts27	Opp Speaker #1_ (1hitmore pts 23)
Prop Speaker #2 Shinizy pts 27	Opp Speaker #2pts 28
30 = Perfect 29 = 0 27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	
	ging Criteria
 offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant at Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable 	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant al the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer come each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
REASON FOR DECISION:	 blc I max lost on point reducts is specific sto need to have more evident & specific sto Show expertise. Handled PSI mell. Opp 2: white (28) - wery postession of domaner - over ever and gestures. - over ever and gestures. - over ever deree. - Environment is ne ma not well delivers and - Environment is ne ma not well delivers and - Environment is ne ma not well delivers and - Environment is ne ma not well delivers and - Environment is ne ma not well delivers. - Environment is debate.
- Better analysis of most - This team showed	nove commenter and strong
position talken.	

Danica Tanquilut (*11) Round 2 11:00am L2 (single flight) Gov: 6 Jia - Jiang	Judge's Name: Marrah Turner
Opp: 24 Hansen - Beatie Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: JLHS
PROP	Team Code #:QU
Prop Speaker #1 JPC pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Hansen pto 24
Prop Speaker #2 Jeang pts 27.5	Opp Speaker #2 <u>Beatre</u> pts <u>26</u>
Please award each speaker points based o 30 = Perfect 29 = C	n the following scale: Dutstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not goo 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for ruge or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ging Criteria
 offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficience evidence which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak is and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful 	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge etively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: Opp 1: Opp 1: COULD better allocate there in the first speech to go over your own points
Prop 2: responses were thoughton & complete	- can't bring up new points in Last speech Opp 2: throat clearing and relaxed/informal tone became a distraction from Your man points
L L	rop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION DProp Sh	aved that the human & anomal
effects	of barning factory farms were great
· the O	pp gave no conter-plan
- Opp ha	rs no solvency for propharms

Matt Petruska (*27) Round 2A 11:00am D204 Gov: 23 He - Bartenetti Opp: 6 Deng - Qian)			Judge's Name: Matt Petruske Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High Schel
Varsity Parli Debate				Judge's School Affiliation: WindSur 11136 School
Team Code #:	PROP	23	· · · · · · · ·	OPP Code #:
Prop Speaker #1_	Barte	nett;	_pts_26	OPP Team Code #: Opp Speaker #1 Aing Quan pts 29.5 Opp Speaker #2 Revin Deng pts 28
Prop Speaker #2_	He		_pts_7	Opp Speaker #2 Kevin Deng pts 28
Please award	-	-		on the following scale: Dutstanding 28 = Very Good
2				ad enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair			• •	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
			Jud	ging Criteria
• Analysis: offered du		-	nd effective	by the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence:	How app	ropriatel	y and effici	ently the debaters support arguments with
				references to authority as well as general knowledge
		ow direct	ly and effec	ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other		on Hou	, roloziont o	nd offective were the questions and the ensurers
				nd effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily			ners speak	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
•			nd respectfu	I the debaters were to opponents and judges
v			r	
Using the abo each debater:		ia, please	e offer com /	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
D 1			/	
Prop-1:	- 11			Opp 1:
(+) persua	sive a	rgue per	ts eng	(+) Very persuasive refutes and arguements
strag e	vidince	. well	presquel	Questions were relevant to acquerient.
				(lear and percise delivery
			/	(ver and percise being)
		/	/	
Prop 2:			- •	Opp 2:
(1) Analy	sic so	plant for	Pril	Opp 2: (+) Analysis supported prop 1 Great delivery
al ca	Litica	of def	initions	(F) mar 1/ 1
1~ 9 . 682	and a			Great Cheline y
Prop 2: (1) Analy ind rea Wis s	0	r		
TEAM CODE	#:(2		OPP wins this debate.
REASON FOR	DECISIO	N:		rop or Opp)
The op	R Cou	wher pl	on fu	- not eliminating Ag factory farms was
Strong.	ORD h	sel Sl	ight adu	contase in regard to returning profs
GISURMON- Charse	F. EKO	selent	debate	that was very close and difficult to both teams pooled exclent evidince and Arelysis

Neg particular de tra South for the state of the second state of the an die 1999 waarde geboerne van die 1999 van die 1999 van die 1999 waarde die 1999 van die 1999 van die 1999 v Naar naam wat die geboerne die 1999 van die 19 and the second secon $E_{i} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^$ $(a,b) = (b_1, a_2, \dots, b_n, b_n) = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ A Contraction of the second 4 Carl Margaret State A particular and the second second second

Matt Petruska (*27) Round 2B 11:00am D204		Judge's Name: MGH Fet	ruskc
Gov: 14 Yee - Morrell Opp: 10 Kaushik - Ebtikar Varsity Parli Debate		Judge's Name:MGHE+ Judge's School Affiliation:Wir	ndsor High School
PF Team Code #: (\$99 4 4	OPP Team Code #:\&	9.000 million (1990) (1
Prop Speaker #1	lorrell pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Kqu shih	pts_ <u>29</u> 27
Prop Speaker #2	<u>Yee pts 78</u>	Opp Speaker #1 <u>Kqu shih</u> Opp Speaker #2 <u>Eb ti Kar</u>	pts
Please award eac	ch speaker points based ($30 = Perfect 29 = 0$	on the following scale: Dutstanding 28 = Very Good	nan an ann an
27 = 26-25 = Fair		od enough to qualify for elimination ro <20 = Reserved for rude or inapp	
	Jud	ging Criteria	
• Analysis: Ho offered during	•	ely the debaters analyze the topic ar	nd the arguments
• Evidence: Ho evidence—wh	w appropriately and efficing wich may include facts and on: How directly and effe	ently the debaters support argument references to authority as well as g ctively the debaters respond to the a	general knowledge
•		nd effective were the questions and	the answers
• Delivery: Hoy and easily und		in an organized, communicative sty	le that is pleasant
•		il the debaters were to opponents ar	nd judges
Using the above each debater:	criteria, please offer com /	pliments and/or suggestions for i	mprovement to
Prop 1:		Opp 1:	
(+) clear	Eviding & Amphis	(+) Very persuisive si	Peaker, Excelent
EXCelen PUSUAS	t vebuttal juery	delivery. Relevent	pints of infrancking
Prop 2:		Opp 2:	. ſ
Print(0	t intermontion + intermontion ; e Steaker.	(+) Avglytsis Was s Good Contentions	to property
TEAM CODE #:_	1	Prop wins this debate. Prop or Opp)	
REASON FOR DE	CISION:	the - ground very well.	The prop hed
a clicht of	VEDTAGE IN REGLIC	to refuting OPP'S CI	ritique. The

Round 2 Gov: 23 Opp: 6	Cabasino (*1 A 11:00am J1 3 Fulop - Bennett Hanvey - Moore Parli Debate	En C	Judge's Name: Judge's School Af	CABAS 6 NO
	Team Code #:	PROP 23	Team Code #:	
	Prop Speaker #1_ Prop Speaker #2_	BENNETT pts		IVEY pts
	Prop Speaker #2_	FULOP pts	2 <u>9</u> Opp Speaker #2	MOORE pts 29
		30 = Perfect 2	used on the following scal 29 = Outstanding 28 = Ve ot good enough to qualify fo <20 = Reserved fo Judging Criteria	ery Good
	 offered dur Evidence: evidence— Argument by the othe Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: 	ring the debate How appropriately and -which may include fact ation: How directly and r side nformation: How relev How well the debaters s understandable How courteous and resp ve criteria, please offer	efficiently the debaters sup s and references to author d effectively the debaters re vant and effective were the peak in an organized, com pectful the debaters were to	ity as well as general knowledge espond to the arguments made questions and the answers municative style that is pleasant
Clarity Specifics of what will replace loss of factory factory?	adriminges (eg 2C and 4C personsive. time on v speech, rathe Prop 2: Good folly on what m factory fam. Bating hubits will replace TEAM CODE REASON FOR AFF 2C and		4C) (eq. hearth) were strong (eq. hearth) were strong So opp 2: 4C) (cost focus o global proper blad to have of why he the 23 wins this (Propor Opp) PLOP	ticulation of off-take case disadvinitages / impacts. e points felt snowballed), the economic conterns in your side. Avoid P. 0.01s in AFF spece 3. In issues like food industry collapse, ict, job loss. I would be e head more on the issue uman rights tromp anim I rights. debate.

	USFE should	PARLI Debate
Mark Cabasino (*13) Round 2B 11:00am J1 Gov: 5 Basrai - Hester Opp: 26 Picchi - Owyang Varsity Parli Debate	USF& should Significantly reduce agriculturen Substidies	Judge's Name: Judge's School Affiliation:
P Team Code #:	ROP G	OPP 26 Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1		Opp Speaker #1 $P(CCH)$ pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 $DWTAUG$ pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Please award ea	ch speaker points based or	a the following scale:
27 26-25 = Fair		utstanding 28 = Very Good l enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
 offered durin Evidence: H evidence—w Argumentat by the other s Points of Inf Delivery: Ha and easily un Courtesy: Ha 	g the debate ow appropriately and efficie thich may include facts and r ion: How directly and effect side formation: How relevant an ow well the debaters speak in derstandable ow courteous and respectful	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ntly the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made d effective were the questions and the answers n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges
Prop 1: 6000 a of large cor impacts to se 3r) specin was focus less time and more than AFF 1 c and 3 Prop 2: Good puints of of food 1 md e conomic and Saying subsidies inject of large TEAM CODE #: REASON FOR D Opp did a	ECISION: better job with voter	Opp 1: The idea of "no impact" if large corp gives jobs to farmers will not so persubasive, nor was the idea that large corp indegre will elitarinate debt. However, the topicality issue that cume up in your 3rd speech was personaire. Also good Opp 2: Criticism of the GMOs issue. Cood jub with showing possible economic effects (increased prices of crops, tool, etc) and market effects (outsurvely). Point about cash vops and corn elayle needed clarification. OPP of Opp) - issues and also topicality issue. Mark topicality will a concern.
AFF tag-	enoming Juring speech ;	3, as well as during all Neg speeches, was a contest

Cindy Bulger (*23) Round 2A 11:00am H2 Gov: 13 Cummings - Adriano Opp: 15 Baum - Honaryar Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>Undy Bulger</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>San Romm Valley</u>
PROP Team Code #: 3	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1_Ummingpts_28_	Ý
Prop Speaker #2 Aanand pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 pts_30
	Dutstanding $28 = \sqrt{29}$ ery Good of enough to quality for elimination rounds)
Jud	ging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficience-which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effective by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak is and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful 	Ply the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: Born of the speakers Were very Well spoken and wgamiled Versy talented team. Loved the intro by Horarya- Opp 2: Catture yow attention vight
TEAM CODE #: 15 on the (P) REASON FOR DECISION: Although much of the discuss the notion of a factory farm Plants vegetables. The pop te	AWAY <u>OPP</u> wins this debate. rop or Opp) sim was a bout factory animal forming n would also include forms producing am's argument about higher food prices
went unanswared by the A	Countries access to healthics chinces

Cindy Bulger (*23) Round 2B 11:00am H2 Gov: 27 Galli - Girimonte Opp: 3 Booth - Pracar	Judge's Name: <u>Undy Bulger</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>San Pamm Valley</u>
Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: San Pamm Valley
PROP Team Code #:27	Team Code #:3
Prop Speaker #1_Galli	pts_29_ Opp Speaker #1_B06411 pts_29
Prop Speaker #2 <u>GIri monte</u>	pts 29 Opp Speaker #2 Pracar pts 29
30 = Per 27 = Good (but pos	ints based on the following scale: fect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good sibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
20-25 - Fair 24-20 = .	Poor < 20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
 offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriated evidence—which may include Argumentation: How direct by the other side Points of Information: How Delivery: How well the debuard easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and 	Ind effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments by and efficiently the debaters support arguments with de facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge tly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made w relevant and effective were the questions and the answers aters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
each debater:	e offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
· Prop 1: Great organizat	
good exe contect.	Organized with their arguments,
/	Give eye contact à presentation.
	Ebsy to follow.
Prop 2: You are a string " and very well urganized Easty to follow	Speakr Opp 2:
TEAM CODE #: 3	on the wins this debate.
Well with string argu. March to be decided w	(Prop or Opp) e devision. Both sides presented their cases ments, After a lot of thousand & because this pon net benefit? the win gas to the neg. Economies it most efficient and usually lagor companies will have an forms. Taking away any gor't help could hider this gap

.•

Ms Duong (*3) Round 2A 11:00am D207 Gov: 21 Cao - Gunn Opp: 6 Boozarpour - Li	Judge's Name: Kristing Duong Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley High
Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>JOUNFIEY Fligh</u>
PROP Team Code #: 21 Description Rill Carp	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1ptspts	Opp Speaker #1pts
Prop Speaker #1 <u>Bill Cas</u> pts <u>39</u> Prop Speaker #2 <u>Tames</u> Gunn pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Navid Bowappourpts 29
 27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor Judg Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effective by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak is and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful to the state of t	on the following scale: Dutstanding 28 = Very Good of enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rule or inappropriate behavior ging Criteria by the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant of the debaters were to opponents and judges pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1:	Opp 1:
Prop 2:	Opp 2:
(P REASON FOR DECISION	<u>ODP</u> wins this debate. rop or Opp)
and closing argumen	audiance, introduction

Ms Duong (*3) Round 2B 11:00am D207 Gov: 8 Sawhney - Giang Opp: 21 Katewa - Colenbrander Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Kistina Duorg Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley High
Team Code #:	OPP 2-/
Prop Speaker #1 giang pts_27	Opp Speaker #1_ Colenbrander pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Sawhney pts 28	Opp Speaker #1_ Colenbrander_pts_38 Opp Speaker #2_ Katewa_ pts_29
	Outstanding $28 = \text{Very Good}$ od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	ging Criteria
 offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and effic evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effe by the other side Points of Information: How relevant a Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respective 	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments iently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant al the debaters were to opponents and judges priments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1:
Prop 2:	Opp 2:
TEAM CODE #: $\frac{4}{2}$ on the	wins this debate. Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	
Opponent team was a against all points seemed more orga	ble to provide argument raised by the other teamand wind . prepared.

Round 2 Gov: 1	s Rangwala (A 11:00am D208 6 Herman - Swee	eney		Judge's Name: ABBAS RANGWALA
	4 Krause - Hwon Parli Debate	g		Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS
	Team Code #:	PROP		OPP Team Code #:14
	Prop Speaker #1_	SWEENEY	pts_29	Opp Speaker #1_KRAVSEpts_29
	Prop Speaker #2_	HERMAN	pts_ <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #2 HWONG pts 29
		$30 = P_{0}$ 37 = Good (but points)	erfect 29 =	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	20-23 - 1 and	24-20 -	- 1 001	<20 - Reserved for fude of mappropriate behavior
	 offered du Evidence: evidence- Argument by the othe Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: 	ring the debate How appropriat -which may incl tation: How dire er side Information: He How well the de understandable How courteous	tely and effic ude facts and ectly and effe ow relevant a baters speak and respectf	vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ciently the debaters support arguments with ad references to authority as well as general knowledge fectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers k in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges
	each debater:		ase offer con	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
ANA - ARG - ANA - POIL	5 - WA V/A 5 4.5 <u>Prop 2: HERI</u> -4.5 - GO 4.5 - A B	D WAMAND S LOST IN CIRI ARGUN	in TEUP 15)	$p_{01} - 4$ $p_{EL} - 4.5$ $c_{0V} - 4.5$
cov —	TEAM CODE	#:14		<u>OPP</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)
			(

OPP WON THIS DEBATE PRIMAILY BECAUSE OF WEAK DEFINITION BY AFF TEAM. THEY DID MAKE GOOD ARGUMENTS BASED ON IT AND LOGICAUY CORNERED AFF TEAM. LONGRATULATIONS!

Ø

AFF TEHM MISSED ON II MAN FACTORY FARMS"& RATHER PROPOSED MORE HUMANE FACTOR FARMS. AFF TEHM MISSED BUT ON "BAN FACTORY FARMS"& RATHER PROPOSED MORE HUMANE FACTOR FARMS. IT IS STILL A FACTORY FADM! OPP THEN FOLLSED ON "HUMANE" ALTERNATIVE & IMPACT OF BANNING.

BOTH TEAMS MISSED OUT ON KEY POINTS - HEALTH & SAFETY/ OF ANIMALS & ITS IMPACT ON LONSUMER (DISEASE) SIN CONGESTED SPACE

Round 28 Gov: 10 Opp: 15	5 Rangwala (*1 3 11:00am D208) Ganguli - Sangh 5 Fishlow - Fishlow Parli Debate	vi		Judge's Name:	HBBAS RANGWALA iation: DVHS
		PROP			OPP
	Team Code #:	······································		Team Code #:	
	Prop Speaker #1	GANGULI	pts_ <u>30</u>	Opp Speaker #1	<u>-15HLOW pts 30</u> =15HLOW pts 29.5
	Prop Speaker #2	SANGHVI	pts_ <u>30</u>	Opp Speaker #2 <u>//</u> .	<u>=15HLOW pts 29.5</u>
		$30 = \mathbf{P}_0$	erfect $29 = 0$	on the following scale: Dutstanding 28 = Very of enough to qualify for e	7 Good
	26-25 = Fair	24-20 =	= Poor	<20 = Reserved for r	ude or inappropriate behavior
			Jud	ging Criteria	
P ^{ol} in Unin	 Evidence: 1 evidence Argumenta by the other Points of In Delivery: F and easily u Courtesy: 1 	which may incl ation: How dire r side nformation: He low well the de inderstandable How courteous	ude facts and ectly and effe ow relevant a baters speak and respectfu	ctively the debaters resp nd effective were the qu in an organized, commu- il the debaters were to c	as well as general knowledge pond to the arguments made uestions and the answers unicative style that is pleasant
	each debater:	e cracita, pica		primenty and/or sugg	estions for improvement to
POIA DEL	Prop 1: <u>GAN 6</u> 5 5 6- <i>5 (GREAT POIN</i> 1/A 5 (A BIT TOD A 4 (SUG GES T LE	NTS, TOO IFAST, S	/	$\begin{array}{c} Opp 1: 0. FISHL ANA - 5 EVI - 4.5 ARO - 5 POI - 5 DEL - 5 COV - 5 \end{array}$	OW CARRIED OEBATE MORE PROFESIONALLY GOOD GRACE WHEN BISWSSING DEBAT TECHNICALITY.
ANA - : EVI - : ARG - : PDI - : DEL - :	Prop 2: SANG	401		$\begin{array}{c} Opp 2: H. FISHL ANA - 5 EVI - ARG - 4.5 POI - 5 DEL - 4.5 COV - 5 \end{array}$	GOOD BE A BIT MORE CRISP IN REBUTTAL
	TEAM CODE #	#: <u> </u>	on the(P	<i>OPP</i> wins this de rop or Opp)	bate.

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP: ITS A LOW POINT WIN, PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF PROP TEAMS FOCUS ON DEBATE TECHNICALITY & RAISING IT AGAIN & ABAIN. IT TOOK AWAY FROM SPIRIT OF DEG HEALTHY DEBATE EXCELLENT ARGUMENTS, & REBUTTALS BEST ICAME ACROSS . THIS IS A LOSS TO PROP TO HELP THEM WIN MORE

PROP TEMM: DUN'T TAKE THIS AS A LOSS. ITS A LOSS ON OVERALL MERIT. GOOD LUCK!

The USFG	Should	Ban Faite	ry Farms PARI	I Debate		
Yuyun Shang (*6) Round 2A 11:00am D201 Gov: 14 Shin - Shevele	v		Judge's Nar	ne: /un	Shang Campolindo	
Opp: 10 Gao - Pareek Varsity Parli Debate			Judge's Sch	ool Affiliation:	Campo lindo	H
Team Code #:	PROP 14		Team Co	OPP ode #:	40	-
Prop Speaker #1	sheve lev	pts9	Opp Speaker #1_	Pareel /	pts_29	
Prop Speaker #2	Shin	pts28	Opp Speaker #2	Gao	pts_ <u>_29</u>	
	30 = 27 = Good (but	points based or Perfect $29 = Or$ possibly not good $0 = Poor$	utstanding 28 I enough to qual	= Very Good	on rounds) nappropriate beha	vior
		Judg	ing Criteria/	/		
offered du • Evidence evidence- • Argument by the oth • Points of • Delivery: and easily • Courtesy Using the ab each debater Prop 1:-Great - cleat + Refe	uring the debate How appropri- which may in Itation: How d er side Information: How well the understandable How courteous ove criteria, p <i>contentions</i> for specker its could find	e iately and efficie aclude facts and r irectly and effect How relevant and debaters speak ir e us and respectful lease offer comp	ently the debate references to au tively the debat d effective wer han organized, the debaters w bliments and/o	rs support argunationity as well there is respond to the end of t	as general knowl the arguments ma and the answers e style that is plea ts and judges for improvement firation on de- machine no d machine no d machine no d	edge ide isant fimerin ad judgo crituin ts such as iffame as the infame as the
Prop 2: bene - Grea * Rofo point TEAM CODE	fit t specker to could be 1 with with t:::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::	onive on the Support. on the	Opp 2:	world love refute the Aff had this debate.		evidance to
Both teams K really enjoy			and all	ferr a	err exailen-	t Speakers

The US FG Sh	ould sign	ificantly	rodua PAR	LI Debate	Âgn`cu H	the Subsid	les
Yuyun Shang (*6) Round 2B 11:00am D201 Gov: 19 Gil - Kaur				ame: <u>Y</u> w			
Opp: 8 Yu - Makineni Varsity Parli Debate			Judge's Sc	hool Affiliation:	Campo lin	ndo HS	
PR Team Code #:	кор 19		Team (OPI	8		
Prop Speaker #1	kaur	_pts_28	Opp Speaker #1	Yus		ots_29	
Prop Speaker #2	G:1	_pts_26	Opp Speaker #	2 Makin	nen i	pts_29	
Please award eac			n the followin	•	od		
27 = 26-25 = Fair	Good (but pos		d enough to qua	alify for elimin	ation rounds	iate behavior	
		Judg	ging Criteria				
• Analysis: How	•			s analyze the	topic and the	e arguments	
offered during Evidence: Ho 	•	v and efficie	ently the deba	ters support a	/ rguments w	ith	
	ich may includ	•	•	•• /	-		:
• Argumentation	on: How direct						
by the other si			d offentive w		wa and the		
 Points of Info Delivery: How 							
and easily und		ioio speak i	/	,		at to proubuit	
• Courtesy: Ho	w courteous ar	nd respectful	l the debaters	were to oppor	nents and ju	dges	
Using the above each debater:	criteria, pleas	e offer com	pliments and	or suggestio	ns for impr	ovement to	
cach utbatti.			. +	Coal creck	el no	Definin M	"Significantly"
Prop 1: \star Gaina	d more conf	fiderle oral	Opp 1:	by Aff.	7 7	a gr ma	
the dol					. 1		
* Woul	I like to s	ee mpre		fad robut			,
evide	ance and the	lesy report	÷ +,	Maybe a 1	inthe less	on api	i cality?
		/ '		reduce to			
Prop 2: * Good	refute on	/schools	Opp 2: →	Grove refu	ite		
need more	mure funding teachers	, not only	¥	would life	t see	more evid	lano
* Would	like to feel	improve men	r ton				
TEAM CODE #:_		on the		ıs this debate.			
REASON FOR DE	CISION: SI	Pi ightly C+	rop or Opp)	1 1-		6u++4]	
		، د ر ر	<i>J</i>	(18000		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

.

Kathleen von Raesfeld (*25) Round 2A 11:00am H1 Gov: 8 Vadrevu - Nanda Opp: 15 Kapoor - Berger Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>NORCESSELO</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Sonoma Academy</u>
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:5
Prop Speaker #1 <u>Nand a</u> pt	s <u>28.</u> 25 Opp Speaker #1 Kap oor pts <u>28</u> .5
Prop Speaker #2 Vadrevu pt	s_28.25 Opp Speaker #2_Bergerpts_28
	29 = Outstanding $28 = Very Goody not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)$
 offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately an evidence—which may include fa Argumentation: How directly a by the other side Points of Information: How relivery: How well the debaters and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and reside 	Judging Criteria effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments and efficiently the debaters support arguments with acts and references to authority as well as general knowledge and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made levant and effective were the questions and the answers s speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant espectful the debaters were to opponents and judges fer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Well laid out argument an Strong examples of disease	d Opp 1: polite, gracious Clear, organized, correct balance of passion and + Great posture, execontact
Prop 2: + passion, Organization, gra allowing question = + Strong summaries	
	on the <u>Opp</u> wins this debate. Point (Prop or Opp) ugh time given to make plan, not enough al benefit

Emma Sutton (*12) Round 2A 11:00am K3	Judge's Name: E- Sutten
Gov: 11 Barnes - Gille Opp: 15 Aguilera - Zhou	$\sum (1) \sum (\pm 1)$
Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>JSAJ ("12</u>)
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 pts	Opp Speaker #1 2ho 4 pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Parkes pts 4	Opp Speaker #2 Aguitere pts 27
Please award each speaker points base 30 = Perfect 29	d on the following scale: = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jı	udging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effection offered during the debate 	ively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
•	iciently the debaters support arguments with
evidence—which may include facts a	nd references to authority as well as general knowledge
• Argumentation: How directly and ef	fectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
•	and effective were the questions and the answers
• Delivery: How well the debaters spea	k in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and respec	tful the debaters were to opponents and judges
each debater:	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: JAC Was a bit jesty, here to Smooth out transitions from	al Opp 1: You presented a lot of evidence that
point to print - Keepylines	Opp 1: You presented a lot of Evidence the d: dust veally say what you implied fortuelly the att did not catch it I I really liked the att did not catch it I you returned back
ercollint - when thened -	the att did but catch it I really little the way in your vabattal you vatered back
Lin with your VLbattal	to your intro- very profession.
Prop 2: Opp care hed many	Opp 2: Covent introl Very Swooth sprech
holes that you unseed. Good jul hitting every point but head to lo	of good Job hannering lack at tood
highing Every point, and Evidence,) argument.
"Thoras And birties" - How can the	$\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{I}}$
TEAM CODE #:	$\nabla r \rho$ wins this debate.
For holes in solving & evidence for holes in solving & evidence "Improve And birtics" - How can the Provise the REASON FOR DECISION: New of	(Prop or Opp)
Successfully argued maldis	(Prop or Opp) (Prop or Opp) ost wow on lack of food but off trobution. Att courses definition Solve root causes of problem by you promise to improve anti-bentics. Magich
argument, plus att will	solve voot causes et problem la ? D
banning. Veg-how Can	you promin to improve and the tres thegict

Emma Sutton (*12) Round 2B 11:00am K3	Judge's Name: F. Satton
Gov: 5 DeWitt - Kelley Opp: 25 Kornfein - Raesfeld Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: $\Im S H S (\# I)$
PROP 🗢	OPP 15
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Dr. ls. H pts) Opp Speaker #1 Lornfein pts 27
Prop Speaker #2_ Kelley_ pts_2	b Opp Speaker #2 Parteld pts 29
Please award each speaker points bas $30 = Perfect$ 20	ed on the following scale: = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
• Analysis: How reasonably and effect	tively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
	fficiently the debaters support arguments with and references to authority as well as general knowledge
-	effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	nt and effective were the questions and the answers
• Delivery: How well the debaters speared and easily understandable	eak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
•	ectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
· · ·	
each debater:	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to partner curity her speech
Prop 1: Contentions were weat	F. Opp 1: ANC was afull, fast - this is not
needed to expand on impact.	Opp 1: AVC va atuli, Fortal policy, it's parti. Conversely, rebuttal policy, it's parti. Loud patronizing. I
Ven Wen Outstand	M Know what a dropped argument is they Know what a dropped argument is they
Smooth pace. Outstands vebetted.	Know what a droppid wars ty thit wouldn't let me judge vars ty thit
a la thurd	
Prop 2: Great Sense of humo injected some much neede	(Upp 2: Excellent sprech + 115
injected the road Ala	you created a theme & ford security)
(evily to hunch)	d brought all the arguments back to
levity to the round. Ala dropped from too knuch prestime hit all their point	1) it "Vite for prople having food"= good
TEAM CODE #: on t	he Off wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION: Veg.	he Opp wins this debate. (Prop of Opp) Carried food Security argument - benetit
Aft were unable to dear	rly articulate developing metions argument, in important then domestic food stability. I durd subsidies for retorm) but the lity of
or show that this was me	n important than a omestice 100 a standing
Aft carried vetorin argument (dont ned subsidies for retorn) but stability of veg personaded me that food mon importation

Ritu Khurana (*10) Round 2A 11:00am L1 Gov: 15 Fogarty - Pister Opp: 14 Sutton - Moon Varsity Parli Debate		Judge's Name: Ashish Khurang Judge's School Affiliation: Jac Vington HSh School,
Team Code #:	PROP	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1_	Vister pts 20	Opp Speaker #1pts_20
Prop Speaker #2_	percenty pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 MOON pts
	7 = Good (but possibly not good	a the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
		ing Criteria
 offered dur Evidence: evidence— Argument by the othe Points of I Delivery: I and easily Courtesy: 	ring the debate How appropriately and efficient -which may include facts and r ation: How directly and effect or side Information: How relevant and How well the debaters speak in understandable How courteous and respectful	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ntly the debaters support arguments with eferences to authority as well as general knowledge ively the debaters respond to the arguments made d effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges
-Didn't o -besentati informe - overell e Prop 2: - Goord col	en stills con stills con a bit ocellent effect. lection of agriments eems to 80 oll uld bestautured better	Opp 1: _ Steong Osguments - Regulation was a Killes - Speak slowly Opp 2: _ steong aguments - well structured thoughts - overall excellent debote
TEAM CODE REASON FOR	#: <u>\\</u> on the <u>(</u> Pro (Pro	

Ritu Khurana (*10) Round 2B 11:00am L1	Judge's Name: Ashish Khurana
Gov: 5 Viviani - Cunningham Opp: 27 Rosenthal - Dondero Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington Herschool
PROP Team Code #: 5	OPP Team Code #: 27
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Prop Speaker #1 Cunningham pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 pts_22
Prop Speaker #2 Viviani pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 <u>Rosenthal</u> pts <u>2</u>
Please award each speaker points based 30 = Perfect 29 =	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not go	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	Iging Criteria
	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
	iently the debaters support arguments with
	l references to authority as well as general knowledge
	ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	and offertive years the questions and the ensurement
	and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	in an organized, communicative style that is picasain
-	ul the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: A ORA Hall I Car	Opp 1: Excellent Assentation
-strong assument about him) - Good collection and structure of assuments
-Arguments focused on one could	m = Course of the and a the report
instead of all again alture subsit	Some of the use menus ween i
- Eating Gum?	Courtaled well.
	Opp 2: - Excellent Besentation
Prop 2: - Grozed Besentation SKAls	opp 2: traceller iscervice of the
- Excellent counter of generation	t - strong agaments but counter of Bob
- Besented tope different frem	
the mein tobe (move sube the monstor TEAM CODE # ? 7	Harved
TEAM CODE #: 2.7 on the	Obb wins this debate.
	Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	

Erika Pineda (*14) Round 2A 11:00am D202 Gov: 25 Saxena - Duncan	Judge's Name: Erika Pineda
Opp: 6 Firsov - Kwak	
Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell High School
PROP	OPP
Team Code #:25	Team Code #: (o
Prop Speaker #1 <u>Sax-ena</u> pts_ Prop Speaker #2 <u>1Jun cun</u> pts_	29 Opp Speaker #1 KWak pts 28
Prop Speaker #2_1Jun c un pts_	29 Opp Speaker #2 Firsov pts 28
Please award each speaker points b	
	29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
$27 - Good (but possibly r)$ $26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) = 20 = Reserved for mude on incommunity holocologies
$20-23 - Fail \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
• Analysis: How reasonably and eff	fectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
• Evidence: How appropriately and	efficiently the debaters support arguments with
	ts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
• Argumentation: How directly an	d effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
• Points of Information: How relev	vant and effective were the questions and the answers
• Delivery: How well the debaters s	peak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and res	pectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offe each debater:	r compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	- Very fast speaker! Some
Prop 1: Great jobs oft	Opp 1: points were not clear becaus
Organizing your points.	of your preaking rate.
Careful with your volume	as of your speaking rate.
Current with good the	as breat pitch and eye contract.
on speed you up. Even thon	and the tra life of your hands.
m are an effective fast th	Iker, it can be distracting
henit acts top loud - when	adate 0
n are an effective fust tu hen it gets top loud - un prop 2: it is hard to fo	Mon. Opp 2: 1 to a land have vate and
cat, strong points, - which we	ell- Opp 2: Great speaking rate and volume. Appreciated the
en portegion upartransiti	me volume. Appreciated the
oken. work on your transiti	ons slightly slower rate with
n point to point. Your use a	distracting an increase when
and of between points wa	appropriate
TEAM CODE #:25 on	s distracting an increase when appropriate the <u>Prop</u> wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	(Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	
Effective arments	for marting the proposal.

Opp side had some implausible arguments against.

Erika Pineda (*14) Round 2B 11:00am D202 Gov: 10 Lito - Liu	Judge's Name: Erika Pineda
Opp: 15 Banisadr - Weiner Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell High School
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #: 15
Prop Speaker #1 00 pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 <u>Banisadr</u> pts <u>29</u> Opp Speaker #2 <u>Wriner</u> pts <u>28</u>
Prop Speaker #2 Lik pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Wriner pts 28
Please award each speaker points base	
	= Outstanding 28 = Very Good good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	
Ju	udging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effection offered during the debate 	ively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	iciently the debaters support arguments with
	nd references to authority as well as general knowledge
	fectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	t and effective were the questions and the answers is in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	ik in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
	tful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater:	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Great Introduction.	Opp 1: Great job at attacking the
Appreciated the definitions	. points in a clear and concise
Good volume and vate frice	Manner. Your rate and pitch
job of not valsing your voice	e were enjoyable to listen to.
when you spoke quickly. Som.	e you remained clear even as you
job of not valsing your voice when you spoke quickly. Som of your thoughts needed more Prop 2: organization	Ped up - not always easy to do! Opp 2:
Great speaking rate and volum	
I enjoyed listening to you. Some	Please watch the volume when
of your points went on too long.	yon start speaking. You speak
of your points went on too long. Mo It can reduce the effectiveness.	Alearly - even
TEAM CODE #: 15 on the	e <u>DPP</u> wins this debate. Clearly - even (Prop or Opp) wins this debate. When you speed up.
REASON FOR DECISION:	(Prop or Opp) but the volume can
Record	make it diffice at
Noposide effectively dist	manted props to listen.
Oppside effectively dist ayuments.	nom na pr
V	


•

		PARLI Debate
Nadia Whitmore (*5) Round 2A 11:00am D206 Gov: 6 Gong - Li		Judge's Name: Madia Whithope
Opp: 21 Masters - Fehring Varsity Parli Debate		Judge's School Affiliation: DIShop () Dowd
PROP Team Code #:	6	OPP Team Code #: 2,
Prop Speaker #1 GONG	2 pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 ADD TIASTER pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	pts_29	Opp Speaker #2 to Fehring prs 27
Please award each sp		on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Goo		od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Jud	Iging Criteria
-	•	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the		ionthy the debater gunnent enguments with
-		iently the debaters support arguments with I references to authority as well as general knowledge
		ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side		·······
•	ation: How relevant a	and effective were the questions and the answers
• Delivery: How we	ell the debaters speak	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily underst		
• Courtesy: How co	ourteous and respectf	ul the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above crite each debater:	eria, please offer cop	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Well STR With well defin evidence	ucture points	Opp 1: NOT effective counterplan but excellent presentation.
with well obefin	ie supporting	but excellent prosentation.
evidence		
Prop 2:	/	Opp 2:
		Goul
TEAM CODE #:		Prop or Ópp)
REASON FOR DECIS	ION:	till to to
MUCH STR	enger an	quinent by the Gov To The alot more valid supporting
BAN, FASTOR	Y Farm INT.	The alot more valid supporting
evidence.		

Nadia Whitmore (*5) Round 2B 11:00am D206 Gov: 8 Bardalai - Rangwala Opp: 21 Mubarack - Troup Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>Madia</u> Whitmore Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Dishop O'Dowol</u> ,
PROP	OPP AL
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1_Bardalai_pts_28	- 1
Prop Speaker #2 <u>RANGWala_pts27</u>	Opp Speaker #2 TQOUP pts 19
Please award each speaker points based	on the following scale:
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
$26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	
Juc	lging Criteria
• Analysis: How reasonably and effectiv	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
evidence—which may include facts and	iently the debaters support arguments with I references to authority as well as general knowledge
• Argumentation: How directly and effe	ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
 Points of Information: How relevant a Delivery: How well the debaters much 	and effective were the questions and the answers
and easily understandable	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
	ul the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	apliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: excellent Oral Deliv	e opp 1: excellent point envel Delivery - Supported your point very cell
- Very Courteous and perpettul.	very kell
- Pould have us about for	al
Prop 2: Supporting Euloleure To Support the proposition	Opp 2: _ relevent po1.
TEAM CODE #: 2 on the	
د المستقل المست المستقل المستقل	O(p') wins this debate. (rop br/Opp)
STRONGER argume	It NOT TO Reduce the subsity

٠

Cathe	Topic: The USFG show	ld boos ban Factory Farms PARLI Debate
Kavhi	J 1:00am D205	Judge's Name: Cathy Aquilera
Opp: 27	Stamm-Kirk - Burshteyn Hatcher - Butler Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Mira monte
	PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #: $37/$
	Prop Speaker #1Stamm-Kick pts_28	
	Prop Speaker #2 Burshteyn . pts 27	
	Please award each speaker points based 30 = Perfect 29 =	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 7 Very Good
		od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	$26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Jud	Iging Criteria
		ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	offered during the debate	
	U	iently the debaters support arguments with
		I references to authority as well as general knowledge
ulao V	•	potively the debaters respond to the arguments made
GONING H20V	by the other side	whitely the debaters respond to the arguments made
econ deviz		and effective were the questions and the answers 1)
(S) John more e	•	
will bloom to ho	-/	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant Boar fams
3485 1	and easily understandable	is the debaters were to opponents and judges 2) botas much v
10thenhit.	• Courtesy: How courteous and respect	ul the debaters were to opponents and judges 2) for as much v
Policy Bound		deset . enothing us
Farms	Using the above criteria, please offer con	apliments and/or suggestions for improvement to a). Acoust Read may
Farms Com RUN Farma	each debater: 1) animals freuted	vet ben. to society ~ economy-25 bil factory who factore farms
		/ Capital - 3) o Longertonis
	Prop 1.	E Opp to Butler Suffering food 2). Jood restructures is
A - 900	od analysis 3. numan erghts r 2013 Blooming	Good analysis market 1) pauli vacuum V Cooli chipotle V
5-04	llent evidence) _ remploy more peop	(B- rainer 2) Bringer 3) Brivale farms
A-	The farmers	3) benefits loss jobs, people
· · · ·	2) Food de Sive aus 5) objections of the australiant of the australia	
DESM	ooth, good hone voice chandgestures	120 C-good sectionalized food indusp \$ to Pay
		secontrained status quo
C- 90		
•	Prop 2: Burshy lengn 7390 Tdisesse	Opp 2: Flatter Strong economy already
A-goo	d analysis nearch if unimals treater	A Lund analysis) other plan socialist plant
5	would z) 400 prode died	En accellent Acculmentation FDA approved animal Rights by
A- 90	od angumentation 3) Noeway Ichina	
P-X		great hand gestures, eye contact, tone ? voice
D-ton	e, hand gesture voice good	- MASS 0,000
C- 900	[TEAM CODE #: on the dott on the d	
- U	(1	Prop or Opp)
	REASON FOR DECISION:	
	Both strong, opp had &	olighty better analysis both strong
	evidence.	



Cath	y Aquiltra Topic: The ve	5FG should significantly PARLI Debate	y reduce its agricutea! subsidics.
	J J Ira Randeria (*10)		
Round 2B Gov: 4 F	11:00am D205 Feinberg - Wolf-Jacobs	Judge's Name: <u>Cathu</u>	<u>Aguilera</u> .
	Malfavon - Hulett Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:	Miramonte
	PROP Team Code #: 4	OPP Team Code #:	27
	Prop Speaker #1_Feinbergpts3	O_ Opp Speaker #1_ Mg Favor	pts 27
	Prop Speaker #2 WOLF JULOB pts C	19 Opp Speaker #2 Hulett	pts_28
	Please award each speaker points ba	sed on the following scale:	el en Manuel munde en la contra co
	30 = Perfect 2	29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good	1
	27 = Good (but possibly not 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	ot good enough to qualify for eliminat <20 = Reserved for rude or	
		Judging Criteria	
	• Analysis: How reasonably and effe	ectively the debaters analyze the to	ppic and the arguments
Som RC Cerepter Sources of food Sources of food	\wedge offered during the debate		
Received.	• Evidence: How appropriately and		
can of fu	evidence—which may include fact		
South Count	• Argumentation: How directly and	effectively the debaters respond to	o the arguments made
elimi rule laur	by the other side	ant and offersting source of	
bill uce produce produce	 Points of Information: How relev Delivery: How well the debaters specified on the second second		
procession I wan	and easily understandable	Jeak in an organized, communicati	ive style that is pleasant
Net be nitte	• Courtesy: How courteous and resp	ectful the debaters were to oppone	ents and judges
Vertiening	Using the above criteria, please offer	compliments and/or suggestion	s for improvement to
4	each debater willest with Cut far	m550% ASAP A - I IA	(m)) proof reyond
Spillion	Pron 1 Crin Del g 2) allocak	ms 50%. Foodstamps Ashp. A - good (Mal.) hunger F - good evidence hunger F - good evidence	ieasonable daubt
operations.		France Opp 1: A -	
weed 75 V	A Taxa light Ard matting 4). No Ne	FLOST X NO FUL	echices the B. subsidire by
No need to V breign sub other take away other take away other take away other	A <u>excellent</u> Argumentation	D-yood hard g	estures i tone.
whe away a	ver (D-great hand gestures, eye con		1 mm 4 food gecueity
cal. plans, 10 wa	Jerry tone 2 voice		been Streeder
rake away read to wa		TH	ulett bay y advantages
	wolf-Jacobs.	Opp 2. A-Strong and	UNE WILLION V JOB, TRADE + 5 V
atrendy have	Prop 2: A excellent analysis		
CONSIDON W	A-excellent argument	A- excellent an	gurry Print / 8) Sacnitie
		6- youdeye cont	(9) invision of a layoff a
disasters. Albring food to Albring it 7 fo	durr D-good hard gestyres tone.	C-good har	agestures. roundup eight w
disaver food to	C-good	1 6 900a	/ change in different
3) how tach ~	ТЕАМ CODE #: оп	the KOP wins this debate.	V dia action) . c
deciment		(Prop or Opp)	WER OK coul At it cut
11 +0. " Ind())	REASON FOR DECISION:		drought subsidie a funding
Jun als per	· both were our	ong but evidence:	10-PXist
10 towers	ALMS 12	or an mentional of a cities in	their plan Not bring oc.
5). subsidiug to	plRoundup. He loubt 1	of Prop was outstandi	
NOT MALT	Roundup. 1 Roundup. Wasted & Vit De a reasonable doubt your a) policy can't De a reasonable doubt your		from if it's taken any? take anothe source.

and Ang Agenter and VE MARKENNE ST. - MAR A solution of the solution of - manifals as theready Same Same s i sha Lê s**ha** Qiliya A second and a second of the s And a second and a second a s And a second And a second And a second And a second And a second And a second And a second And a second a sec

Susan Stephan (*15) Round 2B 11:00am D203 Gov: 3 Holt - Mizin · Opp: 27 Chu - Fraga Varsity Parli Debate		Judge's Name: Judge's School A	<u>Styphen</u> ffiliation: <u>Mir</u>	amonte
PR Team Code #:	<u>0</u> <u>B</u>	Team Code #	OPP 27	
Prop Speaker #1	<u>olt pts29.</u>	Opp Speaker #1	roga	_pts9
Prop Speaker #2	lizin pts29	Opp Speaker #2	hu	pts_
	h speaker points based o 30 = Perfect 29 = 0 Good (but possibly not goo 24-20 = Poor	Dutstanding $28 = V$ d enough to qualify for	ery Good	
		ging Criteria		
 offered during Evidence: How evidence—white Argumentation by the other side Points of Info Delivery: How and easily under Courtesy: How 	w appropriately and effici- ich may include facts and on: How directly and effec- de rmation: How relevant and well the debaters speak in erstandable w courteous and respectfu	ently the debaters su references to author ctively the debaters in an effective were the in an organized, con il the debaters were	upport arguments rity as well as gen respond to the arg e questions and th nmunicative style to opponents and	s with neral knowledge guments made he answers e that is pleasant l judges
each debater:	riteria, please offer com	priments and/or su	ggestions for mi	iprovement to
Prop 1: Hold	remember to repute	Opp 1: Fraga Opp 2: Chn	roments, to referte al tel Jub points - 1.07 just maix points	For bold teams feit
TEAM CODE #: REASON FOR DEC	<u>27</u> on the (P CISION: Dpp: more eFF Of Fully reFul	DP wins this rop or opp Eactive in fed argum	arghing arghing Ich H.(me	d Prop re then Oppl.

•

Vishal Garg (*22) Round 2A 11:00am K2 Gov: 14 Lustig - Gerenrot	Judge's Name: VIShal hars
Opp: 8 Mehta - Alvarez Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Monta Vista
PROP Team Code #: 14-	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Lustig pts 30	Opp Speaker #1A Narezpts29
Prop Speaker #2 <u>Cleven vot</u> pts 30	Opp Speaker #2 Mehra pts 30
Please award each speaker points based of	e /
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	ging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate 	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and effici evidence—which may include facts and	iently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
• Points of Information: How relevant an	nd effective were the questions and the answers
and easily understandable	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
• Courtesy: How courteous and respectful	al the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer come each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	Opp 1: ALVAREZ 29
AABBAA	THAT TATA
E TRAAR 30 ABBAA A RABAA A ABBAA	RA BAA RA AR
01 + * * * * * * * *	TAXX X XXXX
TARA TARA	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
F Prop 2: Gevenot	Opp 2: Mehta,
A to	* KB * * (30)
Pol batter (AR ARA
TEAM CODE #: 14 on the	NOP wins this debate.
(P) REASON FOR DECISION:	rop dr Opp)
Proposition wins the	I time Polital
getting better on l	the final Rebuttal.

Vishal Gar Round 2B 11:00 Gov: 15 Hard	am K2 wick - Der	Judge's Name: Vishal Carg
Opp: 14 Yan Varsity Parli [Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Monta Uisha
Tean	PROP n Code #:15	OPP Team Code #:14
Prop	Speaker #1 Dev_ pts 29.5	Opp Speaker #1 Pts_29
Prop	Speaker #2_Hardwick_pts_30	Opp Speaker #2pts3D
Plea		Outstanding 28 = Very Good
26-	27 = Good (but possibly not go25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Jud	lging Criteria
•	offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and effic evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effe by the other side Points of Information: How relevant a Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments iently the debaters support arguments with d references to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges
A E A D D C A E A D D C REA	h debater: 1. Pe V29 ***** ****	Prop wins this debate. Prop or Opp) Now ever frogosition Kobuttal Argumentation, Me for wins the prop wins the prop.

Sum Loberson		PARLI Debate
Round 2A 11:00am J3 Gov: 21 Cheng - Shifs		Judge's Name: 56 M Roberson P
Opp: 6 Reyna - Yang Varsity Parli Debate		Judge's School Affiliation: PNAS
PRO Team Code #:	21 3	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1	<u>nfs</u> pts	Opp Speaker #1 Rrynh pts_2a
Prop Speaker #2	hena pts <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #2 $GANG$ $pts \underline{30}$
		a the following scale:utstanding28 = Very Goodenough to qualify for elimination rounds)<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judg	ing Criteria
• Analysis: How offered during t	reasonably and effectively	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
evidence-whi	ch may include facts and r n: How directly and effect	ntly the debaters support arguments with eferences to authority as well as general knowledge ively the debaters respond to the arguments made
 Points of Infor Delivery: How and easily under 	mation: How relevant and well the debaters speak in rstandable	d effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above care to be the second	riteria, please offer comp	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: great H and aanty u and also gran	one volume Tren speaking 5 Dody language	Opp 1: great 50b! try fospean. a little slower su you dong Stomble and Jomble your words
Prop 2: good USEMOR offy evaluate the of	out time and	Opp 2: great to b clear and to the point with good organnation
TEAM CODE #: REASON FOR DEC LACH OF M UP IN CLUSIN	ISION: JISION:	<u>Off</u> wins this debate. op or Opp) DTOP and New Points Brought

Sam Robersonal	PARLI Debate
Round 2B 11:00am J3	Judge's Name: SAM RODGESOVA
Gov: 15 Stephen - Miskelley Opp: 14 Dahan - Williams-Baron Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: PVAS
PROP رجمع Team Code #:	Team Code #: [\mathcal{U}
Prop Speaker #1 <u>prostation</u> pts 30	Opp Speaker #1
Prop Speaker #2pts	Opp Speaker #2illiamspt2_7_
	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Ju	dging Criteria
 offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficience—which may include facts an Argumentation: How directly and efficience of the other side Points of Information: How relevant Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respect 	wely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ciently the debaters support arguments with ad references to authority as well as general knowledge fectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers is in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater:	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Great 50b! and zind Organization, Tone, Volume captivating Speaking	But durit forget to Say allyour points and contentions in the first speech
Prop 2: Great body language and Great eyel (and when Speaking but Mork on being alittle louder 134 Limboshi TEAM CODE #: on the	Opp 2: Very good top and good Bidy language try to relax Before Speaking So you can comay information a box
REASON FOR DECISION:	
NTOPPEd pomts from neg	as valas an appendatempt
to Bring up attran inform	nation APANIS

11:00am K1 Cramer - Griffin		Judge's Name: DHMAL	leinacka
Skarr - Escarceg Parli Debate	ja	Judge's School Affiliation: M	ntgomery
Team Code #:	PROP 4	Team Code #:	and sense a second s
	Cranov pts 29	_	- pts 28
Prop Speaker #2_	Griffin pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	pts_27
Please award	each speaker points based o		NET Y TO CONTRACT OF A CONTRACT
		Outstanding 28 = Very Good	
2 26-25 = Fair	7 = Good (but possibly not good $24-20 = Poor$	od enough to qualify for elimination r <20 = Reserved for rude or inap	
	Tud	aina Critorio	
Analycie I		ging Criteria ely the debaters analyze the topic a	and the groumen
evidence	which may include facts and	ently the debaters support argume references to authority as well as	general knowled
 by the othe Points of I Delivery: I and easily to the second secon	r side nformation: How relevant a How well the debaters speak inderstandable	ctively the debaters respond to the nd effective were the questions an in an organized, communicative s il the debaters were to opponents a	d the answers tyle that is pleas
 by the othe Points of I Delivery: I and easily to Courtesy: Using the above 	r side nformation: How relevant a How well the debaters speak inderstandable How courteous and respectfu	nd effective were the questions an in an organized, communicative s	d the answers tyle that is pleas and judges
 by the othe Points of I Delivery: I and easily to Courtesy: Using the aboreach debater: Prop 1: 6000 	r side nformation: How relevant a How well the debaters speak understandable How courteous and respectfu ve criteria, please offer com	nd effective were the questions and in an organized, communicative s all the debaters were to opponents a apliments and/or suggestions for	d the answers tyle that is pleas and judges improvement t
 by the othe Points of I Delivery: I and easily to Courtesy: Using the aboreach debater: Prop 1: 6000 	r side nformation: How relevant a How well the debaters speak understandable How courteous and respectfu ve criteria, please offer com	nd effective were the questions and in an organized, communicative s all the debaters were to opponents a apliments and/or suggestions for	d the answers tyle that is please and judges improvement t $P = \sqrt{P = Scent}$
by the othe Points of I Delivery: I and easily to Courtesy: Using the above each debater: Prop 1: GOOD Exphatic OUTE Prop 2:	r side nformation: How relevant a How well the debaters speak inderstandable How courteous and respectfu ve criteria, please offer com D eye contect + pacin W (OUT bleing emotion y passionate Sontect, 6000 volume n excessive use	nd effective were the questions and in an organized, communicative s all the debaters were to opponents and/or suggestions for apliments and/or suggestions for Also, Emph Much emot	d the answers tyle that is please and judges improvement t $\sqrt{prescent}$
by the othe Points of I Delivery: I and easily to Courtesy: Using the above each debater: Prop 1: GOO Chyphatic ON ONE VIE Prop 2: GOOD EYE CO	r side nformation: How relevant a How well the debaters speak understandable How courteous and respectfu ve criteria, please offer com D eye contect + pacin W (OUT bleing emotion y passionate Sontect, 6000 volume in excessive use #: <u>4</u> on the <u>5</u>	nd effective were the questions and in an organized, communicative s all the debaters were to opponents and/or suggestions for apliments and/or suggestions for Also, Emph Much emot South Opp 2: GOOD and C of bando for	d the answers tyle that is please and judges improvement t $\sqrt{pvescent}$

U SEGor Should ban Factory farms? PARLI Debate

Kimiko Cheng (*21) Round 2A 11:00am J2 Gov: 27 Ernst - Davis Opp: 3 Rubsamen - Skep Varsity Parli Debate	oner		Judge's Name: <u>K. Cheng</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>San Manin</u>
Team Code #:	PROP 27		OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1	Ernst	pts50	Opp Speaker #1_ Rub Janen_ pts_29
Prop Speaker #2	Davis	pts29	Opp Speaker #2_ <u>Skeppner</u> _pts <u>29</u>
 26-25 = Fair Analysis: Hoffered duri Evidence: Hevidence Argumentation by the other Points of In Delivery: Heand easily u Courtesy: Heand easily u 	30 = Pe 7 = Good (but po 24-20 = Now reasonably a ing the debate How appropriate which may inclu- tion: How direct side formation: How low well the deb inderstandable How courteous a	rfect 29 = 0 ssibly not goo Poor Jud and effective ely and effective ide facts and ctly and effe w relevant a paters speak and respectfu	Iging Criteria ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments iently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge gtively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant al the debaters were to opponents and judges
each debater: Prop 1: Clear and expl contract critical In Prop 2:	concise, 2 addresse soues Neg.	bood de (refuted broughting	Opp 2: Exallent use of social contract and Vilianson to refute pts made by
TEAM CODE # REASON FOR E Prop Spa berefit-		(P	Prof. wins this debate. Prop or Opp) Speech personaded in priving nut

-

orff 2

Enforcement insure addressed methane is 10 × monse thom Cuz Olready a meet overproduction addressed all pts of Neg 1

close

animal constry

Kimiko Cheng (*21) Judge's Name:	Should us fad givt reduce i	Hagri- subsidies? PARLI Debate
Read 28 1130am 22 Opp 38 50 - Her Judge's Name: L Charge Opp 38 50 - Her Judge's School Affiliation: Sub - Her Judge's School Affiliation: Prop Speaker #1 Prop Speaker #1 Prop Speaker #1 Data Sub - Her Team Code #: Prop Speaker #2 Opp 38 Opp 39 Prop Speaker #2 Opp 39 Sub - Her Team Code #: Opp 39 Prop Speaker #2 Opp 39 Opp 39 Prop Speaker #2 Opp 39 Opp 30 Opp 30 Opp 30 Opp 31 Outsof Information: How relevant and efficiently the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer conthime	_	
$\begin{array}{c c} \hline Prop \\ Team Code # \underline{Prop} \\ Prop Speaker #1 \underline{Prop} \\ Prop Speaker #2 \underline{Cohum. Sum (pf. pts 28)} \\ Opp Speaker #2 \underline{Prop} \\ Opp Speaker #2 Pr$		Index's Marrow K Charles
Prop	Gov: 14 Cohen-Simayof - Drake	Judge's Name: <u>C. Meng</u>
Team Code # Yeam Code # Yeam Code # Yeam Code # Prop Speaker #1 Yeam Yeam Yeam Yeam Yeam Yeam Yeam Yeam	Opp: 8 Su - Her Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin
Team Code # Yeam Code # Yeam Code # Yeam Code # Prop Speaker #1 Yeam Yeam Yeam Yeam Yeam Yeam Yeam Yeam	Antibiological and the second se	
Prop Speaker #2 Cohum. Simplet pts 78 Opp Speaker #2 Her pts 74 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 rule or insopropriate behavior Judging Criteria Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—thick may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge Argumentation: How appropriately and effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—thick 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 Originate of 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 Originate How relevant and effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts 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: - How down are arguments with evide arguments arguments with evide arguments argument by and effectively the	Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #2 Cohum - Simaple pts 28 Opp Speaker #2 Her 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 romds) 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rule or imporporiate behavior	Prop Speaker #1 Drake pts 29	Opp Speaker #1pts_30
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 - Analysis: How reasonably and efficiently 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 efficiently the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side • Points of Information: How relevant and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side • 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: . How A arguments To mach arguments ore pt - insurance way Prop 2: Other - insurance Opp 2: Way arguments TEAM CODE #: 0 on the Off wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: on the Off Op Way Off or Opp) Way Off or ope	Prop Speaker #2 Cohen - Sime yof pts 28	Opp Speaker #2Hevpts_72
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poir <20 = Reserved for rule or inappropriate behavior		
Judging Criteria • Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate • Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge • Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side • Points of Information: How relevant and effective/were the questions and the answers • Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: How of any other. How of any other. How of arguments. • Reprint of plane and easily on the second and the any of any other. How of any other. • Prop 1: How of any other. How of the plane. Opp 1: Word any other. How any other. • More any other. How any other. • More any other. More any other.		/
 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: . Hood arguments. Prop 2:	26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
 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 effectively 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: . Hood arguments. Prop 1: . Hood arguments. Opp 1: Very though in thinging W many food arguments. Prop 2: Opp 2: How arguments. Prop 2: Opp 2: How arguments. Delivery: Arguments. TEAM CODE #: on the Opp wins this debate. REASON FOR DECISION: Were arguments or Wing W to Wing W to	Ju	dging Criteria
 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 communents and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: . Hord arg context. Hord argumentation. Opp 2: Hord argumentation. Hord argumentation. TEAM CODE #:		vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
 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: . Hord argumentation on just ore pt - insurance Prop 2: Objective of the state of the st	0	/
 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: . How deep contact. How deep havies on just or pt - insurance interval Prop 2: Opp 2: . Opp 3: . TEAM CODE #: on the OPP		
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: . Hord every context. Horo much everphasis on just ore pt - insurance Prop 2: Other the speak of the second provide and the method for the second provide of the second p	•	, · · · ·
 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: . Hood event contact. Hood to contact. Hood to		ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
 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: . Hood are contact. Hood are provided in the debaters were to opponents in the figure of the method. Prop 1: . Hood are contact. Hood are provided in the debaters or just one pt - insurance of the method. Prop 2: Opp 2: How counted of the method. TEAM CODE #: <u>8</u> on the <u>off</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: Was any or the problem. 	•	and effective were the questions and the answers
 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: . Hood eye contact. Hood enghasis on just ore pt - insurance Prop 2: Opp 2: Hood processor Opp 2: Hood processor Opp 2: Hood processor TEAM CODE #: on the offer organized to increase price include to increase price include the net ken. slightly Market Strength or offer organized the net ken. slightly Market Strength or offer offer organized the net ken. slightly Market Strength or offer offer organized the net ken. slightly 	• Delivery: How well the debaters speak	
each debater: Prop 1: . Hood eye contact. Hood eye contact. Hood engeneries on just one pt - insurance Prop 2: Otherston-gooding noise - good. TEAM CODE #: <u>g</u> on the <u>Off</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: Mare explanations on you pt of view pushed the net ken. slightly		ful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Prop 2: Other the volution of the set to have been of the set then the set th		mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 2: Other the volution of the set to have been of the set then the set th	Prop 1: •	Opp 1:
Prop 2: Other the volution of the set to have been of the set then the set th	Mind eye contact.	Very though in tringing up that
Prop 2: Other the volution of the set to have been of the set then the set th	I have basis on just	
Prop 2: Otherston-großeng noice - good. Opp 2: Avoid poor related - u/o subuscies Avoid poor related - u/o subuscies Avoid poor related - u/o subuscies formes trane to increase price intrich is trad for conserver. TEAM CODE #: <u>g</u> on the <u>OPP</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: Wore explanations on you pt of view pushed the net ken. slightly	to much emp	Jerg andrews
Prop 2: Otherstron-group nice-grot. Opp 2: Hood processe understal - u/o subscribes formes trane to increase price which is lead for consumers. TEAM CODE #: <u>8</u> on the <u>OPP</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: Ware explanations on ymp. Pt of view pushed the net ken. slightly	one pt - insurance	
TEAM CODE #: <u>8</u> on the <u>OPP</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: Wore explanations on yrm Pt of view pushed the net ken. slightly		
TEAM CODE #: <u>8</u> on the <u>OPP</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: Wore explanations on yrm Pt of view pushed the net ken. slightly	Prop 2:	Opp 2:
TEAM CODE #: <u>8</u> on the <u>OPP</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: Wore explanations on yrm Pt of view pushed the net ken. slightly	attention - granding more go	Avor rebuttal - w/o sweet which
TEAM CODE #: <u>8</u> on the <u>OPP</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: More explanations on ym Pt of view pushed the net ken. (1.ight/y		formes trave to increase process
(Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: More explanations on you pt of view pushed the net ken. (1.isht/y		is had for consumers.
(Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: More explanations on you pt of view pushed the net ken. (1.isht/y		h = h = h = h = h = h = h = h = h = h =
REASON FOR DECISION: More explanations on your pt of view pushed the new index over the APF.	$\mathbf{IEANICODE} #; \underline{\mathbf{S}} \qquad \text{on the} \qquad \qquad$	Prop or Opp)
over the Aff.	REASON FOR DECISION: Wore explanations on y	mpt of view pushed the new .
	over the APP.	

Q. F.P. 1

Some 1.1 B over 10 yrs Subidies are inefficient. Formers are not motivated to some

Ctop insurance

Neg. 1 Brought up issue of job loss who sub. small formes are not competitive Gop ins. - eventually from tax gayers

aff 2 、5 1 it cant. - some billions

N.g. 2 Farmers are not overising resources.

		PARLI Debate	
Joel Jacobs (*4)		Jacobs	
Round 2A 11:00am K4 Gov: 6 Visht - Koshkin		Judge's Name:	
Opp: 25 Greenberg - K Varsity Parli Debate	olling	Judge's School Affiliation:	Berk
	nanananan kata seri seri seni tangga kata kata seri seri seri sangga kata seri seri seri seri seri seri seri s		
Team Code #:	PROP	Team Code #: OPP	d
-	1/1/ 21		79
Prop Speaker #1	1pts	Opp Speaker #1 (reenberg	pts <u>C0</u>
Prop Speaker #2	2 Kosh Kin pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	pts <u>Z</u> 8
Please award	d each speaker points based	2 /	Dar Bill On Annang Kolther General Delek ing
		Outstanding 28 - Very Good	
26-25 = Fair		od enough to qualify for eliminat <20 = Reserved for rude or	
		lging Criteria	
		ely the debaters analyze the to	pic and the arguments
	uring the debate How appropriately and effice	iently the debaters support arg	uments with
		l references to authority as we	
• Argumer	ntation: How directly and effe	ectively the debaters respond to	
by the oth			
		nd effective were the question in an organized, communicati	
	understandable	in an organized, communican	ive style mat is pleasant
•	/	ul the debaters were to oppone	ents and judges
Laing the ch			
Using the ad each debater	ove criteria, please otter con	Haw Can U Win Informations	s for improvement to this is already and solvency? If again this is already will strike tailord is an equal protection test.
	dant def skeued? dear re wh. NB includes berst manes, more space) solve for i" was creative but fore gray ped in MG. NOpp: THIS was the new arg, not RVI!	on books and (2) coubts, i	will strike I metertion test.
Prop 1: Wy	dril det stade NR includes berst	6 Opp 1: Compelling /narrowly	failored 15 91 equal processing used
How days up also los he	dear is with high angline	No application here.	at 1 1 and there inform
"P EF VG "R. II FF	" was control it for a for	> Why not shirt or case spee	when w/ definitional args, since they inform
ceally should be been develo	med in MG.	all other args?	and all Fr but bell he what His
PMR net denner an.	ROpp: THIS was the	They der light they	now to selling thenselves but.
	new arg, not RV1.	" Drapped args are voters only	A important. T ? Did need
			mains all FF; but bell he what FFs may be selling themselves that. If important. FF def in up T arg? Don't need (which might be too generous) - also
the environment. Jou not	ed a much mark nugated anima	to rely on their concession	(which might be too generous) - also
agents are to win on the	that The work of bakes for	and point out that FF = Carn	ng about ethic, not A weithere. Does
"fut" By cleans hat	the non-loaded value council we	Ich Why tan much Home on T	T. I got it affer 30 sees. I don't
intracically, instrumenter	lly, a both.	need justifications the	to vote agginst a non-topical plan.
TEĂM CODE	E#: On the	wins this debate.	(which might be too generous) - also ny about effic, not A welfare. Does T: I got it after 30 sees. I don't to vote against a non-topical plan.
KEASUN FUR		IN LANGUE MORA NOTLEC IT I	VIAN LIDOA LELC THE ALCAL LINER
were some really big,	interesting issues: animal "	referer consumer charge find	colore that was at ally
leveloped. Prop wins por	erty arg-poor can eat th	1995 other than most Al	safety, that were not nally wins gnimal welfare, but doesn't s econ impact, gove overreach 2-but Affat doesn't extend past prove lace T
impact it, and sto is NI	B for humans. Choice takes a	it consumer infil non with	Spran import ant outpreach
(the grais wrong	regulate lote of striff L+ 1	The reports in pour in PMG	2-but Affit doscal when not
enotionat) And Prop	has a les Caraves (in a star	and the paper	Dong logg -

enactment). And Prop Dasically concedes (unnecessarily) T until PMR, so prop loses T.



to the second second of the second of the second se or the participant of the transformed and the second and the secon

and the second the second bearing and the second second the second the second the second second the second the second second second the second when the property of the second of the second of the second of the Addition of the way of the second of the formation of the second of the "Art." En alarmation alle de la lande sont sont alle alle alle

The react word been believe in the set of the break been and been the

white provide the play operation apple to the play of the book white the play of the term of term of the term of term

Viel Kerning and

Florest is the could

When should be sty an about 100 provide the state of a state of the st with a subject forthe appropriate and a set of the state of the set of the se

U.S. Gove should ben Betory Erms.

Judge 1 (*17) Round 2A 11:00am K1 Gov: 16 Hsieh - Roy	Judge's Name: DIANC Klainacka		
Opp: 14 Wilcox - Sutton Varsity Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: MONTGOMEV		
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:		
Prop Speaker #1_HS10h(Ashladas)27	Opp Speaker #1 pts_29		
Prop Speaker #2Roy(Ruben_pts_27_	Opp Speaker #2pts_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		
	dging Criteria		
 offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficience—which may include facts an Argumentation: How directly and efficience Points of Information: How relevant Delivery: How well the debaters spear and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respect 	vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ciently the debaters support arguments with d references to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers c in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to upo Opp 1: Spoke too Quickly Spood Pession + use of influence. Spood presentation Skills · Polite		
Prop 2: good pacing trapo good speaking hobit svoised colloguiduus polite	3, good habits - no uhus Dauses		
	OPP wins this debate.		
REASON FOR DECISION:	(Prop or Opp)		
Opposition provided A	mative comprehensive analysis		
that pulled in conside.	red impacts on the local + slobal		
possion + and more limit	- notice seemed to be based on ted in scope.		