PARLI Debate

Susan Stephan (*15)
Round 2A 11:00am D203
Gov: 14 Chin - Rosenfeld Prop
Opp: 13 Sinha - Herman Opp
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Stephan

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

Team Code #: **PROP** 14 Team Code #: **OPP** 13

Prop Speaker #1 Rosenfeld pts 29.8 Opp Speaker #1 Herman pts 29.8+

Prop Speaker #2 Chin pts 29.8 Opp Speaker #2 Sinha pts 29.8+

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Very close case - record 3 POIs during rebuttal phase!

Prop 1: Rosenfeld - good organization in laying out case excellent

Prop 2: Chin excellent

both missed opportunity to argue Factory Farming is cruel or unnecessary

Opp 1: Herman - better to wait for protected time to end before standing up to make POI e think you stood up before 1 min mark but I wasn't timing. excellent

Opp 2: Sinha excellent

opp should have pushed animal Fact. Farming more

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Didn't fully address animal factory farming comments by Opp.

PARLI Debate

Kathleen von Raesfeld (*25)
Round 2B 11:00am H1
Gov: 15 Ginsburg - Zhou
Opp: 14 White - Hall
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: vonRaesfeld

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	15	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Zhou	pts 28.25	
Opp Speaker #1	White	pts 29	
Prop Speaker #2	Ginsburg	pts 28.25	
Opp Speaker #2	Hall	pts 28.5	

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: - Move furniture BACK & erase board . . . - Speaker pts
+ 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 & eye contact
- remember to move furniture BACK

Opp 1: - slow down when defining counterplan terms
+ excellent passion, professional and compelling delivery. + you are an excellent speaker just had a hiccup with clearly presenting terms of counterplan

Opp 2: + good speaker and presentation style but I did not clearly understand how the counterplan would be implemented. how can we go backward?

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Low point win

Clear plan, solved harms and won on several issues

PARLI Debate

Joel Jacobs (*4)
Round 2B 11:00am K4
Gov: 27 Amato - Ringstrom
Opp: 5 Carter - Wyatt
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Berk

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #: 5	
Prop Speaker #1 Amato	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Wyatt	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Ringstrom	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Carter	pts 27.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Didn't follow "lowers output" arg. What's the link to ag subs? GMO
II. is GMOs, but tag shd explain connection to ag subs/res.
Contentions overlap (e.g. GMOs, wasteful spending)
Say more about how free market is supposed to work (more effic/higher quality producers thrive) and how subsidies distort market

Prop 2: Rocking side-to-side.
"Winners and losers, losers get back up" could be phrased in more classical economic terms. Explain how GMOs fueled by ag subs. Why concede big farms don't get subs? How do subs push big farms to use GMOs?

Opp 1: Watch the pacing Try organizing rebuttal by substantive issues: small biz, food desert, GMOs, etc. fwd&back.
Food desert link to ag subs is unclear.
Need ev that subs go to small biz: it's a surprising assertion.
Work on coverage of Prop case.
Why not run a counterplan to subsidize small farms?
NB is not a voter, it's a standard. Neither is refutations.

Opp 2: Food deserts are not found "where gentrification occurs."
You assert over and over that elim'g ag subs will create food deserts, but u give me very little analysis.
"Our contentions, then their responses to our contention" is not a valid organization. When u discuss ur contention, tell me their response, and why it's wrong. Just repeating ur orig contention w/o their response does nothing. VERY ARTICULATE Speech w/ clearer links to ag subs, ev.

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

LOW POINT WIN

REASON FOR DECISION: Prop wins fairness, $8B for ed/healthcare, GMOs/antibiotics (not clearly explained, but not much refutation from Opp. Opp never gives a clear, plausible link b/w ag subs & food deserts. Small biz is a wash, since Opp never responds to Prop arg to some get them, some don't

PARLI Debate

Nanny Tunnell (*16)
Round 2A 11:00am D209
Gov: 27 Inman - Young
Opp: 5 Moser - Murphy
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell

Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS

PROP (affirmation) 27
Team Code #:

OPP (negative) 5
Team Code #:

Prop Speaker #1 Inman pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Young pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Murphy pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Moser pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: USFG should ban Factory Farm.

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

(more to argue)

Prop 1: (28) Inman
- Good organization of speech
- Took POI's well w/o being disturbed
- Evidence well used in speech
- more professional dress would give more air of confidence
- good analysis work
- Corn argument weakened case.

Prop 2: Young (27)
- good passionate delivery of speech
- good eye contact + gestures
- the gluvnt doom argument weakens own case
- not clear that this team agrees to or not agrees to the resolution.

(could work more)

Opp 1: (28) Peter
- POI's were ineffective
- good evidence provided
- good roadmap
- lighten the handshake
- good argument to distrust the opponents (agreement with a difference)
- analysis had too much quick jumps of cause and effect
- good argument approach
- good organization + eye contact

Opp 2: Moser (28)
- need higher overall energy in speech during roadmap part of speech +
- methane analysis was well provided
- opposing team had to change their position.
- good argument distinctions between two teams position.
- good analysis about cause + effect of banning and cost to economy.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Better analysis and evidence provide.
- Great argument approach (agree but different)
- Better handle on overall economic cause + effect.

PARLI Debate

Nanny Tunnell (*16)
Round 2B 11:00am D209
Gov: 27 Shimizu - McDowell
Opp: 5 White - Whitmore
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell

Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #: 5	
Prop Speaker #1 McDowell	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Whitmore	pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 Shimizu	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 White	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

The USFG should significantly reduce its agricultural subsidies.

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: McDowell (28)
- Good organization of opening speech
- Good passionate speech delivery but need to slow down a little and reduce the pace
- Good use of evidence + definitions
- Analysis work was well done and good subject matter expertise
- Good use of POI - Big business argument well presented.

Prop 2: Shimizu (27)
- Good attention organization + argumentation of other side's position.
- It is better not to leap calling me judge in middle of speech.
- Professional dress was very good.
- Reference attention not the attention number.

Opp 1: Whitmore (25)
- Need better eye contact
- Work voice projection and pace
- need better organization during 1st speech b/c I may lost on point being made
- need to have more evidence + specifics to show expertise.
- Handled POI well.

Opp 2: White (28)
- very professional demeaner
- Good eye contact and gestures.
- Good argumentation effort and good use of evidence.
- Environment issue was not well delivered and seem incomplete + left me wondering. Finish the arguments.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Better analysis + presentation of arguments and evidence
- This team showed more commitment and strong position taken.

PARLI Debate

Danica Tanquilut (*11)
Round 2 11:00am L2 (single flight)
Gov: 6 Jia - Jiang
Opp: 24 Hansen - Beatie
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Mariah Turner

Judge's School Affiliation: JLHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 6		Team Code #: 24	
Prop Speaker #1 Jia	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Hansen	pts 24
Prop Speaker #2 Jiang	pts 27.5	Opp Speaker #2 Beatie	pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Signposting was very clear and easily followable

Prop 2:
responses were thoughtful & complete

Opp 1:
- Could better allocate time in the first speech to go over your own points
- can't bring up new points in last speech

Opp 2:
throat clearing and relaxed/informal tone became a distraction from your main points

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

REASON FOR DECISION: (1) Prop showed that the human & animal effects of banning factory farms were great
- the Opp gave no counter-plan
- Opp has no solvency for prop harms

PARLI Debate

Matt Petruska (*27)
Round 2A 11:00am D204
Gov: 23 He - Bartenetti
Opp: 6 Deng - Qian
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Matt Petruska

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 6	
Prop Speaker #1 Bartenetti	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Ming Qian	pts 29.5
Prop Speaker #2 He	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Kevin Deng	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
(+) persuasive arguments and strong evidence. well prepared

Opp 1:
(+) Very persuasive refutes and arguements Questions were relevant to argument. Clear and precise delivery

Prop 2:
(+) Analysis supported prop 1 and rectification of definitions was solid.

Opp 2:
(+) Analysis supported prop 1 Great delivery

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The opp counterplan for not eliminating Ag factory farms was strong. Opp had slight advantage in regard to refuting prop's argument. Excellent debate that was very close and difficult to choose a clear winner. Both teams provided excellent evidence and Analysis

Aff

Neg

PARLI Debate

Matt Petruska (*27)
Round 2B 11:00am D204
Gov: 14 Yee - Morrell
Opp: 10 Kaushik - Ebtikar
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Matt Petruska

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 10	
Prop Speaker #1 Morrell	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Kaushik	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Yee	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Ebtikar	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
(+) clear Evidence & Analysis Excelent rebuttal, very persuasive.

Opp 1:
(+) very persuasive speaker. Excelent delivery. Relevent points of information

Prop 2:
(+) Great Evidence & relevant Points of information Persuasive Speaker.

Opp 2:
(+) Analysis was supported opp 1 & Good contentions to prop

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The opp critique was debated - argued very well. The prop had a slight advantage in regard to refuting opp's critique. The prop had strong plan that was clear & persuasive.

PARLI Debate

Mark Cabasino (*13)
Round 2A 11:00am J1
Gov: 23 Fulop - Bennett
Opp: 6 Hanvey - Moore
Varsity Parli Debate

USFG should ban factory farms.

Judge's Name: CABASINO

Judge's School Affiliation: (13)

PROP (23)		OPP (6)	
Prop Speaker #1 BENNETT	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 HANVEY	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 FULOP	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 MOORE	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good clarity of points / advantages resulting from the ban. 2C and 4C were particularly persuasive. Try to spend more time on voter issues in 3rd speech, rather than all rebuttals.

Prop 2: Good focus on dropped points (4C) on what might occur without factory farms (people will always need food, eating habits will improve, smaller markets will replace large, etc.)

Opp 1: Good articulation of off-case and on-case disadvantages / impacts. While some points felt snowballed (eg. health), the economic concerns were strong on your side. Avoid so many P.O.O's in AFF speech 3.

Opp 2: Good focus on issues like food industry collapse, global impact, jobs loss. I would've liked to have heard more on the issue of why human rights trump animal rights.

Clarify specifics of what will replace loss of factory farms?

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

REASON FOR DECISION: PROP

AFF 2C and AFF 4C outweigh the economic concerns in the Neg case. Delivery was equally strong on both sides.

USFG should significantly reduce agricultural subsidies

PARLI Debate

Mark Cabasino (*13)
Round 2B 11:00am J1
Gov: 5 Basrai - Hester
Opp: 26 Picchi - Owyang
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: CABASINO

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

PROP Team Code #: 5

Prop Speaker #1 BASRAI pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 HESTER pts 27

OPP Team Code #: 26

Opp Speaker #1 PICCHI pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 OWYANG pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

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

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good articulation of harms of large corporation and negative impacts to smaller farms. 3rd speech was a bit rushed — focus less time on rebuttals and more time on voter issues. AFF 1C and 3C were strongest points.

Prop 2: Good points about America's overproduction of food, and also discussion of economic and health concerns. Saying subsidies would go to smaller farms instead of large corp was a topicality issue

Opp 1: The idea of "no impact" if large corp gives jobs to farmers was not so persuasive, nor was the idea that large corp employer will eliminate debt. However, the topicality issue that came up in your 3rd speech was persuasive. Also good

Opp 2: Criticism of the GMOs issue. Good job with showing possible economic effects (increased prices of crops, food, etc) and market effects (outsourcing). Point about cash crops and corn ethanol needed clarification.

TEAM CODE #: 26 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp did a better job with voter issues and also topicality issue. Aff case was a bit stronger, but topicality was a concern. Aff tag-teaming during speech 3, as well as during all Neg speeches, was a courtesy concern.

PARLI Debate

Cindy Bulger (*23)
Round 2A 11:00am H2
Gov: 13 Cummings - Adriano
Opp: 15 Baum - Honaryar
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	13	Team Code #:	15
Prop Speaker #1	Cummings pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Honaryar pts 30
Prop Speaker #2	Aariano pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Baum pts 30

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Excellent organization and eye contact. Just a tad less confident, bit more confidence would put you in the 29-30 range.

Prop 2: Also great organization and very easy to follow.

Opp 1: Both of these speakers were very well spoken and organized Very talented team.

Opp 2: Loved the intro by Honaryar - catches your attention right away

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Although much of the discussion was about factory animal farming the notion of a factory farm would also include farms producing plants/vegetables. The opp team's argument about higher food prices limiting poor people & developing countries access to healthier choices went unanswered by the Aff.

PARLI Debate

Cindy Bulger (*23)
Round 2B 11:00am H2
Gov: 27 Galli - Girimonte
Opp: 3 Booth - Pracar
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	27	Team Code #:	3
Prop Speaker #1	Galli pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Booth pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Girimonte pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Pracar pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Great organization. good eye contact.

Prop 2: You are a strong speaker and very well organized. Easy to follow.

Opp 1: Both speakers were well organized with their arguments. Good eye contact & presentation. Easy to follow.

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

This was a very close decision. Both sides presented their cases well with strong arguments. After a lot of thought & because this needed to be decided upon net benefits the win goes to the neg. Economies of scale dictate that the most efficient and usually larger company will have an advantage over smaller farms. Taking away any gov't help could widen this gap

PARLI Debate

Ms Duong (*3)
Round 2A 11:00am D207
Gov: 21 Cao - Gunn
Opp: 6 Boozarpour - Li
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Kristina Duong

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 21		Team Code #: 6	
Prop Speaker #1 Bill Cao	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Jordan Li	pts 30
Prop Speaker #2 James Gunn	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Navid Boozarpour	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Opp 1:

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Great connection w/ audience, introduction and closing arguments.

PARLI Debate

Ms Duong (*3)
Round 2B 11:00am D207
Gov: 8 Sawhney - Giang
Opp: 21 Katewa - Colenbrander
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Kristina Duong

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	8	Team Code #:	21
Prop Speaker #1	Giang pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Colenbrander pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Sawhney pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Katewa pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Opp 1:

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opponent team was able to provide argument against all points raised by the other team and seemed more organized + prepared.

PARLI Debate

Abbas Rangwala (*8)
Round 2A 11:00am D208
Gov: 16 Herman - Sweeney
Opp: 14 Krause - Hwong
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ABBAS RANGWALA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	16	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	SWEENEY pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	KRAUSE pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	HERMAN pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	HWONG pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: SWEENEY
ANA — 4.5
EVI — 4.5 - GOOD COMMAND
ARG — 5 - WAS LOST IN CIRCULAR ARGUMENTS.
POI — N/A
DEL — 5
COU — 4.5

Prop 2: HERMAN
ANA — 4.5 - GOOD PRESENCE,
EVI — 4.5 - A BIT MORE LOGICAL TIEUP
ARG — 4.5
POI — 3.5 (TOO MANY INTERRUPTIONS)
DEL — 5
COU — 4.5

Opp 1: KRAUSE
ANA — 5 - GOOD DELIVERY & PRESENCE
EVI — 5 - GIVE POI A CHANCE
ARG — 5
POI — 3 (NOT ENTERTAINING)
DEL — 5
COU — 5

Opp 2: HWONG
ANA — 5 - GOOD DELIVERY & PRESENCE
EVI — 5 - AVOID SLANGS LIKE BLA BLA
ARG — 5
POI — 4
DEL — 4.5
COU — 4.5

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP WON THIS DEBATE PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF WEAK DEFINITION BY AFF TEAM. THEY DID MAKE GOOD ARGUMENTS BASED ON IT AND LOGICALLY CORNERED AFF TEAM. CONGRATULATIONS!
AFF TEAM MISSED OUT ON "BAN FACTORY FARMS" & RATHER PROPOSED MORE HUMANE FACTOR FARMS. IT IS STILL A FACTORY FARM! OPP THEN FOCUSED ON 'HUMANE' ALTERNATIVE & IMPACT OF BANNING.
BOTH TEAMS MISSED OUT ON KEY POINTS — HEALTH & SAFETY OF ANIMALS & ITS IMPACT ON CONSUMER (DISEASE) ↳ IN CONGESTED SPACE

PARLI Debate

Abbas Rangwala (*8)
Round 2B 11:00am D208
Gov: 10 Ganguli - Sanghvi
Opp: 15 Fishlow - Fishlow
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: ABBAS RANGWALA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 10		Team Code #: 15	
Prop Speaker #1 GANGULI	pts 30	Opp Speaker #1 O. FISHLOW	pts 30
Prop Speaker #2 SANGHVI	pts 30	Opp Speaker #2 H. FISHLOW	pts 29.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

LOW POINT WIN

- **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: GANGULI
ANA — 5
EVI — 5
ARG — 4.5 (GREAT POINTS, TOO FAST, SLOW DOWN)
POI — N/A
DEL — 5 (A BIT TOO AGGRESSIVE)
COU — 4 (SUGGEST LESS INTERUPTION OF UR PARTNER)

Prop 2: SANGHVI
ANA — 5
EVI — 5
ARG — 5
POI — 5
DEL — 5
COU — 4

Opp 1: O. FISHLOW
ANA — 5
EVI — 4.5
ARG — 5
POI — 5
DEL — 5
COU — 5
CARRIED DEBATE MORE PROFESIONALLY
GOOD GRACE WHEN DISCUSSING DEBAT TECHNICALITY.

Opp 2: H. FISHLOW
ANA — 5
EVI —
ARG — 4.5
POI — 5
DEL — 4.5
COU — 5
GOOD AEL, COULD IMAROVEA BIT
TRY TO BE A BIT MORE CRISP IN REBUTTAL

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

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

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

The USFG Should Ban Factory Farms

PARLI Debate

Yuyun Shang (*6)
Round 2A 11:00am D201
Gov: 14 Shin - Shevelev
Opp: 10 Gao - Pareek
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Yun Shang

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 10	
Prop Speaker #1 Shevelev	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Pareek	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Shin	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Gao	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: - Great definition
- clear contentions
- Fabulous speaker
* Refute could link how your plan would decrease GHG (not

Prop 2: benefit
- Great speaker
* Refute could be more on the points ~~and~~ with evidence support.

Opp 1: - Great clarification on definition and judge criteria
- Clear contention
- refute was on the points such as kill be machine no difference as kill by Human. GHG no not decrease

Opp 2: - strong refute points, well organized
- would love to see more evidance to refute the safety (flue-flue) point Aff had.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Clear contentions and strong rebuttal

Both teams had clear contentions and all four are excellent speakers, really enjoyed your debate!

The US FG should significantly reduce **PARLI Debate** Agriculture Subsidies

Yuyun Shang (*6)
Round 2B 11:00am D201
Gov: 19 Gil - Kaur
Opp: 8 Yu - Makineni
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Yun Shang

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo HS

PROP			**OPP**		
Team Code #:	19		Team Code #:	8	
Prop Speaker #1	Kaur	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Yu	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Gil	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Makineni	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: * Gained more confidence over the debate
* Would like to see more evidence and less repeat

Opp 1: * Good catch of no definition on "significantly" by Aff.
* Good rebuttal
* Maybe a little less on topicality? (reduce topicality arguments)

Prop 2: * Good refute on schools need more funding, not only more teachers
* Would like to see improvement on material/content organization

Opp 2: * Great refute
* would like to see more evidence

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Slightly stronger and clearer rebuttal

PARLI Debate

Kathleen von Raesfeld (*25)
Round 2A 11:00am H1
Gov: 8 Vadrevu - Nanda
Opp: 15 Kapoor - Berger
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: vonRaesfeld

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	8	Team Code #:	15
Prop Speaker #1	Nanda	Opp Speaker #1	Kapoor
pts	28.25	pts	28.5
Prop Speaker #2	Vadrevu	Opp Speaker #2	Berger
pts	28.25	pts	28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Well laid out argument and strong examples of disease

Opp 1: polite, gracious
Clear, organized, correct balance of passion and
+ Great posture, eye contact

Prop 2:
+ passion, organization, grace in allowing question
+ Strong summaries

Opp 2:
+ "impossible dream" point well supported

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Low point win

Inherency - not enough time given to make plan, not enough broad societal benefit

PARLI Debate

Emma Sutton (*12)
Round 2A 11:00am K3
Gov: 11 Barnes - Gille
Opp: 15 Aguilera - Zhou
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: E. Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: JSHS (#12)

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	15
Prop Speaker #1	Gille pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Zhou pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Barnes pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Aguilera pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: IAC was a bit jerky, need to smooth out transitions from point to point. Rebuttal was excellent - you turned a possible loss into a win with your rebuttal

Prop 2: Opp case had many holes that you missed. Good job hitting every point, but need to look for holes in solvency & evidence. "Improve Antibiotics" - How can they promise that?

Opp 1: You presented a lot of evidence that didn't really say what you implied. Fortunately aff did not catch it! I really liked the way in your rebuttal you referred back to your intro - very professional!

Opp 2: Great intro! Very smooth speech, good job hammering lack of food argument.

TEAM CODE #: 11 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Neg almost won on lack of food, but aff successfully argued maldistribution. Aff carries definition argument, plus aff will solve root cause of problem by banning. Neg - how can you promise to improve antibiotics? Magic?

PARLI Debate

Emma Sutton (*12)
Round 2B 11:00am K3
Gov: 5 DeWitt - Kelley
Opp: 25 Kornfein - Raesfeld
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: F. Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: JSHS (#12)

PROP			OPP		
Team Code #:	5		Team Code #:	25	
Prop Speaker #1	DeWitt	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Kornfein	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Kelley	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Raesfeld	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Contentions were weak, needed to expand on impact. Very well delivered, good smooth pace. Outstanding rebuttal.

Prop 2: Great sense of humor, injected some much-needed levity to the round. Also dropped their points. Next time, not all

Opp 1: 1NC was awfully fast - this is not policy, it's parli. Conversely, rebuttal was somewhat slow & patronizing. I know what a dropped argument is, they wouldn't let me judge varsity if I didn't know the rules. Be careful not to speak to partner during her speech

Opp 2: Excellent speech, I like how you created a theme (food security) & brought all the arguments back to it. "Vote for people having food" = good, like

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Neg carried food security argument (= best benefit)
Aff were unable to clearly articulate developing nations argument, or show that this was more important than domestic food stability. Aff carried reform argument (don't need subsidies for reform) but stability > Neg persuaded me that food more important

PARLI Debate

Ritu Khurana (*10)
Round 2A 11:00am L1
Gov: 15 Fogarty - Pister
Opp: 14 Sutton - Moon
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ashish Khurana

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 15		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Pister	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Sutton	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Fogarty	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Moon	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: -Good data points
-Didn't offer alternatives
-Resentation skills can improve a bit
- overall excellent effort

Prop 2:
- Good collection of aguments
-speech seems to go all over. Should be structured better

Opp 1: - strong aguments
-Regulation was a killer
- speak slowly

Opp 2: - strong aguments
-well structured thoughts
-overall excellent debate

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very balanced debate. Both sides were equally persuasive. Finer points helped tilt the balance.

PARLI Debate

Ritu Khurana (*10)
Round 2B 11:00am L1
Gov: 5 Viviani - Cunningham
Opp: 27 Rosenthal - Dondero
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ashish Khurana

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 Cunningham	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Dondero	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Viviani	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Rosenthal	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
-Strong argument about GMO
-Arguments focused on one company instead of all agriculture subsidies.
-Eating Gum?

Prop 2:
-Good Presentation skills
-Excellent counter arguments
-Presented topic different from the main topic (move subs. to monsato to small companies)

Opp 1: Excellent Presentation
-Good collection and structure of arguments
-Some of the arguments weren't countered well.

Opp 2: Excellent Presentation
-Strong arguments but counter of Prop arguments wasn't as strong.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Erika Pineda (*14)
Round 2A 11:00am D202
Gov: 25 Saxena - Duncan
Opp: 6 Firsov - Kwak
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Erika Pineda

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 25		Team Code #: 6	
Prop Speaker #1 Saxena	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Kwak	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Duncan	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Firsov	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Great job at organizing your points. Careful with your volume as you speed up. Even though you are an effective fast talker, when it gets too loud - it is hard to follow.

Prop 2: Great, strong points, well-spoken. Work on your transitions from point to point. Your use of Uh and OK between points was distracting

Opp 1: - Very fast speaker! Some points were not clear because of your speaking rate. Great pitch and eye contact. Watch the use of your hands - it can be distracting

Opp 2: Great speaking rate and volume. Appreciated the slightly slower rate with an increase when appropriate

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Effective arguments for the proposal. Opp side had some implausible arguments against.

PARLI Debate

Erika Pineda (*14)
Round 2B 11:00am D202
Gov: 10 ~~Lid~~ - Liu
Opp: 15 Banisadr - Weiner
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Erika Pineda

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 10		Team Code #: 15	
Prop Speaker #1 Yoo	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Banisadr	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Liu	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Weiner	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Great introduction. Appreciated the definitions. Good volume and rate - nice job of not raising your voice when you spoke quickly. Some of your thoughts needed more
Prop 2: organization
Great speaking rate and volume. I enjoyed listening to you. Some of your points went on too long, and It can reduce the effectiveness.

Opp 1: Great job at attacking the points in a clear and concise manner. Your rate and pitch were enjoyable to listen to. You remained clear even as you sped up - not always easy to do!
Opp 2:
Great job with your response. Please watch the volume when you start speaking. You speak clearly - even when you speed up - but the volume can make it difficult to listen.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Prop side~~
Opp side effectively dismantled props arguments.

Nadia Whitmore (*5)
Round 2A 11:00am D206
Gov: 6 Gong - Li
Opp: 21 Masters - Fehring
Varsity Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Nadia Whitmore

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 6		Team Code #: 21	
Prop Speaker #1 GONG	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 ~~GONG~~ MASTER	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 LI	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Li FEHRING	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Well structure points with well define supporting evidence

Opp 1: NOT effective counter plan but excellent presentation.

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

MUCH STRONGER argument by the GOV TO BAN FACTORY Farm with alot more valid supporting evidence.

PARLI Debate

Nadia Whitmore (*5)
Round 2B 11:00am D206
Gov: 8 Bardalai - Rangwala
Opp: 21 Mubarack - Troup
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Nadia Whitmore
Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	8	Team Code #:	21
Prop Speaker #1	Bardalai pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Mubarack pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Rangwala pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Troup pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: excellent Oral Delivery
- Very courteous and respectful.
- Could have use additional supporting evidence to support the proposition

Prop 2:

Opp 1: - excellent point and Delivery
- supported your point very well

Opp 2: - relevent point.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

STRONGER argument NOT To Reduce the subsidy.

Cathy Aguilera Topic: The USFG should ~~ban~~ ban Factory Farms

PARLI Debate

~~Kavindra Randeria (#10)~~
Round 2A 11:00am D205
Gov: 3 Stamm-Kirk - Burshteyn
Opp: 27 Hatcher - Butler
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Cathy Aguilera

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	Stamm-Kirk pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Butler pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Burshteyn pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Hatcher pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

saving H2O ✓ ecoli ✓ 65% farms ✓ 2 will run more bloomberg. 3 yrs. Net benefit ✓ Policy round Farms.- Corn run farms

1) NOT TRUE ✓ Boom farms too expensive. 2) Not as much ✓ food ship out in desert. anything ✓ grown healthy ✓

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

Stamm Kiek

Prop 1:
A- good analysis
E- excellent evidence
A-
P-X
D- Delivery smooth, good tone voice & hand gestures
C- good

1) animals treated ✓ body ✓ rights animal ✓ 2 33% ↑ likely disease ✓ 3. human rights ✓ 2015 Bloomberg employ more people ↑ $ farmers 2) food desert ✓ Blue acre farms 3) obesity ✓ H2O

Prop 2: Burshy lenyn
A- good analysis
E-
A- good argumentation
P-X
D- tone, hand gesture voice good
C- good

75% ↑ disease ✓ catch animal ✓ drought ✓ if animals treated well ✓ 2) 400 people died ✓ 3) Norway/china ✓

Butler

Opp 1:
A- good analysis
E- excellent evidence
P-X
D- great eye contact & tone
C- good

net ben. to society ✓ economy ✓ capital ✓ 25 bil factory ✓ safety food ✓ market ✓ 1) power vacuum ✓ 2) $5 offset detriments ✓ 3) benefits of farms create jobs ✓

1) ↑ w/o factor farms 2). food restrictions tighter. ie ecoli chipotle ✓ 3). private farms ✓ loss jobs, people ↓ jobs ↓ farms.

Opp 2: Hatcher.
A- very good analysis.
E- excellent argumentation
A-
P-X
D- great hand gestures, eye contact, tone & voice
C- good

sectionalized food industries $ to pay ✓ maintaining status quo ✓ gov. already subsidies ✓ strong economy already ✓ other plan socialist plan ✓ $/N cotton era ✓ FDA approved animal rights ✓ regulated by admin Law ✓

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Both strong, opp had slightly better analysis both strong evidence.

Cathy Aguilera Topic: The USFG should significantly reduce its agricultural subsidies.

PARLI Debate

~~Kavindra Randella (#10)~~
Round 2B 11:00am D205
Gov: 4 Feinberg - Wolf-Jacobs
Opp: 27 Malfavon - Hulett
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Cathy Aguilera.

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	Feinberg pts 30	Opp Speaker #1	Malfavon pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Wolf-Jacobs pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Hulett pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: A- excellent analysis Feinberg. E-excellent evidence. A- excellent Argumentation. P- X NO POI. D- great hand gestures, eye contact, very tone & voice. C- good.

Prop 2: Wolf-Jacobs. A- excellent analysis. E- good evidence. A- excellent argument. P- NO POI. D- good hand gestures & tone. C- good.

Opp 1: A- Malfavon. E- good evidence. A- P- X NO POI. D- good hand gestures & tone. C- good.

Opp 2: Hulett. A- strong analysis. E- A- excellent argument. P- X NO POI. D- good eye contact, tone hand gestures. C- good.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

both were strong but evidence & argumentation & delivery of Prop was outstanding

17). cut farms 50%. ASAP. 1) proof beyond reasonable doubt. 2) allocate foodstamps. 2) food stamps & by other means. 3) reduce hunger. help those need. 3). subsidize by disasters. 4). NO net cost. 4) food security. 5) re Europe. ↑ Need = food! 6) advantages job, trade & $. 7) develop new tech. thrive. 8) sacrifice. 9) involvement of country round up right.

can receive other sources of food - secures eliminate farm bill - can not produce corn Iowa produced than used Net benifits

$ 8 billion overspending. No need $ foreign sub. take away other fed. plans. arms lead to war

1) already have 50 billion $ to fix disasters. 2) bring food to people who need it? foodstamps 3) how tech decrease $? 4) - farm subs doesn't go towards tech. 5). subsidize farms. NOT Monsanto / Roundup. NO impact 1) Move wasted $ 2) policy can't be beyond a reasonable doubt met by doing good

people ready troops 240 million people to feed. war or drought

Change in different direction. food ↑ $ if cut subsidize funding. Co-exist. their plan NOT unique. where food going to come from if it's taken away? take another source.

PARLI Debate

Susan Stephan (*15)
Round 2B 11:00am D203
Gov: 3 Holt - Mizin
Opp: 27 Chu - Fraga
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Stephan

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	Holt pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Fraga pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Mizin pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Chu pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Holt

remember to refute and sub points - not just main points

Opp 1: Fraga

remember to refute all sub points - not just main points

For both teams fair intend of

Prop 2: Mizin

Opp 2: Chu

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp. more effective in arguing d Prop not fully refuted arguments. (more than Opp).

PARLI Debate

Vishal Garg (*22)
Round 2A 11:00am K2
Gov: 14 Lustig - Gerenrot
Opp: 8 Mehta - Alvarez
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Vishal Garg

Judge's School Affiliation: Monta Vista

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 8	
Prop Speaker #1 Lustig	pts 30	Opp Speaker #1 Alvarez	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Gerenrot	pts 30	Opp Speaker #2 Mehta	pts 30

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Lustig. 30

Opp 1: ALVAREZ 30 29



Prop 2: Gerenrot



Opp 2: Mehta.



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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Proposition wins this by marginally getting better on the final Rebuttal.

PARLI Debate

Vishal Garg (*22)
Round 2B 11:00am K2
Gov: 15 Hardwick - Der
Opp: 14 Yan - Chu
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Vishal Garg

Judge's School Affiliation: Monta Vista

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	15	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	~~[illegible]~~ Der pts 29.5	Opp Speaker #1	Yan pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Hardwick pts 30	Opp Speaker #2	Chu pts 30

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Der 29 30

Prop 2: Hardwick 30

Opp 1: Yan 30 29

Opp 2: Chu 30

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both were excellent, however proposition Rebuttal got (+1) extra in Argumentation.
Team Code # 15 on the Prop wins the Debate.

Sam Roberson

[redacted] (*19)
Round 2A 11:00am J3
Gov: 21 Cheng - Shifs
Opp: 6 Reyna - Yang
Varsity Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Sam Roberson

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 21	30 xG	Team Code #: 6	
Prop Speaker #1 Shifs	pts ~~29~~	Opp Speaker #1 Reyna	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Cheng	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Yang	pts 30

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

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

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: great tone volume and clarity when speaking and also great body language

Prop 2: good work try to use more of your time and evaluate the opp case more

Opp 1: great job! try to speak a little slower so you don't stumble and jumble your words

Opp 2: great job clear and to the point with good organization

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

lack of evidence from prop and new points brought up in closing speech

Sam Robertson

[redacted]*19)
Round 2B 11:00am J3
Gov: 15 Stephen - Miskelley
Opp: 14 Dahan - Williams-Baron
Varsity Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Sam Robertson

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	15	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	miskelley pts 30	Opp Speaker #1	Dahan pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Stephen pts 30	Opp Speaker #2	williams pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: great job! amazing organization, tone, volume. captivating speaking

Prop 2: great eye contact great body language and animation when speaking but work on being a little louder but fantastic

Opp 1: great job! good eye contact and great Body language But don't forget to say all your points and contentions in the first speech

Opp 2: very good job and good Body language try to relax Before Speaking So you can convey information a bit more clear

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Dropped points from neg as well as an attempt to bring up additional information points

US Fed Govt should Reduce Ag Subsidies
Policy - Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge 1 (*17)
Round 2B 11:00am K1
Gov: 4 Cramer - Griffin
Opp: 27 Skarr - Escarcega
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Diane Kleinecke

Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomery

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 4		Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 Cramer ✓	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 JP ESCARCEGA	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 GRIFFIN	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 SKARR	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good eye contact + pacing
*emphatic w/out being emotional or overly passionate
polite

Opp 1: Good posture / presence
Also, emphatic w/out too much emotion.
polite

Prop 2:
Good eye contact, Good volume
careful with excessive use of hands
polite

Opp 2: Good eye contact and use of hands for emphasis.
polite.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Better BROAD BASED Analysis of the topic. Solid Concluding Argument.

U SF Gov should ban factory farms? **PARLI Debate**

Kimiko Cheng (*21)
Round 2A 11:00am J2
Gov: 27 Ernst - Davis
Opp: 3 Rubsamen - Skepner
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: K. Cheng

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #: 3	
Prop Speaker #1 Ernst	pts 30	Opp Speaker #1 Rubsamen	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Davis	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Skepner	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
clear and concise. Good eye contact. addressed (refuted) critical issues Neg. brought up.

Opp 1:
Persuasive in Raising the issue of re-enforcement.

Prop 2:
addressed all issues opp 1 brought up.

Opp 2:
Excellent use of social contract and utilitarian to refute pts made by aff.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop. Speaker #1 in closing speech persuaded in proving net benefit.

Policy – Net Benefit/min

factory-like, not farms

caring capacity-desired free range

Corn shortage - caused by feed taken away from human

cows (methane) more polluting than cars

~~de~~ pesticide use

animal abuse

whose to enforce

plan not possible in 3 yrs

Utilitarianism

Social Contract - obligation to citizens first

lower price meat for poorer families

farms - Provide jobs

Aff 2

Enforcement issue addressed

methane is 10x worse than CO_2

already a meat overproduction

addressed all pts of Neg 1

Close

animal cruelty

Neg 2

fed gov't shouldn't infringe upon people's freedom to food choice

more food production - better for people

Close

~~Should~~ us fed govt reduce its agri. subsidies?
Should

PARLI Debate

Kimiko Cheng (*21)
Round 2B 11:00am J2
Gov: 14 Cohen-Simayof - Drake
Opp: 8 Su - Her
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: K. Cheng

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	8
Prop Speaker #1	Drake pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Su pts 30
Prop Speaker #2	Cohen-Simayof pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Her pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Good eye contact.
Too much emphasis on just one pt - insurance. ~~Should~~

Prop 2:
Attention-grabbing voice - good.

Opp 1:
Very though in bringing up many good arguments.

Opp 2:
Good ~~re~~ rebuttal - w/o subsidies, farmers have to increase price which is bad for consumers.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
More explanations on (your Neg) pt of view pushed the net ben. slightly over the Aff.

Aff. 1

Save 1.1 B over 10 yrs

Subidies are inefficient.
farmers are not motivated to save

Crop insurance

Aff 2

1st cont. – save 1,5 billions

Neg. 1

Brought up issue of job loss
w/o sub., small farmes
are not competitive

Crop ins. – eventually from
tax payers

Neg. 2

farmers are not oversing
resources.

PARLI Debate

Joel Jacobs (*4)
Round 2A 11:00am K4
Gov: 6 Visht - Koshkin
Opp: 25 Greenberg - Kolling
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Berk

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	6	Team Code #:	25
Prop Speaker #1	Visht pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Greenberg pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Koshkin pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Kolling pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Why admit def skewed? When u give the std be clear re wh. NB includes bens to animals. How does ur plan (no hormones, more space) solve for foie gras? "Ban FFs" vs. "Ban all FFs" was creative, but really should hv been developed in MG. PMR needs clearer org.

Opp: THIS was the new arg, not RVI!

Prop 2: "Nature shd be important, because that's the environment." You need a much more nuanced animal rights arg to win on this topic. Work on org: you jump around b/w ur case and theirs. The word ur looking for is "frat." Be clearer about wh. we should value animal welfare intrinsically, instrumentally, or both.

Opp 1: Compelling/narrowly tailored is an equal protection test. No application here. Why not start ur case speech w/definitional args, since they inform all other args? Wish I know they claim Ø banning all FF, but tell me what FFs they don't ban. They may be selling themselves short. Dropped args are voters only if important.

How can U win inherency and solvency? ① This is already on books and ② courts will strike

Opp 2: Why not refer to FF def in ur T arg? Don't need to rely on their concession (which might be too generous) - also point out that FF = caring about ethic, not A welfare. Does plan change that? Why too much time on T: I got it after 30 secs. I don't need justifications to vote against a non-topical plan.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: This debate would have been better if it had been less technical. There were some really big, interesting issues: animal welfare, consumer choice, food safety, that were not really developed. Prop wins poverty arg — poor can eat things other than meat. Also wins animal welfare, but doesn't impact it, and std is NB for humans. Choice takes out consumer confid. Opp wins econ impact, govt overreach (as the arg is wrong — we regulate lots of stuff - but this response is new in PMR - but fiat doesn't extend past enactment). And Prop basically concedes (unnecessarily) T until PMR, so Prop loses T.

U.S. Govt should banfactory farms.

PARLI Debate

Judge 1 (*17)
Round 2A 11:00am K1
Gov: 16 Hsieh - Roy
Opp: 14 Wilcox - Sutton
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Diane Klonacka

Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomery

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 16		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Hsieh (Ashley)	27	Opp Speaker #1 Wilcox	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Roy (Ruben)	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Sutton	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: good ~~spee~~ pacing/tempo
good volume/eye contact
dramatic impact.
polite

Opp 1: spoke too quickly
good passion + use of inflection. good presentation skills. polite

Prop 2: good pacing/tempo
good speaking habits,
avoided colloquialisms
polite

Opp 2: speaking too quickly.
good habits - no uhms, pauses, buts, etc. good eye contact.
polite

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opposition provided a mature/comprehensive analysis that pulled in/considered impacts on the local + global level. Prop argument ~~was~~ seemed to be based on passion + was more limited in scope.