

PARLI Debate

Ted Appel (*24)

Round 4B 3:30pm J3
Gov: 14 White - Hall
Opp: 15 Hardwick - Der
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ted Appel

Judge's School Affiliation: Santa Rosa HS

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 15

Prop Speaker #1 Hell pts 30

Opp Speaker #1 Der pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 White pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Hardwick 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: Aggressive attack and use of questions. Laid out solid plan. Strong clear voice and good eye contact.

Opp 1: Nice job of staying on track despite repeated POI.

Prop 2: Aggressive attack and use of questions. Did overdo POI, but you used it effectively to box in details of opp plan.

Opp 2: Excellent counterattack. Could've done better job of supporting ~~points~~ importance of incremental change.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop offered solid plan and effectively attacked Opp proposal on impact of tuition inflation. Strong argument on net benefits of mobility vs. responsibility. A vigorous and entertaining debate. Well done by both sides!

PARLI Debate

Danica Tanquilut (*11)

Round 4A 3:30pm J2
Gov: 14 Chin - Rosenfeld
Opp: 10 Kaushik - Ebtikar
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Marian Turner

Judge's School Affiliation: JLHS

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 Rosenfeld pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Kaushik pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Chen pts 28.5

Opp Speaker #2 Ebtikar 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:

could better allocate time in formal speech to address all of the waters

Opp 1:

can't bring up new evidence in last speech

Prop 2:

sufficient coverage of the reg's points as well as defending your own

Opp 2:

signposting will help the judge follow your arguments in a more organized manner

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

REASON FOR DECISION: ① China's stock market downturn over the past week has had a real impact on the US stock market
② Opp has no offense in the round, their single contention was largely off-topper

PARLI Debate

Mr Olson (*23)
Round 4A 3:30pm J1
Gov: 14 Wilcox - Sutton
Opp: 25 Saxena - Duncan
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: R. OLSEN

Judge's School Affiliation: 23

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 25

Prop Speaker #1 SUTTON pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 DUNCAN pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 WILCOX pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 SAXENA 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 INTRODUCTION, GOOD USE CONTEXT AND ENTHUSIASM. WELL RESEARCHED POINTS. VERY CLEAR AND UNDERSTANDABLE. VERY CLEAR ABOUT MAIN THREE POINTS. GOOD USE OF EMOTION.

Opp 1: - INTERESTING GOOD POINT. CLEAR, GOOD THE CONTEXT, PROVIDED EVIDENCE, GREAT SOURCES, PASSIONATE AND CLEAR RESTATING FACTS. GREAT SPEAKER. GOOD POINTS. GREAT KNOWLEDGE OF POLITICAL SITUATION. GLOBAL WARMING. GOOD WRAP UP, CLEVER POINTS. REFERRED SOURCES WELL. GOOD WARS.

Prop 2: - GOOD COUNTERPOINTS, REALLY GOOD KNOWLEDGE. VERY GOOD STATEMENT OF FACTS. EXCELLENT RESEARCH. ANSWERED QUESTION WELL. REALLY WELL DONE. GREAT SPEAKER

Opp 2: - CLEARLY RESTATED, POINTS, DEMOGRAPHIC CONCERNS, GOOD POINTS CONTRASTED. GOOD POINTS ABOUT CONFLICTS. A LITTLE CONFUSED ON DATA BUT KNOWS FACTS. TOO FAST. GOOD PRESENTATION OVERALL.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

FANTASTIC TEAMS ON A REALLY ~~GOOD~~ TOPIC. OPP HAD JUST A LITTLE MORE RESEARCH & BACKGROUND NO

China Economy

PARLI Debate

Nadia Whitmore (*5)

Round 4A 3:30pm D209
Gov: 16 Hsieh - Roy
Opp: 14 Yan - Chu
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Nadia Whitmore

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

Team Code #: 16 **PROP**

Team Code #: 14 **OPP**

Prop Speaker #1 Hsieh pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 YAN pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Roy pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Chu 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:

~~POI~~: - ~~Good~~ presentation and argument -
 - china's devaluation of their currency will NOT affect
 Prop 2: vs company Ability To pay their worker

Opp 1: Great orator and presentation

~~POI~~: of facts
 - Very courteous and respectful
 - Very effectively analyze the resolution
 Opp 2: one provided supported points.

POI

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opposition provided more supporting fact to support the US will be threaten.

Free Higher Education

PARLI Debate

Nadia Whitmore (*5)

Round 4B 3:30pm D209
Gov: 15 Stephen - Miskelley
Opp: 14 Lustig - Gerenrot
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name:

Nadia Whitmore

Judge's School Affiliation:

Bishop O'Dowol

Team Code #: PROP 15

Team Code #: OPP 14

Prop Speaker #1 Stephen pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Lustig pts 26

Prop Speaker #2 Miskelley pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Gerenrot pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Great job addressing all the benefit of free Higher Education via J.C and vocational schools
 POI: was not accurately address

↳ inaccurate on their contentions
 Opp 1: community college do provide certificate and not just AA.
 therefore technical school would not
 provide as much employment with 24% more income

Prop 2:
 - Very eloquent
 - strong argument with excellent examples

Opp 2: be a valid counter plan

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Team supports the proposition with all their contentions

On balance, China's recent economic difficulties threaten the U.S.

PARLI Debate

~~Ken Stone (#16)~~ Liu Chin
Round 4A 3:30pm K3
Gov: 13 Sinha - Herman
Opp: 5 Moser - Murphy
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: §
Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

Team Code #: PROP 13

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 Herman pts 30

Opp Speaker #1 Murphy pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 Sinha pts 30

Opp Speaker #2 Moser pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Excellent speaker. Very good pace and well presented. Good job presenting info and supporting.
Prop 2: also excellent.

Opp 1: Very good counters and well presented. Counters provided good level of detail
Opp 2: distracted by constantly messing w/your hair

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop brought the debate back to the resolution of China's economic challenge and was able to support their contentions. Good job by Neg, though.

US FC should guarantee citizens to face higher up education
PARLI Debate

~~Ken Stone (16)~~ Liru Chin
Round 4B 3:30pm K3
Gov: 21 Masters - Fehring
Opp: 6 Firsov - Kwak
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: _____

Judge's School Affiliation: Louisiana

Team Code #: PROP 21

Team Code #: OPP 6

Prop Speaker #1 Fehring pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Kwak pts 26

Prop Speaker #2 Masters pts 27

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: set up a good foundation to withstand the topicality challenge

Opp 1: too hyper - verbally & physically - speaks so fast as to render some points incomprehensible

Prop 2: good job supporting Prop's contentions. Too many "clms"

Opp 2: very passionate speaker, excellent points in the topicality detour

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg's attempt to detour the debate based on topicality was a valiant effort and made for a spirited presentation but ultimately, successfully rejected. Opp's presentation withstood the attempt

Derek Barnes
Gathy Aguilera (*15)

Round 4A 3:30pm D205
Gov: 10 Liu - Liu
Opp: 21 Cao - Gunn
Varsity Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Derek Barnes

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 21

Prop Speaker #1 Yoo pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Cao pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Liu pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Gunn pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Very well presented
Good articulation
Well organized

Opp 1:

Very well presented and organized

Prop 2:

Good presentation

Opp 2:

Well spoken

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Although problems for China were well articulated, how those problems would affect the US were not persuasive.

Derek Barnes
Cathy Aguilera (*15)

Round 4B 3:30pm D205
Gov: 4 Feinberg - Wolf-Jacobs
Opp: 27 Chu - Fraga
Varsity Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Derek Barnes

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

Team Code #: PROP 4

Team Code #: OPP 27

Prop Speaker #1 Feinberg pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Fraga pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Wolf-Jacobs pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Chu pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Very well presented and organized.
Clear delivery of pros and cons

Opp 1: Alternate plan was not well presented
Presentation was good but not persuasive

Prop 2: Well organized

Opp 2: Forced to clarify alternate plan

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp did not convincingly demonstrate why government guaranteed college is detrimental

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Jeff Eng

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell High School

Jeff Eng
Anna Katowa (*21)
Round 4B 3:30pm D206
Gov: 5 Viviani - Cunningham
Opp: 8 Su - Her
Varsity Parli Debate

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 8

Prop Speaker #1 Cunningham pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 SU pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Viviani pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Her 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 sharp/strong points
+ relaxed style

Opp 1: + Good organization and structure to thoughts

- I was cool with your initial approach but be aware that informal style can mited your message (eg wearing your backpack)

- arguments lack evidence

Prop 2: + Clean communication - with lots of information
+ good engagement with audience

Opp 2: + Good eye contact
+ Good collaboration ~~with partner~~ with partner

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop won debate due to Net Benefits consideration, not so much about racism. OPP would have even the debate & investigated more about viability. * - additional points

It is the USFG guarantees, then colleges could start to budget sex more and become bloated entities would be one reason sex not being viable. Need to draw more credible reasons about waste like that and other reasons why it should not be free.

PARLI Debate

Vishal Garg (*22)

Round 4A 3:30pm K1
 Gov: 5 White - Whitmore
 Opp: 27 Malfavon - Hulett
 Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Vishal Garg

Judge's School Affiliation: Monta Vista

PROP
 Team Code #: 5

OPP
 Team Code #: 27

Prop Speaker #1 White pts 29.5 Opp Speaker #1 Malfavon pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 Whitmore pts 28 Opp Speaker #2 Hulett 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:

White (30) (29)

Prop 1:	A	5	4
	E	5	5
	Arg	5	5
	POI	5	5
	D	5	5
	C	5	5
Prop 2:	A	4	
	E	5	
	Arg	4	(28)
	POI	5	
	D	5	
	C	5	

Malfavon (29) (30)

Opp 1:	A	5
	E	5
	Arg	5
	POI	5
	D	5
	C	5
Opp 2:	A	
	E	
	Arg	
	POI	
	D	
	C	

Hulett

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
 Extremely well presented debate on a difficult topic, the opposition just fared slightly well on the Rebuttal

Whitmore

PARLI Debate

Vishal Garg (*22)

Round 4B 3:30pm K1
 Gov: 27 Shimizu - McDowell
 Opp: 3 Booth - Pracar
 Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: VISHAL GARG

Judge's School Affiliation: Monta Vista

Team Code #: PROP 27

Team Code #: OPP 3

Prop Speaker #1 McDowell pts 30

Opp Speaker #1 Booth pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Shimizu pts 30

Opp Speaker #2 Pracar 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:

McDowell

Prop 1: A	5	5
E	5	5
Arg	5	5
Poi	5	5
D	5	5
C	5	5

(30) (30)

Shimizu

Prop 2: A	5
E	5
Arg	5
Poi	5
D	5
C	5

(30)

Booth 29 29

Opp 1:	5	5
	4	4
	5	5
	5	5
	5	5
	5	5

Pracar

Opp 2:	5
	5
	5
	5
	5

(30)

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Excellent job presenting it both sides,
 Prop wins marginally on the evidence.

PARLI Debate

Karina Giang (*8)

Round 4A 3:30pm K4
Gov: 21 Katewa - Colenbrander
Opp: 14 Shin - Shevelev
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: KARINA GIANG

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

Team Code #: PROP 21

Team Code #: OPP 14

Prop Speaker #1 Colenbrander pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 SHEVELEV pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Katewa pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 SHIN 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: *Finalized strong at the second speech. Good Analysis. More eye contact with audience would be beneficial at the debate.*

Opp 1: *Good ~~prop~~ analysis and speech delivered clearly. Organized.*

Prop 2: *Good reasoning. Handled questions professionally. Strong POI and debate delivered clearly. Organized.*

Opp 2: *Well organized thoughts. Argument ~~was~~ expressed clearly.*

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

REASON FOR DECISION: *Opp won because*

PARLI Debate

Karina Giang (*8)

Round 4B 3:30pm K4
Gov: 10 Ganguli - Sanghvi
Opp: 13 Cummings - Adriano
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: KARINA GIANG

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP
Team Code #: 10

OPP
Team Code #: 13

Prop Speaker #1 Ganguli pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Cummings pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Sanghvi pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Adriano 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: *Speak clearly with confidence. Strong POI whole speech delivered.*

Opp 1: *Good analysis and argument. Finished with great, clear*

Prop 2: *Organized and good support of POI.*

Opp 2: *Argument and evidence are very realistic.*

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

REASON FOR DECISION: *Prop shows stronger argument at POI. It is a great debate and I enjoy very much!*

PARLI Debate

Ted Appel (*24)

Round 4A 3:30pm J3
Gov: 8 Bardalai - Rangwala
Opp: 6 Gong - Li
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ted Appel

Judge's School Affiliation: Santa Rosa HS

Team Code #: PROP 8

Team Code #: OPP 6

Prop Speaker #1 BARDALAI pts 30

Opp Speaker #1 LI pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 RANGWALA pts 20

Opp Speaker #2 GONG pts 20

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 command of economic facts. Impassive presentation.

Opp 1: Excellent summary. Well-thought out argument. Sophisticated understanding of US power.

Prop 2: Excellent rebuttal, attacked OPP key points strongly

Opp 2: Took 2 questions and thought well on feet, turning them into points that reinforced argument.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP broadened the debate to focus on overall impact to US interests, not just the economy, then proved it. Both sides had excellent facts. A vigorous and entertaining debate. Well done! Hated to pick a winner here.

PARLI Debate

Danica Tanquilut (*11)

Round 4B 3:30pm J2
Gov: 27 Skarr - Escarcega
Opp: 6 Visht - Koshkin
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Mariah Turner

Judge's School Affiliation: JLHS

Team Code #: PROP 27

Team Code #: OPP 6

Prop Speaker #1 Escarcega pts 30

Opp Speaker #1 Visht pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Skarr pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Koshkin 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:

Opp 1:

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION

- ① aff definitions are fair
- ② opp counterplan is ill-funded and actively encourages illegal immigration
- ③ aff allows for a path to citizenship, so it solves for people who are already in the US

PARLI Debate

Mr Olson (*23)
Round 4B 3:30pm J1
Gov: 27 Galli - Girimonte
Opp: 5 DeWitt - Kelley
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: R. Olson
Judge's School Affiliation: 23

Team Code #: PROP 27

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 GALLI pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 DEWITT pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 GRIMONTE pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 KELLY 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 INTRODUCTION & SOURCES
ANSWERED QUESTIONS VERY WELL. GOOD Q&A
CONTACT & PRESENTATION. GOOD PRESENTATION.
GOOD REBUTTAL TO OPPS. POINTS. GOOD RECAP
STRONG & CLEAR PROBLEM IS HUGE - GOOD POINT.
GREAT PACING.

Prop 2: - VERY PASSIONATE INTRODUCTION.
GOOD ANSWER TO QUESTION. BROUGHT ANSWER IN
TO DISCUSSION. POLITE NICELY DONE.

Opp 1: - GREAT INTRODUCTION. ANSWERED QUESTION WELL
GREAT POINTS MADE. VERY GOOD PRESENTATION.
RECAPED COSTS WELL.
GOOD FACTS AND DROVE POINT HOME

Opp 2: - THEATRICAL INTRODUCTION, GOOD SPEAKING. GRAND REBUTALS.
ANSWERED QUESTIONS WELL. SHORTLY RATTLED. PROB. SHOULD HAVE
VERY QUICK SUMMATION. PLEASED AND
QUESTIONS.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

IT'S COLD IN HERE - STUDENTS RUSHED SOMEWAY. REALLY GOOD TOPIC & DEBATE. OPP REALLY
HAMMERED COSTS OF PROGRAM. LIKED BOTH TEAMS & VERY CLOSE VOTE!

PARLI Debate

Wendy Young (*27)

Round 4A 3:30pm D202
Gov: 15 Ginsburg - Zhou
Opp: 14 Yee - Morrell
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Young, Marlon V.

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

Team Code #: PROP 15

Team Code #: OPP 14

Prop Speaker #1 Zhou pts 20

Opp Speaker #1 Morrell pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Ginsburg pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Yee pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Great job with Road map & Organization. Good Logical & Topical arguments.

Try to spare words just a little Good here, But words start to run together
Prop 2:

Made Many Good Points. Great Team work - Build on what Partner said

Be Careful with Body language while Team member Talking. we know you Agree Don't know that

TEAM CODE #: 15 on the Prop wins this debate.

(Prop or Opp)

Opp 1: Good job setting out 2 way Opp can win! Almost filled w/ off. made it close! Good
- Good point - more \$ in v.s.
- Good summation of points & argument.
- Great job not taking questions and getting side tracked

Opp 2:
Best point - "Long Term" put the decrease into scale (Time scale). Good Job showing U.S. strong & China's Relative Effect would be limited

REASON FOR DECISION:

The (mt) Decision falls upon the Term "threaten" that makes this Decision which was very close. It was considered there was a threat; But opp did a great job and that threat is limited & not likely to be significant

Had the question ~~been~~ been "Significant Threat" opp
would have won debate

My favorite Debate of the Day. Great job by
Both Teams

PARLI Debate

Wendy Young (*27)

Round 4B 3:30pm D202
Gov: 10 Gao - Pareek
Opp: 16 Herman - Sweeney
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Young, Marlon
Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

PROP
Team Code #: 10

OPP
Team Code #: 16

Prop Speaker #1 Pareek pts 28.5

Opp Speaker #1 Sweeney pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Gao pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Herman 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:
Had a very clear Plan & Setting out terms of Debate
Great job Handling POI's what getting Side tracked - Gave you two +s (plus) for how handled.

Prop 2:

Opp 1: - Good Point made
- Question value of a Act History degree
- Tuition creep & cost increase w/ split between fed. & state involvement
- Won by not changing Debate framework But taking the Plan Head on
Opp 2:
- very good Counter point. → Decrease value of Education; if given free opportunity cost point
- Good Point. Not everyone need 4 years may hurt Economy

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP Won by coming up with a better plan (or at least an viable Alternate plan) under Prop's Definition of Higher Education and "scaring" or pointing out the concern of ballooning cost of Tuition creep w/ Real life Exams or what has happen with current college tuition over

OPP Won by taking the Debate on the Floor
and plan proposed by Prop and developing a viable
alternative and big risk of Prop's plan; But Keep in
mind, that Alternate for the same problem. Cost-effective &

PARLI Debate

Bonnie Hayne (*25)

Round 4A 3:30pm D208
Gov: 15 Fogarty - Pister
Opp: 8 Sawhney - Giang
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: BONNIE HAYNE

Judge's School Affiliation: SOUVANA ACADEMY

Team Code #: PROP 15

Team Code #: OPP 8

Prop Speaker #1 PISTER pts 30

Opp Speaker #1 GIANG pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 FOGARTY pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 SAWHNEY 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: PISTER

Clear grasp of macroeconomic concepts
Fluent delivery, clarity
Analysis & evidence clearly expressed

Prop 2: FOGARTY

Clear delivery - excellent
analysis & evidence - use of POI's

Opp 1: GIANG

Korea issue felt like a bit of a side-trade
A lot of good things to say, a good recovery after pause

Opp 2: SAWHNEY

Good delivery
Generous allowance of questions
Effectively argued

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Followed through all points

PARLI Debate

Bonnie Hayne (*25)

Round 4B 3:30pm D208
Gov: 27 Rosenthal - Dondero
Opp: 6 Boozarpour - Li
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: BONNIE HAYNE

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

PROP
Team Code #: 27

OPP
Team Code #: 6

Prop Speaker #1 DONDERO pts 29.5

Opp Speaker #1 LI pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 ROSENTHAL pts 29.5

Opp Speaker #2 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: DONDERO
Good analysis & excellent argumentation
impressive evidence, very articulate

Opp 1: LI
Thank you for explaining debate concepts
Rapid delivery
Nice - very close to original proposal

Prop 2: ROSENTHAL
Good addressing of PICK issue
excellent & persuasive rebuttal

Opp 2: BOOZARPOUR
also excellent & persuasive rebuttal of rebuttal!

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Excellent argumentation & delivery on both sides
Had to go with PROP for ability to respond to PICK
statements.

NADEEM ALAM
~~Sam Roberson~~ (*19)
Round 4A 3:30pm D207
Gov: 14 Krause - Hwong
Opp: 15 Kapoor - Berger
Varsity Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: NADEEM ALAM

Judge's School Affiliation: PINOLE VALLEY

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 15

Prop Speaker #1 KRAUSE pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 KAPOOR pts 29.5

Prop Speaker #2 HWONG pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 BERGER pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Nice Posture / Presentation
Argued valid points

Opp 1: Nice posture / Presentation
intelligent ~~replies~~ arguments

Prop 2: Nice posture / Presentation

Opp 2: Energetic
Nice presentation

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

All speakers were outstanding. Addressed the issues, their presentation was very good.

NADEEM ALAM

PARLI Debate

~~Sam Roberson~~ (*19)

Round 4B 3:30pm D207
Gov: 15 Aguilera - Zhou
Opp: 8 Vadrevu - Nanda
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: NADEEM ALAM

Judge's School Affiliation: PINOLE VALLEY

Team Code #: PROP 15

Team Code #: OPP 8

Prop Speaker #1 Aguilera pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Vadrevu pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Zhou pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Nanda 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: *intelligent argument -
Nice speech*

Opp 1: *Nice presentation
Energetic.*

*

Prop 2: *Well spoken*

Opp 2: *Nice presentation
Energetic
Fluent*

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

All spoke well, Team 15 gave a better presentation

PARLI Debate

Joel Jacobs (*4)

Round 4A 3:30pm L1

Gov: 8 Mehta - Alvarez

Opp: 14 Dahan - Williams-Baron

Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Berk

Team Code #: PROP 8

Team Code #: OPP 14

Prop Speaker #1 Mehta pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Wms-Baron pts 28.5

Prop Speaker #2 Alvarez pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Dahan 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

~~Mehta, who or factors that was still Opp drops, don't use their 20. Use yours!~~

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: U don't need a roadmap in PmC, except maybe a preview of contentions.

Can Need evidence, or at least more stats. But this topic is so empirical and technical, sources wd help a lot!

Each "US had trade rls w/C" - Tag contention with a type of threat: don't bury the harm deep in a subpoint.

Prop 2: A number is much better than "a lot."

You drop Opp Contention III (↑ US investment in China) v

If we shift production of steel, cement to US, WEIGHT

↑ costs vs. jobs for me. Work on coverage, word economy.

POI response was non-responsive.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp gives me jobs, (the maybe shdnt have

dropped alt arg that manuf will shift to other lower cost countries) and cheap investm

which mean L/T payoff. AIB was mostly dropped. Prop harms by the end have

fuzzy links and impacts. Main one is TPP. No Everybody needs to weigh more,

tho I know it's tough if u don't have the #s

Opp 1: Make TPP arg in response to Prop's; it's not indep.

↓ in Yuan is a separate point, but not labeled as such.

POI was like 30 seconds: keep it under 15.

"This has been a great debate." - filler.

You hv 3 big args (1) jobs; (2) cheap investm in C; (3) Kill AIB.

Enumerate these in rebuttal, win them, then show how they

Opp 2: "I'm the second speaker for the negation" really

sounds like filler.

THANK YOU for walking me thru important args.

TPP response flows thru red ink. Need a better rsp to "Other

countries + C > just other countries." Maybe Prop failure to

quantity? Other args outweigh?

Everybody: learn how to deal with predictions. Not evnt to say "it's speculative." Argue: the reasons we've given for why it's likely are more persuasive than the args they give for why it's unlikely.

Over spec as barrier to cheap investmts
Seemed new in PmC: it seemed very different than C never made as a response in mg.

outweigh threats identified by Prop team. Jobs could be huge.

PARLI Debate

Joel Jacobs (*4)

Round 4B 3:30pm L1
Gov: 23 Fulop - Bennett
Opp: 15 Banisadr - Weiner
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Berk

Team Code #: PROP 23

Team Code #: OPP 15

Prop Speaker #1 Bennett pts 25

Opp Speaker #1 Banisadr pts 26.5

Prop Speaker #2 Fulop pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Weiner pts 25.5

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: UC is not \$600k/yr. More like \$35k.
 U need to explain funding for plan.
 Why not make the wealthy pay tuition?
 really radical plan. Better to have govt funding.
 Don't drift off @ end of speech: finish strong

Prop 2: Watch the "likes." Never say "Could
 U just sit down?" to a POI.
 When there's a CP, ur args can't compare plan to SQ:
 must compare plan to CP, which dramatically is funding
 work on eye contact.

10-year freeloader was new in LOR.
 Opp 1: Probably want to introduce counterplan at top of
 speech. U can't have 2 C/Ps - it's really one plan
 with two prongs.
 U really needed to ask for a POI to clarify Prop plan.
 Altho I guess u did, and the answer was different from the
 answer they gave to your "invited POI" during PMC.
 Opp 2:
 A little late to run T.
 Start w/CPs, since ur using them in ur other arg
 Discussion of T was hopelessly muddled w/args about
 advantages.
 If funding is = (using some \$) then could anybody get a
 merit scholarship?

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

REASON FOR DECISION: T arg is too late (and frankly, pretty weak, since anybody can gain admission somewhere: obstacle is cost). Both Both sides' plans are big messes (who gets them? how long?)
 but at least opp has some connection to merit, working hard in HS & college, etc. Opp wd've done itself a
 big favor by denying arbitrariness (people who award are experienced experts.) Opp gets some mileage
 from fairness arg re depts. Prop mishandles CPs. Opp spends too much time opp talking about open admissions. irrelevant

PARLI Debate

Ms Duong (*3)

Round 4 3:30pm L2 (single flight)
Gov: 14 Cohen-Simayof - Drake
Opp: 11 Barnes - Gille
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Kristina Duong
Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley High

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 11

Prop Speaker #1 Drake pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Barnes Gille pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Cohen Simayof pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Gille Barnes 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:

Opp 1:

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Team was well organized w/ facts and citations. Presented point by point very clearly.

PARLI Debate

James Nerny (*6)

Round 4A 3:30pm H2
Gov: 8 Yu - Makineni
Opp: 21 Mubarak - Troup
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: JAMES NERNY

Judge's School Affiliation: CAMP LIND

Team Code #: PROP 8

Team Code #: OPP 21

Prop Speaker #1 YU pts 30

Opp Speaker #1 MUBARACK pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 MAKINENI pts 30

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:

Opp 1:

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

the prop side won because they had the preponderance of evidence

PARLI Debate

James Nerny (*6)

Round 4B 3:30pm H2
Gov: 24 Hansen - Beatie
Opp: 3 Holt - Mizin
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: JAMES NERNY

Judge's School Affiliation: CAROLINO

Team Code #: PROP 24

Team Code #: OPP 3

Prop Speaker #1 HANSEN pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 ~~HOLT~~ HOLT pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 BEATIE pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 MIZIN pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Opp 1:

SPEAKER EFFECTIVELY RESPONDED TO THE ARGUMENT BY THE OTHER SIDE

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

CLEAR AND MEANINGFUL SPEECH

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

EXPANDED FUNDAMENTAL OF PLAN WAS A MORE ELEGANT PROBLEM THAN MISTAKING AGENT OF CHANGE

PARLI Debate

Vincent Banas (*13)

Round 4A 3:30pm H1
Gov: 3 Stamm-Kirk - Burshteyn
Opp: 21 Cheng - Shifs
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Vincent Banas

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

Team Code #: PROP 3

Team Code #: OPP 21

Prop Speaker #1 Burshteyn pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Shifs pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Stamm-Kirk pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Cheng 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 use of citations
- backup for contentions
• Clear and concise - able to direct speech and speak confidently
• Provided good facts
• Good rebuttal speech - systematic*

Prop 2: *• Clear and concise - had good delivery to judge
• Good addressing Neg case and strengthening authors case.*

Opp 1: *• Good attempt to define present and constrain Aff case?
• Good clear presentation presented with confidence
• Needed more citations/facts to support case.*

Opp 2: *• Good speaker and clear and easy to understand
- good confident delivery
- May have been tripped-up by Aff POI.*

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

*Aff built a case with good citations and fact.
Neg case was compelling but couldn't rebut
Aff case due to lack of citations.*

PARLI Debate

Vincent Banas (*13)

Round 4B 3:30pm H1
Gov: 27 Hatcher - Butler
Opp: 3 Rubsamen - Skepner
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Vincent Banas

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

Team Code #: PROP 27

Team Code #: OPP 3

Prop Speaker #1 Butler pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Rubsamen pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Hatcher pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Skepner 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 plan and good delivery.
- Clear speaker with good pace (Not too fast)
- Confident, but seemed somewhat shaky/nerves

Prop 2: - provided clear and consist delivery
- Good argument regarding similarity of Net counter plan
- work on providing more evidence/facts.

Opp 1: - Clear and Concise speaker
- delivered counter plan + evidence effectively.
- provided good support/information for proper procedure.
- Presented with confidence and in an assertive manner
- Good arguments regarding "Guarantee"

Opp 2: - Good arguments regarding clash and providing evidence for HOI on Education
- very clear and confident delivery.
- Good argument against how Aff ~~will~~ "Guarantee" education.

TEAM CODE #: 3 on the Opp (Prop or Opp)

wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides did very well - it was a tough case given the plan and counterplan, but Opp was able to refute the Aff case based on the inability for the plan to successfully Net benefit to America.

PARLI Debate

Montgomery Judge 1 (*17)

Round 4A 3:30pm K2
Gov: 5 Basrai - Hester
Opp: 23 He - Bartenetti
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Catherine Singstad

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell H.S.

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 23

Prop Speaker #1 Basrai pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 He pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Hester pts 29.5

Opp Speaker #2 Bartenetti 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 defining of Threat & return to that — convincing. Powerful (& speedy) delivery. You're very clear with your points & supporting evidence. Great eye contact & ability to speak extemporaneously. Excellent team !!

Prop 2: Love how confident & articulate you are — quick to put thoughts together on the fly. Excellent example of Greece/Italy. Easy to understand — very powerful.

Opp 1: Argument — clearly state against all points prop made. Refute pts. very excellent, logical, evidence-based with strong substantiating info. Good tactic to redefine threat & argue prop's use of word. Your speech was a little choppy at end but otherwise v. good job!

Opp 2: Excellent arguing against prop, especially point about housing market & recession. Not fully persuasive about China — I felt some hesitance. Great question/challenge to prop re stating new info in summary.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Montgomery Judge 1 (*17)

Round 4B 3:30pm K2
Gov: 6 Reyna - Yang
Opp: 27 Amato - Ringstrom
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Catherine Singstad

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell H.S.

Team Code #: PROP
6

Team Code #: OPP
27

Prop Speaker #1 Reyna pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Amato pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Yang pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Ringstrom 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: Passionate, great eye contact & gesturing, strong style. Not sure of relevance about consumer confidence. Great argument against opp.

Opp 1: Very clear speaker - you make a lot of important points & negated their points strongly. Love your counterplan - clever & compelling.

Prop 2: Clearly you put a lot of care into your speaking style - very impressive. Clever to capture their counterplan. Your argument for helping kid too emotionally based. Great on cycle - good point.

Opp 2: Persuasive style: relaxed and confident. You're easy to follow. Convincing points & arguments about valuing edu. Through paying for it & also consumer confidence.

TEAM CODE #: 27 on the OPP wins this debate.

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Ken Schneider (*14)

Round 4A 3:30pm D201
Gov: 15 Baum - Honorary
Opp: 4 Cramer - Griffin
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ken Schneider

Judge's School Affiliation: Kowell

Team Code #: PROP 15

Team Code #: OPP 4

Prop Speaker #1 Honorary pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Cramer pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Baum pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Griffin 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: Provided informative context and historical precedent. Some confusion about Russia (no longer Communist). Excellent rebuttal, reminding us that it is a factual debate and OPP digressed into whether China would collapse, which was not the question posed by the resolution.

Prop 2: Very strong economic argument, good rebuttal, good response to POI, included the TPP in an appropriate context, well presented, well-crafted argument.

Opp 1: Impressive command of economics, raised good POI. Rebuttal clarified economic argument and responded intelligently to PROP's contentions. Good effort at MAD analogy, but I found it confusing.

Opp 2: Good rebuttal, improved as her argument progressed. Raised critical questions of PROP's arguments and line of thinking. A little confusion on numbers (China has double or triple growth of US?)

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

A very close match, spirited and intelligent debate. Prop gets the nod because they correctly criticized opp's focus on whether China would collapse while the resolution looked at the potential consequences of a collapse.

PARLI Debate

Ken Schneider (*14)

Round 4B 3:30pm D201

Gov: 6 Deng - Qian ~~Qian~~ Qian

Opp: 25 Kornfein - Raesfeld

Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Ken Schneider

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

Team Code #: PROP 6

Team Code #: ORP 25

Prop Speaker #1 DENG pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 KORNFEIN pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 MING QIAN pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 RAESFELD 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: provided compelling data that we are poorly educated, but diverged argument to advocating for online ed. Came back with a strong close talking about the value of college and advantages of online.

Prop 2: Strong rebuttals, good response to pol. good command of contracts - interesting argument about costs of higher ed. noted that neither side solved discrimination

Opp 1: very well prepped, mounted strong critique that Prop did not fully address resolution but rather focused on online ed. gave good example that to build an engine, a student needs a lab, not a screen. Strong close good command of economics (tax and debt)

Opp 2: Clear argument on supply and demand and rising cost of Prop's plan. Addressed need to raise our ed. level and gave reasonable counter plan, as well as argued against Prop's diversion into online ed.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp had the tough job, and made a strong argument against Prop, claiming that Prop did not really address the resolution. Prop came back strong but their on-line ed plan was incomplete and not fully a true argument of the resolution

PARLI Debate

Sophia Burshteyn (*3)

Round 4A 3:30pm D204
Gov: 5 Carter - Wyatt
Opp: 26 Picchi - Owyang
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: SOPHIA BURSHTEYN

Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEYN

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 26

Prop Speaker #1 Wyatt pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Owyang pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Carter pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Picchi 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: good case, strong arguments

Opp 1: clear roadmap, list of voting issues, arguments

Prop 2: good support for a partner. not clear understanding of opp. points

Opp 2: (good rebuttal (arguments) list of evidences.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

strong case. I agreed with neg convincing (regarding not addressing 2 neg points and agreeing with the last point.

PARLI Debate

Sophia Burshteyn (*3)

Round 4B 3:30pm D204

Gov: 6 Jia - Jiang

Opp: 27 Ernst - Davis

Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: SOPHIA BURSHTEYN

Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEY

Team Code #: PROP 6

Team Code #: OPP 27

Prop Speaker #1 Jia pts 30

Opp Speaker #1 Ernst pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 Jiang pts 30

Opp Speaker #2 Davis 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 speaker great flow, arguments

Opp 1: perfect speaker very good arguments and responses.

Prop 2: excellent speaker strong support for a partner

Opp 2: clear and valid points, great flow and organize rebutting.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

agreed with Neg team. It was more convincing and strong to the point of resolution.

PARLI Debate

Scott Gast
Ashok Vijay (*10)
Round 4A 3:30pm D203
Gov: 27 Inman - Young
Opp: 6 Hanvey - Moore
Varsity Parli Debate

Judge's Name: Scott Gast
Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP
Team Code #: 27

OPP
Team Code #: 6

Prop Speaker #1 Inman pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Hanvey pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 Young 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: clear, confident, evidence based, used even some humor, good delivery, sometimes got a little confused with points or dwelled too long on them, good example with toothpaste

Prop 2: very well went through logic of points, but sometimes took too long on each point; could have allowed a POI/POG from other team but didn't

Opp 1: very clear, great evidence, referenced opponents' points to support argument, sometimes moved/talked too quickly

Opp 2: great pace/delivery, lots of good evidence, took POI/POGs well, overall good job

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Team #27 won because they demonstrated how Chinese-U.S. economies are thoroughly intertwined. Team 6 ~~was~~ attempted to dismiss this but ultimately fell a little short of being able to refute this point. Both teams however truly did an excellent job of evidence-based discussion and had great deliveries.

Scott Gast

Ashok Vijay (*10)

Round 4B 3:30pm D203
Gov: 25 Greenberg - Kolling
Opp: 15 Fishlow - Fishlow
Varsity Parli Debate

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Scott Gast

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

Team Code #: PROP 25

Team Code #: OPP 15

Prop Speaker #1 Kolling pts 30

Opp Speaker #1 Fishlow 0 pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 Greenberg pts 30

Opp Speaker #2 Fishlow H 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: courteous, asked about preferred style, used humor: evidence well, used good emotional appeal arguments (Iran, Saudi A.), ~~could have been more assertive~~
~~Prop 2: excellent communicator and style, neutralized Opp arguments very well, evidence based, nothing constructive: best debater observed today~~
 Prop 2: ~~dismissive of Opp~~

Opp 1: defined alternate solution (Pell) ^{very} well; great points about it being more effective/targeted solution and showing downside of Prop's arguments; good point about "guarantee" but brought this up too late in debate
 Opp 2: great point about Prop's argument not covering whole cost; effective communication and responses to Prop's questions; used questionable logic for H.E. institutions in cutting services

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Team #25's plan didn't disagree with Team #15's plan. The ability to have a larger plan that also included Team 15's plan (Pell grants) was more advantageous. Team 15 tried valiantly but couldn't argue that their more limited plan would be more effective.