PARLI Debate

Byrne, William (*20)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 426
Gov: 3 Burgmann - McCann-Phillips
Opp: 7 Giang - Shen
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: William Byrne

Judge's School Affiliation: Pinole Valley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	7
Prop Speaker #1	McCann-Phillips pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Giang pts 24
Prop Speaker #2	Burgmann pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Shen 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: You had a good grasp of the topic at hand, but the first round jitters may have gotten to you as your delivery could use some work. Having said that, you may also want to be more specific when elaborating on your contentions as general attacks based on your points can lack impact. Your "voter accomodations" point was dropped after Pro I, but it was your best answer to a lot of the Opp points.

Prop 2:

Opp 1: It may help to plan out your talking points as the pauses in your speech can take away from the very valid points that you are making. A lot more can be accomplished when you can use all of your time speaking on the topic at hand. Also, do not voluntarily take an extra 30 seconds.

Opp 2: You did a very good job when it came to making sure that all points made by both sides were carried over, but the delivery was lacking in cadence, possibly due to first round jitters.

Address to both speakers.

TEAM CODE #: 7 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: My decision was mostly based on the strength of the opp's points which made up for the delivery errors. Also, the prop dropped a POO in the last speech. The biggest decision maker was the Bill of Rights contention.

PARLI Debate

Byrne, William (*20)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 426
Gov: 24 Fulop - Bennett
Opp: 22 Masters - Fehring
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: William Byrne

Judge's School Affiliation: Pinole Valley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	24	Team Code #:	22
Prop Speaker #1	Bennett pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Masters pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Fulop pts 30	Opp Speaker #2	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: You did a fairly good job speaking and keeping your contentions solid. You may want to tuck in the shirt.

Opp 1: You may want to practice your delivery as you made good points, but you tend to stagger towards the end.

Prop 2: You are possibly the best non-varsity speaker that I have encountered in five years of judging, thus no critiques.

Opp 2: You may want to focus more on getting out statistics to support the first speaker. You started to and then fell off into repeating the first speech, however you have an excellent delivery.

TEAM CODE #: 24 **on the** Prop (Prop or Opp) **wins this debate.**

REASON FOR DECISION: Stronger points from the Prop won out plain and simple.

PARLI Debate

Bulger, Cindy (*24)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 407
Gov: 7 Zhang - Yang
Opp: 17 Chou - Kim
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	7	Team Code #:	17
Prop Speaker #1 Yang	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Chou	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Zhang	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Kim	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

US gvt - require voting

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 #: 7 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Better educated voter bloc and improved representation arguments stronger than systemic harm proposed by Neg. team.

PARLI Debate

Bulger, Cindy (*24)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 407
Gov: 5 Visht - Koshkin
Opp: 11 Sadana - Wagh
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 11	
Prop Speaker #1 ~~Kushkin~~ Visht	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Sadana	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 ~~Visht~~ Kushkin	pts 30	Opp Speaker #2 Wagh	pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

US should ban death penalty

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

Prop 1: Both speakes are easy to follow and did a great job w/ eye contact, use of information and communication.

Prop 2:

Opp 1: Excellent diction and speed. Speech easy to follow but a bit unorganized in your presentation of points.

Opp 2: Nice use of eyecontact and easy to understand. Should use more detail in arguing or accepting points instead of "okay we accept."

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

(1) ~~Unorganized~~ Well supported and structured case

(2) ~~Excellent~~ use of statistics, and supporting evidence.

(3)

US SHOULD REQUIRE CITIZENS TO VOTE IN ELECTIONS

PARLI Debate

Cabasino, Mark (*13)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 425
Gov: 5 Reyna - Yang
Opp: 26 Arroyo - Stephens
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: MLC

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	5	Team Code #:	26
Prop Speaker #1	REYNA pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	STEPHENS pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	YANG pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	ARROYO 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 plan, good list of advantages, and good articulate delivery. Good analogy (& jury duty, taxes). I wasn't clear on link of police brutality to topic, but overall, well done.

Prop 2: Good idea of permutation, and good rebuttals and explanation of 2 advantage. Explain how permutation will work and how/why it's better than original plan.

Opp 1: Good pathos appeals (immigrants / poor), (votes don't matter). Good counterplan, but elaborate on how counterplan would be carried out and advantages of counterplan. Also work on confidence of delivery.

Opp 2: Good pathos appeals (right to protest), (taxes boost education). Good rebuttal of police tagline. Work on confidence of delivery

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Stronger delivery, good choice of permutation (which was dropped by neg), clearer voting issues at the end, and clearer outline of plan (FAME, etc). Good debate overall.

US SHOULD BAN THE DEATH PENALTY.

PARLI Debate

Cabasino, Mark (*13)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 425
Gov: 20 Rahman - Zhou
Opp: 7 Su - Her
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: MLC

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

PROP (20)		OPP (7)	
Prop Speaker #1 ZHOU	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 SU	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 RAHMAN	pts 29	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 contentions and interesting choice to run case as a "moral" case. Good pathos appeals (eg. US #united, power/responsibility, controversy ≠ democracy). It's ok that you ran without plan, but opp does have the right to run a counterplan.

Prop 2: Good emphasis on key points in rebuttal (eg. jail = rehab, social contract). Good job defending your case and responding to opp's contentions.

Opp 1: Good choice for counterplan and good supporting evidence. Good job responding to AFF's contentions. Good voter issues and good clear quick delivery.

Opp 2: Good job requesting sources of AFF. Good points reiterated from partner's speech (eg. deterrant, humanitarianism, etc).

TEAM CODE #: OPP **on the** (7) **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

More specificity in case (counterplan, sources of evidence). Good pathos appeal (humanitarianism). Good job of neg to get through both its own case and rebuttals in NEG 1 and NEG 2 speeches. Clear solid delivery from all competitors.

Should vote

PARLI Debate

Keshav, Sineesh (*23)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 424
Gov: 13 Sinha - Almeida
Opp: 14 Guan - Schmidt
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: SINEESH KESHAV

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON ACADEMY (DIABLO VISTA)

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	13	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Anchal Sinha pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Guan pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Garrett Almeida pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Schmidt 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: Sinha
+ well structured
- Swaying + Eye contact
posture - Reliance on notes
- Content was not strong
+ Rebuttal addressed

Prop 2: Almeida
Joke candidate + Excellent content
- Eye contact
+ less reliance on notes
+ Courtesy

Opp 1: Guan
+ eye contact - too much reliance on one point
+ less reliance on notes
+ Loud, clear enunciation
- too many "uhm..." + Parsonett
+ content was good argument
- went over time

Opp 2: Schmidt
+ Good question on 1st election
+ Good eye contact
- Went over time
+ Great argument about funding
+ Looking at prop speakers when rebutting
- too much reliance on one point

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

- Better rebuttals & analysis
- Better delivery

Ban death penalty

PARLI Debate

Keshav, Sineesh (*23)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 424
Gov: 24 Corbett - Somerday
Opp: 14 Eng - Morgenstein
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: SINEESH KESHAV

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 24	Team Code #: 14
Prop Speaker #1 Corbett pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Morgenstein pts ~~28~~ 29
Prop Speaker #2 Somerday pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Eng 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: Corbett – No POIs
+ Evidence concrete with numbers
+ relaxed confident posture & tone + Great rebuttal
– Delivery a little dry – need more passion

Prop 2: Somerday – No POIs
+ posture + good argument for crime deterrant
– didn't take time to elaborate. kept it brief

Opp 1: Morgenstein – No POIs
+ Eye contact with pro team
– looking down on notes too much
+ Good argument & delivery
+ Great impassioned rebuttal

Opp 2: Eng – No POIs
– too much looking down on notes
– delivery – repetitive
– analysis was too focused on couple of points

TEAM CODE #: 24 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

- Strong analysis & evidence
- Better delivery

The US should require citizens to vote in elections

PARLI Debate

Chin, Liru (*14)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 406
Gov: 22 Baetkey - Blanchard
Opp: 5 Cuddihy - Goldblatt
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Liru Chin

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	22	Team Code #:	5
Prop Speaker #1	Blanchard pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Goldblatt pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Baetkey pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Cuddihy 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: Too brief. "Should" expand more on your contentions. Missed opportunity including — when more people voted, whether they are educated or not, they may choose someone who reflects their views or their ideals.

Prop 2:

Opp 1: For Opp team to completely dismiss the topic and start off the debate by stating that the opponent "wasted" their research time to me negates the entire process of debate. Debating on topicality is futile. That said, Cuddihy brought up an excellent point, "democracy is the right to choose".

Opp 2:

TEAM CODE #: 22 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp debated on topicality, dismissed the exercise as a waste of time because Prop did not research on the same basis as they did. If prop had done so, this wouldn't be much of a debate. Also leap from uneducated voters to death & destruction is too big of a jump

The US should ban the death penalty

PARLI Debate

Chin, Liru (*14)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 406
Gov: 27 Ramirez - Castenada
Opp: 24 Bodisco - Ransweiler
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Liru Chin

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	27	Team Code #:	24
Prop Speaker #1	Castenada pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Bodisco pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Ramirez pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Ransweiler 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: Contentions were very well structured & presented. Even though prop disagree. w/Opp that this is a Value & not Policy debate, you still provided very good counters.

Prop 2:
On issue of overcrowding prison — the next step would be to point out % of death row population and how executions would alleviate the overcrowding. Would it?

Opp 1: Engaging speaker, good job communicating. Contentions can be better delineated. Making morality one of your main contentions, then dismissing prop's use of morality, weakens your own assertion.

Opp 2:
Spent too much time on how to speak about debate. Recommend that you invest that time to strengthen your case or weaken opponent's. Linkage between death penalty and loss of govt trust not well connected. Also do not see basis of statement that criminals are not concern w/death penalty and would rather die right away; not to mention death penalty is a long drawn out process.

TEAM CODE #: Opp **on the** 24 **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Stronger presentation. Contentions better presented and supported in argument.

The US should require citizens to vote in elections

PARLI Debate

Skarr, Teresa (*27)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 409
Gov: 7 Tripathi - Wong
Opp: 14 Wu - Ying
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Teresa Skarr

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	7	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Tripathi pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Ying pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Wong pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Wu pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

← Sorry for messy scores - it's early for me!

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

Prop 1: Tripathi
+ Very clear, organized speaker, good cadence
Δ Some problems with case & math 80% + 15% ≠ 100% work on organization (eg 2nd Neg contention not numbered or distinct)

Prop 2: Wong
+ Clear speaker, good cadence and emphasis
Δ Aff case poke holes in (eg. citizens include infants) + strong rebuttal / good refutation

Opp 1: Ying
+ organized
Δ Work on fleshing speech better, adding justification req't. 1st speech was too fast - S/B to allow clash. links

Opp 2: Wu
+ Nice tone of voice
Δ Roadmap was confusing - said work on Aff case but started with Neg case then went back again. Work on cadence / smoothe

went over time in rebuttal by :43

had to follow ended early.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
While both sides had some good points and opportunities for improvement, the Neg side had better-reasoned refutations and contentions with solid links. Both sides could improve with more evidence (eg. Australia)

The US should ban the death penalty

PARLI Debate

Skarr, Teresa (*27)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 409
Gov: 11 Pandit - Maddhuri
Opp: 5 Chen - Jones
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Teresa Skarr

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	5
Prop Speaker #1	Maddhuri pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Jones pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Pandit pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Chen 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: Maddhuri
+ good cadence and patnos
Δ give more background/explain links and impacts. Provide a judging criteria work on higher level perspective during rebuttal.

Prop 2: Pandit
+ good, clear speaker
Δ spend more time on refutations and directly vs. CounterPlan

Opp 1: Jones
+ good organization, clear speaker. Good g Shmes, obviously smart
Δ HR 2804 is non-sequiter "what is a counterplan needed more elements "uniqueness"? dropped Aff points/doesn't allow clash Counterpoint refuted way too late in rebuttal.

Opp 2: Chen
+ organized speaker
Δ could use more evidence/history on Supreme Court handling of death penalty misinterpreted Aff's refutation. work on engaging more in speaking style.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The Opp's ~~Affut~~ DA was a "wash" after refutation by Aff, but their CounterPlan went unrefuted even though Aff's contentions were still standing. Because Opp argued they had access to Aff benefits, they ended with stronger case. "Uniqueness" was BS though and I would have preferred to vote Aff.

PARLI Debate

Owen, Jeff (*25)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 408
Gov: 24 Campagna - Mortensen
Opp: 27 Lavell - Hall
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Jeff Owen

Judge's School Affiliation: Santa Rosa Highschool

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	24	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	Mortensen pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Hall pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Campagna pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Lavell 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 at formalizing points & supporting same. Listened well to opposition. The riot argument & was emotional story acted

Prop 2: Good arguments & Rebuttals. Please tie your tie completely & Roll down sleeves.

Opp 1: Excellent points and arguments. Did well in showing how Props "Benefit" argument was not well fo-meld initially

Opp 2: Slow down. Relax. good arguments. Good job

TEAM CODE #: 24 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: The debate was close until final Rebuttal. Prop did not prove benefit until final Rebuttal. The example of terrorist or Gay Rights issues. The benefit of forcing people to become more informed by forcing them to vote is Argued well

PARLI Debate

Owen, Jeff (*25)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 408
Gov: ~~11 Shingwekar - Vichare~~
Opp: 7 Gan - Mathew
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Jeff Owen

Judge's School Affiliation: Santa Rosa High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:		Team Code #:	7
Prop Speaker #1	pts	Opp Speaker #1 Mathew	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	pts	Opp Speaker #2 Gan	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: 11 AFF NO SHOW Please inform

Opp 1: Great job guys Again Slow down: Quality points are always better than trying to have more Points

Prop 2:

Opp 2: Gan-Mathew

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Jacobs, Joel (*3)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 404
Gov: 24 Barton - Madsen
Opp: 27 Manni - Brown
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Berkeley HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 24	25	Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 Barton	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Manni	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Madsen	pts 25	Opp Speaker #2 Brown	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: Don't bother defining terms that don't matter/ not controversial (US), or use circular defs (citizens)

Rebuttal was very forceful and clear.

Prop 2: What is the ev from Ms-NBC? You gave no stats or quotes.
You can't beat a constitutionality arg with a pragmatic response. Discuss constitutionality w/ your coach.
Work on flowing. You thought their overview was a response to ur 1st contention, but it wasn't

Why didn't Opp ever use major concession in POI? (Voting doesn't matter.)

Opp 1: You don't need to make a big production out of starting your timer. Just start it.
Burden press seems unnecessary, and u don't justify it/when. I would skip.
53% is not a "huge majority"
Watch the rocking back and forth while u speak.
A bit more passion would help.

Opp 2: U don't need to tell me ur the 2nd Speaker. I can count.
"It does'nt make sense" is not a response (minority xs to voting) is not a substantive response. Tell me why their arg is wrong.

Rebuttal: Tell me what ur ev says/proves, not just why the source is more credible. "Criteria" is not a voting issue; it's a voting standard.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Constitutionality is an absolute voting issue, and well impacted in this round. On a policy level, Opp convinces me (and Prop never really addresses) that freedom includes right not to vote.
Round had very little clash (attacking heart of opponents' arg), but that will come with practice.

PARLI Debate

Jacobs, Joel (*3)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 404
Gov: 14 Shin - Shevelev
Opp: 13 Banas - Santos
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Berkeley HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	13
Prop Speaker #1 Shevelev	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Banas	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Shin	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Santos	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

Great picture painting!!! (image of execution happening)

PMR Lead, and spend more time on, harms of DP & BA responding to Opp args.

What is "Off line Archives"?

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

A POI that begins "Are u aware" is a bad POI.

Going down flow and listing random dropped pts is a poor rebuttal strategy - give me a few reasons to vote for you, and explain them.

Prop 1: Nice, conversational speaking style.
Use R hand for gestures sometimes - not just L.
Opp: U can't just cite the conclusion of one Supreme Ct justice - majority of USSC determine constitutionality. And give me analysis. - "cruel and unusual," not "basic rights." Refer to exact language.

Opp 1: "Status quo okay" is not a disad - it's a case attack.
Don't "suicide rates ↑" + "Life w/o parole is worse than Death" Contradict "↑ criminal activity/deterrence"?
Why can't they give a source in 2nd speech?
Why do we need a death penalty, esp. since it's almost never used?
"To roadmap, I'll be going over some voting points of why we shd win this debate" - Wasted sentence.

Prop 2: Ask urself whether u need to refute ur opponents args, or just use it or show it's irrelevant. Of course more prisoners wd commit suicide w/o DP, but so what? It's because more of them will be alive-corpses don't commit suicide. Why does it matter wh. this is value or pol debate? Finish strong, at the podium - you walked away, still talking, ur voice trailing off.

Opp 2: V debate need not have comparative resolution. Why does it matter wh. res is value or pol?
Genocide is killing an entire race, religion, etc. - not just killing innocents.
Roadmap: you went over Second Opp prop, then first. Confusing! Stick with Opp case, then Prop Case. One organizational scheme is enf.
"In 2013, 39 people..." - finish the sentence. not 37.

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

"Net benefit against society" is a "net harm."

REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop wins Unconstitutionality (which is an obsolete value), DP = torture (at least until better drugs), Govt shdn't kill, racial bias. These are basically untouched. Opp args are lower impact, less developed, and contradictory.
Opp does win missing elements of plan, but that's only a voter if u explain why plan is too vague/unfair to debate.

PARLI Debate

Clark, Stacy/Wallis (*26)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 423
Gov: 5 Firsov - Kwak
Opp: ~~Antonio Valdivieso~~ 11 Dara - Randeira
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Stacy CLARK

Judge's School Affiliation: Economics Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	5	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	Firsov pts____	Opp Speaker #1	Dara pts____
Prop Speaker #2	Kwak pts____	Opp Speaker #2	Randeira pts____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Opp 1:

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

11 Dara - Randeira did NOT show.

PARLI Debate

Clark, Stacy/Wallis (*26)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 423
Gov: 14 Liu - Fu
Opp: 17 Desai - Khare
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Stacy CLARK

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 17	
Prop Speaker #1 Liu	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Desai	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Fu	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Khare	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:
+ Defines terms
+ Articulates clear thinking
– Think about balancing pace with desire to move through points (Although pace much better 2nd time speaking)

Prop 2:
+ Passionate delivery
+ Roadmap laid out
+ courteous
– Consider eye contact to all in room, including opposition.

Opp 1:
+ eye contact w/ all in room
+ professional handling of questions / points from other team
+ outline of claims
– refutations? / Review parli rules.

Opp 2:
+ eye contact w/ all in room
+ Great pace!
+ brave under fire.
– Reviewing parli rules.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The prop presented a clear and persuasive analysis, and they effectively responded to arguments made by other side. Clear and organized thinking.

U.S. Require citizens to vote in elections

PARLI Debate

Burrous, Eileen (*22)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 405
Gov: 14 Tran - Vainberg
Opp: 24 Woerner - Miner
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Eileen Burrous

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 24	
Prop Speaker #1 Tran	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Woerner	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Vainberg	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Miner	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: clear speaking, not enough solid evidence need to support opinions

Opp 1: Well spoken, quotes + stats were relevent

Prop 2: clear speaker good eye contact, energetic need better stats

Opp 2: facts were not as clear need better prep

TEAM CODE #: 24 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp won - they quoted better reasons, had stats explained it would be impractical, expensive. Points backed up argument

U.S should ban death penalty

PARLI Debate

Burrous, Eileen (*22)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 405
Gov: 4 Johnson - Pashman
Opp: 24 Crenshaw - Bulger
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Eileen Burrous

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 4		Team Code #: 24	
Prop Speaker #1 Johnson	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Crenshaw	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Pashman	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Bulger	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: needs to slow down. Quotes good facts, clear points offer good stats.

Opp 1: needed better facts not just opinions.

Prop 2: good points, should speak a bit slower, very passionate

Opp 2: could have more supporter facts, better points, quotes.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: They were able to use clearer facts to support banning death penalty. - Covered both financial + moral points.

PARLI Debate

Sawhney, Sakina (*7)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 401
Gov: 13 Tang - Blais
Opp: 22 Katewa - Colenbrander
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Sakina Sawhney

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 13 - Tang - Blais	Team Code #: 22 Katewa - Colenbrander
Prop Speaker #1 Tang pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Aditya Katewa pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Blais. pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Tyler Colenbrander 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: -Tang (Use polls/study for examples.
• Good eye contact / smile ☺
• Delivery of speech, sometimes not easy to understand.
• Arguments should be given for each contention.
• Analysis must be provided with appropriate examples.
• Provide evidence with examples.
• How will you educate citizens?

Prop 2: Blais
• Must make eye contact; avoid looking at ceiling.
• Arguments must be well organized
• refute opponents contention more with providing examples and data.

Opp 1: Katewa: Good voice projection
• Contention organized although provide examples and data if possible
• Evidence was provided for contentions try to have it for all your contentions if possible.

Opp 2: Colenbrander
Good voice projection and eye contact.
• Organized
• Again, please have examples for evidence/argumentation.

TEAM CODE #: 22 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp was chosen to win since the analysis and evidence was more clearly delivered. Argumentation was organized in a logical way.

PARLI Debate

Sawhney, Sakina (*7)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 401
Gov: 4 Jayasuriya - Schulz
Opp: 5 Yuan - Stankus
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Sakina Sawhney

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 4		Team Code #: 5	
Prop Speaker #1 Schulz	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Yuan	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Jayasuriya	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Stankus.	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 voice projection provide examples if possible. • Delivery was good. • Argumentation can be a bit more organized. overall good. Good questions to opp ☺

Prop 2: - Very good speaker provided good argumentation against opp team. • Cost's argument seems impact. • Good questions asked of opp

Opp 1: Yuan :- Good voice projection. Need stats provide state examples/backlash. Congress! execution vs. house passing bills. links used for contentions were statements without appropriate evidence. just b/c passing of one 6:11 will not make the other not pass. • States barring death penalty? what PROP? or OPP? • use more analysing contentions.

Opp 2: Good speaker, appreciate your taking some questions from other team. • Need statistics with sources to substantiate your statements. • Definitions given by aff were not refuted, arguments made w/o new was were not in order. • Point brought up. 2nd AFF speaker brought it up.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opps did not provide any argumentation against AFFS (GOV); actually they supported the winning teams contentions. AFF's provided definition and contentions which they supported, and were not refuted by negs.