

PARLI Debate

Stromberg, Robert (*26)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 406
Gov: 14 Guan - Schmidt
Opp: 7 Gan - Mathew
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: STROMBERG

Judge's School Affiliation: SA

PROP
Team Code #: 14

OPP
Team Code #: 7

Prop Speaker #1 GUAN pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 MATHEW pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 SCHMIDT pts 27

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: ~~GUAN~~ SCHMIDT

Opp 1: MATHEW

- COURTEOUS, GOOD PRESENTS.
- GOOD HAND GESTURES
- ~~WEAK~~ ARGUMENTS - GOOD ATTACK

- COURTEOUS - GOOD PRESENCE -
- GOOD HAND GESTURES
- GOOD RESPONSE TO ATTACK
- BETTER OVERALL ARGUMENT

Prop 2: GUAN - GOOD VOICE -

Opp 2: GAN

- GOOD PROJECTED - A BIT ALL OVER THE PLACE, CAME BACK STRONG, GOOD DEFENSE - NEEDS TO SLOW DOWN

- GOOD RESPONSE TO PROP -
- STRONG ENERGY - BETTER SPEAKER; VERY CLEAR - COULD SLOW DOWN JUST A BIT

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

(Prop or Opp)

PROP

Decision reversed based on protest.

- SIMPLY MADE A CLEARER CASE - VERY CLOSE

PARLI Debate

Stromberg, Robert (*26)

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 406
Gov: 5 Cuddihy - Goldblatt
Opp: 24 Crenshaw - Bulger
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: STROMBERG

Judge's School Affiliation: SA

PROP
Team Code #: 5

OPP
Team Code #: 24

Prop Speaker #1 GOLDBLATT pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 BULGER pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 CUDDIHY pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 CRENSHAW 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: GOLDBLATT -

- COULD BE MORE FORCEFUL - GOOD CLEAN SPEECH - CAME ON STRONG AT THE END - NEED MORE ACTUAL EXAMPLES LESS HYPOTHETICALS -

Prop 2: CUDDIHY

GOOD CLEAR VOICE - COULD BE A BIT MORE CONFIDENT - NEEDS TO FACT CHECK DATES - FEEL THAT HE GAVE UP A BIT AT THE END

Opp 1: BULGER -

COURTEOUS - STRONG PRESENCE - GOOD RESPONSE TO ATTACK OF PROP - MAKES A BETTER ARGUMENT - GOOD ALT EXAMPLES, GOOD ALT PLAN

Opp 2: CRENSHAW

GOOD PRESENCE - CONFIDENT - GOOD TEAM WORK - GOOD CLEAR MESSAGE

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

- HELD A CLEAR STANCE - MORE CONVINCING ARGUMENT
- BETTER FACTS

Laws which protect citizens for trenches are justified
PARLI Debate

Brown, Peter (*27)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 405
Gov: 20 Rahman - Zhou
Opp: 7 Tripathi - Wong
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Peter Brown
Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

Team Code #:	<u>PROP</u> <u>20</u>	Team Code #:	<u>OPP</u> <u>7</u>
Prop Speaker #1	<u>Rahman</u> pts <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #1	<u>Tripathi</u> pts <u>27</u>
Prop Speaker #2	<u>Zhou</u> pts <u>27</u>	Opp Speaker #2	<u>Wong</u> pts <u>26</u>

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:
 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: + Strong voice
- Need to water clock in rebuttal round 6:22

Opp 1: + Great speaker
- when doing P.O.I need to wait to be called on. but just blurt out

Prop 2: + Good flow
- Getting up passing notes and changing seats during speech is very distracting.

Opp 2: - Very choppy and broken up
- need to make better use of time - 4:28

TEAM CODE #: 20 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: The prop presented a stronger argument and was able to rebuttle all contentions of the neg.

When Govt. fails to enforce the law, vigilantes is justifiable

PARLI Debate

Brown, Peter (*27)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 405
Gov: 11 Dara - Randeria
Opp: 14 Shin - Shevelev
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: PETER BROWN

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

PROP
Team Code #: 11

OPP
Team Code #: 14

Prop Speaker #1 Randeria pts 26

Opp Speaker #1 Shevelev pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Dara pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Shin pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: + Good body language
⊖ Very short speech - 2:47 first speech and 3:50 rebuttal. Need to use time to strengthen argument

Prop 2: + Very clear speaker
- Had time left and did not address p.o.i.

Opp 1: + Very calm speaker
+ Great at refuting all points
+ Very good at time management

Opp 2: + speaks with emotion
+ speaks clear
- Getting up to pass notes during speech is very distracting

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The ~~prop~~ opp negated all contentions the prop. The prop dropped contentions.

PARLI Debate

Cuddihy, Odessa (*5)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 408
Gov: 14 Eng - Morgenstein
Opp: 13 Banas - Santos
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Odessa Cuddihy

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolondo

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Nick Morgenstein pts 30 Opp Speaker #1 Jay Santos pts 24

Prop Speaker #2 Julianna Eng pts 29 Opp Speaker #2 Eve Banas 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:
Debater had good/great efficient information, very strong argument outstanding debater.

Opp 1:
Debater made subject matter very personal, by personal experiences but very effective.

Prop 2: debater responded with facts and understanding of topic

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop was well organized with material, rebuttle spoke confidently

PARLI Debate

Cuddihy, Odessa (*5)

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 408

Gov: 7 Su - Her

Opp: 24 Bodisco - Ransweiler

Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Odessa Cuddihy

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolondo

Team Code #: PROP 7

Team Code #: OPP 24

Prop Speaker #1 SU pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Bodisco pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Emily Her pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Mia Ransweiler pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good

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

26-25 = Fair

24-20 = Poor

<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Both debaters on this team were very well informed and delivered their topic with authority and confidence.

Prop 2: Very direct and stuck to facts. They were both able to respond effecently to argument

Opp 1:

Debater was able to deliver extremely well her knowledge and able to refute her opponent with facts.

Opp 2: Debate was pleasant how ever, she piggy backed off her partner. Her knowledge was relevent.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

reason for decision on prop is because the prop was very well prepared, strong understanding of the topic. communication was excellent. The reason they did not get a perfect score was because they spoke way too fast.

PARLI Debate

Fulop, Anna (*24)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 424
Gov: 11 Sadana - Wagh
Opp: 22 Masters - Fehring
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Anna Fulop

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley High

Team Code #: PROP 11

Team Code #: OPP 22

Prop Speaker #1 Sadana pts 25

Opp Speaker #1 Masters pts 30

Prop Speaker #2 Wagh pts 25

Opp Speaker #2 Fehring 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: Sadana:

I'm not sure your critique was as effective as it potentially could have been. However, I like your delivery

Prop 2: Wagh:

Work on delivery so that you can be a more effective speaker. Your evidence for example (the one about the bridge in Austin, Texas, for example) was great!

Opp 1: Masters:

I was impressed by your delivery and you did an excellent job defending your case from counterarguments. Great supporting evidence.

Opp 2: Fehring:

Good delivery. Make sure when you remind the judge of your side's contentions, you do more than merely repeat the points. Your case will be less redundant and more effective if you do more than merely repeat yourself. Overall, good work!

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The Opp effectively argued the contentions with supporting evidence, and prop failed to refute opps definition of "justify".

PARLI Debate

Fulop, Anna (*24)

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 424
Gov: 22 Baetkey - Blanchard
Opp: 14 Wu - Ying
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Anna Fulop

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley High School

Team Code #: PROP 22

Team Code #: OPP 14

Prop Speaker #1 Blanchard pts 26

Opp Speaker #1 Ying pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Baetkey pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Wu 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: Blanchard

To be a more effective speaker, consider practicing or trying to improve delivery/preparation. I liked your contentions and supporting evidence.

Prop 2: Baetkey

you had a nice, logical flow in your speech!

Opp 1: Ying: You are a very effective speaker with outstanding delivery.

Opp 2: Wu

You did a great job attacking your opponent's contentions!

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Even though the prop brought up good points, prop failed to adequately defend opp's argument that vigilantes can cause chaos and may be cruel.

PARLI Debate

DeWitt, Jane (*14)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 425
Gov: 27 Manni - Brown
Opp: 4 Jayasuriya - Schulz
Parliamentary Debate/JV

VALUE
push for ^{own} value
as superior to
others

Judge's Name: Jane DeWitt

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell (14)

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: <u>27</u>	Team Code #: <u>4</u>
Prop Speaker #1 <u>Manni</u> pts <u>28.5</u>	Opp Speaker #1 <u>Jayasuriya</u> pts <u>28</u>
Prop Speaker #2 <u>Brown</u> pts <u>24</u>	Opp Speaker #2 <u>Schulz</u> pts <u>28.5</u>

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

Laws which protect citizens from themselves are justified.
 Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Well organized speaker. Good closer, makes an ~~organized~~ organized case for why Pro should win, but maybe a bit too manipulative / kind of lame on heavy with waste of time argument but good at it!

Prop 2: had a tough situation as well because had to refute topicality, refute opps case + support own case. Got a bit disorganized a little way but covered all points thoroughly.

Opp 1: had a tough situation of dealing with topicality + explaining own case. Because of this time pressure, did not present own value as well in initial speech, but both opp 2 and rebuttal clarified this. Very good in rebuttal, when focused more on Prop's case.

Opp 2: speaker's points were organized and clear, refuted Pro contentions in a systematic way, both restating what Prop said + making own point.

I think you could have refuted Prop's case without raising topicality.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: I think it's reasonable to assume safety as a value for this resolution + while you can't argue against safety, you can argue against the contentions + present own case - opp hampered self to some degree with topicality issue + distracting to own case.

PARLI Debate

DeWitt, Jane (*14)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 425
Gov: 13 Sinha - Almeida
Opp: 17 Desai - Khare
Parliamentary Debate/JV

FACT
Circumstances
the resolution is
a valid fact

Judge's Name: Jane DeWitt
Judge's School Affiliation: _____

PROP
Team Code #: 13

OPP
Team Code #: 17

Prop Speaker #1 Sinha pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Khare pts 26

Prop Speaker #2 Almeida pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Desai 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

When governments fail to enforce the law, vigilantism is justified
Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Organized case with complete explanations of contentions.
Contention 3 examples the weakest American revolutionaries were not vigilantes enforcing British Law.
Prop 2: Did a good job reemphasizing own case and refuting contentions of Opps case.

Opp 1: Did not seem fully prepared, speeches were very short - 1 minute for both 1st opp speech + rebuttal. Not nearly enough information to make own case + did not refute opp case at all. Well spoken, needs to develop more information.
Opp 2: Did not refute Props contentions but did refute ~~the opps rebuttals~~ ~~to~~ props rebuttations to own contentions. Own case not strong but addressed pol well - with more prep + thought, could be more effective.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp offered no refutation to Props contentions, did not fully explain their own contentions or offered examples that did not meet own definition of vigilantes (people who enforce law without authority - can't be the emperor). OPP just wasn't prepared to either make own case or refute Props case.

PARLI Debate

Baetkey, Kerri (*22)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 407
Gov: 13 Tang - Blais
Opp: 14 Tran - Vainberg
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Baetkey

Judge's School Affiliation: SMHS

Team Code #: PROP 13

Team Code #: OPP 14

Prop Speaker #1 Tang pts 26

Opp Speaker #1 Tran pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Blais pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Vainberg 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:

Remember: never let them see you sweat!!

Prop 1: You were a bit jittery to start which made it hard to follow but you really came back! I liked how you brought up all of the good ideas + added the morality element + that it could save lives!

Prop 2: Move lives!
You had a good opening. I liked the vignette that a sick person can't think for themselves - it was a strong point. Stay calm - even under pressure.

Opp 1: Very clear, organized, calm I liked your agenda + pacing. You did a nice wrap up - outlining all of your points 'we need resources not laws' Good call with the 14th amendment.

Opp 2: You have a strong voice, nice affect, solid eye contact. You also added appropriate hand gestures that added to your effectiveness. You offered a clear 'roadmap' that helped nail your side!

Good P.O.O. :)

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

They attacked every point and had their own solutions. They were clear, organized and thoughtful. The Aff would be fun to see when they have more time to prepare. It was a solid debate despite the Aff's personal setback (timing issue).

Don't quit when things go wrong! Take a breath + dig deep. I liked how you battled back from a hurried start!!

PARLI Debate

Baetkey, Kerri (*22)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 407
Gov: 24 Woerner - Miner
Opp: 5 Reyna - Yang
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Baetkey

Judge's School Affiliation: SMHS

Team Code #: PROP 24

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 Woerner pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Reyna pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Miner pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Yang 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 opening, precise, clear, commanding, good eye contact. Loved your quote from Dec. of Ind. and your examples. I actually liked the Batman reference BUT then you said 'bomb butt' which epically failed - too far!!

Prop 2: You did a great job with clarity + intent. I loved the Jim Crow example and how you brought that in as a better example. You handled yourself well and have amazing pen twirling control!

Opp 1: Good opening, firm, excited, powerful. You layered in questions which is effective. You did a good job bringing up definitions + declaring it a fact round but then got flustered a bit with the semantics. Your next time up you were able to regain an organized, clear flow!

Opp 2: You drove it home! You were clear + precise. You presented well and refuted everything. I like how you told me how you won and to base it on the quality + quantity of the facts. Your organized, calm approach was very effective.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The opp took control of the debate from the definitions, to winning the argument about fact or value and then in the P.O.O. in the final round. The entire debate was an awesome back and forth but the opp seemed to control it overall. Everyone performed at a high level!

PARLI Debate

Sutton, Jim (*14)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 401
Gov: 4 Johnson - Pashman
Opp: 27 Lavell - Hall
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Jim Sutton
Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

laws to protect people from themselves

Team Code #: PROP 4

Team Code #: OPP 27

Prop Speaker #1 Johnson pts 26

Opp Speaker #1 Hall pts 20

Prop Speaker #2 Pashman pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Lowell 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: If you wanted to improve based on net benefits/forcing laws, you needed to bring up specific laws which save lives. Wrote down/read too much during first speech. Water breathing -- too breathy

Prop 2: Need better eye contact. Tone was more persuasive when you spoke faster -- very forceful.

Opp 1: Don't smile at opponents' arguments. Good substantive arguments: laws don't work and people should have ability to choose. Ran out of time in rebuttal -- summary would have been helpful.

Opp 2: Watch flipping your hair and clapping hands. Need better eye contact; read from papers too much. Good emphasis that net benefits is not appropriate for a values round.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Both sides needed to provide specific examples of laws designed to protect people from themselves -- seat belts, motorcycle helmets, drinking/smoking by minors, soda taxes, etc. Both sides needed to list out "costs" in rebuttal. AFF never refuted OPP's main pts: laws don't work (see # of murders), and people have it to make own decisions

low point
man had
Holl had
best arguments
which cost
did not
refute
the way
very
good
during
and for
after
speeches.
Quality

DONT lecture your opponent
ABOUT RULES -- VERY RUDE!!

PARLI Debate

Sutton, Jim (*14)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 401
Gov: 17 Chou - Kim
Opp: 11 Pandit - Maddhuri
Parliamentary Debate/JV

uplantation

Judge's Name: Jim Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

Team Code #: PROP 17

Team Code #: OPP 11

Prop Speaker #1 Chou pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Pandit pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Kim pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Maddhuri pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good

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

26-25 = Fair

24-20 = Poor

<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate

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

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

*low point
win. Opp
1st speaker
made three
arguments which
were
replied to
even though
Opp were
better
speakers,
quicker*

Prop 1: Take label off the sleeve of your suit. Excellent formal speaking style. Very thorough speaker. Very good arguments, but he needed to acknowledge and respond to OPP's specific arguments.

Opp 1: First speech was excellent - refuted all OPP's points and made full case. Both speeches too short - needed summary of voting issues.

Prop 2: Beautiful speaking voice. Great job getting through all of partner's points and providing more detail about specific examples. Needed better summary at end of speech.

Opp 2: Voice a bit too shrill. Good eye contact. Need to give "roadmap" at start of speech telling me structure of your speech. Could have used more counter-arguments. Examples about Haiti, Sudan, and Revolution. Speech too short.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: *Opp did better job of giving examples of when uplantation is justified. OPP made three points which went unanswered: (1) Uplantation may be acting for selfish reasons; (2) Uplantation may be bad people; and (3) Uplantation only "fix" to solve problem. OPP were better speakers, but they completely ignored these 3 points.*

PARLI Debate

Erdelyi, Eszter (*14)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 426

Gov: 3 Burgmann - McCann-Phillips

Opp: 26 Arroyo - Stephens

Parliamentary Debate/JV

A fight only

Judge's Name: ESZTER ERDELYI

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL

Team Code #: PROP 3

Team Code #: OPP 26

Prop Speaker #1 McCann-Phillips pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Stephens pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Burgmann pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Arroyo 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: I commend your polite manners and ability to articulate great summary in the VOTER. May I suggest you use reference to your contentions (first second etc) to make it easier to follow.

Opp 1: Made great points on "no actual laws were brought up" and "costs are relative". May I suggest to make the arguments also more "general" saying how your arguments relate to theirs in the context.

Prop 2: Good summary point: even if there are no laws it is justified. What is the source of knife and saw laws? Quote instead of saying "easily seen".

Opp 2: Good attempt to redefine case answer contentions, good organization easiest to follow. If you made the suicide case one example where PROP does not stand the NEG would have had a very strong case.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: This was a difficult debate as the PROP presented a fairly unsupported case but the OPP focused on the T argument when instead they could have just said: Suicide law is a big example of not justified! PROP wins by a hair - being a little better organized

Laws which protect us from themselves are unjustified
PARLI Debate

Fogarty, Matthew (*16)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 423

Gov: 5 Chen - Jones ^① AFF

Opp: 24 Campagna - Mortensen ^①

Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: MAT FOGARTY

Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 24

Prop Speaker #1 JONES pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 MORTENSEN pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 CHEN pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 CAMPAGNA 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:
Use all your time (1 minute left)
Better structure, you were repeating points.
Great voice + confidence

Prop 2:
Prioritize points - (what is the strongest). More structure

Opp 1:
Avoid being dogmatic about rules & interpretation
Better structure needed
Use your time well

Opp 2:
well handled POI
Structure your time - I got covered

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PROP FAILED TO MAKE STRONG POINTS.

Fogarty, Matthew (*16)

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 423

Gov: 7 Zhang - Yang ①

Opp: 14 Liu - Fu

Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: MAT FOGARTY

Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

Team Code #: PROP 7

Team Code #: OPP 14

Prop Speaker #1 Yang pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Liu pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Zhang pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Fu 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 powerful voice - needs more eye contact
- More structure of points needed
- be careful about new info in last speech

Prop 2:

- Good structure
- good refutation
- but own points were weak.

Opp 1: Be clearer when you are refuting (I thought you were summarizing)

Good 4 points delivered
Second speech only lasted 1:40 min

Opp 2: Manage time better (+40 seconds)

Very good voice + presence.
Avoid POI thing unless it is really important (seemed small to me)

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

WEAK POINTS OF PROP

PARLI Debate

Sadana, Sumit (*11)

Round 3A 1:30pm Room 404
Gov: 24 Corbett - Somerday
Opp: 5 Visht - Koshkin
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Sumit Sadana

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School

Team Code #: 24 **PROP**

Team Code #: 5 **OPP**

Prop Speaker #1 Corbett pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Visht pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Somerday pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Koshkin pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

<p>Prop 1: + Pleasant, friendly opening + Examples + Eye contact + 1- Some examples are weak somewhat weak (eg: denim) but overall very good</p> <p>Prop 2: + friendly opening + Good refutation - Can improve poise and articulation</p>	<p>Opp 1: + Friendly opening + Confident; + Good, convincing arguments + Eye contact - Repetition</p> <p>Opp 2: + Confident speaker - Can have more eye contact, less reading + Great potential in debate + Good poise</p>
--	--

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Team #5 provided more confident, convincing arguments and effectively refuted opponents. Close debate - both sides did well.

PARLI Debate

Sadana, Sumit (*11)

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 404
Gov: 22 Katewa - Colenbrander
Opp: 7 Giang - Shen
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Sumit Sadana

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School

Team Code #: PROP 22

Team Code #: OPP 7

Prop Speaker #1 Katewa pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Giang pts ~~25~~ 25

Prop Speaker #2 Colenbrander pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Shen 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: + Confident speaking
+ Good arguments
- Repetition (eg: "march, chaos")

Opp 1: + Good, friendly start
+ Good potential
- Communication style can be improved
- Some arguments not clear/crisp or ^{were} weak
- Time management

Prop 2:
+ Solid analysis, debate
+ Good approach to refuting opposition

Opp 2:
+ Effective communication style
+ Crisp & clear arguments which improved on partners' points
+ Strong, skilled and has great potential, well done!!

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Well reasoned arguments, crisply delivered by winning team. From opposing team, Shen was excellent.

PARLI Debate

Siegel, Kevin (*14)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 409
Gov: 24 Barton - Madsen
Opp: 5 Yuan - Stankus
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Kevin Drake Siegel

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	_____	Team Code #:	_____
Prop Speaker #1	<u>Barton</u> pts <u>25</u>	Opp Speaker #1	<u>Yuan</u> pts <u>27</u>
Prop Speaker #2	<u>Madsen</u> pts <u>24</u>	Opp Speaker #2	<u>Stankus</u> pts <u>26</u>

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:

25
Prop 1: good use of definitions strong on rebuttal, particularly the point about opponents' conceding euthanasia of mentally unstable being prohibited proves your point. Don't play with tie so much.

24
Prop 2: your presentation was a little unfocused. But good job identifying examples of relevant laws

Opp 1: Good job clarifying definitions, 27 but the argument that helmet laws only protect against harms by others was a distinction without a difference. Good job focusing on individual liberty, but liberty ≠ democracy. They are distinct.

Opp 2: Good use of examples and fast facts on human rights. 26

TEAM CODE #: Yuan, Stankus on the Opp wins this debate.
(Prop of Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: More detail, specifics

PARLI Debate

Siegel, Kevin (*14)

Round 3B 1:30pm Room 409
Gov: 5 Firsov - Kwak
Opp: 24 Fulop - Bennett
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Kevin Drake Siegel

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	_____	Team Code #:	_____
Prop Speaker #1	<u>Kwak</u> pts <u>26</u>	Opp Speaker #1	<u>Bennett</u> pts <u>28</u>
Prop Speaker #2	<u>Firsov</u> pts <u>26</u>	Opp Speaker #2	<u>Fulop</u> pts <u>27</u>

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 speedy and coherent delivery. Try not to swing arms too much. Clever idea about superheroes without special powers, but you didn't tie enough to reality

Prop 2: Good job to try to ask questions, but you were a little snarky. Good job sticking to theme

Opp 1: Excellent job with specifics about potential harms from untrained enforcers, anarchy, loss of respect for law, individual perceptions, etc. Some example was more extreme than needed to make your point.

Opp 2: you had time to take questions - clear refutation of their points, ~~then~~ bringing up point about fictional worlds, etc.

TEAM CODE #: Bennett + Fulop on the Opp wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

More practical, detailed discussion