PARLI Debate

Chen, Hong (*23)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 405
Gov: 4 Jayasuriya - Schulz
Opp: 5 Chen - Jones
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Meera Paul

Judge's School Affiliation: Head-Royce

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	5
Prop Speaker #1	Jayasuriya pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Jones pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Schulz pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Chen pts 28

The USFG should substantially increase regulation of advertising targeting children

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: very well-delivered; eye contact, hand gestures, + explanations were very clear. Spoke at a moderate rate, good vocal projection. watch for ums and AHS in speech. some definitions such as FERB should be explained to your audience. Good explanations though redundant in your argument. watch for time slightly run over 7 min. closing good, again definitions unclear.

Prop 2: well-delivered overview of speech. very clear, delivery with hand gestures + eye contact outstanding. watch for AHS in speech. organization of speech needed. Though presented an overall great speech — ideas + information were scattered, overall → good speech. Also, slight overtime the 7 minutes

Opp 1: Lots of AHS in your speech, tended to speak a little fast, slow speed rate will improve quality of speech, excellent hand gestures + eye contact made, and vocal projection. Great organized speech, lots of information given, just watch out for the AHS. Slight over the 7 min. very clear + outstanding closing rebuttal. slightly over 5 min, 24 sec.

Opp 2: Gave great outline to audience going into your speech. strong stand on your case, brilliantly outstanding! Delivery outstanding, well convinced. Organization, + explanations flowed smoothly and clear. Great vocal projection + delivery!. overtime 7 min. 33 sec.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

This was a tough decision in closure. Both teams gave great debater speeches to argue their case. I was leaning towards opp. team for overall quality of speeches with delivery + speeches, however I also felt Prop. gave a great argument in closure and Opp. team needed to lesson the interruption in arguments to Prop. speech which caused slight 1 min. overtime. for that. Prop. has won.

PARLI Debate

Chen, Hong (*23)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 405
Gov: 26 Arroyo - Stephens
Opp: 7 Su - Her
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Meera Paul

Judge's School Affiliation: Head-Royce

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	26	Team Code #:	7
Prop Speaker #1	Stephens pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Su pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Arroyo pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Her pts 29

The USFG should substantially increase support for Nuclear Energy.

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: The outline was unclear, heard A lot of ums in speech. Delivery quality can be improved, hand gestures were good. Eye contact with audience. well prepared speech, good explanations and arguements addressed. Slightly under time to a minute. 6 min, 9 sec.

Prop 2: Well-Delivered, Clear outline provided. Interruption heard in speech and mentioned "never-mind" as getting distracted from teammate lost you in following your speech. would help to rehearse speech for smooth follow through. Delivery with eye contacts, hand gestures, speech were however outstanding.

Opp 1: Great speech. Slight interruption in speech heard, work on delivery: eye contact to audience, use or can use hand gestures, speak slower. Tended to speak fast though very clear and articulate. Ended at exact time great job. 4 min, 15 sec, in closing, to speech

Opp 2: Articulate when speaking, thus also spoke fast though clear organized + clear in speech. Delivery was ~~best~~ very good; eye-contact / hand gestures. word pronunciation / pause heard in speech. Very convincing & great / outstanding arguements heard.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Good debate delivered by both teams. Noted improvements in speech quality for each presenter & as a team. Though Prop. gave a good case, several interruptions in entirety of individual speeches with cell phones & communication gaps were heard on a whole speech quality better on opp. team though need to practice to slow rate of speed.

PARLI Debate

Ambrose, Mrs (*24)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 409
Gov: 14 Tran - Vainberg
Opp: 11 Sadana - Wagh
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Sheila Ambrose

Judge's School Affiliation: SRV

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 11	
Prop Speaker #1 Tran	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Sadana	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Vainberg	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Wagh	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: Clearly outlined plan + supporting pts. You handled objections to your presentation well - didn't get flustered.

Prop 2: Excellent job refuting Opp. pts. of "unfair topicality". Clarified Child = K-18

Opp 1: 1st speech focused on trying to win by saying Prop was vague and off topic. This was not true + wasted time

Opp 2: Good pts. but be careful being to "all or nothing". Prop

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop stated clearly plan + value of plan outlining ways plan will positively impact society. Opp. based 80% of debate on proving Prop unfair via mention of funding source. This wasn't proven → Opp said Prop "could" bring up pts on funding source. But Prop did not. Therefore mute pt.

PARLI Debate

Ambrose, Mrs (*24)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 409
Gov: 14 Guan - Schmidt
Opp: 5 Firsov - Kwak
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Sheila Ambrose

Judge's School Affiliation: SRV

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	5
Prop Speaker #1	Guan pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Kwak pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Schmidt pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Firsov 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 start & speaker need to define nuclear energy

Opp 1: Good pts. Slow talking + body movement = stronger pts. You are a strong presenter - this would make you even stronger.

Prop 2: Good try with POI to use opp new definition to use their plan as yours.

Opp 2: Excellent knowledge of pts of debate + what is required to win pt. Good that is knowledge to hit home pts.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp. specified diff type of nuclear energy - Fission + Fusion. Prop didn't consider fusion until opp brought up. Regardless of geographical or reactor accuracy, the argument was what was.

NOT inaccuracies although be careful as this damages credibility

PARLI Debate

Sankaralingam, Avu (*2)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 406
Gov: 7 Gan - Mathew
Opp: 22 Baetkey - Blanchard
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: SANKARALINGAM, AVU

Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	7	Team Code #:	22
Prop Speaker #1	Mathew pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Baetkey pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Gan. pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Blanchard. 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: Laid a broad definition of proposition (all content in part Cats) but had some specific attacks against ads. Email - viruses seemed extraneous

Opp 1: EU not relevant. fair point. Broad attack [Commerce, freedom of speech, free freedom] ... not opened themselves up to relevance questions

Prop 2:
- Good job differentiating between Content and freq.
- Parental Control in different mode than
- EU is relevant made the case.
- focused on harms from deceptive ads.

Opp 2: Technology enables parental control, good Censors denies knowledge; but didn't convince on that. Counter, This was alright.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Affects ability to make a profit was not an effective enough counter for harm proposed by proponents - ditto Didn't support their free speech claims sufficiently

PARLI Debate

Sankaralingam, Avu (*2)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 406
Gov: 5 Yuan - Stankus
Opp: 14 Eng - Morgenstein
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: SANKARALINGAM, AVU

Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	5	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Stankus pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Morgenstein. pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Yuan. pts 28	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: Laid out a good Case on benefits. Made some fantastic assumption on benefits.

Prop 2: Reiterated fantastic plan. But importantly, Co-opted opponent plan.

Opp 1: Effectively ~~Ignored~~ ignore the fantastic arguments Prop 1 made... but did a nice job of laying a counter plan.

Opp 2: Good question on why do you need to fund it if it is so good? but didn't drive that point home but went back to Contention 1 mission.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Effectively Co-opted counter plan into their own. Opp had opportunity to rebut but didn't. Close call, because rest of their claims were a little fantastic.

PARLI Debate

~~VanZutphen, Jane~~ (*20)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 401
Gov: 11 Pandit - Maddhuri
Opp: 4 Johnson - Pashman
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Emma Sutton
Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett H.S.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	4
Prop Speaker #1	Maddhuri pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Johnson pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Pandit pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Pashman 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: Showed impact - good! 1st speech needs to be long- no criteria?

→ Introduced many new args in final speech! Opp only called you on one. I counted at least 3!

Prop 2: Good job hammering away at harms. Could've done more w/ difference between ads & news. Well organized

Opp 1: Great points, but need better organization. Good catch on new info in summary by Prop team! Excellent summary of voting issues.

Opp 2: Good job covering all points. Kind of disorganized which made you harder to follow

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Tough decision! Ultimately Prop failed to show solvency. Prop introduced multiple new arguments in final speech which I must discount. (altho they were good - should've brought up sooner (Calling ~~Jo~~ base ppl lazy is kind of bad)

PARLI Debate

VanZutphen, Jane (*20)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 401
Gov: 14 Liu - Fu
Opp: 27 Ramirez - Castenada
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Emma Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett H.S.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	Liu pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Castenada pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Fu pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Ramirez 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: Slow down in 1st speech! You had plenty of time left, but speeches rushed. Well organized, showed impact.

Prop 2: Great eye contact, good speaking style, but glossed over a number of issues raised by Opp.

Opp 1: Your figures don't make sense (I think you just got your words mixed up). Final summary was outstanding - very good job homing in on voting issues.

Opp 2: Don't accuse other team of not taking PoI, then refuse yourself (that was quite funny really).

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Prop failed to convince me of safety issue. Net benefits go with Opposition. Prop team - you need to introduce the source of your evidence. You cannot assume it will come out in PoI!!

PARLI Debate

Lustig, Robert (*14)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 404
Gov: 27 Lavell - Hall
Opp: 24 Barton - Madsen
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: LUSTIG

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	27 - Wright	Team Code #:	24 - San Ramon.
Prop Speaker #1	Hall pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Barton pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Lavell. pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Madsen - 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: Strong refutation of opponents at end. Brought in substantiated evidence. Making argument that 8 year old was persuaded when they were made 8! ☺

Prop 2: Kids get allowances right? Who / companies make matter? Not forceful enough about the responsibility argument.

Opp 1: Agree that news is just as violent as ads. Hitting the parental control issue too hard. - parents don't have control. Not all bad parenting. Advertising not clearly beneficial to economy - argument against 4 year old GTA was specious!

Opp 2: We're just sweating - where do you learn to be strong? Said companies have corporate responsibility - cannot. Loss of jobs? - We're at 5% unemployment.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Substantiated evidence - Loved the argument about regressions made before age 8!

PARLI Debate

Lustig, Robert (*14)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 404
Gov: 13 Banas - Santos
Opp: 7 Zhang - Yang
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: LUSTIG.

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	13 - Livermore	Team Code #:	7 - Dougherty Valley.
Prop Speaker #1	Banas pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Yang. pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Santos. pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Zhang. 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: Inconsistent about argument
r mandates, shifting facts.
What re: Innovation? Never defined.
Keystones is a one-time cost suggested.
What about the next 4 years?

Prop 2:
The FIAT argument is specious.
We don't fund wood for energy.
Best argument: We do need an environment
To invest.

Opp 1: At different times, said money was not enough and too much
Good point about what atoms you can split.
Agreed, prop's plan is not-to-scale,
can't power the US with this expenditure.

Opp 2: But played up the disaster argument too much
Benefit to economy? Oil prices are down
Agreed that can't pay for reactors, innovation
r education at same time.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: While at different times, they said the money was too much or not enough, they were able to refute other points

PARLI Debate

Firsov, Oleksandr (*5)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 425
Gov: 22 Masters - Fehring
Opp: 20 Rahman - Zhou
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: FIRSOV, OLEKSANDR

Judge's School Affiliation: CHADO

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 22		Team Code #: 20	
Prop Speaker #1 Fehring	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Zhou	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Masters	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Rahman	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 sampling, No need to rush in speach, there was enough time

Prop 2: Ads rating idece was unique.

Opp 1: parental control was a strong argument, unfortunnately almost single one. Need a bit. extra.

Opp 2: Good citations, use of emotions. like the tech side; google search options.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
close match. Aff. team used more imagination. The Aff vs Ops world essece on children been a decision point.

PARLI Debate

Firsov, Oleksandr (*5)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 425
Gov: 24 Crenshaw - Bulger
Opp: 17 Chou - Kim
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: FIRSOV, OLEKSANDR

Judge's School Affiliation: CAMDO

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 24		Team Code #: 17	
Prop Speaker #1 Bulger	pts 30	Opp Speaker #1 Chou	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Crenshaw	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Kim	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Great speach tempo, voice control.
memorable: The use of nuc. power in Navy as a prove of efficiency effect on global politics. due to ~~oil~~ securing of oil. Sun-powered earth

Prop 2:
memorable: efficiency of energy sources: nuke vs solar vs wind...

Opp 1: nice layout of points, operating on numbers (60%
good emotions
a bit loud. summary did not addressed' negations on points

Opp 2:
good use of oppoints it's own advantage

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
stronger speach, points, attention to opponent's arguments made PROP definite winner.

PARLI Debate

Maddhuri, Babu (*11)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 408
Gov: 14 Shin - Shevelev
Opp: 24 Corbett - Somerday
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: BABU MADDHURI

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HIGH SCHOOL

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	24
Prop Speaker #1	Shevelev pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Corbett pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Shin. pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Somerday 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

The U.S. F.G. ~~Must~~ Should substantially increase regulation on advertising targeting ~~children~~ children.

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

Prop 1: Excellent presentation Very good POIs. Good rebuttals only thing he forgot is to greet everybody in the room.

Prop 2: Great rebuttal. Good way to strengthen his contentions. Excellent presentation

Opp 1: Should have defined the topic & net benifits well. Very good speaker. Fact based. Good rebuttal.

Opp 2: POIs could have been handled better. Good rebuttal. Good presentation skills.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Strong contentions & rebuttal. OPP moved away from net benifits and had wrong contention (change ads VS. Remove ads.

PARLI Debate

Maddhuri, Babu (*11)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 408
Gov: 7 Tripathi - Wong
Opp: 13 Tang - Blais
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: BABU MADDHURI

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HIGH SCHOOL

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 7		Team Code #: 13	
Prop Speaker #1 Tripathi	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Tang.	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Wang.	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Blais.	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

The USFG should substantially increase support for nuclear Energy.

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

Prop 1: Good definition Excellent contentions. Good Refute.

Prop 2: Confused between spending $9B is $9M- Refute could have improved. Be Confident in delivery.

Opp 1: No strong counter plan. & Good refute. Repeating the same statements again & again could impact negatively.

Opp 2: Improve on focused rebuttal → Did not concede on rebuttal on 2nd contention confused between $9B and $48. → Did not take POIs even when there is time.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: I did not consider the addition to contention that AFF did. They won because of Opp not having a strong counter plan.

PARLI Debate

Rajani, Seema (*7)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 423
Gov: 14 Wu - Ying
Opp: 13 Sinha - Almeida
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Seema Rajani

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	13
Prop Speaker #1	Wu pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Sinha pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Ying pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Almeida 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: Viewpoints and responses are outlined clearly + orderly.

Prop 2: Reasonably refutes arguments in unbalanced manner. Presentation is satisfactory.

Opp 1: Logically organized characterized by depth + insight to development of effective ideas / agreements.

Opp 2: Some Effective reasons are give to arguments Some facts given to support reasons to previous arguments.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The speakers contribut to the spontaneity of the debate, effective response and refutation of previous ideas.

PARLI Debate

Rajani, Seema (*7)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 423
Gov: 5 Reyna - Yang
Opp: 27 Manni - Brown
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Seema Rajani

Judge's School Affiliation: DUHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	5	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	Reyna pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Manni pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Yang pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Brown 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:
Evidence/Argument are provided but need more persuasive

Prop 2:
content has depth with thought and development of ideas.

Opp 1: Speakers purpose is present but not logically organized.
Arguments need to be more clear - more evidence + clarity

Opp 2:
speaker effectively synthesizes response + refutation of prevous ideas with new arguments

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Supported evidence to prevous arugmt and great new ideas offered to/for resolution.

USFG should substantially increase regulation of advertising targeting children

PARLI Debate

Sundararamen, Siva (*22)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 407
Gov: 5 Visht - Koshkin
Opp: 11 Dara - Randeria
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: SUNDAR RAMASAMY

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN HIGH School

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: _____	Team Code #: _____
Prop Speaker #1 Visht pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Randeria pts 25.5
Prop Speaker #2 Koshkin pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Dara pts 25.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Defined clearly, provided some data. consistent eye contact. Opp questioned and answered used MC. I Happy meal as an example. Mentioned about how FCC acts now should add/elaborate on lead. - could have used little slower.

Prop 2: provided data ($179 Spending); clearly articulated; given quote by Stanford professor; provided more on just food. Talked about health issues. Had smile all the time.

Opp 1: pointed out the negative impact due to increase in regulation; how it would impact profits and in turn how it would impact other programs run from those profits. - Difficulty with the flow; not so clear

Opp 2: Good intro; talked about how pop up ads helps. Talked about how it would impact the GOV market. - could require little more preparation with the talking points.

TEAM CODE #: Visht & Koshkin **on the** Aff **wins this debate.**
(Prop) or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Both Aff and Opp had great points to back up their team. The main reason that prop won due to their articulation & presentation with no break.

USFG should substantially increase its support for nuclear energy

PARLI Debate

Sundararamen, Siva (*22)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 407
Gov: 7 Giang - Shen
Opp: 24 Woerner - Miner
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: SUNDAR RAMASAMY

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN HIGH School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:		Team Code #:	
Prop Speaker #1 Giang	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Woerner	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Shen	pts 26	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:

talked about health issues by having one case study

Prop 1: Started with the definition; provided data related to funding. talked about fusion in a chemical reaction way. pointed out how it would reduce pollution

- flow would have been much better
- recommend more eye contact; many ahs.

Prop 2: started with the ahs. roadmap; responded to Opp's argument about security; clarified two opp's concerns; Reiterated the support + opposite statements.

Opp 1: good intro; pointed out two nuclear explosions; provided true data on how nuclear already been stored; reiterated the points; good presentation.

Opp 2: Started on a risk note. Talked confidently. Tone level and eye contact is good. provided the consequences in long run. provided other alternative energies that are not-renewable. explained the long lasting consequences due to previous accidents.

TEAM CODE #: Woerner / Miner **on the** Neg **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp team had mentioned valid statements whereas Aff team's points are plain and with no data or research (mainly about Solar)

PARLI Debate

Choy, Suzie (*4)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 424
Gov: 24 Campagna - Mortensen
Opp: 3 Burgmann - McCann-Phillips
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Susie Chung

Judge's School Affiliation: BDD

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	24	Team Code #:	3
Prop Speaker #1	Campagna pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	McCann-Phillips pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Mortensen pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Burgmann pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Great job outlining arguments

Opp 1:
Don't disclose school.
Great delivery & closing

Prop 2:
Great job supporting partners case.

Opp 2:
Good job.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
OPP did a better job addressing Prop's points while Prop failed to address a couple of OPP's points.

PARLI Debate

Choy, Suzie (*4)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 424
Gov: 24 Bodisco - Ransweiler
Opp: 5 Cuddihy - Goldblatt
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Suzie Choy

Judge's School Affiliation: BOD

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 24		Team Code #: 5	
Prop Speaker #1 Bodisco	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Goldblatt	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Ransweiler	pts 28	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:

Great delivery & closing speech

Prop 2:

Good job supporting partner's points.

Opp 1:

Seemed really tired. Try to have more energy when speaking. Great examples of Russia & Japan as evidence of dangers of nuclear

Opp 2:

Need to be sure to have an answer for all of the Prop points.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp failed to address several points & economics, efficiency

PARLI Debate

Young, Wendy (*27)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 426
Gov: 24 Fulop - Bennett
Opp: 22 Katewa - Colenbrander
Parliamentary Debate/JV

SINGLE FLIGHT

Judge's Name: Andrew Budisco

Judge's School Affiliation: SRVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 24		Team Code #: 22	
Prop Speaker #1 Bennett	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Colenbrander	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Fulop	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Katewa	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: (watch whispering)

- good delivery
- good evidence
- Courteous
- need smoother delivery "umm"

27

- SF happy meals and obesity rate was a good argument

Prop 2:

- clear links of logic
- directly countered opponent

29

- more eye contact
- move

More forceful on the final ask

28

Opp 1:

- Courteous
- good argumentation
- good delivery

- lost a bit at the end of argument re. tobacco ads
- got a little repetitive

Opp 2: 27

- Very courteous
- good passion
- good eye contact
- vary volume. Great voice projection but don't use all of the time

- didn't follow logic as well
- no conclusion

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Fulop delivery and very well organized and clear logic supporting her argument