PARLI Debate

Dara, Ramesh (*11)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 220
Gov: 14 Woo - Melman
Opp: 5 Hinchcliff - McKinney
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: RAMESH DARA

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HIGH

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 14	Team Code #: 5
Prop Speaker #1 Melman. pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Hinchcliff. pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Woo pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 McKinney 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:

* RELAX - GREETING FRIENDLY TAKES NERVOUSNESS OUT TO START CONFIDENT.
AWESOME Rebuttal.

Opp 1:

VERY GOOD Speech.
A LOT OF REPETION IN REBUTTAL.

Prop 2:

VERY NICE SPEECH WITH GOOD POIs.

Opp 2:

VERY GOOD SPEECH.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PROP DIDNOT START WITH A GOOD PLAN BUT DID AN AWESOME REBUTTAL.

Res: The US should require citizens to vote in election.

PROP

1. Better Representation.

2. By Constitution be Republic — no democracy

3. —.

(IT) Govt represent top 1% population?

For fairer time.

MOTIVATES people making them to vote

UNLIKELY EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

EVERY ONE'S OPINION COUNTS WITH TRUST.

(IT) Death of Status quo.

Quality of life no sense when dead.

OPP

1. Political Freedom Secured.

2. Violating RIGHT to vote Degrades quality FREEDOM.

3. Political Education. — Awareness of time? Celebrity vs Politicians.

4. Good Leadership Enforcement External forces.

(IT) Theft RIGHT WITH FREEDOM

Populous vs EXPERIANCED → BAD DECISIONS

CHOICE NOT TO VOTE.

PARLI Debate

Dara, Ramesh (*11)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 220
Gov: 26 Goody - Sherman
Opp: 27 Cohen - Lemenager
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: RAMESH DARA

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HIGH.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	26	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	GOODY pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Cohen pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	SHERMAN pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Lemenager 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:

PROACTIVELY CONCEIVED ALL THE PROPOSITIONS — GOOD JOB.

Prop 2:

YOU ARE GOOD SPEAKER - BUT CONTINUOS PROMPTING PUT YOU OFF THE TRACK.

Opp 1:

AWESOME SPEAKER RIGHT SPEED, CLARITY OF THOUGHT. WELL PRESENTED. AWESOME JOB.

Opp 2:

DONE WELL. MAKE A POINT AND THEN GO FOR SCENARIOS/ EXAMPLES.

TEAM CODE #: ~~29~~ 26 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

A VERY CLOSE CALL. FIRST ROUND GOES TO OPP. REBUTTAL WENT TO PROP.
AN AWESOME DEBATE OVER ALL.

PROP

THE US should ban the death penalty.

OPP:

(I)

DEATH PENALTY → Rehabilitation

1/10 FOUND INNOCENT.

NO TURNING BACK

EXPENSIVE

HIGHEST CRIME WITH DEATH PENALTY

EXECUTION EXPENSIVE THAN LIFE LONG PRISON

$ 9000 MORE.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION.

(II)

KILLING IS OK — MESSAGE

RACISM ONLY FOR DEATH.

CHANCE TO REHABILITATION

LEADS TO LESS DEATHS

OVERALL DEATHS WILL BE LESS.

MORE ECONOMICAL — SAVES MORE TIME.

(I) "CAPTURED" # DOES NOT KILL ✓

17 PEOPLE MORE + 1 MORE SLAVE

MONEY ON EXECUTION ⇒ REHABILITATION

RACISM.

MURDER INNOCENT

(I)

→ INNOCENTS ARE ANYWAY KILLED BY MURDERS ✓

→ EXPERIENCE? BUILD INFRASTRUCTURE.

→ INSANE CRIME REHABILITATION ? ✓

→ RACIAL IS NOT SPECIFIC ✓

→ LET STATES DECIDE

(II)

→ ESCAPES FROM PRISON ⇒ DEATHS.

→ OUR MONEY TO PROTECT CRIMINALS THAT KILLS CHILDREN.

PREVENT 17 FUTURE DEATHS

REHABILITATION CAN BE EXPENSIVE ✓

RACISM

VALUE DEBATE VS NET BENEFITS.

PARLI Debate

Fulop, Anna (*24)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 228
Gov: 20 Le - Rather
Opp: 7 Kaura - Gajula
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Anna Fulop

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley High School

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 20	Team Code #: 7
Prop Speaker #1 Le pts____	Opp Speaker #1 Kaura pts____
Prop Speaker #2 Rather pts____	Opp Speaker #2 Gajula pts____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Le : 28
When you maintain eye contact and don't look down onto your paper too much, you are a very effective speaker. Well-delivered counter arguments!

Prop 2: Rather: 29
I was impressed with how much confidence and poise you spoke with. You are an effective debater. Keep it up!

Opp 1: Kaura: 25
To be a more effective speaker, practice delivering your points with more confidence. If you want to argue the definition of a word or you have a different definition justify why you are right. This will strengthen your case.

Opp 2: Gajula: 18
Even though Prop was wrong, you should not interrupt or speak out of turn. I take into consideration Prop was wrong; however it is important to respect the protocol and speaking order. When speaking try to maintain better eye contact and try to look down at your ~~[illegible]~~ less. You have potential to be a very effective speaker!

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Pro had better delivery and argued ~~[illegible]~~ case more effectively by refuting well

PARLI Debate

Fulop, Anna (*24)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 228
Gov: 23 Wei - Zheng
Opp: 14 Rettenmaier - Pineda
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Anna Fulop

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley High School

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 23	Team Code #: 14
Prop Speaker #1 Wei pts____	Opp Speaker #1 Rettenmaier pts____
Prop Speaker #2 Zheng pts____	Opp Speaker #2 Pineda pts____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

(28) Prop 1: Wei ; your points effectively support your resolution. Your voice is clear, and your confidence when you speak aids your persuasion. Try to bring up your points only when it's your turn to speak. I like that you used relevant supporting evidence.

Prop 2: Zheng: consider practice speaking with more confidence (for example maintain more eye contact with the judge) in order to strengthen your cases.

(24)

(27) Opp 1: Rettenmaier
In order to strengthen your case; improve argumentation by making sure you refute all of your opponents contentions. Your confidence and eye contact aid your delivery.

Opp 2: Pineada (28)
youre an effective speaker because you maintain eye contact try using more supportive evidence to strengthen your contentions.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Overall, better supporting evidence for contentions.

PARLI Debate

Young, Wendy (*27)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 210
Gov: 23 Habib - Keshav
Opp: 11 Chippa - Cherukuri
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Wendy Young

Judge's School ~~Affiliation~~: Windsor High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 11	
Prop Speaker #1 Keshav	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Srinath Chippa	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Habib	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Cherukuri	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: Nasha opened the debate with good contentions of voting reflecting the will of the citizens. How required voting would reflect the pulse of the people. Good arguments but read from her paper & made no eye contact.

Prop 2: Aidan was on top of the debate. He clearly knows debate to the letter of the law. He will go far in this intellectual sport! Strong vocabulary & does not let anything pass him.

Opp 1: Chippa has a strong vocabulary and will do well in debate w/ more experience. good argument and caught what aff dropped quickly

Opp 2: Vikram will get stronger with more debate experience. He seems to work well with his partner & respect to identify the holes in the affs contentions

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
While I felt the aff team had a good argument they never identified how they were going to get the message to lower income communities to vote or how they were going to get them to the polls to place their ballot. This would have won the →

heard for them! Neg argument using first amendment of speech or No speech was pretty solid. Tough to refute and aff didn't really try to amend the 1st amendment to include citizens must Vote to enjoy the freedoms offered by the U.S.

PARLI Debate

Young, Wendy (*27)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 210
Gov: 14 Luk - Tserennamid
Opp: 20 Alam - Nguyen
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Wendy Young
Judge's School Affiliation: Windom 27

PROP	OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Luk pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Alam pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Tserennamid pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Nguyen 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: Jerelyn is a good strong speaker and will do well as she learns debate. Factual - Great teammate for Mgi

Prop 2: Mgi brought more true life evidence (the passionate response) to the team, but at some points, lost which side she was on!

Opp 1: Alam - great speaker + used his time wisely. When he had completed his case within his allotted time, & still had time left over, he went back & "restated for Clarification" Good job!

Opp 2: Nguyen is strong + factual + supported his partners case well brought up good supporting arguments to their refutations + against contentions

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg arguments were reasonable enough to create enough doubt in this judges decision. Aff Continued on their line of reasoning but did not refute their assessment enough to sway in their direction

Lacombe, Victor (*25)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 225
Gov: 20 Valle - Pollard
Opp: 14 Lee - Fairchild
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: LACOMBE

Judge's School Affiliation: 25

US should require citizens to vote in elections

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 20		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 VALLE	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 FAIRCHILD	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 POLLARD	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 LEE	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: 1. FINES, CANADA / EDUCATION
1. DEMOCRATIC WARS *
2. KNOW NEEDS *
3. NO IGNORING

Prop 2: Recapped points and counter points. Relied on notes heavily

Opp 1: 1. EDUCATION - PEOPLE DON'T CARE
NEG * SUPER PAC'S MORE POWERFUL
* BIG FALSE ISSUES, NOT REAL ISSUES
* COUNTERED DEMOCRATIC POINT
VOTER - NO BENEFIT, HARM FROM PAC'S
TANGENT (NEW ISSUE) GOOD USE OF TIME
STRONG SUMMATION

Opp 2: Brief and clear counter to Democratic argument for freedom and education measures, but also would

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The opp countered the 2 AFF points and landed a strong point about harm from Super PAC's that went undefended.

Lacombe, Victor (*25)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 225
Gov: 8 Zaheer - Chaudhri
Opp: 14 Ng - Huang
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: LACOMBE

Judge's School Affiliation: 25

USFG SHOULD BAN the DEATH PENALTY.

PROP Team Code #: 8

OPP Team Code #: 14

Prop Speaker #1 ZAHEER pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Ng pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 CHAUDRI pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 HUANG 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:

VAULÉ - human life

Prop 1: 1. Hypocrisy - lose faith, French Rev
2. INNOCENT
3. REHAB, MOTIVES PREVENT JOBS FOR psychic
4. COSTS look to recent

Clear, speaker organized, map and thoughts excellent.

Prop 2: Good counters to arguments, nice pace of speech. Good organization & mapping. Might not change remainder clear they, invested 4th point.

Opp 1: REF 1. JUSTICE SYSTEM
2. 7's STATISTIC
3. STUDIES been DONE, ENVIRONMENT CHANGE
4. COSTS

CONT: 1. PAY less - S.A. - EXECUTE
2. LIFE is WORSE, MORE MONEY

Passionate speaker, missed deterrence. An outline & clear breaks would help separate thoughts. Very good.

Opp 2: - Deterrence, fear - CA 52%
- confined $200K cost & cost to incarcerate. (POI)
- Bill well - Try to organize presentation ahead of time & consider the 2 partners.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF provided a clear Map with cogent points tied to the stated value. The opp missed the 4th point and the opportunity

Sankaram, Nandakumar (*7)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 204
Gov: 20 Jerez - Moran
Opp: 24 Scott - Ambrose
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: SANKARAN

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 20		Team Code #: 24	
Prop Speaker #1 JEREZ	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 SCOTT	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 MORAN	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 AMBROSE	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: Try to use clock to the fullest. Make eye contact with opponents. You mentioned instituting fines and starting educational programs but didnt get into specifics or rebut when your opponents claimed lack of agents of enforcement

Prop 2: Opp speaker 1 claimed website will crash which you could have addressed in more detail to make an effective argument

Opp 1: Make more eye contact. Use your clock wisely and dont leave time unspent. Time and cost factors were used very effectively in your arguments.

Opp 2: Your points about "not yet 18" so they dont know how long it takes to vote, calling out that speaker 1's claim about lack of agents of enforcement as a dropped point.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Neg's arguments were more forceful and largely went unrefuted. The use of "agents of enforcement", bringing up time and cost arguing that forcing people to vote leads to careless voting were all effective. I encourage PROP to consider focusing on a couple of points of argument, making forceful arguments, using the clock to dive deep and reinforcing them at each opportunity. Show more conviction.

PARLI Debate

Sankaram, Nandakumar (*7)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 204
Gov: 11 Arshad - Sankar
Opp: 14 Bystrom - Gast
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: SANKARAN

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	SANKAR pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	GAST pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	ARSHAD pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	BYSTROM pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Very methodical in laying down your points. You could have dived deeper into some of your points to support your emotional arguments! For instance, you mentioned 88% of criminologists claiming it is not a deterrent. But no further reinforcement.

Prop 2: Tighten your focus on a couple of points. You also focused more on an emotional strategy of argumentation which turned out harder to defend with your opponents.

Opp 1: Very articulate. Showed a lot of conviction. Effective in poking holes though opponents arguments. Your claim that it hurts economy and hence not a net benefit largely went uncontested substantively.

Opp 2: Well supported your partner's points and strongly refuted your opponents without sounding disagreeable.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Enjoyed the debate, particularly the courtesy and camaraderie among the debaters. Opp's arguments better held sway and were effective overall. They re-inforced partner's positions better overall.

PARLI Debate

Whitmore, Gerald (*4)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 221
Gov: 14 Holwitz - Kay
Opp: 26 Clark - Flanagan
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Gerald Whitmore

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 26	
Prop Speaker #1 Holwitz	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Flanagan	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Kay	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Clark	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: Impressive management of anxiety. Very well organized w/ summary of contentions Clearly stated contentions Powerful use of POI Excellent rebuttal of opponents Tremendous potential as a debater

Prop 2: Well organized. Managed anxiety well. Solid definition of contintn Work on eye contact

Opp 1: Improve definition of contention. When eye contact was established strong presentation of ideas. Took time to manage anxiety Good idea ideas to take this time

Opp 2: Take time to manage anxiety He got rattled and wasn't able to stay on track. I could see he had good ideas to present but could not due to his anxiety

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop won due to their well organized presentation & summary of contentions and excellent rebuttals. They also used a POI in a clever manner

PARLI Debate

Whitmore, Gerald (*4)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 221
Gov: 14 Lawrence - Privalov
Opp: 20 Byrne - Pareja
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Gerald Whitmore

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 20	
Prop Speaker #1 Lawrence	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Byrne	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Privalov	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Pareja	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: Very well defined + stated contentions When eye contact was made the judge was more engaged. Try not to look out of the window to manage anxiety

Prop 2: Good use of POI. Improve organization: Started + Stopped & direction of presentation Looked disorganized with loose tie + collar

Opp 1: Incredible use of examples to create a narrative to define and demonstrate contentions Refuted contentions well. Very well managed anxiety. Outstanding effort

Opp 2: Refuted contentions of ~~Affirmation~~ well. Try to improve eye contact + management of anxiety

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp won this debate due to well defined and stated contentions. They were also able to be more organized + refuted Affs contentions successfully

PARLI Debate

Firsov, Oleksandr (*5)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 222
Gov: 14 Chao - Wang
Opp: 25 Lacombe - Appel
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: OLEKSHANDR FIRSOV

Judge's School Affiliation: CAMPO

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	25
Prop Speaker #1 Wang	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Victoria Lacob	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Chao	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Appel	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 poi outlining: impact on the future, any voice still carries value... could use more attention for technicality - from round definition to comparison of own POI to OPP.

Prop 2: good reasoning on change the value to policy round. Respect. would be nice to play more on OPS POI, there was plenty of space.

Opp 1: POI been decent and interesting, great technicality Attention to ~~opp~~ ~~POIs~~. timing and direct ~~too~~ eye contact as w/ judge as the team

Opp 2: great presentation skills, responce on opposite POIs and elaboration of own.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
points and presentation, technicality where on OPP side.

PARLI Debate

Firsov, Oleksandr (*5)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 222
Gov: ~~Muddassany, Syed~~ 7 Bardalai – Rangwala Judge's Name: OLEKSANDR FIRSOV
Opp: 14 Chan - Foley
Parliamentary Debate/Novice Judge's School Affiliation: CAMPO

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 7	Team Code #: 14
Prop Speaker #1 Bardalai pts 30	Opp Speaker #1 Chan pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Rangwala pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Foley 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 emotional and in same time rational speach, good attention to points

Opp 1: strong ~~operation~~ interaction on audience ref. to PoI. Memorable the "motivational factors" as result of ban.

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both teams been strong and it is a close match. Bardalai last speach won as emotional, well planned and laid out conclusion.

PARLI Debate

Brogan, John (*2)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 206
Gov: 14 Situ - Zhang
Opp: 20 Afzal - Kelly
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: John Brogan

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP			OPP		
Team Code #:	14		Team Code #:	20	
Prop Speaker #1	Zhang	pts 25	Opp Speaker #1	Kelly	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Situ	pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Afzal	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: Eye contact needs improvement
Appears nervous
Better not to read from written notes

Opp 1: started with definition, lead to some loss of impact
Good eye contact, v. good presentation skill. Did not read notes (good)

Prop 2: Good presentation skills
Obama care a digression that took me off the point, trump

Opp 2: Made good point on vote for candidate vs. laws
good response on trump
Slow down

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

REASON FOR DECISION: ~~Point was~~ Rebuttal nominee must did not advance argument.
Team 20 made better, more direct responses to opponent's position

PARLI Debate

Brogan, John (*2)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 206
Gov: 26 Sheridan - Sappington
Opp: 23 Deng - Luo
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: John Brogan
Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	26	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	Sheridan pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Luo pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Sappington pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Deng pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Should open with an overview & positions & arguments. When is it going? asks the judge. Organize thoughts better

Prop 2:
Dealt well with the opponent's interruption. Did not respond to Opp's position (distinction) as to mass(4) murders

Opp 1:
Good direct responses, point by point. Clearly understood his points. Good point on degree of certainty & guilt

Opp 2:
Good introduction - said what he was going to do. But then did not relate his side's position and rationale.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Team 23 better organized their arguments and presented them more coherently. Team 26 did not attack Team 23's distinction on mass murderers.

PARLI Debate

Sutton, Emma (*12)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 205
Gov: 2 Archibald - Hohmeyer
Opp: 4 Thomas - Ralston
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: ~~[redacted]~~ Emma Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	Bentley	Team Code #:	Bishop O'Dowd
Prop Speaker #1	Ethan Archibald pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Nadia Ralston pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Inigo Hohmeyer pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Katka Thomas 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 speaking style! Need to organize your speech- Label your contentions? Definitions? Judging criteria? Point given to much time w/ questions!

Prop 2: ~~[redacted]~~ Good job sticking it out against a well organized attack. Refuted most arguments Dropped their constitutionality argument- don't drop!!

Opp 1: Very well organized, easy to follow! Flow. Good job showing impact. ~~[redacted]~~ Excellent final speech, nice summ

Opp 2: Very well organized speech! Followed up on all arguments Excellent refutation

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp presented a well-organized case & effectively carried them on all arguments (I did not buy the topicality argument - they did have a case, just a somewhat disorganized one)

PARLI Debate

Sutton, Emma (*12)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 205
Gov: 14 Kerr-Stein - Lee
Opp: 2 Hemerling - Barnett
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Emma Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	Lowell	Team Code #:	Bentley
Prop Speaker #1	Chloe Kerr-Stein pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Alexander Hemerling pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Emily Lee pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Will Barnett 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:

Referring to murderers as "people who made a mistake" is a bit of a stretch

Prop 1: Great speaking style! Nice, well organized & easy to follow. Excellent final summary of voting issues etc.

Opp 1: Very nice speech, great speaking style! But needs more refutation of their [redacted] arguments. - left that for your partner. OK, but you had more time, you could have attacked their points

Prop 2: Excellent refutation & clash. Work on sounding more confident - you had great points. Avoid saying "I don't understand their argument"

Opp 2: Great opening, good job refuting their points. Work on organizing & labeling more

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Excellent round! Opp. did a nice job with a tough topic (hard not to sound like jerks on this topic). Unfortunately Opp. [redacted] was unable to overcome arguments on injustice, dropped many arguments. Flow goes Prop. I vote Prop

PARLI Debate

Tunnell, Nanny (*17)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 227
Gov: 18 Raven - Fischer (G)
Opp: 20 Mart - Andola (G)
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell

Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS

PROP (Affirmative)		OPP	
Team Code #: 18		Team Code #: 20	
Prop Speaker #1 Fischer	pts 25	Opp Speaker #1 Andola	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Raven	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Mart	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:
+ courtesy (good intro)
- smoother delivery needed
- need to show more confidence
+ good evidence
- delivery (need to stop playing with shirt)

Prop 2: - Delivery (more eye contact please)
+ Delivery is very natural
+ good organization
+ Evidence provided better depth
+ Argumentation

Opp 1:
+ Evidence
- Delivery (use less "Like")
- Abrupt ending
+ good projection in voice
+ POI - Fair play argument is good and should be strengthened

Opp 2:
+ Delivery (good eye contact)
+ Argument (good effort at refutting)
- Argumentation (repeating some point)

TEAM CODE #: 20 (Andola Mart) **by the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
+ Better overall delivery of points
+ Confidence level was high
+ Good organization

PARLI Debate

Tunnell, Nanny (*17)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 227
Gov: 1 Ochoa - Chand
Opp: 23 Eizner - He
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell

Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS

PROP (Affirming)		OPP (Negative)	
Team Code #: 1		Team Code #: 23	
Prop Speaker #1 Ochoa	pts	Opp Speaker #1 Eizer	pts
Prop Speaker #2 Chand	pts	Opp Speaker #2 He	pts

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Ban deathpenalty

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: +Courtesy (shake hands good)
+Evidence - good buildup of history
+POI -
+Analysis - good options given
+Delivery - good confidence, natural delivery

Prop 2:
-Delivery (need better eye contact)
+Argumentation (good points, especially with analysis)

Opp 1:
+ Evidence (good facts memorized)
+ Delivery (strong voice but could slow down a little)
+ Argumentation (good passion about topic)
- Delivery (need better organization)

Opp 2:
+POI - good clarifications
+Evidence - good depth
+Delivery (good projection, good pace)
+Argumentation (clear connections)
- should of gone into greater depth about wrongly accused.

TEAM CODE #: 1 (Ochoa, Chand) **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

- Better evidence and organization
- Better delivery

Roberson, Sam (*20)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 203
Gov: 23 Ho - Prashanth
Opp: 14 Kwong - Tan
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Sam Roberson RJ

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Prashanth	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Kwong	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Ho	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Tan	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: Make sure you relax before speaking and keep calm so you can properly convey your ideas and what you want the judge to know. Good job!

Opp 1: Before speaking make sure you are able to relax and feel confident in what you are saying. Speak clear articulate take good notes keep eye contact with the judge and convey professional body language. Good job!

Prop 2: Contact with your eye as well as speak clearly and coherently as well as body language.

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop drop 1st contention until the very end and claimed that Opp ~~never used~~ did not use it until the end but it was their first contention. ~~Pro~~ also misinterpreted/dropped 2nd contention as well

Roberson, Sam (*20)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 203
Gov: 23 Samra - Yim
Opp: 2 Greenwall - DuPuy
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Sam Roberson IB

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 2	
Prop Speaker #1 Samra	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 greenwall	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 yim	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 V	pts ___

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: good JOB try not to JUST read from your paper But keep some eye contact and make sure to use all your time to convey points

Prop 2: good JOB try to articulate a little more clearly and use all your time

Opp 1: very good eye contact tone and clarity But try to relax so you can articulate more effectively and try not to use too many "Um's"

Opp 2: great use of time!

TEAM CODE #: 2 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Multiple dropped points from the Prop I.E. mental illness; 1 year rule

PARLI Debate

Kapoor, Ram (*16)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 207
Gov: 7 Mohiuddin - Sharma
Opp: 23 Zhai - Khan
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: RAM KAPOOR

Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 7		Team Code #: 23	
Prop Speaker #1 MOHIUDDIN	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 ZHAI	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 SHARMA	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 KHAN	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: LINKED THE ARGUMENTS WELL

Opp 1: CLEAR ARGUMENTS

Prop 2: GOOD REFUTATION

Opp 2: VERY GOOD DELIVERY
NICE USE OF EMOTION

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
CLARITY OF ARGUMENT AND BETTER REFUTATION.

PARLI Debate

Kapoor, Ram (*16)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 207
Gov: 14 Lyons - Wyszynski
Opp: 3 Berck - Adams
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: RAM KAPOOR

Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	3
Prop Speaker #1	WYSZYNSKI pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	ADAMS pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	LYONS pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	BERCK 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: EXCELLENT, IMPASSIONED DELIVERY

Opp 1: GOOD DELIVERY, LACK OF CONTENT

Prop 2: GOOD REFUTATION

Opp 2: SOMEWHAT MEANDERING ARGUMENTS

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

BETTER PREPARED AND STRONGER REFUTATIONS

PARLI Debate

Stromberg, Robert (*26)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 223
Gov: 22 Caramucci - Tarleton
Opp: 11 Wang - Lin
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: STROMBERG

Judge's School Affiliation: SM

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 22		Team Code #: 11	
Prop Speaker #1 TARLETON	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 LIN	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 CARAMUCCI	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 WANG	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:
TARLETON – WEAK ARGUMENTS – NO REAL POINTS OR FACTS – – STRUGGLING – KIND AND COURTEOUS

Prop 2:
CARAMUCCI – TIMID – LONG PAUSES – STRUGGLE FOR POINTS – NO ARGUMENT AT ALL – NEED BETTER RESEARCH –

Opp 1:
LIN
VERY STRONG – GOOD DELIVERY – NICE ENERGY – GOOD FACTS – WELL DONE

Opp 2:
WANG –
VERY STRONG AND CONFIDENT – GREAT CLEAR FACTS AND FIGURES – GOOD DEFENSE –

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

THE OPP CLEARLY WERE MORE PREPARED – STRONG ATTACK AND GOOD DEFENSE –

PARLI Debate

Stromberg, Robert (*26)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 223
Gov: 23 Wang - Zhu
Opp: 18 Nash - Thrasher
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: STROMBERG

Judge's School Affiliation: SA

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 18	
Prop Speaker #1 WANG	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 NASH	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 ZHU	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 THRASHER	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: WANG
COURTEOUS - STRONG SPEAKER - KIND AND GOOD FACTS - VERY - CONFIDENT - GOOD ALT PLAN GREAT ATTACK

Prop 2: ZHU
GREAT STRONG VOICE - GOOD FACTS - COMPELLING - WEAKENED OVER TIME - STUTTERED - STRUGGLED TO GET WORDS OUT

Opp 1: NASH - A BIT TIMID - BECAME MORE CONFIDENT OVER TIME - - NEEDS TO SLOW DOWN AND BREATH - SOME GOOD POINTS - WEAK ARGUMENT OVERALL

Opp 2: THRASHER - GREAT PERSONALITY COURTEOUS - STRONG - GOOD HAND GESTURES, CONFIDENT
GOOD ARGUMENTS - GOOD ATTACK

TEAM CODE #: 18 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

VERY CLOSE - ONE STRONG TEAM MEMBER ON EACH SIDE

PARLI Debate

Eng, Jeff (*14)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 202
Gov: 23 Roth - Yue
Opp: 22 Baxter - Nam
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jeff Eng

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23rd		Team Code #: 22	
Prop Speaker #1 Roth	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Baxter	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Yue	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Nam	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 projection and delivery of points
- can slow down to emphasize points more
- movement distracting - should try to move with purpose

Prop 2:
- can have better body positioning and focus on audience when speaking
- ~~can be better to audience~~ = slow down

Opp 1:
+ great presence & delivery
+ good strong finish on points
+ good structure on points

Opp 2:
+ excellent speed
+ good structure to follow for judge

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Strong points were made on the benefits of the resolution (including the whole population for better policies). Opp could have explore more about the "requirement to vote". There are very few requirements in the U.S.

PARLI Debate

Eng, Jeff (*14)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 202
Gov: 20 Ahmadi - Phan
Opp: 22 Burrous - Blackenburg
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jeff Eng

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:		Team Code #:	
Prop Speaker #1	Ahmadi pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Burrous pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Phan pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Blackenburg 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:
+ nice calm demeanor
- could expand on arguments more

Prop 2:
+ like the research & explanations
- keep practicing on delivery work on removing "um"

Opp 1:
+ + excellent confident delivery
+ Nice scenario setting & vision
- linkages from argument and the point you are making can be stronger.

Opp 2:
+ Good voice
- movement was distracting so try to keep feet calm
you may feel that you were stuttering a little but you made strong points at the end (reform court system)

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp made stronger case/argument for keeping the death penalty. Prop could have investigate more about the suffering on inmates with existing drug cocktails.

Li, Caroline (*23)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 201
Gov: 2 Lanzone - Hubinger
Opp: 4 O'Rafferty - Figueroa
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Caroline Li

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	4
Prop Speaker #1	Hubinger pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	O'Rafferty pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Lanzone pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Figueroa pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
- excellent delivery with proper voice projection & refuting arguments
- asked good questions during the debate

Prop 2:
- Some good points delivered
- delivery of speech could be more fluent (so slowing down your speech helps).

Opp 1:
- effective delivery
- eye contact proper
- supported arguments with evidence

Opp 2:
- good job in refuting the % of people who vote in USA
- convincing arguments with reference to opponents' deliberations.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Both teams are strong in debate, demonstrating great presentation skills.
- As a team, opps were able to deliver stronger arguments against the aff. team with more solid evidence & references to facts.

Pathways in the end.

- Both teams had strong points, disappointing that possession split.

- It was [illegible] to see [illegible] performances.

- Some good points defensively
- Defence at times could be
more pressure on ball
- Communication difficult with [illegible]
more vocal in 1st
- Good to see [illegible] the ball at people
- Support difficult with [illegible]
- Out numbered people
- Effective tackling

- Overall good technical display
More predictions & decision making required
- Passing accurate

Coaches Name

Team Name Valley

Matches played	28
Matches won	25
Matches drawn	2
Matches lost	1
Goals for	78
Goals against	12

Li, Caroline (*23)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 201
Gov: 22 Rice - Griggy
Opp: 14 Stroumza - Chen
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Caroline Li

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 22		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Griggy	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Chen	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Rice	pts 25	Opp Speaker #2 Stroumza	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:
- like your "eye for eye" statement
- proper voice projection

Opp 1:
- gave logical arguments
- good analysis of the points

Prop 2:
- organized presentation

Opp 2:
- fluency, convincing arguments.
- know your materials

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

- Stronger arguments
- logical and persuading points delivered
- good speech delivery, knowing materials well that were delivered.

- Aligned Alignments
- Logical and Persuading Points delivered
- Good speech delivering Points that will also delivered

Sun Rivers Valley

Director 1-1

Shannon

Clive

Rio

Griggs

12

PARLI Debate

Condello, Dave (*1)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 200
Gov: 14 Fong - Geller
Opp: 27 Campanella - Petruska
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: DAVID CONDELLO

Judge's School Affiliation: ANALY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	FONG pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	CAMPANELLA pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	GELLER pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	PETRUSKA 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: − EYE CONTACT
+ ESTABLISHED POINTS WELL
+ DID NOT RUSH ☆
+/− GOT FLUSTERED, THEN BACK ON TRACK - TWICE

Opp 1: + GOOD JOB OF RE-FORMING ARGUMENT
− TONE DOWN/REDUCE HAND GESTURES.
+ EYE CONTACT
− SLOW DOWN A BIT TO ADD CLARITY
+ ADDRESSED PROP POINTS WELL
+ SHOWED PASSION BUT NOT TOO MUCH

Prop 2: + ADDRESSED OPP POINTS WELL + IN ORDER
− SLIGHTLY SHAKEY START
+ EYE CONTACT
− NOTES SEEMED TO DISTRACT

Opp 2: + GOOD TONE/VOLUME
− EYE CONTACT DUE TO CHECKING NOTES
+ ADDRESSED PROP ISSUES WELL
+ STRONG RETURN TO OPP POINTS

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP TEAM WAS SMOOTHER + DID A BETTER JOB OF LAYING OUT AND THEN SUPPORTING THEIR POINTS. BOTH TEAMS SHOW PROMISE + WILL IMPROVE

PARLI Debate

Condello, Dave (*1)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 200
Gov: 2 Colbert - Clark
Opp: 14 Krishnaswamy - Goldstein
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: DAVID CONDELLO

Judge's School Affiliation: ANALY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 2		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 COLBERT	pts 28 27	Opp Speaker #1 GOLDSTEIN	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 CLARK	pts [redacted]	Opp Speaker #2 KRISHNASWAMY	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:

+ NICE START + ESTABLISHING
Prop 1: DEBATE
+ BODY LANGUAGE + TONE
- EYE CONTACT
+ STATED POINTS IN CLEAR MANNER
+ ADDRESSED OPP POINTS WELL

+ RELAXED
+/- ODD CHOICE TO ASK QUESTION @ START
Opp 1: + CONFIDENCE TO ADDRESS PROP POINTS IN THE ORDER OF HIS CHOOSING
- EYE CONTACT
- TOO BRIEF FOR OPENING STATEMENT (4 MIN)
+ RESTATED OPP POINTS WELL

Prop 2: - CHEWING GUM?
+ GOOD EYE CONTACT
+ ORDERLY REFUTATION OF OPP
+ GOOD REVIEW OF PROP POINTS
- VERY BRIEF (3 MIN)

Opp 2: ++ GREAT TONE + VOLUME
+ [redacted] PASSION W/ CONTROL
- TRANSITION ON POINTS COULD BE SMOOTHER
+ EYE CONTACT
- VERY BRIEF (3 MIN)

TEAM CODE #: 2 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

EVENLY MATCHED TEAMS. PROP PICKED AND SUPPORTED STRONGER ARGUMENTS. NEG/OPP TEAM MADE SOME STRONG POINTS BUT DIDN'T PURSUE THEM.

Kovitz, Bo (*3)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 226
Gov: 12 Murdock - Santana
Opp: 14 Duan - Kim
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: BO KOVITZ

Judge's School Affiliation: BERKELEY HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 12		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 MURDOCK	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 KIM	pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 SANTANA	pts 24	Opp Speaker #2 DUAN	pts 27

RES: The US should require all citizens to vote in elections

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Excellent speaking style, just be a little more confident. You did a good job in your first speech drawing out impacts, and your ~~rebuttal~~ rebuttal speech was also very effective. Try to work on substantiating your points/ideas with EVIDENCE

Prop 2: Very short rebuttal. Would have liked to have seen you attack each of their contentions, or reinforce your own points.

Opp 1: Pretty good. Need to work on speech/presentation. Contentions need to be worded better. Your third contention made no sense when you explained it. Also... warrants for your claims? You can fill the 7 mins by using examples/EVIDENCE—which would make you more persuasive

* Don't pat your desk after each speech. It's distracting

Opp 2: Very good job with refutations — you did the best out of everyone. You, along with everyone, need to do a better job going down their CASE and attacking each point, or reinforcing each of your contentions. Your jury duty example/analogy was very effective

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

* OPP did a better job with refutations and balancing their speeches. But both sides need to work on strengthening your cases with EVIDENCE/EXAMPLES, better organizing speeches, working on fluency while speaking, and sharpening analytical skills.

RES: THE US SHOULD BAN THE DEATH PENALTY

Kovitz, Bo (*3)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 226
Gov: 5 Wu - Ayalon
Opp: 22 Harris - Marr
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: BO KOVITZ

Judge's School Affiliation: BERKELEY H.S.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 22	
Prop Speaker #1 AYALON	pts 24	Opp Speaker #1 HARRIS	pts 24
Prop Speaker #2 WU	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 MARR	pts 25

Be NICE in final speech ↑ talk to judge, not at OPP

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

Needed this!

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 — NO POI's
- **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

↳ don't address opponents by saying "you". Talk to JUDGE! Say "my opponents"

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

↑ spend final speech on impacts/voters

Prop 1: Good form + command of policy format. Need to work on speaking independent of notes. Speaking more fluidly. Contentions need more CAUSAL LINKS and depth/analysis of logic & impacts. Need more variety of points.

Prop 2: Refutations need organizing. Go through points chronologically. You had a good speaking style. Nice point on rehabilitation/restorative justice. Should address potential arguments (it was kinda OPP's DA #2) about deterrence

↑ should spend final speech on impacts/weighing round

Opp 1: Lots of contentions but not a lot of depth. You just listed contentions but you didn't really get into the meat of the arguments (evidence and impacts) so it was hard for me to believe your case. This would kill more time and make your case hard to attack. Refutations were OK, but could be stronger. You could have attacked them w/ better points

Opp 2: Thank you for using examples! Don't say "you guys" — say "my opponents." Good speaking, need to improve fluidity. Was wondering why OPP didn't make the states' rights argument or respond to the Supreme Court precedent mentioned by AFF. Need to more systematically respond to case of AFF. Also no response to wrongful imprisonment

* Also, NEG needs to attack their plan. Does it work? Does it solve the problems it seeks to fix?

↑ Need to explain retributive/deterrence theories of justice, how are your strongest points — correcting wrongs in society/restoring balance/sending message, to society re: what is right + wrong

↳ should have been a part of your case

↳ really needed to milk the wrongful imprisonment arg. its known that multiple innocent ppl have been killed → use EXAMPLES

Potential other points: what about wrongful convictions? Restorative justice verses RETRIBUTIVE?

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

need to appeal to moral ~~[illegible]~~ arguments overall good but need to organize better.

REASON FOR DECISION:

Voted Aff because they overall did a better job explaining their case, attacking the opposing case, and defending their points.

PARLI Debate

Herman, Roy (*13)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 208
Gov: 20 Fong - Ligutan
Opp: 1 Schloten - Condello
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Roy Herman

Judge's School Affiliation: Livermore

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	20	Team Code #:	1
Prop Speaker #1	Fong pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Schloten pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Ligutan pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Condello 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: All should practice fluid speaking for parent judges and confidence in arguments, All should use time effectively.

Prop 2: FONG reviewed arguments when he had time, This can be good and effective

LIGUTAN USED CANADA EXAMPLE WELL

Opp 1: Signposting was a good organizational tool from the NEG

Opp 2: All should cite references and use more hard data

TEAM CODE #: 1 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
STRONGER ARGUMENT BY NEG. AFF DROPPED THE "NO VOTE SHOWS DISSENT," WHICH IS PERHAPS NOT TRUE BUT UNCHALLENGED. NEG. PUSHED IMPOVERISHING AMERICA AND MORE EDUCATION EFFECTIVELY.

PARLI Debate

Herman, Roy (*13)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 208
Gov: 22 Sundararaman - Elmhirst
Opp: 23 Cheng - Wei
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Roy Herman

Judge's School Affiliation: Livermore

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	22	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	Elmhirst pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Cheng pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Sundararaman pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Wei pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good signposting, great first speech! Use all your time.

Opp 1: Very clear case + refutation. Good speech. Good use of time.

Prop 2: Very nice job. Beware of pounding podium. Parents love enthusiasm but it can get distracting.

Opp 2: GREAT JOB OVERALL! NEEDED BETTER EXAMPLES ON D.P. REDUCING ALL CRIME.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
NEG MADE A GOOD RUN AT "DEATH IS JUST + NATURAL" AFF'S COUNTER WITH GHANDI, LIFE IS MORE VALUABLE THAN MONEY, D.P. IS NOT A SOLUTION TO OVERPOPULATION WAS STRONGER. SAYING "KILLING INNOCENTS IS TWISTED" WAS GREAT.

PARLI Debate

Baetkey, Kerri (*22)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 224
Gov: 7 Maitra - Aggarwal
Opp: 2 Fickinger - Williams Bentley Lafayette
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Baetkey

Judge's School Affiliation: SMHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	7	Team Code #:	2
Prop Speaker #1	Aggarwal pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Fickinger pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Maitra pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Williams pts 27.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

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

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

Judging Criteria

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

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Both sides were so polite, courteous and thoughtful! Loved hearing powerful girls. So knowledgeable, clear + effective!

Prop 1: You have a quick pace in your speaking - very articulate and knowledgeable. Great vocabulary. Organized your final speech nailed it!

Prop 2: Very organized - loved how you stated the agenda/layout! Loved the vote from home! Great vocabulary + knowledge

Opp 1: Great reasons, very thoughtful and accurate. You were very clear and poised. You were also organized. I liked when you said it was an issue of solvency! Your first speech ended w/ "so, ya, thank you" You can end stronger than that as you had many good points.

Opp 2: You were very articulate + stated many good points. I liked when you said there was no plan to "inform the uninformed" You were very organized + clear. You fuss with your shirt a bit which is distracting You have good points - so go for it!

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

They really articulated the policy debate + how it needs to flow and supported their ideas well. The final speech nailed it! It was organized + addressed all points very well. It came down to the end as both were very strong! It was neck-n-neck!!

PARLI Debate

Baetkey, Kerri (*22)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 224
Gov: 2 Galvan-Carty - Lisy
Opp: 25 Owen - Coscarelli
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Baetkey

Judge's School Affiliation: SMHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	25
Prop Speaker #1	Lisy pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Owen pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Galvin-Carty pts 26.5	Opp Speaker #2	Coscarelli 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: Congratulations ladies! You amazed and deligted with your knowledge + organization!!!

Prop 1: You have great intonation and command up there! You had many solid arguments. Very articulate! You handled the POO + POI with grace + stayed on track. I loved your moral argument! "Although treacherous, how do you decide?" ♡ Used MLK quote too!!

Prop 2: You have a great way of painting a picture and using questions to express your points. Dig deeper to explore topics and use all of your time. Feel free to re-state previous arguments to support the team. bias in courtrooms - great point!!

Opp 1: You were poised, organized + prepared. Your layout was clear + you specifically tackled their points. I liked when you said that the jury decided already. You had strong closings. The fiscal element was strong but at first a bit hard to follow - it got stronger later.

Opp 2: You did a good job backing all arguments + restating claims. Very organized. I did wish your team stated where you got those costs - that would enhance the argument. As you get more comfortable - hold eye contact longer - look up.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

They really adequately addressed each point and their # fiscal point was not refutted. I also thought their use of the Supreme Court + 8th ammendment was strong. Good use of POO + POIs! Both teams were strong and it was close!! Great work!!