PARLI Debate

VanZutphen, Jane (*20)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 222
Gov: 14 Stroumza - Chen
Opp: 23 Wang - Zhu
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jane van Zutphen

Judge's School Affiliation: Pinole Valley HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	Chen, Karen pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Wang, Chilsea pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Stroumza, Adrian pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Zhu, Wanzhu 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:

(27) Prop 1: Karen you came across rather brief in your affirmation especially with the contention of war creating a better quality of life

(27) Prop 2: Adrian you made up up with the military contention with more being lost to save families and it creating peace

Opp 1: Chilsea very effective in bringing points across - civil war ('loss of lives' - environment - devastation / division (28)

Opp 2: Wanzhu a little nervous but able to bounce back after being challenged on P.O.I (27)

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Unable to bring out enough valid points to make the case stronger to its opposition

PARLI Debate

VanZutphen, Jane (*20)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 222
Gov: 14 Kwong - Tan
Opp: 7 Mohiuddin - Sharma
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jane van Zutphen

Judge's School Affiliation: Pinole Valley HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	7
Prop Speaker #1	Tan, Stephanie pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Mohiuddin, Asim pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Kwong, Ryan pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Hematshot, Sharma 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:

(28) Prop 1: Stephanie valid points correlating to topic at hand. Did not sway from the topic. Need more fact finding to substantiate points.

(25) Prop 2: Ryan could use better focus and not lose train of thought in bringing points across

(27) Opp 1: Asim very effective in using research information to counteract affects of negative behavior. Well presented and positive eye contact.

(27) Opp 2: Sharma studies regarding time period, family / genetics and 2000 Anderson Hill case (4 inconclusive & 1 positive make points stronger

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Although fact finding research was involved there is still more of a correlation to the validity of Stephanies points to make it believable.

PARLI Debate

McCabe, Linda (*27)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 205
Gov: 22 Baxter - Nam
Opp: 2 Archibald - Hohmeyer
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Linda McCabe

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	22	Team Code #:	2
Prop Speaker #1	Baxter pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Hohmeyer pts 25
Prop Speaker #2	Nam pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Archibald 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: Nice introduction, setting up definition, define type of debate and judging criteria. Good use of utilitarianism in closing speech. Your contentions were a little weak, but they were not refuted directly at all by Neg #1 speech.

Prop 2: Good start to your speech noting no refutations from Neg side. Good analogy of slaves being freed as belonging to net benefits judging criteria. A little halting style, but this will improve w/ practice.

Opp 1: Did not make a clear distinction in first speech that you disagreed w/ definition of the term "war." This should be a "bullet point" w/o challenging the judging criteria, you allow it to stand as offered by Aff. Your first speech had many examples, but none directly responded to Aff's contentions. Your closing speech was much better. I would like to nail your feet to the ground to stop you from knocking them. Very Distracting foot motions, but your hand motions are fine.

Opp 2: Much better attempt to engage w/ Aff's contentions, than in your partner's first speech. Nice speaking style, A little halting, but this will improve w/ practice.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Aff did a better job structuring the terms of the debate and had a more convincing net benefits argument.

PARLI Debate

McCabe, Linda (*27)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 205
Gov: 20 Alam - Nguyen
Opp: 23 Roth - Yue
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Linda McCabe

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	20	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	Nguyen pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Roth pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	A Tam pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Yue 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: Good set up for debate w/ defining type of debate, terms. Should have mentioned judging criteria (not even covered in 2nd speech. Don't forget that!) Good examples for your contentions, they were strong contentions. Good speaking style.

Prop 2: A little halting in your speaking style, this will improve w/ practice. You started your speech by refuting the Neg case, then rebuilt your case, then went back to refuting Neg case. I + would be better to ~~[illegible]~~ manage your time ~~but~~ more efficiently and not go back over same ground.

Opp 1: Thank you for mentioning judging criteria in your first speech. Then in your second speech you began by stating how you would prove judging criteria but forgot to state "preponderance of evidence" and how your case fulfilled that, Strong, passionate speaking style, but trying to minimize the significance of your opponents examples by suggesting only 2 in real world fell flat when Aff 2 brought up a third example, Sandy Hook? Why did you not introduce that?

Opp 2: Ugh! I hate spreading, Try to resist speed talking and hyperbole. Shifting blame to the victim of violence is not a winning strategy unless you are a defense lawyer ~~[illegible]~~ You have a confident speaking style but avoid making sweeping generalizations.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The Aff side fulfilled their burden w/ a well structured case. The neg side used hyperbole as a means of refutation which undermined their credibility.

Please CLEAN THE BOARD AFTER ROUND WHEN ASKED!

PARLI Debate

Lustig, Robert (*14)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 204
Gov: 25 Owen - Coscarelli
Opp: 7 Bardalai - Rangwala
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: WSTG

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	Santa Rosa	Team Code #:	Doherty Valley
Prop Speaker #1	Owen pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Bardalai pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Coscarelli pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Rangwala 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: Not every war has a winner + loser (eg. Korean War) Treaties do not define winners + losers - They specify cement + state of affairs.

Prop 2: Children games do not constitute war

Opp 1: Cold War did not itself constitute a "violent" conflict. While war can lead to loss of resources, the norms can gain resources in the process.

Opp 2: War without death does exist.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Neg argued their point on war leading to more wars & no clear winner over time most effectively.

PARLI Debate

Lustig, Robert (*14)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 204
Gov: 26 Clark - Flanagan
Opp: 22 Caramucci - Tarleton
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: LUSTIG

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP			OPP		
Team Code #:	26 · Sonoma Academy		Team Code #:	San Mateo · 22	
Prop Speaker #1	Flanagan	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Tarleton	pts 25
Prop Speaker #2	Clark	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Caramucci	pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: The neurochemical of entertainment is NOT the same as the neurochemical of addiction.

Prop 2: Nice value statement at end. True - young children have more fake Redemption argument among children

Opp 1: Children can't tell the difference between a TV show and a commercial - the fact that they are "fake" is irrelevant. Point about mentally ill was good — but how do you measure cause & effect?

Opp 2: Stanford study showed LESS TV/VIDEO ⇒ LESS VIOLENCE; so point not made. Role models DO kill - eg. Oscar Pistorius

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Except for arguments about neurochemicals, needed more concrete points that could be backed up.

PARLI Debate

Jia, Jack (*5)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 202
Gov: 1 Schloten - Condello
Opp: 22 Rice - Griggy
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jack Jia

Judge's School Affiliation: Campo

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:		Team Code #:	22
Prop Speaker #1	Scholten pts 28.5	Opp Speaker #1	Rice pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Condello pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Griggy 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 Analysis → clear def. of winning
Good Evidence WW2 28 +28.5
Goals +0.5
Good argu. on Rev. War
privilege of def.

Prop 2: 27
Argu. on def.
(What if there is no war?)

Opp 1: Good Analysis 29+28.5
WW1 → WW2 Great Evidence
Revolution War Civil war → most killed ✓
PTSD

Opp 2: 29
Def. of won — good argu.!
Iraq war good example!
Debt, PTSD → good evidence
WW2 — treaty not won.

Def. is good, but more evidence pls.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp → More evidence and strong argument. I expect prop team talk more about how war helped people (liberation, saving lives etc).

PARLI Debate

Jia, Jack (*5)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 202
Gov: 14 Bystrom - Gast
Opp: 23 Samra - Yim
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jack Jia

Judge's School Affiliation: Camp 6.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 23	
Prop Speaker #1 Bystrom	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Samra	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Gast	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Yim.	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 young kids, 29+ 28
Role model, mirroring → good Analysis and evidence (my sister)
② reward for killing ⇒ strong point.
③ habit, addicted. 29

Prop 2: → convincing. ④ teenager → teen problem
① may add anger → good argu.
② lots of parent no control → good argu
③ aggressive ~~to~~ killing → sound.

Opp 1: ① let out anger → sound. 28+
② parents rating → sound 29
parent control → good argu
fun and relax → good ~~&~~ strong.
~~Ask~~ Will you control your kids?

Opp 2: ① diff from real world → good
② role model. 27
~~Give~~ argue right on your opponents point.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Good~~ Better analysis and more evidence.

PARLI Debate

Jacobs, Joel (*3)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 227
Gov: 22 Harris - Marr
Opp: 14 Kerr-Stein - Lee
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Berk

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 22		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Harris	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Kerr-Stein	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Marr	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Lee	pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Number your contentions. Give me at least one clear example of a won war, and what makes it that.

Prop 2: You need to tie ur pts more closely to the resolution.

Opp 1: How does arguing that "Both sides win" disprove the resolution?
Very confident speaking style. GREAT SPEAKER.
Careful about language from resolution: "Even tho one side clearly won [the Civil War], it didn't." - confusing

Opp 2: Please help me understand analytically how I shd answer the question that the resolution poses. Work on the bigger picture.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp doesn't challenge Prop def of war as "any conflict". Opp seems to concede that some conflicts are won (and seems to argue that sometimes everybody wins.

PARLI Debate

Jacobs, Joel (*3)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 227
Gov: 24 Scott - Ambrose SR
Opp: 14 Lawrence - Privalov L
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Berkeley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	24	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Scott pts 27.5	Opp Speaker #1	Lawrence pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Ambrose pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Privalov 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: Short speech. In an empirical round like this one, u can fill up ur speech w/ more evidence. Aren't there any studies re acts of violence (as opposed to MIT study re effect on brain).
"You have no facts" - I think u mean "evidence." Work on rebuttal organization - don't go down the flow.

Prop 2: "Refutation," not "refuten."
Good use of MIT study.
Talk about difference b/w causation and correlation in context of crime rate.
Give multiple responses: talk about MIT study and 9-year old who killed parents in response to each arg (that they apply to).

Opp 1: This resolution is an empirical claim. You need evidence to refute it. And no, I can't "look it up" after the round. Ev must be in speech.

Good attack on MIT study, good analysis.

Opp 2: Tell me elsewhere on the flow - you started w/ 1st Opp contention. I find Roadmaps generally to be overdone, but a few words telling me where u are on the flow would help. How does mental illness point refute resolution?

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Resolution on face and as defined is an empirical claim. Prop has supporting evidence, Opp doesn't. Opp puts all eggs in mental illness basket, but doesn't connect to resolution. Quality of speaking/analysis was otherwise pretty evenly matched.

PARLI Debate

Choy, Suzie (*4)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 201
Gov: 14 Ng - Huang
Opp: 1 Ochoa - Chand
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Susie Choy

Judge's School Affiliation: BOD

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	1
Prop Speaker #1	Ng pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Ochoa pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Huang pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Chand pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Great job outlining case.
Delivery & style were good.
A couple pts made by Opp which you indicated where to address.

Prop 2:
Try to project voice a little more.

Opp 1:
Great job addressing Prop points.
Evidence/arguments were well done.

Opp 2:
Need to do better job supporting arguments stated by partner.
Try to be more confident.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp had the tougher side. Opp 1 did a fantastic job refuting Prop contentions, however, Opp 2 didn't follow arguments and seemed to support Prop. Opp 2 also dropped a couple issues.

PARLI Debate

Choy, Suzie (*4)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 201
Gov: 27 Campanella - Petruska
Opp: 11 Arshad - Sankar
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Susie Choy

Judge's School Affiliation: BOD

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	27	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	Campanella pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Sankar pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Petruska pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Arshad 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 volume / delivery. loved the animated voice.
need to focus on using entire time to expand / make points.

Prop 2:

Rather than referencing pt #1, #2, etc, you should restate what the contention was.
Try not to speak so loudly to partner when Opp is speaking.

Opp 1:

great job outlining case & poking holes in prop contentions.

Opp 2:

great job supporting partner w/ arguments.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Huffington Post discussion about 93% of households have/play video games but don't lead to violent behavior never addressed by Prop.

PARLI Debate

Bardalai, Snigdho (*7)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 207
Gov: 14 Lee - Fairchild
Opp: 5 Wu - Ayalon
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Emerald Greter

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 19		Team Code #: 5	
Prop Speaker #1 Fairchild	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Ayalon	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Lee	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Wu	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: - Not very sure of yourself. Be confident in your speech
+ Great eye contact.
+ Good pacing and tone.
Don't say 'I guess' be sure of the points you're making.

Prop 2: USE YOUR TIME.
- No eye contact...
- Made one weak point and then ended your speech.

Opp 1: - Watch your Ums.
- Almost no eye contact.
- Finish your speech before walking away.
+ Great Flow and organization.

Opp 2: - Work on organization of speech.
+ Great tone..
- Fast pacing made some words inaudible.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The OPP took their time outlining why their side was correct. They were organized and confident in what they presented.

PARLI Debate

Bardalai, Snigdho (*7)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 207
Gov: 14 Rettenmaier - Pineda
Opp: 2 Galvan-Carty - Lisy
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Emerald Geter

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	2
Prop Speaker #1	Pineda pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Lisy pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Rettenmaier pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Galvan-Carty 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 confident.
+ Clear focus.
- Watch the Um's
+ Great summary and wrap up.

Prop 2: + Very organized.
- Watch the Um's
+ Great job refuting contentions.

Opp 1: + Great eye contact.
- Watch the Um's.
+ Very organized.

Opp 2: + Confident
+ Great tone and paeing.
- Could have used your time to refute PROP contentions.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The PROP was very organized, they had clear points that stood throughout the round.

WAR CAN BE WON

PARLI Debate

Cabasino, Mark (*13)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 224
Gov: 23 Cheng - Wei
Opp: 14 Luk - Tserennamid
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: MLC

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

PROP Team Code #: 23

Prop Speaker #1 CHENG pts____

Prop Speaker #2 WEI pts____

OPP Team Code #: 14

Opp Speaker #1 LUK pts____

Opp Speaker #2 TSERENNAMID 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 general definitions and good voting issues in the first speech. Try to add more concrete specifics to flesh out your case.

Prop 2: Good job responding to neg contentions/examples (eg. China hacks, WWI). Your own case is still a bit vague and needs more specificity.

Opp 1: Good development of case with lots of concrete examples (Syria, WW I, Balkanization, etc). Be sure to accept/reject definitions in 1st speech and state voter issues in 3rd speech.

Opp 2: Good job adding additional examples to support your side (ISIS, cuban missle crisis, Israel/Palestine, etc). I think you might've switched around OPP2C and OPP3C.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP had numerous examples to support their fact case. OPP also used more of its allotted time for case and for rebuttals. OPP had persuasive pathos appeal and clear delivery.

VIOLENT VIDEO GAMES LEAD TO VIOLENT BEHAVIOR

PARLI Debate

Cabasino, Mark (*13)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 224
Gov: 2 Hemerling - Barnett
Opp: 23 Habib - Keshav
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: MCC

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	HEMERLING pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	HABIB pts 30
Prop Speaker #2	BARNETT pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	KESHAV 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: Good clear contentions and a few good examples. I would've liked contentions extended with more examples/evidence. Also, bring up 3rd speech points (eg. big or small, some cause not only cause) earlier.

Prop 2: Good anecdote of sports vs. gun games. Good point about how violence becomes "normal" or "ok." Try to use more of your allotted time.

Opp 1: Good organization with thorough evidence, strong command of vocabulary, and smart rebuttals. You speak already at the varsity level and should compete there. Good voter issues (eg. correlation not causation) etc.

Opp 2: Good job stating dropped point about how gaming communities have nice people. But what other points were dropped? And what are your rebuttals to AFF contentions? You underused your allotted time severely.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Habib clearly carried the debate: articulating the burdens and backing up contentions with several concrete examples, rebutting all points in order with corresponding contentions, and fleshing out the speeches to their fullest potential. AFF had good points but not enough evidence to support.

PARLI Debate

Zaheer, Affan (*8)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 208
Gov: 20 Mart - Andola
Opp: 23 Ho - Prashanth
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Affan Zaheer

Judge's School Affiliation: Dublin High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	20	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	Andola pts 24	Opp Speaker #1	Ho pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Mart pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Prashant 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:
Focus on flow of your point to stress the goals. Good examples but closure was weak.

Prop 2:
Good presentation & delivery. A strong closure with rebuttal on opposition point would help.

Opp 1: Good presentation. Need to be more structured & organized. Good pts on cost/price vs benefits.

Opp 2: Good start & points. Suggest to work on the flow & closure.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Zaheer, Affan (*8)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 208
Gov: 2 Fickinger - Williams
Opp: 20 Le - Rather
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Affan Zaheer

Judge's School Affiliation: Dublin High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	20
Prop Speaker #1	Fickinger pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Rather pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Williams pts	Opp Speaker #2	Le 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:
Great start setting criteria & definition nice flow delivery & presentation.
Ending was week & should be improved.

Opp 1: Good Presentation, control & delivery. Topic was tough to negate, could used some better example to make a point in your favour

Prop 2:
Good point. Please focus on a more eye contact & be precise. Too many words at times

Opp 2: Presentation was weak & not very organized. Point were good. Need to connect better via examples to prove your point

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Sankaralingam, Avu (*2)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 206
Gov: 5 Hinchcliff - McKinney
Opp: 20 Valle - Pollard
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Avu Sankaralingam

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	5	Team Code #:	20
Prop Speaker #1	~~McKinney~~ Hinchcliff pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Pollard pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	McKinney pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Valle 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 job of defining the term
- Could bolster the definition by "why"?
- Undermines the case a little by making it too narrow

Prop 2:
↳ Could engage other team's argument instead of just dismissing it as not our definition

Opp 1:
↳ Started by refuting other team's argument.
↳ Didn't give themselves time to make their case; more complicated because it is net-benefit

Opp 2:
- Did a better job of engaging the other team's definition.
- With net-benefit argument you just laid out the cost. You didn't engage the benefit.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opposition never engaged with benefit of war only cost but wanted to make a net-benefit case.
Pro-side was able to adduce evidence to their case better

PARLI Debate

Sankaralingam, Avu (*2)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 206
Gov: 7 Kaura - Gajula
Opp: 12 Murdock - Santana
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: AVU SANKARALINGAM

Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 7		Team Code #: 12	
Prop Speaker #1 Gajula.	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Murdock.	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Kaura	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Santana.	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:
Liked Structure of argument - Two propositions. but evidence was the same for both proposition.

Prop 2:
Did a good job of undercutting opposition.

Opp 1:
Started with a strong refutation. -but reiterated same point as argument. Consider Combining the two.

Opp 2:
Didn't really bolster the case from before. Just restated it.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Articulated argument with some evidence. Was able to undercut opposition premise "~~Not all~~ by saying "Not all violence needs to be caused by video games"

PARLI Debate

Owen, Jeff (*25)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 225
Gov: 20 Byrne - Pareja
Opp: 2 Lanzone - Hubinger
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jeff Owen

Judge's School Affiliation: Santa Rosa High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	20	Team Code #:	2
Prop Speaker #1	Byrne pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Hubinger pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Pareja pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Lanzone 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: Very effective. Nice job staying slow & concise in your message

Opp 1: Effective job in focusing on the aspect of the debate hinging on the definition of war.

Prop 2: Relax before you ~~start~~ start talking

Opp 2: Excellent job in working with your teammate

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The debate came down to the definition of "war!" Prop did a more effective job of stating "war" was achieving the desired results of going to war verses a treaty. ~~Good~~ Good job on both sides!

PARLI Debate

Owen, Jeff (*25)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 225
Gov: 23 Zhai - Khan
Opp: 14 Fong - Geller
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jackson

Judge's School Affiliation: Sandpoint High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Zhai pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Geller pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Fong pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Fong 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: Excellent job on stating the definition. Good flow of thoughts

Opp 1: Your presentation was smooth & strong

Prop 2: Great summation in focusing on the definition

Opp 2: Great presentation slow down! Focus on quality not quantity of arguments

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Prop did an excellent job of stating the definition so as to include Mental & emotional as well as Physical. Opp did a great job of ~~refute~~ refuting Physical but not the other aspects of the definition

War Can be won.

PARLI Debate

Sundararamen, Siva (*22)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 228
Gov: 11 Chippa - Cherukuri
Opp: 14 Woo - Melman
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: SUNDAR RAMASAMY

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN HIGH SCHOOL

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Chippa pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Melman pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Cherukuri pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Woo 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: Start could have been much better. talked about the cause which should be for good. Mostly looked at the opponent. Not utilized much of his time. Not many strong points.

Prop 2: Nice start. Talked about only the good causes for war but not for bad. Had eye contact. Talked based on assumptions, not based on facts or data. Not so clear in explaining. Showed fuces and sarcastic smile.

Opp 1: Good start. Melman did not use and pointed out the issues like recession, [illegible] lives etc. Not much eye contact. Read mostly. Answered the Aff's question provided some facts.

Opp 2: Start is good, little tensed it seems. Good on contention, talked about the spending and its impacts.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp team is strong on their points and more professional. In overall, both teams are good. one of the members in Opp team did not even hand smile.

violent video games lead to violent behavior

PARLI Debate

Sundararamen, Siva (*22)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 228
Gov: 4 O'Rafferty - Figueroa
Opp: 14 Chao - Wang
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: SUNDAR RAMASAMY

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN HIGH School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	O'Rafferty pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Wang pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Figueroa pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Chao 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: Good start; criticized the violent video games about killing stealing and getting points for the same. Great voice. Had eye contact. Talked about bullying. Little fast a. mentioned media of all.

Prop 2: started with a nice smile and introduction. clear in articulating the points. talked about how it impacts the kids. and their behavior. It impacts the decision making process. explained via Science as well as a part of opp's question. It becomes

Opp 1: Start is good. Mentioned a point there are not much news about killing or bad behaviors due to video games. Had a little issue in flow. Difficulty in articulating need. Not much clear. Good eye contact. Tried her best. Lots of repetitive start is good. Given a different perspective. People core most angry while playing itself. So they do not show much after back. parents & teachers showed teach bet reality & action. video games are not the only reason.

Opp 2:

TEAM CODE #: O'Rafferty & Figueroa **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: 4

Just based on the nature of this topic, the AFF team had more points to back up than OPP. Even from Articulation perspective, AFF is better than Opp. Both team gave their best.

NIKHIL MEHTA(8)

~~Chon, Hong (*23)~~

Round 2A 11:15am Room 210

Gov: 14 Duan - Kim

① Opp: 20 Jerez - Moran

Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: NIKHIL MEHTA

Judge's School Affiliation: DHS (Dublin High)

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:		Team Code #:	20
Prop Speaker #1 Duan	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Jerez	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Kim	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Moran	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 Analysis of the topic, ~~but~~ Strong Speaker but ~~to~~ Arguments not supported with Evidence (POO) during Rebuttal

Prop 2:

Strong Speaker, Responded well to the arguments but ~~to~~ again the argument not well supported by Evidence

Opp 1:

Presented good Arguments supported by Evidence and facts. Good Delivery

Opp 2: Good Analysis, Can improve more on delivery, Strong Argument supported by Evidence

TEAM CODE #: 20 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp team ~~had~~ ~~very~~ responded directly and support argument with Evidence.

NIKHIL MEHTA (#5)
~~Chen, Hong (#23)~~
Round 2B 11:15am Room 210
Gov: 18 Nash - Thrasher
② Opp: 14 Lyons - Wyszynski
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: NIKHIL MEHTA

Judge's School Affiliation: Dublin High (DHS)

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	18	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Nash pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Lyons pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Thrasher pts 30	Opp Speaker #2	Wyszynski 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 Delivery but can improve. Relevant POI Good Analysis

Opp 1: Strong speaker, good Arguments but not well supported by evidence

Prop 2: Excellent Delivery Good Analysis and all Argument supported by appropriate Evidence.

Opp 2: Strong speaker, argument were off main topic of "violent video games" lack of Evidence.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams were really good but judgement is based on the valid Argument and Evidence provided by team #18

PARLI Debate

Maddhuri, Babu (*11)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 200
Gov: 14 Chan - Foley
Opp: 18 Raven - Fischer
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: BABU MADDHURI

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HIGH

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 18	
Prop Speaker #1 Chan	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Raven.	pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 Foley.	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Fischer	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

Topic: War Can be won.

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

Prop 1: Defined the topic pretty well.
· Very confident, thoughtful
Good preparation and observation.

Prop 2: Good refute.
Very confident, thoughtful prep & POIs.

Opp 1: Go with the attitude of "You don't have anything to loose."
You have good points for Neg.
You can present well, once you got the flow, You did a very good job.

Opp 2: Good refute. Can improve in supporting your own contingencies, preparation was there and can be improved.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Team 14 did a better job on analysis, evidence Arguments, POIs & Courtesy

PARLI Debate

Maddhuri, Babu (*11)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 200
Gov: 22 Burrous - Blackenburg
Opp: 26 Goody - Sherman
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: BABU MADDHURI

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HIGH.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	22	Team Code #:	26.
Prop Speaker #1	Burrous pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Goody. pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Blackenburg. pts 24	Opp Speaker #2	Sherman. 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

TOPIC: Violent videogames lead to violent behavior.

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

Prop 1: Define the topic. You are a good speaker & listener. Be more analytic and show facts. You can be a good debater.

Prop 2: Could prepare better. Don't go off topic. Defend your contingencies & refute well. You can do it.

Opp 1: only thing I would say: Don't repeat the same point again and again for all contentions. Excellent performance.

Opp 2: Very ~~good~~ debater. You have lots of confidence. Prepare well and be independent of your partner → This is currently impairing your flow.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Thorough analysis, evidence, arguments and courtesy.

PARLI Debate

Villa, Paul (*6)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 221
Gov: 3 Berck - Adams
Opp: 23 Wei - Zheng
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Paul Villa

Judge's School Affiliation: College Park

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 23	
Prop Speaker #1 Adams	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Zheng	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Berck	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: Your voice is great. Well spoken. Well signposted, well organized. You need to compartmentalize your arguments. Give me a criteria and round type.

Prop 2: Great historical knowledge and analysis. I think you miss some really easy answers. They basically concede the aff in the LOC.

Opp 1: Good confidence. Very polite. Good refutation on case. I would like more depth on your counter contentions. Establish a round type. You really contradict with your CC1.

Opp 2: I think you did the best job of sign posting and I urge you to keep that up. You need to work on refutation and extension of your own arguments.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Lack of T from opp means I evaluate round through the affirmative framing, meaning neg has no risk of offense.

PARLI Debate

Villa, Paul (*6)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 221
Gov: 23 Deng - Luo
Opp: 20 Fong - Ligutan
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Paul Villa

Judge's School Affiliation: College Park

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	20
Prop Speaker #1	Luo pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Fong pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Deng pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Ligutan 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: You never actually say there is a link between video games and violent behavior! The first time you say video games cause behavior is in the rebuttal.

Prop 2: You need to do more work on framework. Honestly you are in a huge hole going into the MG. I still haven't heard an example of videogames causing violence.

Opp 1: Good framework press. Great argument on CC2, saying video games can actually reduce violence, turns all of the aff case.

Opp 2: Way to say what you have to say and then sit down. Judges hate when people talk in circles. I think you miss some easy refutation. Someone needs to say why vote for me.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Aff fails to provide any warrants.

PARLI Debate

Ambrose, Mrs (*24)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 223
Gov: 2 Greenwall - DuPuy
Opp: 22 Sundararaman - Elmhirst
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Sheila Ambrose

Judge's School Affiliation: SRV

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 2		Team Code #: 22	
Prop Speaker #1 Greenwall	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Elmhirst	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 DuPuy	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Sundararaman	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 have more eye contact. Good job on rebuttal - pt. by pt. Why Prop proved position

Prop 2: Nice work pointing holes in opp. definition

Opp 1: Concise, well articulated. Be sure to have source for definition. If you had a more clear definition you could tie to a source - give validity.

Opp 2: Rebuttal contentions well. Even if it is a common assumption by society, that is still an opinion - need to substantiate pt.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop provided good definition + presented specific cases to support definition. Opp provided good examples of ramifications of war but definition is key.

PARLI Debate

Ambrose, Mrs (*24)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 223
Gov: 23 Eizner - He
Opp: 8 Zaheer - Chaudhri
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Sheila Ambrose

Judge's School Affiliation: SRV

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 8	
Prop Speaker #1 Eizner	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Zaheer	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 He	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Chaudhri	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 clear definition and pts. Third pt. re: online harassment was not supported well.

Prop 2: refuted pt. w/ bears chinese cartoon. Good job.

Opp 1: Correlation vs. causation. Good pts. of reversing potential cause. Violent behav → playing violent games.

Opp 2: Good job highlighting lack of proof game resulted in violence. -Proof presented by Prop. ✓

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp. showed that prop. failed to prove violent behavior was a result of playing violent video games. A→B
Weighing mech. was logical reasons. Need to show B→C
Therefor A→C

PARLI Debate

Nash, Jennifer (*18)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 226
Gov: 20 Afzal - Kelly
Opp: 7 Maitra - Aggarwal
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jennifer Nash

Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomery High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	20	Team Code #:	7
Prop Speaker #1	Kelly pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Aggarwal pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Afzal pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Maitra 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 examples.

Opp 1: Good job using facts.

Prop 2: Good style. Nice job of addressing opponents arguments, need more rebuttal points/support.

Opp 2: ~~Good job of using current events as evidence.~~ Good job of using current events in presentation

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Overall presentation, use of facts

PARLI Debate

Nash, Jennifer (*18)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 226
Gov: 11 Wang - Lin
Opp: 14 Holwitz - Kay
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jennifer Nash

Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomery High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: Wang 11		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Wang	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Holwitz	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Lin	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Kay	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 use of evid~~ Good presentation of evidence.

Opp 1: Good arguments, evidence more broad.

Prop 2: Good use of evidence, citing specific evidence

Opp 2: Good use of facts. Good speaking style.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Prop team did a better job of citing specific evidence in presentation, although both teams had excellent arguments.

PARLI Debate

~~Maxson, Tricia (*1)~~
Round 2A 11:15am Room 203
Gov: 14 Krishnaswamy - Goldstein
Opp: 20 Ahmadi - Phan
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Chien Fang

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	20
Prop Speaker #1	Goldstein pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Phan pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Krishnaswamy pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Ahmadi 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 delivery & organization
+ clear definition of topic
– only one contention
– short speech

Prop 2:
+ Good delivery
+ good eye contact
+ Sign post

Opp 1: + strong contention under own definition
– delivery needs some work (less stutters)
– Need to explain why your definition should be used

Opp 2:
+ good argument under own definition
– rebuttal is not clear & ~~or~~ effective. Need better arguments

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop is able to define the resolution clearly & argue strongly for it. Opp needs to provide reasons for changing the definition & debate on their definition.

War can be won

AFF

value

① a) objective to achieve
(short speech)
Rev. War
P.I. if bloodshed is intentional?

② Road map:
def: stands
value
Neg def not fair
Res. only about winning/losing of wars

Reb Aff: def. stands
Neg never explain why
Def should be beneficial
Not debating under the def.

NEG

① Def: beneficial
a) Long-lasting after effect
(stutters a bit)
Rebuttal: both sides suffers loss
b) treaty
c) Govt can't do job
example: Eng. v Fr.

② Rebuttal
Few war w/o bloodshed & death
Net. benefits
Economic impact
Ex. Spain treaty

Reb Beneficial debate
a) long-lasting aftereffect
b) Govt can't do job.

PARLI Debate

~~Maxson, Tricia (21)~~
Round 2B 11:15am Room 203
Gov: 27 Cohen - Lemenager
Opp: 2 Colbert - Clark
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Chien Fang

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	27	Team Code #:	2
Prop Speaker #1	Cohen pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Colbert pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Lemenager pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Clark 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 framework, clear def.
+ strong, evidence-based contentions
+ Very good delivery
+ Excellent final rebuttal

Prop 2:
+ Example-based rebuttal
- delivery can be improved (less pauses, smoother speed)

Opp 1:
+ good delivery
+ many contentions on benefits of violent video games
- did not have evidence on why violent V.G. do not lead to violence

Opp 2:
+ good rebuttal on why V.G. itself can have be beneficial
- delivery can be improved.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop has a clear definition & framework for the debate. Provided evidence and strong arguments. Opp tries to ~~counter~~ counter the Prop arguments by blaming the parents or kids themselves. However, this is not what the resolution is really about.

Violent video games lead to cause violent behavior

AFF

① Factual, what circumstance Neg has prove beyond a doubt
- a) Children most impressionable
- b) Glorifies violence
  aim to kill / death is objetive
- c) Evidence - Sandy Hook
  Shooter play violent video games
  (effective delivery)

② Sign Post
- restate contention
- Rebuttal by example
  - Teen depression → V.G.
  - → poor behavior
  - → cruely to younger sibling
- Sandy Hook: shooter play violent V.G. → leads to real life violence.
- Glorifies violence - by example
  J.F.K assasin
- Human nature is violent
  V.G. amplifies it.

Reb Opp misinterpeted Resolution
V.G itself. not parental responsibility
as game developer.
Crim is not subject of debate
V.G. increases violent behavior
Has evidence / opp has not.

NEG

① Agree w/ Def.

Reb. V.G. rated for age
(failure is on parents)
- Crime predates V.G.
- vehicle for venting
- social aspects helps teens to vent.
- Sandy Hook: parental failure

② Rebuttal: parental failure because of rating.
S.H shooter has mental illness
(P.I. he did not)
- Kid mature enough to know fiction from real
- vent anger
- safe haven for social gathering

Reb children imp.
Age Rating
Glorifie violence - virtual
V.G. does not come w/ weapon
Vent

Res: War can be won.

PARLI Debate

Banisadr, Allison (*16)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 220
Gov: 25 Lacombe - Appel
Opp: 26 Sheridan - Sappington
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Banisadr

Judge's School Affiliation: 16

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	25	Team Code #:	26
Prop Speaker #1	~~Lacombe~~ Appel	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 ~~Sheridan~~ Sappington	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	~~Appel~~ Lacombe	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 ~~Sappington~~ Sheridan	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:
⊖ left lots of time unused 1st
⊕ good in pointing out that war being good or bad is not topical

Prop 2:
⊕ good at refutations & turning opp's points in prop's favor
⊕ good POI regarding def of war conflict betw two parties

Opp 1:
⊕ very good at pointing out any gain or "win" is outweighed by human loss / waste of resources
⊕ very nice that you clearly enjoy debate & are a clear, confident speaker
⊖ be a bit more discreet in accepting help

Opp 2:
⊕ nice POI
⊕ nice framing of the topic making it philosophical & defining us all as one on earth & war causes loss of something

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both sides laid out great cases. Loved that both teams were so friendly & encouraging to each other. All very strong, confident speakers. Prop won b/c stated they only needed to give one example of a war that was won. Gave Revolutionary War example which Opp didn't directly refute. Great job!

Res: Violent video games lead to violent behavior.

PARLI Debate

Banisadr, Allison (*16)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 220
Gov: 4 Thomas ① - Ralston ②
Opp: 14 Situ ① Zhang ②
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Banisadr

Judge's School Affiliation: 16

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 4		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Thomas	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Situ	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Ralston	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Zhang	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:
⊕ nice presentation of info - liked your fact - importance - inference format
⊖ could've revisited your weighing mechanism in final rebuttal

Prop 2:
⊕ good smooth speaker, confident, good examples & reasoning

Opp 1: ⊕ great points
⊖ could improve confidence & organization

Opp 2:
⊕ some great points, but also some fuzzy logic - acknowledged that twins were copying video games in real-life shooting but blaming inability to differentiate reality & fiction - still they were emulating video games

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Prop pointed out that video games are one factor that leads to violence &, Opp had a hard time refuting this.