Round 2 Gov: 1 Opp: 2	utphen, Jane (*20) A 11:15am Room 222 4 Stroumza - Chen 3 Wang - Zhu nentary Debate/Novice		Judge's Name: \(\sigma\)	iation: Pinole Volley	H.5
ramai	PROP Team Code #:	ANNAN AN THE RESERVE OF THE CHARLEST CONTRACT CONTRACT OF THE CHARLEST CONTRACT C	THE CONTRACT OF THE STATE OF TH	OPP	,
			Team Code #:	·	
	Prop Speaker #1 Web	Karen pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	ng,dhilsea pts_28 Wanzhy pts_27	
	Prop Speaker #2 Stroun	79, Addison 27	Opp Speaker #2 Zhi	, (Wanzhy pts 27	
	27 = Good	0 = Perfect 29 = Out (but possibly not good	utstanding 28 = Very enough to qualify for e	y Good	
		Judgi	ing Criteria		
	 offered during the de Evidence: How apprevidence—which ma Argumentation: How by the other side Points of Information Delivery: How well and easily understand 	nably and effectively bate opriately and efficiency include facts and row directly and effect on: How relevant and the debaters speak in lable	the debaters analyzed the debaters analyzed the debaters supposed to authority ively the debaters result offective were the quan organized, comm	e the topic and the arguments port arguments with y as well as general knowledge pond to the arguments made uestions and the answers unicative style that is pleasant opponents and judges	
	Using the above criteria each debater:			estions for improvement to	~
(27)	Prop 1: Kareri y across rather your affirma especially with Contention of Prop 2: a better			very effective ng points across nr (lose of lives' nmend tion / division	(28) v
(a7)	addan you up with the contention we being lost to the team code #: 23	made up mulitary th mem sowe famili and it creat on the c	beit able being che ing peace ing peace mon (Opp)	hu a little neru to bounce bac allerged on P.O. I bate. valid points to to it's opposition	
				, ,	

Rou	InZutphen, Jane (*20) und 2B 11:15am Room 222 ov: 14 Kwong - Tan	Judge's Name: Jone Van Trofphen
Op	p: 7 Mohiuddin - Sharma rliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's Name: Jone Van Totphen Judge's School Affiliation: Pinole Volley H.5
	PROP Team Code #:	Y Team Code #: 7
	Prop Speaker #1 Tan, 54c	ephaniepts 28 Opp Speaker #1 16 h. oddin, Asimpts 27
	Prop Speaker #2 Kung;	Ryon pts 25 Opp Speaker #2 Home ks hat Shamus 27
	-	aker points based on the following scale:
	27 = Good	60 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 4-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
		Judging Criteria
	offered during the de	onably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments bate ropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with
	evidence—which ma	by include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge by directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
	 Points of Information Delivery: How well and easily understand 	the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant dable teous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
		a, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
(28 (28	Prop 1: Stephanis	opp 1: asim very effective in
-	points correla	Ting to, using research information
	topic at ha	and Did to counteract affects of negative on the limited behavior Well presented and
	topic. The d mi	red. Hed to counteract affects of regalive come the behavior. Well presented and professions for first finding positive eye contact.
(25)	hotter locus a	nd not sharma studies regarding
	lose trour of t	thought in 2000 anderson Hill case (4 incording
	bringing por	1 6 1 goodawe marke goods seeming
	TEAM CODE #:	on the <u>Prop</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)
	REASON FOR DECISION	fact finding research was involved there, of a correlation to the validity of Stephanies by it believable

McCabe, Linda (*27) Round 2A 11:15am Room 205 Gov: 22 Baxter - Nam	Judge's Name: Linda Malale
Opp. 2 Archibald - Hohmeyer Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High School
PROP Team Code #: 22	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Bax 1-11 pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Hohmeyer pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 \Quad pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Arch ka (d pts 26
Please award each speaker points base	ed on the following scale: = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	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 effect offered during the debate 	tively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	ficiently the debaters support arguments with
	and references to authority as well as general knowledge
 Argumentation: How directly and e 	effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	nt and effective were the questions and the answers
	ak/in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	/
• Courtesy: How courteous and respé	ctful the debaters were to opponents and judges
	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	Didnot make a clear distinction in first speech that
Prop 1: definition, define the of about and judging criteria. Gooduse of while	Opp 1: you disagreed wide finition of the term "war."
in closing speech, Your contentions	were your first speech had many examples, but none directly
a little weak, but they were not ro	LHOULTDEAD LILL to HAT & completely loss i our Closing speech was much
discoluted la ha #1	heter I would like to nail your test to the grained to
directly at all by Neg#1 speech.	Stop you from knocking them Very Distracting fort motions, but your
Prop 2: Good start to your speech note	Stop you from knocking them Very Distracting fort motions, but your Opp 2: hand motions are file
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
no relatations from Ness do bood and of slaves being freed as belongingto	than in your partner's first speech. Nico speaking style,
of slaves out of the secondary	A is the last of the state of t
benefits judgifs criteria. A little halten	A little halting, but this will improve alpractice
style, but this willings rove w/practice	
TEAM CODE #: on to	(Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	(Prop or Opp)
Aff did a better not str	ucturing the terms of the debate
and fad as and fa	win and harlite and

McCabe, Linda (*27) Round 2B 11:15am Room 205 Gov: 20 Alam - Nguyen	Judge's Name: Linda M'Cabl
Opp: 23 Roth - Yue Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: Windsur High School
PROP Team Code #: 2 0	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Nauyen pts 2	7 Opp Speaker #1 Roll pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 H (aw pts_2	Opp Speaker #2 14 pts 26
Please award each speaker points bas	
	9 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	t good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judain - Catharia
	Judging Criteria
offered during the debate	ctively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
•	efficiently the debaters support arguments with
·	and references to authority as well as general knowledge
-	effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
•	ant and effective were the questions and the answers
	eak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
•	ectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
	year in year to opponente una juages
	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater: bood set up for debate wide fine	The Mark of a marketing and a parter
Prop 1: type of debate, +erms. Show	
mentioned Judging criteria (notice in 2nd speech. Don't forgot that !) Go	you began by stating howyou would prove under
in Ind speech. Don't target that !/ UT	they and how your easy fulfilled that, Frong passio
examples for your contentions, were strong contentions, Good	they and how your easy fulfilled that, Strong passio
were strong contentials, Good	speaking style, but trying to minimize the significance
speaking style	your opponents examples by suggesting only Zin realwar
	Speaking style, but trying to minimize the significana your opponents examples by suggesting only 2 in real was: flat when Aff 2 brought up on third example, Sundy Hook? Style. Opp 2:
Prop 2: A little halting your speaking	wour Wigh! I hate spreading, Try to resist speed to hailt and hyperbole. Shifting blame to the victim finds
This will implove wifiactive. Iou started,	your Mgh! I hate Spreading Try to resist speed to
speech by retuting the Kleg case, then re	huilt and hyperbole. Shifting blame to the victim of viole. I time is not a winning strategy unless you are adofen.
your case, then went back to refuling he would be better to deter manage you more efficiently and not go back over same	vigors is not a winning strateau unless when In
I would be better to the manage you	1 fine lawyer and I have adoptent
of more officiently whateof go much ever same	Jon have a contident sporting sty
TEAM CODE #: on t	the Prop wins this debate.
	(Duan ali Onn)
REASON FOR DECISION:	I ride full their burden w/a
well structured and	sury further sur
we arriched class, of	he was side used hipertole as a
1	
means of regulation	P side fulfilled their burden w/an he was side used hyperbole as a which undersuined their creshbiller. BOARD AFTER ROUND WHEN ASKED

Lustig, Robert (*14) Round 2A 11:15am Room 204 Gov: 25 Owen - Coscarelli Opp: 7 Bardalai - Rangwala Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's Name: <u>USD</u> <u>Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell</u> .		
Team Code #: Sair u Koja	OPP Team Code #: Dolugy		
Prop Speaker #1 Dwem pts 27			
Prop Speaker #2 Cod case Co. pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 /Zangwall) pts28		
	n the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior		
Inde	ring Critoria		
 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 com each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to		
Prop 1: Mot every was has a white + loser (eq. Koream war Treaties do not define which the losers - May specify conent Test of affairs. Prop 2: Children games do not contitute war	Conflict.		
TEAM CODE #: on the on the President of mo clear with green 8	The most effortively		

Lustig, Robert (*14) Round 2B 11:15am Room 204	Judge's Name: USTO
Gov: 26 Clark - Flanagan Opp: 22 Caramucci - Tarleton	
Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation:
Team Code #: PROP 26' Sou mua	OPP Ciclen Team Code #: 5 an Man 22. Opp Speaker #1 Tallton pts 25
Prop Speaker #1 Flanaga pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Tallton pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 Oau pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Coramoci. pts 7
Please award each speaker points based	,
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Ju	dging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective 	rely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
	ciently the debaters support arguments with
	d references to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	cerivery the debaters respond to the arguments made
•	and effective were the questions and the answers
	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	,
Courtesy: How courteous and respects	ul the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer coreach debater:	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: The new cheenful of	Opp 1: Chilhen can't tell The difference
entertainment & NOT The sim	between a What and a comercial-The
of The neuro bearing of socialy ato	D' fort That They and fathe is millound.
/	Pour about mentally Il was good -
Niw Value statement at and	. Mil how do you measure court to feel
Prop 2: The yorking children foul	Opp 2: Storford study should
Prop 2: Nice value statement at end how fated	(BSSTV/VIDISO=)LISS VIOLENCE
Redundatorquement onyong children	So pout notmate
TEAM CODE #: 76, on the	Prop Gold models Do Killing. Onen Pistrims wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION: To Aco	Prop or Opp) Query of Sort menter So pout notmade Prop or Opp) Query of Sort menter So pout notmade Alle eg. Oncon Pistorius Prop or Opp) Query of Sort menter Query of
Steel	1 4 can fair to the war the state of the sta
coerstant points That ion	ld bobadeling.

Jia, Jack (*5)

	ack (*5) A 11:15am Room 202	Judge's Name: Tack Fa
Gov: 1	Schloten - Condello	Judge's Ivaine:
	2 Rice - Griggy nentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: Cwmpo
	PROP	OPP
	Team Code #:	Team Code #: 27
	Prop Speaker #1 Scholten pts 28.50	
	Prop Speaker #2 Condello pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Grigg y pts 20
	Please award each speaker points based on 30 = Perfect 29 = Or	the following scale: atstanding 28 = Very Good
		enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judgi	ng Criteria
		the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	offered during the debate	
	• Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and re	eferences to authority as well as general knowledge
		ively the debaters respond to the arguments made
	by the other side	
		deffective were the questions and the answers
	and easily understandable	an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
	Courtesy: How courteous and respectful	the debaters were to opponents and judges
1	Using the above criteria, please offer comp	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
pet, is	/	
sood, but	- new act.	Opp 1: Wood Analysis 29+28.5
	Prop 1: Good Analysis	Opp 1: Wood Malyers
move/	Good Evidence WWZ 128,5	WWI-> WWZ Growt bridenc
evidence	Croals / +0.5	Revolution War Civil war most
p14.	Good argn. or Rev. Wm	PTGD 26 Killed
1	previlege of all.	Dal of Dulleto - Otto d ansal
	Prop 2: 27	Opp 2: Nef. of won-good argu!
	(What it where is	Iraq war good axample!
	100 0160 2)	1 - 150 - GOON PNINONG
	- Dia and (17/989)	WNZ - freaty and won.
	TEAM CODE #: 22 on the OPTO	PP wins this debate.
	DEACON FOR DECICION.	. ()
Opro-	-> More evidence and 5	rrong orgument, Zexpect
{ r	Drop toam Lulle mor	e about how warshelped
	Deople (liberation	Garing lixeral et
	MUNICE CHIMINE) JUVVVVVD DUVUEDD CIC)

Jia, Jack (*5) Round 2B 11:15am Room 202 Gov: 14 Bystrom - Gast	Judge's Name: July DIA
Opp: 23 Samra - Yim Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: () .
Team Code #: PROP	OPP Team Code #: > 3
Prop Speaker #1 Py5776m pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 4 mm ra pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 17 NA pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
Please award each speaker points based of	n the following scale: outstanding 28 = Very Good
	denough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ring Criteria
	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	/
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficient	
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
	tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	1 -66 -4:
	d effective were the questions and the answers
and easily understandable	n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
,	the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer comp	oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater: a young kids/29+ 28	a let out anger->4 ound, 28+
Prop 1: Yole model, Mil Noving	Opp 1: 2 Maranes Yating Grand
-> good Anghyris and	fun and relax - good world - so
evidence (my my tel) reward for kning hyong point.	payent constat - 3 good with
a reward for kning	Sun and Yelax - Sood Litie
Anong bom.	hada Mill Don Contral gom was
3 habit, addicted. 29	The works and works
Prop 2: 7 Convincing	Opp 2: a Mitt from read World >> 30
Prop 2: 7 CONVINCING. any add anser teen problem Sood argu.	Orele model. 27
-> Sood argu.	and areas a vicilar on wom
of persent no control of your	Streonight Hymn
cypressive of killing >50 und 8	opponents point.
TEAM CODE #: on the	wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	op or Opp) Opponents Point, op or Opp)
Gester manyers	s and more evidence.

PARLI Debate	
lge's Name: Og Cob	
ge's School Affiliation:	
Team Code #: OPP	Million Proposed and the second second
aker#1 Kerr-Stein	pts_ <u>28</u>
peaker #2_Lee	_ pts <u>Z5</u>
	LANGE CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY

Jacol

Round 2 Gov: 2 Opp: Parlia

Judge's Name:	Judge's Name:	
Judge's School Aff	iliation:	
n page mata net transport page page to transport ment, in the mediane condition, such transport condition measurement from problems.	OPP (//	
Team Code #:_		
pts 27 Opp Speaker #1	11-Stell pts 28	
pts_Z7 Opp Speaker #2_L	ce pts <u>Z5</u>	
nts based on the following scale		
_	• /	
<20 = Reserved for	rude or inappropriate behavior	
Judging Criteria		
nd effectively the debaters analyz	ze the topic and the arguments	
	1	
y and efficiently the debaters sun	mort arguments with	
e facts and references to outhorit		
	Judge's School Aff Team Code #:_ pts Opp Speaker #1 pts Opp Speaker #2 Ats based on the following scale ect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Veribly not good enough to qualify for coor Judging Criteria and effectively the debaters analyze and efficiently the debaters sup	

- e—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:

caen acouter.	
Prop 1: Number your contentions. Give me at least one dear example of a won war, and what makes it that.	Opp 1: How does arguing that "Both sides win" disprove the resolution?. Very confident speaking style. GREAT SPEAKER. Careful about language from resolution: "Even the one side clearly wer the Civil War], it didn't: -configuration.
Prop 2: You need to the Ur pts more closely to the resolution.	Opp 2: Please help me understand analytically how I sha assur the question that the resolution possible on the bigger picture.
TEAM CODE #: 27 on the	wins this debate.

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

Jacobs, Joel (*3) Round 2B 11:15am Room 227	Clarify Clarify
Gov: 24 Scott - Ambrose 5th	Judge's Name: \(\sum_\text{QCOUS}\)
Opp: 14 Lawrence - Privalov - Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: De WO PA
THE STATE OF THE S	
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Scott 270	Opp Speaker #1 \ \ awrong \ pts \ \ \ \ Dopp Speaker #1 \ \ \ \ awrong \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
Prop Speaker #2 Prop Speaker #2	Opp Speaker #2 Private pts 7
Please award each speaker points based of	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	ging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate 	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
_	iently the debaters support arguments with
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
 Argumentation: How directly and effe by the other side 	tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
	nd 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	al the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	resolution
Prop 1: Short speech. In an engiral round like this one, U can fill up ur speech W	opp 1: They 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.
1 WY UNUMONIO No. T AA /	up after the round. We must be in so. I
of Violence (as opposed to MIT study re "You have no facts" - I think unean "evidence." Jour the flu work on rebutted organization Interest on the flu work on rebutted organization, "not "rebuten." Good use of MIT stud.	peeon.
"You have no forte" - I think uman "evidence" . M. DI.	w. Good attack on MIT Study, good analysis.
Work on rebuttal organization - bit so your the 110	Opp 2: Tell me prowhere on the flow-you started of
Good use of MIT study.	1st Opp Contestion. I for Roydown as angully to be
Talk about difference by the contraction and correlate	overdone, but a few words talling to when it am on the
in context of crime rates.	1st opp contention. I find Roadmans generally to be Overdone, but a few words telling the where u are on the flow would help. How does nextel illness point refute resolution
Give multiple responses: talk about MT study and 9	thear old who killed parents is
TEAM CODE #: on the _	rop or Opp) The boss ments in response to each arg (that the rop or Opp) The boss ments in response to each arg (that the rop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION: A L	Prop or Opp)
has supporting evidence, One doesn't. One a	top dr Opp) force and as defined is an empirical Claim. Prop its all eggs in mental illness busket, but doesn't connect to
C) while of one 14 / 1	Mys in mentin miness busket, but obesit connect to
Working of Speaning/analysis was	otherwise pretty everly matched. resolution.

Choy, Suzie (*4) Round 2A 11:15am Room 201 Gov: 14 Ng - Huang	Judge's Name: Susie Chon
Gov: 14 Ng - Huang Opp: 1 Ochoa - Chand	
Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP 14	OPP
ream Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 N6 pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Chand pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 Huding pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Chand pts 25
Please award each speaker points based o	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	ging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate 	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	ently the debaters support arguments with
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
	ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	•
• Points of Information: How relevant a	nd effective were the questions and the answers
and easily understandable	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
,	al the debaters were to opponents and judges
- Courtesy: How counted and respecting	if the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer com each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1:	Opp 1:
Prop 1:	Opp 1: aprent job addressing Prop points.
eat job onlyning case.	apread pop adaption 110 points.
living of style were good.	Evidence la guments were well done.
couple pts/made by Opp with yor indicated weren Hardren Prop 2:	
und you thereased when Hardren	ned.
Prop 2:	Opp 2:
Ton to moreca voice a like	hed to do letter job supporting arguments
14.62	parted by norther.
man de la company de la compan	Opp 2: need to do better job supporting arguments Aarted by purher. Try to be more untidend.
TEAM CODE #: 14 on the P	Prop wins this debate.
(P. REASON FOR DECISION:	rop of Opp)
had the toughow orde, opp 1	ded a fantadiz job terring prop untentions
verer, Opp 2 dodn4 follow argui	nexts and seemed to support Prop.

Opp 2 also dropped a comple issues.

Choy, Suzie (*4) Round 2B 11:15am Room 201	Judge's Name: Surie Chun
Gov: 27 Campanella - Petruska Opp: 11 Arshad - Sankar Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP Team Code #: 27	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Companella pts 27	Opp Speaker #1pts_28
Prop Speaker #2 Petrus/ca_pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Sanka pts 28 Opp Speaker #2 Archad pts 27
	utstanding 28 = Very Good I enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
 Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficie evidence—which may include facts and note and an effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful 	d effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
Prop 1:	Opp 1:
aper plume I delivery, bired she	great job ordining case of
need to four on using entire time	great job ordining case of poking holes in prop whentims
to expand make points.	
Prop 2:	Opp 2:
planter than referencing pt \$1, \$2, etc. you should restate what the contention was.	great job supporting portner of
Try but to speak so loudly to portner when Opp 13 speaking. TEAM CODE #: 11 on the Property of the Property o	Opp wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	
games but den 4 lead to volen	931. of housholds havelplay video & behavior never addressed by

Prop.

Bardalai, Snigdho (*7) Round 2A 11:15am Room 207 Gov: 14 Lee - Fairchild	Judge's Name: Emerald Greter
Opp: 5 Wu - Ayalon Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Fairchild pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Ayalon pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Lee pts 22	Opp Speaker #2 Wu pts 28
Please award each speaker points based on	the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good
	enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Judg	ing Criteria
9	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficie	ntly the debaters support arguments with
• • • • •	eferences to authority as well as general knowledge
	ively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	d effective were the questions and the answers
	an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	All and all accompanies are as a superior of the desired
• Courtesy: How courteous and respectful	the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1:- Not very sure of your.	Opp 1: - Watch your Ums.
self. Be confident in your speech	- Almost no eye contact.
+ Chreat eye contact.	- Finish your speech before walking auch
+ Good pacing and tom.	+ Great Flow and organization.
Don't say I guess' be sure of	
Prop 2: USE Your TIME.	Opp 2:-Work on organization of speech.
-NO and contact	
-No eye contact	- Fast paoing made some words inaudible
- Made one weak point and	Tasa po emig
than ended your speech.	
	wins this debate.
DEACON FOR DECISION.	op or Opp)
READON FOR DECISION:	was all a their side was
The OPP took their time ou	tlining why their side was zed and confident in what
were organi	
they presented.	

Bardalai, Snigdho (*7) Round 2B 11:15am Room 207	Judge's Name: Emerald Geter
Gov: 14 Rettenmaier - Pineda	Judge's Name. VIVO WIG OFFICE
Opp: 2 Galvan-Carty - Lisy Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation:
Team Code #: PROP 4	Team Code #: 2
	Opp Speaker #1 USY pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Fettenma ier pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Galvan-Cartypts 28
	the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good l enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Inda	ing Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effectivel offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficie evidence—which may include facts and at a contract the Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant an Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater: 	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments only the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made deffective were the questions and the answers of an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: t Very confident.	Opp 1: + Great eye contact.
tclear focus.	- Warch the Umis.
- Watch the Um's	+ Very organized.
+ Cyreat summary and wrap up.	
Prop 2: + Vury Organized Watch the Um's	Opp 2: + Confident + Great tone and paeing.
t Great Job refuting contentions.	- could have used your time to refute PROP contentions.
TEAM CODE #: on the (Pr	PFOP wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	shad what had dear some
The PROP was very orgethat stood throughout th	anized, they had clear points e round.

WAR CAN BE WO	PARLI Debate
Cabasino, Mark (*13) Round 2A 11:15am Room 224	Judao'a Nama
Gov: 23 Cheng - Wei	Judge's Name:
Opp: 14 Luk - Tserennamid Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation:
Team Code #: PROP 23	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 CHENG pts	Opp Speaker #1pts
Prop Speaker #2 WE pts	Opp Speaker #2 TSERENNAMIS pts
Please award each speaker points based on	n the following scale: putstanding 28 = Very Good
	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
` • •	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ging Criteria
_	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
Evidence: How appropriately and efficie and a providence which recovered to the factor and	
	references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	invery the debaters respond to the arguments made
	d effective were the questions and the answers
- ,	n 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 compeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: God general definitions	Opp 1: God teldsprient of case with
and good voting issues in	lot of whose examples
	(C = MAT R H
the fact speedy. Try to add	a contraction (ballenization, etc).
Converte specifics to	(Styrin, ww I, Ballenization, etc). Be sure to accept / reject definitions in 1st speech and State votor usues in 3rd speech
Pron 2.	Onn?
steph out you case. Prop 2: Coul its responding to neg	Opp 2: Good job adding additioned examples
Contentions lexengles (sey, China	to Support your side (Isis,
Contentions lexemples (sey, Chuna hack, LINI). Your own care is Still a bit vague and news more stration	This you might be switched wand of 3C.
TEAM CODE #: on the	wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION: (PA	op or Opp)
Opp had numerous examples	to support this that case.
OPP also used more of its	allotted time for case and
for Cebuttals. Off had	persusive parties appeal and clear delivery.

VIOLENT VIDEO GAI	nes LEAD	To VIOLENT PARLI Debate	BEHAVIOR
Cabasino, Mark (*13) Round 2B 11:15am Room 224		Judge's Name:	1cc
Gov: 2 Hemerling - Barnett		sudge o rume.	72
Opp: 23 Habib - Keshav Parliamentary Debate/Novice	CONTROL OF THE CONTRO	Judge's School Affiliation:	
PROP Team Code #:	2)	OPP Team Code #:	(2)
Prop Speaker #1 HEMERL Prop Speaker #2 RARNET	1NG pts 28 C	pp Speaker#1_HAB15	5 pts 30
Prop Speaker #2 KARNET	pts	Opp Speaker #2KESHA	4V pts 26
Please award each speak	-	the following scale: tstanding 28 = Very Goo	
		enough to qualify for elimina	
•		<20 = Reserved for rude o	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Judgir	ng Criteria	
	ably and effectively	the debaters analyze the to	opic and the arguments
offered during the deb		41 41- a dala/4	
- -		tly the debaters support are ferences to authority as we	
		vely the debaters respond	
by the other side	,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
 Points of Information 	: How relevant and	effective were the questio	ns and the answers
-		an organized, communicat	ive style that is pleasant
and easily understanda	,		
• Courtesy: How courte	ous and respectful t	he debaters were to oppon	ents and judges
Using the above criteria, each debater:	please offer compl	iments and/or suggestion	s for improvement to
D . G. J duce		0 1 (5 2 1)	
Prop 1: Good clear cont	when and	Opp 1: Good organi	ition with thorough
a few good examples		Evidence 1 Strong	command of voicebolary,
tud continue ext	croed with more	and smars (ebutt.	nls. You speak
examples evilence. A	lsy bring up	already at the	
		and should compet	e there. Good voter
Frop 2:	only couse) entry,	issues (eg. worsel	e there. Good voter ation not causation) ex.
Prop 2:			
Good medote of	Storth A?		dropped point about
TON games. Goo!	POINT WENT HIM		munities have nive people.
Villace belones "non	nul of the	But what other point	s were supped? And what are
Try to vice more of you	is allotted time.	100 (ebuttal) to AF	F contentions? You underused
TEAM CODE #:	on the \bigcirc	wins this debate.	s were propped: And what are F contentions? You undervised you allosted time severely.
REASON FOR DECISI ON:			•
			ng the burdens and backing
ab contempor mith	several conc	ex examples, resu	tting all points in
order with wirespon	J'my Contentions AFF had goo	I and fleshing out of eno	the speeches to their who evidence to support.

Zaheer, Affan (*8) Round 2A 11:15am Room 208 Gov: 20 Mart - Andola Opp: 23 Ho - Prashanth	ı	Judge's Name:_	Affa	n Zaheee Duslin High	
Parliamentary Debate/No	ovice	Judge's School A	Affiliation:	Dusin mgh	
	PROP	rykan i 1990-te 1990-te 1995-te 1996-te 1996-te 1996-te 1996-te 1996-te 1996-te 1996-te 1996-te 1996-te 1996-t	OPP	makeuwan vu a 1 traj allela gale wa windeliji (), (), () to (), () () a (), () () () () () () () () () () () () ()	
Team Code #:			¥:		
Prop Speaker #1_	Andola pts 24 Mark pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Но	ptg/ 27	
Prop Speaker #2	Mask pts 27	Opp Speaker #2/	Prashout	pts	
	each speaker points based on 30 = Perfect 29 = O 7 = Good (but possibly not good	Outstanding $28 = V$	Very Good		
26-25 = Fair				inappropriate behavior	
	Jude	ging Criteria			
 evidence— Argumenta by the other Points of It Delivery: Hand easily use Courtesy: It 	How appropriately and efficient which may include facts and attion: How directly and effect raide information: How relevant and How well the debaters speak in anderstandable How courteous and respectful we criteria, please offer compared to the courteria of the courteria of the courteria of the courteria of the criteria of the courteria of the courteria of the courteria of the criteria of the courteria of the criteria of the courteria of the criteria of the	references to authoritively the debaters and effective were the nan organized, could the debaters were	ority as well respond to ne questions mmunicativ to opponer	as general knowledge the arguments made and the answers se style that is pleasant ats and judges	
Prop 1:	, /	Onn 1: Garage	0 presal	atri. Nead to	
	g you point	be mare	Stevilor	ed a organized	2
to stress the but closure a	8 cal. Good Gramples	Sood pli	i en c	eost/price 1/8 bene	6
Prop 2: nood fresentation sue with rebuth nt world help.	of delivey. A strong	Opp 2: Good	e studi	flow a closure	l−
TEAM CODE #	(Pr	op or Opp)	s debate.		

Zaheer, Affan (*8) Round 2B 11:15am Room 208 Gov: 2 Fickinger - Williams Opp: 20 Le - Rather	Judge's Name: Affan Zaheee Judge's School Affiliation: Dustin High		
Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: Dustin High		
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #: 20		
Prop Speaker #1 Fickinger pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Ralker pts 28		
Prop Speaker #2 William pts	Opp Speaker #2pts		
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)		
T	daina Cuitonia		
 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: 			
Great stat acting criterial definition Topic was tough to negate, could used some vice from delivery a presentation. bette cramples to make a point in your toward. Ending was weak a should be improved.			
Prop 2: Good points. Please forus on a more eye contact a be precise. Too many words at times	Opp 2: Presentation was weak a not reary organized. Point were good. Need to connect better via examples to prove your point		
	Prop or Opp)		

REASON FOR DECISION:

Sankaralingam, Avu (*2) Round 2A 11:15am Room 206 Gov: 5 Hinchcliff - McKinney Opp: 20 Valle - Pollard Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's Name: <u>AVU SANKARALINGAM</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>BENTLEY</u>
PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 5	Team Code #: 26
Prop Speaker #1 Mckinton pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Pollmol pts 20
Prop Speaker #2 McKinney pts 25	Opp Speaker #2 Valley pts 27
Please award each speaker points based	l on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Ju	ıdging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effecti 	vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	iciently the debaters support arguments with
 	nd references to authority as well as general knowledge
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	fectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side Points of Information: How relevant	and effective were the questions and the answers
	k in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and respect	tful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer co	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1:	Opp 1: Started by refuting other team's argument. Themselves time
	is Started by sefuting other teams
Good j'ob of defining the to	argument.
- Could bolster the definition	nid is a give themselves home
by "why?	is plan more emphicate
- undernined the care a win	now to make their course it is not benefit
- Could bolster the d'efinition by "why? - undermines the care a little - Prop 2: has making it too me	Did n'1 give them selves time source their care: more remplicated to make their care: more remplicated opp 2: pecause it is net-benefit a better job of engaging the
in call ename other realties	
argument instead of just dismissing it as not soundefin	other teams agranis
dismissing it as not som defin	on - with net-senefit argument flids
TEAM CODE #: 5 on the	Prop with net-benefit argument you int laid out the cost. clida? (Prop or Opp) The benefit argument you clida? Engle the benefit.
REASON FOR DECISION:	(Prop or Opp)
ALASON FOR DECISION.	and with benefit of war only 63h
ENTROPINE TO THE TOTAL	O o denet core:
but wanted to make a	1 11 a sidence to their care teller
pro-side was at	gazed with benefit of war only cost nei-benefit case. de to adduce evidence to their care teller

Sankaralingam, Avu (*2) Round 2B 11:15am Room 206 Gov: 7 Kaura - Gajula	Judge's Name: BENTLEY Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEY
Opp: 12 Murdock - Santana Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEY
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #: \2
——————————————————————————————————————	Opp Speaker #1 Murdock, pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 kmra pts 250	Opp Speaker #2 Santang. pts 26
27 = Good (but possibly not good)	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	ging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficie evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant at Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable 	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments iently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer comeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Liked Structure of argume - Two propositions	of Opp 1: Started with a strong refutation
- Two propositions	-but greaterated same point as
In pote proposition.	argument. Combining the two.
Did a good Job 4	nideally policies are
Opperitor.	from before. Just restated it.
TEAM CODE #: on the	Prof. wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION: Apprical ted argument	with some evidence. Was able
to underent opportion	premse potation of
"Not all violence "	reach to be laund by video games"

Owen, Jeff (*25) Dund 2A 11:15am Room 225 OV: 20 Byrne - Pareja	Judge's Name: Deen
pp: 2 Lanzone - Hubinger arliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation Jack Posa High School
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Byone pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Lan Zoe pts 200
Prop Speaker #2 Pace pts 98	Opp Speaker #2 Lan Zone pts 200
27 = Good (but possibly not good	a the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ing Criteria
 • Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and the substitution of the street evidence of the	d effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges
Prop 1: Very exercise. Nice pos Staying slow a concise in Your Message	Opp 1: Essective is to becoming on the agreets the detate hinging on the desire of war.
Prop 2: Relax before you shall belling	Opp 2: Excalant job in working with you teamway
TEAM CODE #: 20 on the 2 (Pro	
The state of the s	is of stating " won" way achieving the sees a trady. Case job so

Owen, Jeff (*25) Round 2B 11:15am Room 225 Gov: 23 Zhai - Khan	Judge's Name:
Opp: 14 Fong - Geller Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: Sandalan High Solay
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 2 pts 20	Opp Speaker #1 Caler pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 For g pts 96	Opp Speaker #2 Forg pt 90
Please award each speaker points based o $30 = Perfect$ $29 = C$	n the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jude.	ging Criteria
•	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
 Evidence: How appropriately and efficience evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant are Delivery: How well the debaters speak is and easily understandable 	ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge envely the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer come each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Excellent job on. Stating the definition. God Flower thoughts	Opp 1: Your Presentation was
Prop 2: Grant Sucardion in Docessing on the delinities	Opp 2: Great presentation slow down! Focus on quality not quentity of arguments
so as to include Mental & emol	Prop wins this debate. rop or Opp) excellent job of stating the definition from as reall as Physical. Opp did a y Physical but not the other aspects

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: JUNDAR RAMACOMY

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN HAN

PROP	OPP 14
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Chippa pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Me (man pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Che rukun' pts 25	Opp Speaker #2 Wes pts 216

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 = Fair24-20 = 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 men letter, talked about one Cause which Scould bef for Good. mostly cooled at the opponent, no utilized much or his time Not Prop 2: Mice Stont, Talked about only the good caused for wan but not for and. Had eye contact Talked back an assumption, net impaco.

Opp 1: Good Start, newword dreet me civit um and priviled out the issues like vecus, to, some lives ete. Not much else contact. Read mostly. Auswerd the Aff's question provided some factor. Opp 2: Start is good, withe takked it seem, and en contention, willed about the spending and its

wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:

Off fear is strong en rein peints and mul professional. In over all, son remail goods one if he somewhen in OPP Em eld vit even hand smalle.

Violent Video sames lend to w. cent PARLI Debate

Sundararamen, Siva (*22)

some their bein

Round 2B 11:15am Room 228 Gov: 4 O'Rafferty - Figueroa Opp: 14 Chao - Wang Parliamentary Debate/Novice Judge's Name: SUNDAR RAMA SANY

Judge's School Affiliation: LAN WARIN HIGH ScHOOL

PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 O'Raffer by pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Wang pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Figue rek pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Choo pts 76
Please award each speaker points base	d 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 = Fair24-20 = 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: broad Start; copticized Opp 1: Spark is Soul newbouned a the violent wides samel about potur feren in post are non Letting sealing and Jerry much news about willing or said believes due to video Same. prents for hu Same/ Great Had a little ilsue in place voice, Had eye contact, Wheel Difficulty is affaitably near not Opp 2: men clear beet este contun. Tried her belt, tota of repenting about onlying. Little basta, neutrind media of all Prop 2: Started on the anice Surviva and resedeferm, clear in Start in Soud, dinen a different perpedu. People core ause while plusny areturally the point rated about how it impacts the kidse. and ruens buch itself. So every wir snow much ofter from De imparts the decision makely prices explained 144 back. parents & reman sured wins this debate. Leach bet reality & Via Cylene TEAM CODE #: O'Kaftery & on the AFF as will for a park opp's gressian a park Figueroa eppy grasmireason for DECISION: 4 Just based on few nature it mas topic, rue Aff Lean had were points to ball up than opp. Even from

Assiculation perspective, Aff is better from opp. Both beam

NIKHILMEHTA(8)	PARLI Debate
Chen; Hong (*23) Round 2A 11:15am Room 210 Gov: 14 Duan - Kim	Judge's Name: NIKHIL MEHTA
Opp: 20 Jerez - Moran Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: DNS (Dublin High)
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #: 2 0
Prop Speaker #1 Dyam pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Jere2 pts 2
Prop Speaker #1 Dvam pts 28 Prop Speaker #2 km pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Pts 29
27 = Good (but possibly not good	a the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rade or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ing Criteria
 Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful 	eferences to authority as well as general knowledge ively the debaters respond to the arguments made deffective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
Prop 1: Good Analysis of the topic, but strong Speaker but barguments not supported	Opp 1: Presented good Argument's Supported by Evidence and facts, Good Demery
Prop 2: Strong speaker beganded well to the argument but Aparagain the argument not will supported by Fruitne	Opp 2: 600d Analysi, Can improve nove on dehucty, strong tryment
TEAM CODE #: 20 on the (Pro	op or Opp) wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	and the same
asquirent with Endeno	responded directly and support

0

NIKHILMEHTA(35)	PARLI Debate
Chen, Hong (*23) Round 2B 11:15am Room 210 Gov: 18 Nash - Thrasher	Judge's Name: NIKHIL MEHTA
Opp: 14 Lyons - Wyszynski Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: Dubin High (DMS)
PROP Team Code #: 8	Team Code #: 4
Prop Speaker #1 pts_	28 Opp Speaker #1 1 pop pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Throusher pts	30 Opp Speaker #2 Wyszynski pts 28
Please award each speaker points b	pased on the following scale: 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
$26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	
	Judging Criteria
• Analysis. How reasonably and ef	fectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	rectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	d efficiently the debaters support arguments with
	ets and references to authority as well as general knowledge
	nd effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	vant and effective were the questions and the answers
	speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and res	spectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offe each debater:	er compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	1
Prop 1: Good Dehingey but a	an Opp 1: Strong speaker, good
improve. Reherant Pos	I Arguments but not well
600d Analysis	Arguments but not well cupposted by emiliance
Prop 2: Excellent Delniery	Opp 2: strong speaker, orogiment
Ground Analysis and all A	ogunal were of maintopin of "violat video games
supposted my appropriate	la Lack of Evidence.
Enidence.	l l
TEAM CODE #: 0	n the wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	(Prop or Opp)
Both teams were re	ally good but judgement is based
on the Argument a	ally good but judgement is based and Evidence provided by teamfile

			PARLI	Debate		
Maddhuri, B Round 2A 11:15am Gov: 14 Chan - Opp: 18 Raven	Room 200 Foley				MADDHO	
Parliamentary D			Judge's School	Affiliation:	PUINCTOI	U HIGH
Team Co	PROP ode#: 14	edard todaya Garage and regar where it have a Guida (1995).	Team Code	OPP	18	east tudop contygue:
	eaker#I <u>Cham</u>			Raven.		٤
Prop Spe	eaker #2 Foley.	pts_ <u>29</u>	Opp Speaker #2	Figher	pts_2	<u>-</u> 7
Please		erfect 29 = 0	on the following so Outstanding 28 denough to qualify	Very Good		
26-25			<20 = Reserved			ehavior
offe Evi evic Arg by t Poi Del and Cor Using t each de		tely and efficient to the decision of the deci	ently the debaters of references to authoritively the debaters and effective were to an organized, could the debaters were pliments and/or second sec	support arguments respond to the questions ommunicative to opponents suggestions	uments with I as general know the arguments s and the answe ve style that is p nts and judges for improvem	owledge made ers pleasant
Sulty well Very Good Olose Prop 2:	Defined to l. confidunt, the d paperation vation. Cood refu confidunt, to POIs.	aughtful and	You Can got the fl Opp 2: Good	busent low, you of your	well on well a su did	ining to loss. I Neg. Ce you job very good job improve in muganics Can be

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

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Team 14 did a better Job on analysis, evedince

Arguments, POTS & Courtesy

	PARLI Debate
Maddhuri, Babu (*11) Round 2B 11:15am Room 200 Gov: 22 Burrous - Blackenburg	Judge's Name: BABU MADDHURI
Opp: 26 Goody - Sherman Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: IRUINGTON HIGH.
PROP Team Code #: 22	OPP Team Code #: 26 ·
Prop Speaker #1 Burrous pts 28 Prop Speaker #2 Blackenbug. pts	Opp Speaker #1 Goody, pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Blackenbug. pts 24	Opp Speaker #2 Sherman. pts 28
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
Youth	ging Criteria
offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficiency evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant are Delivery: How well the debaters speak is and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful Violence and Violence and Violence and Using the above criteria, please offer come each debater:	ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges to the behavior. I the debaters were to opponents and judges to the behavior. pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
REASON FOR DECISION: Thorong	Prepare well and be independent of your foutner-sities with is currently impairing your flow.
and Countery.	des) with the

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 #:	Team Code #:		
	Opp Speaker #1 Zheng pts 30		
Prop Speaker #2 Berck pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 We; 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 aprent, well	Opp 1: Good confidence. Very polite. Good refutation		
Spoken. Well sign posted Well organized You	on case. I would like more depth on your		
need to compertmentalize your arguments.	canter contentions. Establish a round type.		
Give me a criteria and round type.	You really contradict with your CCI.		
DEAGON FOR DEGICION	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. Prop wins this debate. Op of Opp) From opp means I evaluate round through		
the affirmative framing	ig, meaning neg has no rish of offense,		

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: Callege Park		
PROP	OPP		
Team Code #:	Team Code #:		
Prop Speaker #2 Dwg pts 38 Prop Speaker #2 pts 38	Opp Speaker #1 Forg pts &		
Prop Speaker #2 0 cg pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Liguran pts 28		
Please award each speaker points based on 30 = Perfect 29 = Ou 27 = Good (but possibly not good)	TO A TOTAL CONTROL OF THE CONTROL OF		
	ing Criteria of the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments		
 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 understandableCourtesy: How courteous and respectful	the debaters were to opponents and judges		
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to		
Prop 1: You never actually say there is a link between Videogenes and violent behavior! The first time you say video grass cause behavior is in the rebuttal.	Opp 1: Good Franciwork press. Great argument on CCd, saying video games can actually reduce violence, turns all of the aff rase.		
Prop 2: you need to do more worken framework, Honestly you are in a huge hole going into the MG. I Still hourst heard on example of vileogenes causing violence. TEAM CODE #: Decreased on the (Pro	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. Opp wins this debate.		
REASON FOR DECISION: Aff fails	to provide any warrants.		

Ambrose, Mrs (*24) Round 2A 11:15am Room 223	Judge's Name: The Ta Amboos
Gov: 2 Greenwall - DuPuy Opp: 22 Sundararaman - Elmhirst	Judge's Name: Specie Trobio
Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP	OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #: 22
Prop Speaker #1 Care Out pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Clash & pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Du Puy pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Successor Opp Speaker #2
Please award each speaker points based of	
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
$27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
20-25 - Fair $24-20 = Foor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	ging Criteria
	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	Southers to 1/1
·	iently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge
	ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	on very the decides respond to the diguments made
•	nd effective were the questions and the answers
	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
Courtesy: How courteous and respectful	al the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	p
Prop.1: Try to have more	Opp 1: Concise, well articulated.
eng contact. Good to	Besure to have source for
a relative of pt. by pt	definition of you have a more
why Prop praged posetion	
The process process	to a source - aver validity
Prop 2:	Opp 2: refused contentions were
nice you phighde	Then if it is a comman
in opp. definition	
44.0	assumption by society. That to still an opinion - need to
TEAM CODE #: on the _	ADP wins this debate. Substantiate
	rop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	, , ,
Page Mr. 200 March Dol	I with the so to Snonity
The pronoces your org	Invitat to perented Specific Deptation conscioned and examples
1. b - X - 2 - 2 - 1	The one were and when

Ambrose, Mrs (*24)

ov: 23 Eizner - He	Judge's Names De la thouse
pp: 8 Zaheer - Chaudhri	Judge le Cabard A Stillerian Ch
arliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 23	Team Code #: S
Prop Speaker #1 2 pts	· ·
Prop Speaker #2 pts	27 Opp Speaker #2 Chaudhi pts 28
Please award each speaker points b	
	29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	< 20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and ef offered during the debate 	fectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and	d efficiently the debaters support arguments with
	cts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
-	nd effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side Points of Information: How rele	evant and effective were the questions and the answers
	speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	Spour in fine enganteen, construction to specific many in processing
• Courtesy: How courteous and res	spectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offe each debater:	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
Prop 1: Good dear deli	the Opp 1: Correlation vs. consettion
and pts. Thirday re:	Good the of - 123
Online herosoft wa	Coupe Mind of reversing potential
not supported week.	cause. Violent betan 7 plansing
•	volend
	gas
Prop 2: refused of w bea	Opp 2: C
Certoon Am Cal	Opp 2: Goodship Later of
certoon, Socoligo.	probane Rouered is violence
	- Prof presented by pro. &
C C	
TEAM CODE #: 0	n thewins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	(Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	1. V Og vove 10.DI & Applant
Upp. Showed What p	nop tarles to prove
was a result o	planne violent video games 3B
Whiteline number les	nop. failed to prove violent beland B planie violent video games, 3 B no logical reasons, held boland 3 CA 7
5 0 3.0-0	Therefore HT

Nash, Jennifer (*18) Round 2A 11:15am Room 226 Gov: 20 Afzal - Kelly	Judge's Name: Jernifer Wish
Opp: 7 Maitra - Aggarwal Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomery High
PROP 20	Team Code #:
•	Opp Speaker #1 Aggarwal pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Afzal pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Maitoa pts 28
	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Juc	lging Criteria
 Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and efficient by the other side Points of Information: How relevant a Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectif 	ciently the debaters support arguments with direferences to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant full the debaters were to opponents and judges in pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 2: God Style. Nice job of addressing opponnets curguments, need more rebuttal points/support. TEAM CODE #: on the General of facts	Prop or Opp)

Nash, Jennifer (*18) Round 2B 11:15am Room 226 Gov: 11 Wang - Lin	Judge's Name: Ulmiter Uash
Opp: 14 Holwitz - Kay Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: Montgemeny High School
Team Code #: Wood	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 way pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Holwitz pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Lin pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 hCly pts 27
	the following scale: utstanding 28 ≠ Very Good lenough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	ing Criteria
 Evidence: How appropriately and efficie evidence—which may include facts and/r Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater: Prop 1: Crossing the control of th	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments partly the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge cively the debaters respond to the arguments made deffective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: Op
Prop 2: Exad Use of evidence, although specific evidence	Opp 2: God Use of facts. God speaking style.
reason for decision: Prop team of citing specific evident both teams had excert	Not wins this debate. Top or opp) I did a bester job Ce in presentation, although ent organents.

	PARLI Debate			
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			
The state of the s	(19 For a surrounderford and continued and c			
Team Code #:	Team Code #:			
Prop Speaker #1 Goldstoin pts 2				
Prop Speaker #2 Krish naswagypts 2	8 Opp Speaker #2 Oh madi pts 27			
	sed on the following scale: 9 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good t good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)			
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior			
 Analysis: How reasonably and effect offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and evidence—which may include facts Argumentation: How directly and by the other side Points of Information: How relevated belivery: How well the debaters speand easily understandable 	Judging Criteria ctively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments efficiently the debaters support arguments with and references to authority as well as general knowledge effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers eak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ectful the debaters were to opponents and judges			
Using the above criteria, please offer each debater: Prop 1:+ Good delivery 4 of the dean definition of the contention of the short speech	- delivery needs some work (less stutters)			
Prop 2: + Good delivery + good eye contact + Sign post	Opp 2: definition should be used + good argument under own definition - rebutted is not clear on affective Next better argument and better argument of the PROP wins this debate.			

REASON FOR DECISION:

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

(Prop or Opp)

War can be won

NEG 1) as objective to achieve Def: benefitial (short speech) a) Long-lasting after effect Reb. War & (stutters a bit) Rebuttal: both sides soffers loss P.J. if bloodshed is intentional? (2) treaty c) Gut can't do job example: Eng. v Fr. (2) Road map: Rebuttel Few war w/o bloodly def: stands value Neg def not fair Net benefits Economic impact Res. only about winnig/losing Ex. Spain treaty of wars

Reh Aff: def. stands Neg never explain why Def should be beneficial Not debaty under the obf. Reb Beneficial debate
a) loy-lasting aftereffet
b) Govt court do joh.

	PARLI Debate
Sen Frioia (4) 28 11:15am Room 203 27 Cohlen - Lemenager	Judge's Name: Chien Fang
2 Colbert - Clark mentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Victor
PROP 7	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Cohen pts 26	
Prop Speaker #2 Lemona go / pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 <u>Clark</u> pts <u>28</u>
Please award each speaker points base	ed on the following scale: = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
$26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
,	Judaina Cuitonia
	Judging Criteria
	tively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
	ficiently the debaters support arguments with
-	and references to authority as well as general knowledge
-	effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	/
	nt and effective were the questions and the answers
- <i>- 1</i>	ak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and respec	ctful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer ceach debater:	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: + good framework, dear do	ef. Opp 1: good delivery
+ strong, evidence - based	+ many contentions on
t very good delivery	benefits of violent nideo gam
+ Very good delivery	- did not laws ovide as
+ Excellent final rebut	tal - did not have evidence on why violent V.G. do not lead to viole
Prop 2: + Example-based rebutto	of opp 2: + good rebuttal on why v.G. itself ved can have be beneficial
- delivery can be impro- less tauses, smoothers	ved can have be beneficiel
lless pauses, smoothersp	- delivery can be improved

Prop has a clear definition & framework for the debate. Frovided evidence and strong arguments. Opp Tries to scripter the Prop arguments by blaming the parents on kids themselves. However, this is not what the resolution is really about.

on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

1 Factual, what eincumstance Neg-has prove beyond a doubt

a) Children most impressionable

b) Glorifies Violence aim to kill / death is objetive

c) Evidence - Soundy Hook shooter play violent video games (effecting delivery)

Agree W/ Def.

(Reb), V.G. rated for age (failure is an parents)

To crime produtes V.G.

· vehicle for venting

· social aspects helps teens to veit

· Sandy Hook: parental farline

(2) Sign Post

@ restate contention & Rebuttal by example

teen depression > V.G.

-> poor behavior

-> cruely to younger sill

Sarly Hook: Shorter play

violent V.G. -> leads to real

Glorifies Violence - by example J.F.K assain

Human nature is violent

V.G. amplifies it.

Meb Opp mis inhappeted Resolution

V. G itself not perental responsibility

ar game developer.

Crim is not subject of debate

V.G. incresses violent behavior

Has evidence 1 opp has not.

Rebuttal: parental failue because of rating.

S.H shooter has mental illner O(P, I, he did not)

· Kid mature enough to Know fiction from red

' vent anger

· safe haven for social

gathery

chidren emp.

Age Rathing

Glorific 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	Judge's Name: Bani Sadr
Opp: 26 Sheridan - Sappington Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: (6
PROP Team Code #: 25	OPP Team Code #: 26
Prop Speaker #1 Lacombe pts 27	Sappington Opp Speaker #1 Shordag pts 27 , Shevidan
Prop Speaker #2 Appropriate pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Zavern 91001 pts 27
	the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judgi	ing Criteria
offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and respectively. How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater: Prop 1:	deferences to authority as well as general knowledge ively the debaters respond to the arguments made deffective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges diments and/or suggestions for improvement to
De good in pointing out that war being good or bad is not topical	Outweighted by months of enjoy debate i are a great very nice that you clearly enjoy debate i are a great clear confident speaker
	De a bit more discreet in accepting help
Prop 2: (1) good at retutations & turning off's points in props favor (2) good per regarding def of wor conflict between parties	Opp 2: ① nice Po) ② nice framing of the topic making it philosophical i defining us all as one on earth is war causes 1055 of something
TEAM CODE #: $\frac{25}{}$ on the $\frac{9}{}$	roρ wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION: Both sides laid out great cases friendly to each Prop won b/c stated they only n	nother. All very strong, confident speakers, reded to give one example of a war that war example which oppositions to directly refute. Great job!

dr, Allison ((*16)			0	.1	
11:15am, Room 22 homas - Ralsto Situ Zhang	on@		Judge's Nam	ie: 17au (5	adr	
Sittle Zhang 3) ntary Debate/N	lovice		Judge's School Affiliation: 10 OPP Team Code #: 14			
	PROP					
				•		
rop Speaker #1_	Thomas	_ pts_ <i>28</i>	Opp Speaker #1	ク社ひ		pts <u>26</u>
rop Speaker #2_	Raiston	pts_28_	Opp Speaker #2_	Zhanq		pts <u> 26</u>
lease award	each speaker poir	nts based o	n the following	scale:	nagament (n	ering to traper also assessible -> 4 Nove to the Affect
			outstanding 28	, .		
	27 = Good (but poss					
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = P	'oor	< 20 = Reserve	of for rude o	r inappr	opriate behavior
		Judg	ging Criterja			
Analysis:	How reasonably an	_	,	nalyze the t	opic and	the arguments
-	ring the debate		· /	•	•	J
	How appropriately	y and efficie	ently the debater	s support ar	guments	s with
	-which may includ	e facts and	rataranaas ta au	thority as w	ell as ge	neral knowledge
			reservations to au	citority as w	011 as 50	morar kno wroag.
Argument	tation: How direct					
by the other						
by the other Points of I	er side I nformation: How	ly and effect relevant an	tively the debate ad effective were	ers respond the question	to the ar	guments made the answers
by the other Points of I Delivery:	er side I nformation: How How well the deba	ly and effect relevant an	tively the debate ad effective were	ers respond the question	to the ar	guments made the answers
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable	ly and effect relevant an iters speak in	vively the debate ad effective were n an organized,	ers respond the question communica	to the ar	guments made the answers e that is pleasan
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily	er side I nformation: How How well the deba	ly and effect relevant an iters speak in	vively the debate ad effective were n an organized,	ers respond the question communica	to the ar	guments made the answers e that is pleasan
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy:	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an	ly and effect relevant an iters speak in a respectful	tively the debate of effective were not an organized, I the debaters we	ers respond the questic communica ere to oppon	to the ar	guments made the answers e that is pleasan d judges
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy:	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an ove criteria, please	ly and effect relevant an iters speak in a respectful	tively the debate of effective were not an organized, I the debaters we	ers respond the questic communica ere to oppon	to the ar	guments made the answers e that is pleasan d judges
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy:	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an ove criteria, please	ly and effect relevant an iters speak in a respectful	tively the debate of effective were not an organized, I the debaters we	ers respond the questic communica ere to oppon	to the ar	guments made the answers e that is pleasan d judges
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: sing the about the debater:	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an eve criteria, please	ly and effect relevant an aters speak in a respectful	tively the debate of effective were n an organized, I the debaters we pliments and/or	ethe question communica ere to oppon	ons and to tive style ents and	guments made the answers e that is pleasan d judges
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: sing the about the debater:	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an ove criteria, please	ly and effect relevant an aters speak in a respectful e offer comp	tively the debate of effective were not an organized, I the debaters we pliments and/or	ethe question communicatere to opport suggestion	ons and the archive style ents and the style ents and the style ents and the style ents archives for in	guments made the answers e that is pleasan d judges
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: sing the about the debater:	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an ove criteria, please	ly and effect relevant an aters speak in a respectful e offer comp	tively the debate of effective were not an organized, I the debaters we pliments and/or Opp 1: Opp 1: Co	ethe question communicatere to opport r suggestion great policied impro	ons and the archive style ents and the style ents and the style ents and the style ents archive.	guments made the answers the that is pleasant d judges approvement to
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: sing the about debater: top 1:	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an eve criteria, please	ly and effect relevant an aters speak in a respectful e offer comp	tively the debate of effective were not an organized, I the debaters we pliments and/or Opp 1: Opp 1: Co	ethe question communicatere to opport suggestion	ons and the archive style ents and the style ents and the style ents and the style ents archive.	guments made the answers the that is pleasant d judges approvement to
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: sing the about debater: top 1:	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an eve criteria, please atation of in-	ly and effect relevant an iters speak in a respectful offer complete offer comple	of ively the debate of effective were not an organized, if the debaters we pliments and/or Opp 1: Opp 1: Con	ethe question communicatere to opport r suggestion great policied impro	ons and the archive style ents and the style ents and the style ents and the style ents archive.	guments made the answers the that is pleasant d judges approvement to
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: sing the about debater: top 1:	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an eve criteria, please atation of in-	ly and effect relevant an iters speak in a respectful offer complete offer comple	of ively the debate of effective were not an organized, if the debaters we pliments and/or Opp 1: Opp 1: Con	ethe question communicatere to opport r suggestion great policied impro	ons and the archive style ents and the style ents and the style ents and the style ents archive.	guments made the answers the that is pleasant d judges approvement to
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: sing the aboach debater: rop 1: nice present format format we change in the court fact format could be a mechanise to the court format co	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an ove criteria, please atation of in-	ly and effect relevant an iters speak in a respectful offer complete offer comple	of effective were n an organized, I the debaters we pliments and/or	ethe question communicatere to opport r suggestion great policied impro	ons and the archive style ents and the style ents and the style ents and the style ents archive.	guments made the answers the that is pleasant d judges approvement to
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: sing the about the debater: rop 1: nice present format could be remained by the present of the prese	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an eve criteria, please atation of inimportance- evisited your an in final rela	ly and effect relevant an iters speak in a respectful e offer complete offer comp	of vely the debate of effective were not an organized, if the debaters we pliments and/or Opp 1: Opp 2:	ethe question communicatere to opport suggestion freat point of improved im	to the arons and the tive style ents and the tive style ents and the tive style ents and the tive ents are arganized arganized.	rguments made the answers the that is pleasant d judges approvement to
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: Ising the about the present wour fact format could've remechanism rop 2:	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an eve criteria, please atation of inimportance- evisited your an in fival relation of the speaker, co	relevant and effect relevant and respectful e offer complete offer confident, and	of effective were an an organized, if the debaters we pliments and/or Opp 1: Opp 2: Opp 2:	ethe question communicate to opport suggestion freat point and improved improved improved improved to the point of the poi	to the arons and the tive style ents and the style ents and the style ents are the style	guments made the answers the that is pleasant d judges approvement to
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: Ising the about the present wour fact format could've remechanism rop 2:	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an eve criteria, please atation of inimportance- evisited your an in final rela	relevant and effect relevant and respectful e offer complete offer confident, and	of effective were an an organized, the debaters we pliments and/or Opp 1: Opp 2: Some 91 also sow	ethe question communicate to opport rangestion improved improved improved improved fidence?	to the arons and the tive style ents and the style ents and the style ents are the style	guments made the answers the that is pleasant d judges aprovement to
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: Using the about the present of I: Prop 1: Prop 1: Prop 1: Prop 1: Prop 2: Prop 3: Prop 2: Prop 3: Prop 4: Prop 5: Prop 5: Prop 6: Prop 6: Prop 6: Prop 6: Prop 6: Prop 7: Prop 6: Prop 7: Prop 6: Prop 7: Prop 6: Prop 7: Prop 7: Prop 7: Prop 8: Prop 8: Prop 9: P	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an eve criteria, please atation of inimportance- evisited your an in fival relation of the speaker, co	relevant and effect relevant and respectful e offer complete offer confident, and	Opp 2: Opp 2: Opp 2: Opp 2: Opp 2:	ethe question communicate to opport reat point improvationer for the following video and video v	to the areas and the tive style tents and the tive organization of the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents ar	guments made the answers the that is pleasant d judges aprovement to
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: Jsing the aboach debater: Prop 1: Prop 1: Prop 1: Prop 1: Prop 2: Prop 2: Prop 2: Prop 2: Prop 2: Prop 2:	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an eve criteria, please atation of inimportance- evisited your an in fival relation of the speaker, co	relevant and effect relevant and respectful e offer complete offer confident, and	Opp 2: Opp 2: Opp 2: Opp 2: Opp 2:	ethe question communicate to opport reat point improvationer for the following video and video v	to the areas and the tive style tents and the tive organization of the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents ar	guments made the answers the that is pleasant d judges aprovement to
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: sing the about the about the present format format mechanism top 2: bood smooth sould be a mooth sould	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an eve criteria, please atation of inimportance- evisited your an in final relation for speaker, comples & reason	ly and effect relevant an aters speak in a respectful e offer complete offer complete offer complete offer complete offer complete outland out	Opp 2: Opp 2: Opp 2: Opp 2: Opp 2:	ethe question communicate to opport reat point improvationer for the following video and video v	to the areas and the tive style tents and the tive organization of the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style style tents are the tive style tents and the tive style tents ar	guments made the answers the that is pleasant d judges aprovement to
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: sing the about the present of I: nice present format could've remechanism rop 2: pooch smooth	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an eve criteria, please atation of inimportance- evisited your an in final relation for speaker, comples & reason	y relevant an aters speak in a respectful e offer comp for liked inference weighing outland	Opp 1: Opp 1: Opp 2: Opp 2: Opp 2: Opp 2: Opp 3: Opp 4: Opp 4: Opp 4: Opp 6:	ethe question communical ere to opport suggestion in the following the following the following the different point in the diff this debate.	to the arms and the style ents a	eguments made the answers the that is pleasant dididges aprovement to thory the reality is ferre annulating
by the other Points of I Delivery: and easily Courtesy: sing the about the about the present of the present format we change for material and the present of	er side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous an eve criteria, please atation of inimportance- evisited your an in fival relation for speaker, comples & reason #:	y relevant an aters speak in a respectful e offer comp for liked inference weighing outland	Opp 1: Opp 1: Opp 2: Opp 2: Some gracknowle were cop real-life inabi	ethe question communicate to opport reat point point dence ? reat point ne fuzzy dged that ying video diff this debate.	to the areas and they we	guments made the answers the that is pleasant d judges aprovement to