Laws which protect citizens from themselves are justified

PARLI Debate

Burrous, Eileen (*22)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 207
Gov: 26 Sheridan - Sappington
Opp: 2 Galvan-Carty - Lisy
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Eileen Burrous

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 26		Team Code #: 2	
Prop Speaker #1 Sappington	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Lisy	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Sheridan	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Galvan-Carty	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 support your opinions with facts/evidence try to offer more than personal opinion, polite & friendly - good eye contact

Prop 2: good questions, polite needs more evidence Style is pleasant delivery good. Good eye contact

Opp 1: try to respond to your opponents points 1st clear well prepared. Delivery very good. Try not to play with hair it is distracting -

Opp 2: Well prepared, good argument brief but effective

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Much clearer on points, quoted facts i.e. Wash post., better understanding of the topic. & debating process.

When governments fail to enforce the law, vigilantism is justified

PARLI Debate

Burrous, Eileen (*22)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 207
Gov: 20 Byrne - Pareja
Opp: 14 Lyons - Wyszynski
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Eileen BURROUS

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin High

PROP		ORP	
Team Code #: 20		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Pareja	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Lyons	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Byrne	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Wyszynski	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 points, examples. Clear speaking. Good order. Many examples. Good delivery.

Prop 2: good examples. Clear speaking. polite

Opp 1: Good clarification of topic. Good knowledge of debate process. Delivery strong. Good points. Good evidence.

Opp 2: Good clear arguments. good points of information. Good eye contact. Very good delivery.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: They had a stronger argument. Points of information was more relevant & stronger. Great jobs.

PARLI Debate

Herman, Roy (*13)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 221
Gov: 11 Wang - Lin
Opp: 14 Bystrom - Gast
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Roy Herman

Judge's School Affiliation: Livermore

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Lin pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	GAST pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Wang pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	BYSTROM pts 27.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Great start to open but speaking energy sort of tailed off. Thought the signposting and structure were effective, WHEN CALLING OUT A POINT AS IRRELEVANT, EXPLAIN WHY

Prop 2: You have a good speaking style. use all your time and reinforce your points. The "diseases are included in the 97% number" point was good

Opp 1: Good speaking skills and presentation. Watch excessive hand gestures as they can be distracting. SUGGEST YOU NOT SAY "ALL THEY HAVE IS A LOT OF DATA" BECAUSE DATA IS VALUABLE

Opp 2: REALLY GOOD SPEAKING SKILL. GOOD POINT ON "LAWS THAT SAVE LIVES DON'T NECESSARILY HELP THE PROBLEM.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG. GOT THE FOLLOWING POINTS THROUGH EFFECTIVELY 1) THAT IT VIOLATED CIVIL RIGHTS AND DECREASED FREEDOM 2) HARD TO ENFORCE 3) TOO MUCH POWER FOR GOV. 4) AFF. HAD NO PLAN TO HELP DISTRESSED.

PARLI Debate

Herman, Roy (*13)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 221
Gov: 2 Greenwall - DuPuy
Opp: 25 Owen - Coscarelli
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Roy Herman

Judge's School Affiliation: Livermore

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	25
Prop Speaker #1	GREENWALL pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	OWEN pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	DuPuy pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	COSCARELLI pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: WARMED UP SLOW. GREAT CHARISMA WHEN SPEAKING. EXCITEMENT CAUSES SOME STUMBLES. GREAT FINISH. WORK MORE ON ORGANIZING THOUGHTS, CONSIDER SIGNPOSTING. CUBA NOT SO GOOD

Prop 2: SPEED AND ARTICULATION OF ARGUMENTS WAS EXCEPTIONAL! HELP PARTNER + SELF WITH BETTER ORGANIZATION OF IDEAS

Opp 1: GREAT OPENING SPEECH AND ORGANIZATION IDEAS. GREAT EXAMPLES: KKK, SOMALIA, AMERICAN IN AFGHANISTAN, BUT CONFEDERACY.

Opp 2: Generally good speaking skill but more emphasis on points. Good organization + solids evidence

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

"GOVT. FAILURE IS NOT MORAL AND JUST," AMERICAN REVOLUTIONARIES AS VIGILANTEES, [redacted] AND "EVERY PERSON DESERVES A VOICE" WERE RALLY CRIES FOR THE AFF

PARLI Debate

Liu, Hongche (*11)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 222
Gov: 23 Eizner - He
Opp: 14 Chao - Wang
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Hongche Liu

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Eizner pts 25	Opp Speaker #1	Wang pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	He pts 24	Opp Speaker #2	Chao 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: defition: protect citizens from other citizens is a slippery one. In fact, it was attacked by oppo.
– no new arguments in rebuttal
– don't argue under the opp definition

Prop 2: that you don't agree.
~~no new arg~~

Opp 1: please point out clearly that you don't agree with Prop definition.
Don't say "they are confused"
~~– no new arguments in rebuttal.~~
~~– don't argue under opp~~

Opp 2: ~~no new arguments in~~
good job pointing out the unfairness of Prop's definition.
Don't give POIs to opponents to make their own statements.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Disagreement on definition. Prop "protection of citizens from other citizens" is not really fair. Besides, the rebuttal argue under OPPO definition.
Prop

PARLI Debate

Liu, Hongche (*11)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 222
Gov: 27 Cohen - Lemenager
Opp: 2 Lanzone - Hubinger
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Hongche Liu

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #: 2	
Prop Speaker #1 Cohen	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Hubinger	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Lemenager	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Lanzone	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: Mexican Government contention pretty much wins the debate.

Prop 2: You did not win on militia or anarchy contention but good job upholding Mexican government contention.

Opp 1: great POIs! You stunned your opponents with all your POIs. Don't call the definition of "militia" a wash. You are yielding. Your question about Mexican government

Opp 2: incompetence helped your opponent. Don't linger on a weak point: Batman. There is no evidence to support a moral factual from fictional

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop cited Mexican Vigilanteism law effectiveness, which the opp side did not bring down.

PARLI Debate

Wang, Yipin (*11)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 200
Gov: 5 Hinchcliff - McKinney
Opp: 23 Deng - Luo
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Wang, Yipin

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: Gov 5		Team Code #: Opp 23	
Prop Speaker #1 McKinney	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Luo	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Hinchdiff	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Deng	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 courtesy, good eye contact, ~~[illegible]~~ if can stand more still. will be good.

Prop 2:
very polite, good & clear speech and more supporting points

Opp 1:
very confident, define topic well. good example & facts, good taking ~~POI~~ POI

Opp 2:
~~[illegible]~~ good speed rate, make more eye contact will be great.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The Opp team have ~~good~~ better analysis and examples.

PARLI Debate

Wang, Yipin (*11)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 200
Gov: 14 Situ - Zhang
Opp: 18 Raven - Fischer
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Wang, Yipin

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: Gov 14		Team Code #: Opp 18	
Prop Speaker #1 Situ	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Fischer	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Zhang	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Raven	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 Courtesy, be more confident

Opp 1:
Good & clear speech, good ~~eye~~ eye contact

Prop 2:
nice speech volume, more eye contact ~~to~~ will be good

Opp 2:
deliver the argumentation well and good speed of speech.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The opp team ~~have~~ has more persuading facts and examples and more confident

PARLI Debate

Geter, Emerald (*20)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 210
Gov: 23 Roth - Yue
Opp: 4 O'Rafferty - Figueroa
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: SANKARALINGAM, AVO

Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	4
Prop Speaker #1	Roth pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	O'Rafferty pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Yue pts 24	Opp Speaker #2	Shields. 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

A good chunk of the arguments of the against side was procedural, but I think that was in part made by the 'pro' strategy of argument by tautology If citizen vote for it it is

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: Made their cases Logical presentation. Multiple propositions - each addressing different part of the main proposition - Makes it difficult to defend since failure to defend all is failure

Prop 2: Should have defended the important of the argument under attack instead of noticing the parts that were not addressing

Opp 1: Went after the notion of citizens as a collective effectively. Could have used somewhat lengthy discussion of why they could not prepare... but not necessary

Opp 2: Repeated argument about assisted suicide laws but effective counter.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

#23 failed to defend the notion that citizens should be treated as a collective Since they only justified laws against citizens as a collective hurting themselves their defense fails.

PARLI Debate

Geter, Emerald (*20)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 210
Gov: 22 Harris - Marr
Opp: 14 Krishnaswamy - Goldstein
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: SANKARALINGAM, ANG
Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 22		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Harris	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Goldstein.	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Marr	pts 25	Opp Speaker #2 Krishnaswamy	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: Created too broad of a case to defend by effectively saying all vigilantes are good and improve justice
→ Should focus on creating a defensible space.

Opp 1: Very good job of focussing on Prop's arguments.
Own arguments were well stated

Prop 2: Somewhat in a bind because the proposition was too broad and difficult to defend. Did try to focus on opp 1 arguments why they shouldn't stand. but not convincing

Opp 2: Good focus on Prop's arguments Didn't really need to make their own case + didn't try too hard. focused on unintended consequences.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Effectively countered the scare that vigilante's prevent anarchy.

PARLI Debate

Rajani, Seema (*7)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 201
Gov: 20 Ahmadi - Phan
Opp: 14 Ng - Huang
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Seema Rajani

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 20		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Ahmadi	pts 25	Opp Speaker #1 Ng	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Phan	pts 24	Opp Speaker #2 Huang	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: Needs more developed ideas / arguments. no real evidence.

Opp 1: Responds with reasonable effective arguments effective delivery / used good eye contact.

Prop 2: Speech lacks organization needs more developed content / ideas.

Opp 2: showed courtesy and is organized. Responds with clear understandable arguments.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Well Developed arguments backed by evidence Good presentation skills, confident / eye contact. Arguments made by other team are responded to effectively

PARLI Debate

Rajani, Seema (*7)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 201
Gov: 25 Lacombe - Appel
Opp: 2 Colbert - Clark
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Seema Rajani

Judge's School Affiliation: DHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 25		Team Code #: 2	
Prop Speaker #1 Lacombe	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Colbert	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Appel	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Clark	pts 24

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:
Reasonable analysis and idea development.
Refutes arguments reasonably

Prop 2: Speakers purpose is area defined with logical organization.
Effective arguments
Dev ideas/arguments
Introduces new ideas

Opp 1: organized;
Effective synthesizing responses
Responds with clarity + confidence.

Opp 2:
Needs to introduce new arguments + failed to previous arguments.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Organized and presented with clarity.
Good use of argument with example.
Effective rebuttal
Good Eye contact

PARLI Debate

Lanzone, Shannon (*2)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 204
Gov: 22 Baxter - Nam
Opp: 14 Lawrence - Privalov
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Shannon Lanzone

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	22	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Baxter pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Lawrence pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Nam pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Privalov 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: She made an excellent roadmap for me to follow, laid out interesting examples and analysis. Her delivery was confident and well spoken.

Prop 2: Ms Nam handled two difficult POI's very well and deftly pointed out true opposition concessions.

Opp 1: Mr. Lawrence did a nice job at elocution, addressing the pro's arguments, and presenting examples for their own opposing arguments. His endings were a little awkward from nerves.

Opp 2: Mr. Privalov delivered some great POI's and interesting rhetorical questions. He seemed to lose his train of thought, but recovered.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The affirmative arguments were better addressed and supported, and they spotted several concessions made by the otherwise convincing opposition.

PARLI Debate

Lanzone, Shannon (*2)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 204
Gov: 12 Murdock - Santana
Opp: 23 Habib - Keshav
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Shannon Lanzone

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 12		Team Code #: 23	
Prop Speaker #1 Murdock	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Habib	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Santana	pts 26	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: Ms. Murdock has an excellent presence and elocution. She made an excellent social contract argument, but it needed more supporting examples to show the value of vigilantism.

Prop 2: Mr. Santana did a nice job of negating an opposing point, pointing out a weakness in the opposition's case, and reiteration. But nerves prevented additional support for the opposition.

Opp 1: Mr. Habib did a great job of displaying passion for his views. He rarely used notes or struggled to recall his points and counterpoints. He sited Aristotle effectively. He unfortunately failed to turn a concession around to his advantage.

Opp 2: Ms. Keshav was very concise and organized with her second opposition, but failed to present

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

While the proposition began with a very strong construct around which to build their case, the opposition was more successful in rebutting this case, and supplying additional and largely unrefuted arguments against it.

If he from responding well to a POI.

PARLI Debate

Owen, Jeff (*25)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 226
Gov: 22 Burrous - Blackenburg
Opp: 7 Mohiuddin - Sharma
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jeff Owen

Judge's School Affiliation: Santa Rosa High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 22		Team Code #: 7	
Prop Speaker #1 Burrous	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Mohiuddin	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Blackenburg	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Sharma	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 job being concise and going over all points

Opp 1: Great organization & Refutations

Prop 2: Relax. Stay focused

Opp 2: Great organization and refutations

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Very close. Good job discussing Life, Liberty and Pursuit of Happiness. Prop did a slightly better job of Proving that having laws to protect themselves Protects Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness in the collective vs the individual is the role of government - the collective. Again VERY close! Great job all

PARLI Debate

Owen, Jeff (*25)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 226
Gov: 24 Scott - Ambrose
Opp: 4 Thomas - Ralston
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jeff Owen

Judge's School Affiliation: Santa Rosa High school

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	24	Team Code #:	4
Prop Speaker #1	Scott pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Ralston pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Ambrose pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Thomas pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good structural presentations.

Opp 1: Very focused and you had good arguments

Prop 2: Good arguments

Opp 2: Great Arguments. Please make eye contact with the judge. You are trying to convince the judge

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Prop defined Governments as world Governments but primarily based their arguments on the Declaration of Independence Opp did a good job with the chaos argument & how vigilantism does not provide structure nor support the collective

PARLI Debate

Kovitz, Bo (*3)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 225
Gov: 7 Kaura - Gajula
Opp: 23 Ho - Prashanth
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: BO KOVITZ

Judge's School Affiliation: BERKELEY HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	7	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1 GAJULA	pts 23	Opp Speaker #1 PRASHANTH	pts 20
Prop Speaker #2 KAURA	pts 24	Opp Speaker #2 HO	pts 21

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

need to work on THESE!!! (Both sides)

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 Practice fluency + confidence
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

OPP speakers — Don't laugh in rounds. Take it seriously, otherwise the judge won't take you seriously.

RESOLUTION: LAWS WHICH PROTECT CITIZENS FROM THEMSELVES ARE JUSTIFIED

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

Prop 1: Not sure what you meant by suicide: what does the law dictate? Also not sure why you talked about drunk driving via minors, drunk driving alone is illegal and could serve your point. Good ideas in final speech → impacts.

Prop 2: Make sure that when you're refuting NEG's POINT, you link back to your points/arguments. Link back to IMPACTS! Explain why your argument matters.

Opp 1: You only listed your points without spending sufficient time on each contention explaining claim → warrant → impacts this was an enormous flaw in your side — very little explanation on your part about why I should believe you.

Opp 2: When you're going through your points, reexplain your contentions as your partner first did. Spend time when you're refuting to not only say they didn't respond but to also explain your original point in more depth. Why did you bring up internet censorship when you defined the resolution as "suicide" issues? Stay consistent. Also don't address your opponents and say "you guys" — say "my opponent" you can't just "add" stuff to your framework in the middle of the round

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff had a better case and drew out more moral impacts, since the resolution is a value debate. Both sides need to work on better understanding how to construct arguments and create warrants/impacts. Both sides need to spend some time understanding how IMPORTANT framework is.

PARLI Debate

Kovitz, Bo (*3)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 225
Gov: 2 Hemerling - Barnett
Opp: 23 Wang - Zhu
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Bo Kovitz

Judge's School Affiliation: Berkeley H.S.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 2	28	Team Code #: 23	
Prop Speaker #1 Hemerling	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Wang	pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 Barnett	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Zhu	pts 22

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

Both sides need to WORK ON THIS, both sides need to have better scrutinized resolution/deeper points

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate — Aff did a better job with cases/evidence
- **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 — Aff refutations are stronger.
- **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

→ good point on self-defense! was waiting for that

WHEN GOVT. FAILS TO ENFORCE THE LAW, VIGILANTISM IS JUSTIFIED.

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

Prop 1: Very fluent speaker. Excellent response to the POI from the NEG, you really nailed it bringing up how judicial systems can [illegible] do injustice to innocents too, showing how status quo can fail citizens. Work on speaking with more organization. great final speech

Prop 2: Fantastic emotion + drawing out of impacts of drug cartel situation + the futility of reform attempts. Don't concede that they refuted your points. Never admit it!

Opp 1: For the most part, good, but some logical mistakes were made. I'm not sure you know what a drug cartel is (highly systematic and organized drug distributors/networks for the sale of drugs in MEXICO). Also, when you have a value debate, you CAN'T TALK net/benefits... value doesn't work that way so be careful. Also vigilante justice can take the form of public trials

Opp 2: Your rebuttals are exact replications of your partner's point earlier. When GOV attacks their point, you have to do more to show why your original points still stand. Aff did a good job explaining how vigilantes are not acting recklessly, you need to prove they are wrong.

final speech was a little over the top. It was irrelevant.

otherwise, solid speaking/organization + refutation

so make sure you make your points as strong as possible

in your final speech, relate back to VALUE in the ROUND.

AFF ↓

Just try to focus on case construction

Explain how it relates to your original framework. Speech needs organizing

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Unsatisfactory responses on the part of NEG about rebuilding govt. PROP made it clear that vigilante justice operates in a state when GOVT fails/is corrupt. Remember, everyone, in a VALUE round you need to speak to principles of justice/how they apply/why they're important

PARLI Debate

Tunnell, Nanny (*17)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 224
Gov: 14 Kwong - Tan
Opp: 11 Chippa - Cherukuri
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell

Judge's School Affiliation: MUHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	Tan pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Chippa pts 25
Prop Speaker #2	Kwong pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Cherukuri 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

Laws protect themselves and justify.

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:

*Drug → Depression → suicide)

Prop 1: - Delivery (need better eye contact)
- Delivery - need to better present their plan
+ Evidence (good specifics)
+ POI (good clarifications)
- Argument (need better classification + examples that fall under them)

Prop 2:
- Delivery (need better eye contact)
+ Delivery (good organization)
+ Evidence (consequence argument is strongly given)

Opp 1:
- Evidence (jump around too much)
- Delivery (the body swaying is distracting)
- Argumentation (did not respond completely)
+ Delivery (good projection + pace of speech)

Opp 2:
- Courtesy (Does not seem sincere in thanking)
- POI (not responded to question well)
+ Argumentation (good linking), can't underst what to point need to be expanded
+ Delivery (shows confidence)

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

- stronger evidence
- better organization
- better delivery style

PARLI Debate

Tunnell, Nanny (*17)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 224
Gov: 7 Maitra - Aggarwal
Opp: 22 Sundararaman - Elmhirst
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell

Judge's School Affiliation: MUHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	7	Team Code #:	22
Prop Speaker #1	Aggarwal pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Elmhirst pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Maitra pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Sundararaman 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:
+ Courtesy (sincere)
+ Evidence (great facts + seem well researched)
– Delivery (need to slow down a little bit)
+ analysis (looked at issues in many angles)

Prop 2:
+ Delivery (good maps, very helpful)
+ Argumentation (good linking)
+ Delivery (well organized + good use of notes v.s. memorization)

Opp 1:
+ Argumentation (good analysis on vigilanti skills + motives)
+ Delivery (well organized, good speech pace)
+ POI (good clarification comments and good response to questions)
Evidence = good counter scenario

Opp 2:
– lacking evidence to support their case, more specific facts to refute opposing team
– Delivery (need better eye contact)
analysis – good summary

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

– Better evidence and examples
– thorough analysis
– Better delivery by both members

PARLI Debate

Haulett, Paul (*27)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 206
Gov: 8 Zaheer - Chaudhri
Opp: 14 Duan - Kim
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: HULETT

Judge's School Affiliation: WINDSOR

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 8		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Zaheer	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Kim	pts 24
Prop Speaker #2 Chaudhri	pts 25	Opp Speaker #2 Duan	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 delivery, excellent job defining the terms and setting up the framefors. You were articulate and had a good rythm.

Prop 2: Good job addressing bothe the other side's arguments as well as your own.

Opp 1: Try to work on a rythm to your speach that you can sustain. You had good eye contact and volume. Remember that if you don't challenge any part of the definition, you are giving AFF a head start

Opp 2: Try to work on your rythm and word choice (perhaps a bit more formal would help) You spoke clearly and confidently

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Excellent definition that was not refuted.

PARLI Debate

Aulett, Paul (*27)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 206
Gov: 20 Fong - Ligutan
Opp: 14 Rettenmaier - Pineda
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: AULETT

Judge's School Affiliation: WINDSOR

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	20	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Ligutan pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Rettenmaier pts 25
Prop Speaker #2	Fong pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Pineda 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: Pretty good definition, but it didn't tilt things in your favor very much. Much of your argument seemed to be based on oppressive governments, but your opponents successfully argued that revolution is not vigilantism.

Prop 2: You may have been able to win had you brought up sympathetic vigilantees like the Lone Ranger and Robin Hood. Good presence and eye contact.

Opp 1: Please don't crack your knuckles. You managed to convince me that the vigilantees would be worse. Your argument that revolution is not vigilantism did more damage than your opponents could recover from.

Opp 2: Please don't crack your knuckles. Your warnings of chaos and gangs were impassioned in a way that your opponents could not match. Well done.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Gutted the Prop arguments and painted a grim future. Prop was unable to connect on that emotional level

"Laws which protect citizens from themselves are justified

PARLI Debate

Chin, Liru (*14)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 203
Gov: 26 Goody - Sherman
Opp: 1 Schloten - Condello
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Liru Chin

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	26	Team Code #:	1
Prop Speaker #1	Goody pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Schloten pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Sherman pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Condello pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Very ~~energ~~ energetic. Good arguments and you seem to be quick with connecting opponents arguments to yours.

Prop 2: Feeding partner info during presentation is disruptive and can be a detriment at higher level. Don't sway. Stand firm and present.

Opp 1: good pacing. clear articulation & voice. Did not strongly refute Opp's contentions. Leap to corruption is too great without basis of support.

Opp 2: In competitive debate, don't apologize. If you have information to support your case, don't wait for opponent's POI to raise it.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp did not refute Prop's contentions. The counter-arguments were not well supported.

When gov't fails to enforce the law vigilantism is justified

PARLI Debate

Chin, Liru (*14)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 203
Gov: 2 Fickinger - Williams
Opp: 26 Clark - Flanagan
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Leru Chin

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	26
Prop Speaker #1	Williams pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Flanagan pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Fickinger pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Clark pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Clear voice. Don't avoid eye contact. Don't fidget with your outfit.

Prop 2: "Vigilantism - to do so in a manner that is not problematic" — How can this be done?

Don't apologize. Clear voice, good presence. Have more conviction in what you say.

Opp 1: good pacing on your arguments. good counters. Missed opportunity = Vigilantism is ad hoc, mercurial and generally a mob mentality.

Opp 2: Good example on Ferguson. Stand up straight. Don't slouch. Be comfortable w/your height & presence.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Better arguments. Provided more context to support their points

PARLI Debate

Villa, Paul (*6)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 228
Gov: 22 Rice - Griggy
Opp: 14 Chan - Foley
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Paul Villa

Judge's School Affiliation: College Park

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 22		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Rice	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Chan	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Grigger	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Foley	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: You speak very well and make good arguments but you conceded 5 minutes out of 7 which is never wise.

Prop 2: I really like your refutation. You seem nervous but your passion is great, don't get discouraged. Spend more time on your own stuff.

Opp 1: I think you only really offer a warrant and never really make a claim or impact. You run this as a policy rather than a fact.

Opp 2: You are certainly the best debater in the round. Great argumentation and passion.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Aff wins on C2.

PARLI Debate

Villa, Paul (*6)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 228
Gov: 14 Fong - Geller
Opp: 22 Caramucci - Tarleton
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Paul Villa

Judge's School Affiliation: College Park

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 22	
Prop Speaker #1 Fong	pts ____	Opp Speaker #1 Tarleton	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Geller	pts ____	Opp Speaker #2 Caramucci	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 contentions. You concede a lot of time, I would rather you expand upon your arguments

Prop 2: Great argument about them not running a T.! Saves you from early loss.

Opp 1: Lots of really good answers but you need to run a T if you want me to buy your definition. At least give me a reason to prefer.

Opp 2: Finally Someone gives a reason to prefer on the definition debate but it is too late at this point. Stop apologizing! You got this man!

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The negative doesn't effectively generate reasons to vote for them. You say "don't vote gov" rather than "do vote neg".

Fernando, Kurukulasooriya

PARLI Debate

~~MacKinnon, Jesse (*4)~~
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 202
Gov: 14 Holwitz - Kay
Opp: 20 Alam - Nguyen
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Kurukulasooriya Fernando

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 20	
Prop Speaker #1 Holwitz	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Nguyen	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Kay	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Alam	pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Very good introduction. Good eye contact & good speaker. Good conclusion at the end. ~~I suggest~~

Opp 1: Thank you for acknowledging the Judge. Good speaker. I would provide more facts, to support your argument.

Prop 2: I liked the fact that you introduced your self. You explain facts well.

Opp 2: I liked the fact that you allowed the opponents to question you at the end. I suggest more eye contact.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Team 14 clearly wins the debate because they were confident in delivery their facts. They efficiently support arguments with evidence. They are well organized, very clear in delivering their facts. they directly respond to the arguments made by others.

Fernando, Kunukulasooriya **PARLI Debate**

~~MacKinnon, Jesse (*4)~~
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 202
Gov: 23 Cheng - Wei
Opp: 2 Archibald - Hohmeyer
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: # Kunukulasooriya Fernando

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O' Dowd.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	2
Prop Speaker #1	Cheng pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Archibald pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Wei pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Hohmeyer 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 introduction. I suggest more eye contact with the audiance. You presented ample of facts on your argument.

Opp 1: Very clear thought process. good eye contact. good speaker. I would better prepare for the Conclusion.

Prop 2: very clear thought process good eye contact good speaker. Presented facts well & pointed out errors in opponents speech

Opp 2: You have a clear voice with better preparation you can go long way. I suggest more eye contact.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Team 3 delivered the debate topic well. They are organised, clear and confident in delivering facts. Their introduction of the topic is well delivered. They directly & effectively responded to the debaters in the other side. They clearly won the debate

Resolved: Laws which protect citizens from themselves are justified

PARLI Debate

Skarr, Teresa (*27)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 227
Gov: 11 Arshad - Sankar
Opp: 23 Zhai - Khan
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Teresa Skarr

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	Sankar pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Zhai pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Arshad pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Khan 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: Sankar
+ Good framework ← clear speaking style. Good evidence
Δ misunderstood resolution

Prop 2: Arshad
+ Clear speaking style, organized
Δ - Call out topicality, framework change without justification

Opp 1: Zhai
+ Clear, organized speaker
Δ autonomy ≠ anatomy (pronunciation)
Δ - Provide reason to favor your interpretation of the resolution they defined as fact round.

Opp 2: Khan
+ organized, good refutation
Δ said resolution said "self harm" but not literally true.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp side had better reasoning and weighting contentions and I believe also had a more accurate interpretation of the resolution meaning self-harm prevention laws.

When governments fail to enforce laws, vigilantism is justified.

PARLI Debate

Skarr, Teresa (*27)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 227
Gov: 20 Mart - Andola
Opp: 14 Lee - Fairchild
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Teresa Skarr

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	20	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Andola pts 27.5	Opp Speaker #1	Lee pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Mart pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Fairchild pts 28.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Note: I use the same scale for speaker pts as for Varsity. Well done!

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: Andola
+ Good, clear speaker, organized
Δ Press on fact that motion states when government fails. Some examples weren't really vigilantes (eg Malala) give better definition

Prop 2: Mart
+ Excellent calling out Neg for dropping your first 2 contentions
Δ Refutations very weak (eg govt has unlimited resources)

Opp 1: Lee
+ Good explanation of own (Neg) case
Δ Dropped Aff's first 2 points. Rebuttal should be higher level not just repeat of your first speech.

Opp 2: Fairchild
+ Excellent, engaging speaker, great points, good example (ISIS) agree with good clarification of vigilantes
Δ Explain why government is less biased, even when they fail

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
although neither side had strong refutations, Neg's contentions were weightier. Aff could have won by focusing on wording of motion "when governments fail" and better justice from vigilantism, not just net benefits from some semi-topical examples

PARLI Debate

Deng, Bo-Liang (*23)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 205
Gov: 20 Valle - Pollard
Opp: 14 Woo - Melman
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Bo-Liang Deng

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 20		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Pollard	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Leah Melman	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Valle	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Sofia Woo	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: showed respect to other people. provided direct answers to the questions/arguments reasonable analysed the topic

Opp 1: provided the answers to the points made by the other side.

Prop 2: delivered very well didn't follow the points very well.

Opp 2: well organized, delivered the message very well.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

more direct and effective responded to the argument and more organized; reasonable analysed the arguments during the debate.

PARLI Debate

Deng, Bo-Liang (*23)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 205
Gov: 7 Bardalai - Rangwala
Opp: 20 Afzal - Kelly
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Bo-Liang Deng

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	7	Team Code #:	20
Prop Speaker #1	Arsuman Bardalai pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Tristan Kelly pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Mohsin Rangwala pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Momal Afzal 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: showed the respect to others. reasonable analysed the topic, well organized and delivered the message.

Prop 2: reasonable analysed the topics, outlined the speech and made easy to follow. showed confidence during debate added more examples

Opp 1: well delivered the messages and well organized effective responded the arguments

Opp 2: lack eye contact

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

more reasonable analysed the topics and delivered the arguments.

PARLI Debate

Bulger, Cindy (*24)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 208
Gov: 20 Jerez - Moran
Opp: 14 Luk - Tserennamid
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	20	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Jerez pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Luk pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Moran pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Tserennamid 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

Laws which protect citizens from themselves are justified.

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

Jerez
Prop 1:
Eye contact - needs a little improvement during speech

Moran
Prop 2:
Good eye contact during the speech, don't lay your head down on the desk while writing. It looks like you are sleeping

Tserennamid
Opp 1:
Nice speaking style, be careful about eye contact & reading from the paper

Luk
Opp 2:
Nice speaking style & use of examples try not to read from the paper

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg. never addressed the issue that laws do already exist to allow for assisted suicide.

PARLI Debate

Bulger, Cindy (*24)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 208
Gov: 18 Nash - Thrasher
Opp: 14 Kerr-Stein - Lee
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	18	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Nash pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Ker-Stein pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Thrasher pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Lee pts 24

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

when govts fail to enforce the law vigilantism is justified

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

Nash
Prop 1:
You are both very good speakers. Mr. Thrasher - you do tend to sound a bit like a lecturer or teacher rather than a debator.

Thrasher
Prop 2:
Don't come off too arrogant.

Lee
Opp 1:
Be confident in your arguments. Try not to read your papers too much.

Kerr-Stein
Opp 2:
Very easy to understand even when speaking fast.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg. side accepted Aff. definitions, especially of vigilants and then proceeded to present arguments about how each persons idea of law could be different. I did not think their case was strong enough to overcome after accepting the def. The comic hero/villian argument was interesting - could be dev. further.

PARLI Debate

Sutton, Emma (*12)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 220
Gov: 23 Wei - Zheng
Opp: 5 Wu - Ayalon
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Emma Sutton

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

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 5	
Prop Speaker #1 Zheng	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Ayalon	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Wei	pts 26	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: Good job defining terms & setting criteria for round. Contentions need impact. Avoid starting out by saying "so...."

Prop 2: Good extension of your teams arguments. Needed to expand more on ~~a~~ def of citizens. Need to sum up & end speech by asking for my vote - don't just sit down!

Opp 1: Nice speech, showed impact. Good argument that they are not really addressing the resolution. Need more than 1 contention, but good job on discussing impact.

Opp 2: Well organized speech, very persuasive. Homed in on the key argument and really drove it home.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Key argument really is protection of rights. Prop focused on people harming each other, opp. showed this is off-topic and that they would protect rights.

PARLI Debate

Sutton, Emma (*12)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 220
Gov: 3 Berck - Adams
Opp: 23 Samra - Yim
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Emma Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 23	
Prop Speaker #1 Berck	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Samra	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Adam	pts 26	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: Very persuasive! Well organized, good use of moral arguments & definitions

Prop 2: Always make a final summary & ask for my vote don't just sit down.

Opp 1: Good use of definitions, constitution etc. Look at judge when you speak - you looked at your partner most of the time. Dropped some key arguments in final speech.

Opp 2: Good clear refutation! Well organized, introduced good points & refuted prop. well

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opposition, you missed opportunity to push that ~~[illegible]~~ rez is not about total govt collapse, just about failure to enforce. You introduced it, but dropped it. Prop. team was able to keep focus on govt abandonment, carried moral argument this way

PARLI Debate

Sharma, Kashyp (*7)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 223
Gov: 20 Le - Rather
Opp: 14 Stroumza - Chen
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Kashyap Sharma

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	20	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Le pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Chen pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Rather pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Stroumza 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: No Definition
- Should be more detailed & Evidences
- Introduction missed

Prop 2: No introduction
- Need more Eye Contact

Opp 1: + Completed in 2 min, should
- provide more facts

Opp 2:
- work on adding facts
- good in delivery

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
It was hard decision since all were almost same performer. But I think Prop should provide more points for debate.

PARLI Debate

Sharma, Kashyp (*7)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 223
Gov: 27 Campanella - Petruska
Opp: 1 Ochoa - Chand
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: KASHYAP SHARMA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS, San Ramon

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #: 1	
Prop Speaker #1 Campanella	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Ochoa	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Petruska	pts 27	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: Minor feedback where you can improve:
- Greet all in the room
- Thank everyone

Prop 2:
- Thank everyone

Opp 1: (Clear, Argumentative, having facts → good feedback)

Opp 2: Need to improve Eye Contact
- Improve argumentative
- work on Neg points

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Evidence, Delivery, Argumentation