PARLI Debate

McCabe, Linda (*27)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 227
Gov: 11 Chippa - Cherukuri
Opp: 5 Hinchcliff - McKinney
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Linda McCabe

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	5
Prop Speaker #1	Chippa pts 25	Opp Speaker #1	Hinchcliff pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Cherukuri pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	McKinney 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:

Thank you for setting up this debate as a policy motion, defining the weighing mechanism, but there was no rationale given for why the USFG needed $3B for regulations. Watch language such as "other things such as that." Mention of toys + video games, but no fleshing it out as a reason to include. W/ 3:40 in first speech you had time to do so. Please bring all your papers to the lectern before speaking.

Prop 1:

Prop 2: You are a bit soft spoken. Try to project a little more. It will come w/ time. Good refutations of Neg's contentions.

No direct mention of their plan in your first speech.

Opp 1: Your 2 disads are really contentious. The slippery slope argument is a bit hyperbolic for me. Limiting ads will not lead to political unrest → anarchy. Nice use of some evidence by ABC news. I think that was the only fact + citation in the debate. Good closing statement w/ using voting criteria - although if Opp used theirs better public health of children would "outweigh" advertising jobs.

Opp 2: Halting speaking style that will improve w/ practice. Watch hand movements w/ right hand. A bit distracting. Good to note Toys/video game argument not expanded by aff. Weak argument about junk food consumed by father → not dialectic. Anecdotal evidence that isn't convincing.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp had a stronger grasp of how cases are to be structured, even though I disagreed w/ their hyperbolic statements

PARLI Debate

McCabe, Linda (*27)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 227
Gov: 14 Duan - Kim
Opp: 20 Le - Rather
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Linda McCabe

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	20
Prop Speaker #1	Duan, Dephny pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Rather pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Kim, Jae pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Le pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: You did a nice set up for the debate. Stating your plan, funding mechanism and timeline. 1st speech set up your arguments in favor of nuclear and anticipated opponent's arguments. Your 2nd speech included new argumentation in response to your opponent's counter plan. You weren't POO'd, but you should have been.

Prop 2: You did not refute the neg's contentions as you should have. Your speech was unorganized and hard to follow. Asking rhetorical ? to opponents is strange. Your halting speaking style will improve w/ practice. Ending was strongest part of speech

Opp 1: Good mention off the top of ~~the~~ your speech 10% is not "substantial." Good use of counterplan and mention if coal is so bad, why not take $ from them. Also good ? about timing of 5 years to ↑ Nute power by 10%. Good ending speech asking for enforcement. ~~You can~~ W/ practice you'll fill up time. Could have mentioned Chernobyl in your nuclear power is dangerous.

Opp 2: Good burden press on Aff and mentioning topicality / violating spirit of resolution. Great ethos + logos.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff did not fulfill their burden, Neg called them on it.

HERMAN, Roy (*13)

~~Fulop, Anna (*24)~~

Round 4A 3:45pm Room 222
Gov: 14 Ng - Huang
Opp: 3 Berck - Adams
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Roy Herman

Judge's School Affiliation: Livermore

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	3
Prop Speaker #1	Ng pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Berck pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Huang pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Adams pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: GREAT SPEAKER! EXCELLENT OPENING AND DEFINITIONS. TARGET: CHILDREN — GOOD POINT

Prop 2: GOOD JOB SUPPORTING FCC POINTS AND TAIWAN EXAMPLE

Opp 1: SEEMED LIKE BRILLIANT THINKING THAT WAS NOT DISCIPLINED. BE WARY OF CITING PERSONAL EXPERIENCE.

Opp 2: ASKING FOR PROOF IS GOOD. HAVING YOUR OWN IS BETTER. GREAT SPEAKS

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

BETTER ORGANIZED ARGUMENTATION. PUSHED POINTS OF OBESITY AND "SOCIAL DAMAGE" WITHOUT TYING TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

Herman, Roy (#13)
~~Fulop, Anna (#24)~~
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 222
Gov: 23 Habib - Keshav
Opp: 22 Rice - Griggy
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Roy Herman

Judge's School Affiliation: Livermore

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	22
Prop Speaker #1	Habib pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Rice pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Keshav pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Griggy pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

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

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Excellent opening not as great on the close but enough to win. Don't slow at the end

Prop 2: USE YOUR TIME WISELY YOU CAN RESTATE POINTS IN ANOTHE WAY OR AS A REMINDER

Opp 1: Good opening that lost steam in the final speech. Good idea to switch "cost benefit" to "greatest impact" but they had impacts as well

Opp 2: LIKED THAT YOU BROUGHT UP CHERNOBYL. SHOULD HAVE EMPHASIZED THAT AND OTHER DISASTERS TO DEFEAT THEIR SAFETY DATA.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

MORE ORGANIZED, STRONGER DATA POINTS AND WERE QUESTIONS ON ACCEPTABLE LEVEL OF SAFETY

USFG should substantially increase regulation of advertising targeting children

PARLI Debate

Brown, Peter (*27)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 220
Gov: 4 Thomas - Ralston
Opp: 2 Greenwall - DuPuy
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Peter Brown

Judge's School Affiliation: Wake

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 4		Team Code #: 2	
Prop Speaker #1 Ralston	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Greenwall	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Thomas	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 DuPuy	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: + speaks clear
+ took POI's
(-) Cannot do P.O.I in first or last minute of speech

Opp 1: + Strong voice
- broken speech

Prop 2: + Good job taking POI's and not getting off track.
+ Good refutations

Opp 2: Good voice
+ speaks clear
+ Good refutations

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The prop refuted all points of the opp. The opp dropped contentions.

The USFG should substantially increase support for nuclear energy

PARLI Debate

Brown, Peter (*27)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 220
Gov: 5 Wu - Ayalon
Opp: 20 Byrne - Pareja
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Peter Brown

Judge's School Affiliation: Winter

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 20	
Prop Speaker #1 Ayalon	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Pareja	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 WU	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Byrne	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: +speaks clear
+flows nice.

Opp 1: +Strong voice
+ confident speaker

Prop 2: + Very calm and collected speaker
+Good use of time

Opp 2: +Energetic speaker
+ used constructive slot perfectly

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Both sides dropped contentions. Prop made definition but Opp didn't really negate the definition but came up with alternate plan. For that I vote for the Prop

Very good round.

PARLI Debate

Clark, Stacy/Wallis (*26)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 203
Gov: 14 Stroumza - Chen
Opp: 20 Mart - Andola
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Stacy Clark
Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 20	
Prop Speaker #1 Chen	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Andola	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Stroumza	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Mart	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: + Conveys plan
+ courteous towards opponents
+ eye contact to all, including opposition

Prop 2: + Identified gaps in opposition arguments
+ Good pace - easy to follow
+ courteous

Opp 1: + Good eye contact
+ Good pace in delivery
+ Courteous
– Contention relating to advertising unclear

Opp 2:
+ Good pace in delivery
+ outlines plan
+ During prop's rebuttal brings attn to parli rules

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The props presented sound analysis and their analysis of the topic was clear & persuasive.

PARLI Debate

Clark, Stacy/Wallis (*26)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 203
Gov: 2 Lanzone - Hubinger
Opp: 14 Situ - Zhang
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Stacy Clark

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Hubinger pts 25	Opp Speaker #1	Situ pts 25
Prop Speaker #2	Lanzone pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Zhang 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: + Articulate
— Long day yes, but think about being courteous & professional throughout debate
— Think about balancing delivery pace w/ desired to get through information/points

Prop 2: + Articulate
— Long day yes, but Think about being courteous & professional throughout debate

Opp 1: + Persuasive examples
+ Analysis
— Eye contact

Opp 2: + Effort to convey passionately.
— Grace under fire
— review parli rules

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The props presented a persuasive analysis.

PARLI Debate

Zaheer, Affan (*8)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 228
Gov: 26 Clark - Flanagan
Opp: 23 Roth - Yue
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Affan Zaheer

Judge's School Affiliation: Dublin High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	26	Team Code #:	~~26~~ 23
Prop Speaker #1 Flanagan	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Roth	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Clark	pts 24	Opp Speaker #2 Ye	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:
great delivery & poise
Good counter arguments.
main logic was weak, suggest to build story on the resolution & you can do better

Prop 2:
Focus on getting smooth delivery & connectivity in your flow. work harder & you do better

Opp 1: Great opening, ~~arg~~ arguments & points. very nicely stated. Nice closing. over all good job

Opp 2: Please slow down as you ~~speak. You will~~ speak. You will be more impacting with slower & controlled delivery.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
opposition arguments were better. Prop team did not have a strong point defending the resolution.

PARLI Debate

Zaheer, Affan (*8)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 228
Gov: 7 Mohiuddin - Sharma
Opp: 25 Lacombe - Appel
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Affan Zaheer

Judge's School Affiliation: Dublin High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	7	Team Code #:	25
Prop Speaker #1 ~~Lacombe~~ Mohiuddin	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 ~~Mohiuddin~~ Lacombe	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 ~~Appel~~ Sharma	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 ~~Sharma~~ Appel	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 starting arguments Should emphsize more on cost v/s output compared to alternate source of energy

Prop 2: Good examples, arguments close debate. other side came out more compelling w/ zero Risk.

Opp 1: great courtesy arguments, highlighting risks, & offering another alternate solution w/ less risk & same cost. Nice closing.

Opp 2: good examples & nice team work supporting each other arguments.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
OPP arguments were compelling opposing the Resolution & providing a low risk alternate solution.

PARLI Debate

Baetkey, Kerri (*22)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 225
Gov: 2 Colbert - Clark
Opp: 7 Kaura - Gajula
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Baetkey

Judge's School Affiliation: SMHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	7
Prop Speaker #1	Colbert pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Gajula pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Clark pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Kaura 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: Really nice, polite group of boys all around!! :)

Prop 1: You were clear, calm organized. Good ideas about accurate portrayals + morality.

Prop 2: I liked how you layed out + stated your organization. You were clear + direct. You gave some good ideas.

Both- I wanted you to dig deeper with examples + give factual evidence of neg. effects.

Opp 1: I liked when you brought up freedom of speech + government legitimacy. You also brought up that ads are changing. You were calm + clear - work on your fluency + eye contact. Your closing could be stronger.

Opp 2: I liked when you said it could lead to good ideas too! You also gave facts about the economy by stating Toys R Us and video game sales. That tipped to the win!

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The Opp offered the only factual back up to their point by stating real figures ($) in their argument. The teams were close but the facts tipped to the win. Support claims with fact reference!

PARLI Debate

Baetkey, Kerri (*22)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 225
Gov: 14 Krishnaswamy - Goldstein
Opp: 24 Scott - Ambrose
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Baetkey

Judge's School Affiliation: SMHS

PROP
Team Code #: 14

Prop Speaker #1 Goldstein pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Krishnaswamy pts 28

OPP
Team Code #: 24

Opp Speaker #1 Scott pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Ambrose pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Really nice kids! Very impressed with overall knowledge and debate tactics! Great job!

Prop 1: You were calm, precise and matter of fact. Your natural cadence is very trustworthy & effective. You layed it out very clearly + handled the interruptions really well!

Prop 2: You were dynamic, clear, and powerful in tone. You gave a solid presentation with facts. Hold strong through the closing.

Opp 1: You were organized and assertive. You had a nice flow and strong arguments. I liked your examples regarding health + environment. You asked good questions as part of your speech.

Opp 2: Ex. "Why do we need more $ for this?" You had good points. I liked when you referenced the trash island (but it didn't relate) and then you brought up Croatia which was a great example.

Great outfits! Even the socks!! :D

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Goldstein layed it all out so clearly + then Krishnaswamy was emphatic, clear and added the info. on fatalities related to oil vs. uranium. They were so organized + precise.

PARLI Debate

Nash, Jennifer (*18)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 223
Gov: 25 Owen - Coscarelli
Opp: 23 Wei - Zheng
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jennifer Nash

Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomery High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	25	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	Owen pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Zheng pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Coscarelli pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Wei 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: Good examples, cited specific examples, work on using filler words less. Need to acknowledge opposing team's strong proposition rebuttal.

Prop 2: Good job supporting partner's arguments. Good ending sentence, summation of points could be smoother.

Opp 1: Good style, good, clear speaking style. Work on using less "filler" words. Addressed POI from opponet well. Good summary after slight stumble

Opp 2: Addressed POI from opponent well. ~~Used~~ Good

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Prop team used evidence better, analysis and argumentation was more clear. Prop team needs to acknowledge opposing team on POI. Good style for both teams, there is room for improvement. Both teams very courteous.

PARLI Debate

Nash, Jennifer (*18)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 223
Gov: 4 O'Rafferty - Figueroa
Opp: 14 Kwong - Tan
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jennifer Nash

Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomery High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	O'Rafferty pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Kwong pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Figueroa pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Tan 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 evidence, cited specific source for evidence. Work on ~~filler~~ using filler words less.

Prop 2: Good job of re-stating of contention points.

Opp 2
~~Opp 1:~~ Good job of supporting + summarizing contentions. Several arguments were presented as questions vs. statements.

Opp 1
~~Opp 2:~~ Good job of directly refuting opponent's first contention, but could have used more evidence in other points. Need more eye contact.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Overall presentation, analysis was better. Opp #2 nice style, Prop #2 good style.

Sutton, Jim (*14)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 206
Gov: 22 Caramucci - Tarleton
Opp: 23 Cheng - Wei
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

advertising targeting children

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Jim Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	22	Team Code #:	23
Prop Speaker #1	Tarleton pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Cheng pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Caramucci pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Wei pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Need to have eye contact with judge. Should have given more speeches about your plan, and about back and forth speeches to that

Prop 2: Don't read from your notes. Good points, but speech was too short. Should have included specific examples of bad, dangerous ads.

Opp 1: Good eye contact. Confident speaking voice. Good coverage of all points. Speeches were a bit short.

Opp 2: Excellent speech. Beautiful speaking voice. Very well organized and thorough. Good point that it's hard to define a "bad ad" or an ad targeting adults vs children. You should be first speaker

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp won by pointing out that it's difficult to decide whether an ad is "good" or "bad" (eg, ads for toys) and that watching ads could improve kids' decision-making skills

nuclear energy

PARLI Debate

Sutton, Jim (*14)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 206
Gov: 23 Wang - Zhu
Opp: 27 Cohen - Lemenager
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jim Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	22
Prop Speaker #1	Wang pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Cohen pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Zhu pts 24	Opp Speaker #2	Lemenager 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: Too many POIs/POOs. Get your ~~hair~~ out of your face. Don't lean on table and read from your notes. Very persuasive speaking style. Be sure to respond to all of opponent's arguments.

Opp 1: Speaking style a bit melodramatic and hesitant - and then you went over time. Very good focus on voting issues in rebuttal - good summary.

Prop 2: You were clearly nervous, but you shouldn't have been! You had good responses and arguments, but you left their POIs fluster you. Don't look at your notes or worry about your opponents - focus on judge and your arguments.

Opp 2: Good points, but need to stay with a good order of opponent's arguments. Your numbers about cost of nuclear power were a bit "vague."

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

REASON FOR DECISION: OPP had good voter issues, but ~~AFF~~ regarded by Prop at that more funding on research will make nuclear plants safer and avoid future accidents.

PARLI Debate

Fernando, Kurukulusooriya (*4)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 201
Gov: 14 Luk - Tserennamid
Opp: 20 Fong - Ligutan
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	Luk pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Fong pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Tserennamid pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Ligutan 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 good speaker. I suggest better eye contact while delivering the speech

Opp 1: good eye contact. I would like if you could speak clearly when you are giving the speech

Prop 2: good eye contact pleasant.

Opp 2: good introduction on negating the point, good eye contact.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Team (14) delivered a better argument on their topic. They are better organized. They effectively analyzed their topic well.

PARLI Debate

Fernando, Kurukulusooriya (*4)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 201
Gov: 14 Bystrom - Gast
Opp: 8 Zaheer - Chaudhri
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Kurukulasooriya Fernando

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	8
Prop Speaker #1	Bystrom pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Chaudhri pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Gast pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Zaheer pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Very good speaker
good eye contact
very pleasant

Opp 1: gave lot of facts negating the topic.
good eye contact
very pleasant.

Prop 2: good eye contact

Opp 2: Very good speaker.
delivers facts flawlessly

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Team 8 clearly won the debate though both teams were very good. Team 8 delivered more facts. they are organized.

Policy - problem + solution appropriateness + merits of problem + solution

PARLI Debate

DeWitt, Jane (*14)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 205
Gov: 23 Ho - Prashanth
Opp: 12 Murdock - Santana
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jane DeWitt

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	12
Prop Speaker #1	Ho	Opp Speaker #1	Murdock
pts	28.5	pts	28
Prop Speaker #2	Prashanth	Opp Speaker #2	Santana
pts	27	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

substantially increase the regulation of advertising targeting children.

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

Prop 1: ~~strong~~ speaker - organized, good pacing + articulate. Case is good if not completely proven. Did give some examples / facts as evidence, but not 100% convincing. Did not strongly counter parent purchasing * counter argument.

Prop 2: A bit disorganized - did not refute contentions directly, got a bit sidetracked - freedom of speech became cruel to advertise to children, ~~[illegible]~~ spoke with emotion and delivered ideas in a good way.

Opp 1: Good job refuting Prop's contentions, ok contentions for own side. Good speaker, good pacing. Evidence for contentions not completely strong.

* Refutation that parents control purchasing good pt. Counter argument to Props contentions.

Opp 2: A bit disorganized presentation of arguments but made good points.

The disrupts free market argument is good but how that leads to monopolies + crashing economics is a bit of a stretch. Just loss of market share due to loss of advertising would have been enough.

TEAM CODE #: OPP **on the** 12 **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp) by a hair

REASON FOR DECISION:

Overall made a stronger + more concrete case and had better refutation to Props contentions.

PARLI Debate

DeWitt, Jane (*14)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 205
Gov: 2 Archibald - Hohmeyer
Opp: 27 Campanella - Petruska
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Policy

Judge's Name: Jane DeWitt

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 2		Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 Archibald	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Campanella	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Hohmeyer	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Petruska	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

substantially support nuclear energy (+ build self automated power plants on another planet

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: All 4 speakers are strong.

Prop 1: just don't suppress laugh when introducing idea - got to sell it, no matter what. Use of Chinese to illustrate ~~[illegible]~~ understandability of opps case (and) ok as a play on ~~[illegible]~~ did this without trying

Prop 2: disrespectful. Didn't really refute Opps contentions - just restated their refuting. Never established could have safe nuclear, just said it wouldn't matter.

Good attempt - backup w/ evidence & facts of technology to make plan feasible-ish.

Opp 1: Organized, passionate speaker. Good job not getting distracted by topical issue - you stated it but went on to your plan. + Good points good use of evidence - where was Fukushima?

Opp 2: Calm + systematic in speech. good job laying it all out again + calmly establishing why their plan won't work, why that they provided no evidence and supporting own contentions.

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

Favorite debate of the day! Thank you!

REASON FOR DECISION: PROP had an idea that would make safety + health concerns obsolete, but provided no evidence that we will have the technology to be able to build a nuclear power plant to on another planet + get energy back to earth. OPP pointed out weaknesses in their PROPs case + built strong case for themselves.

USFG & increase reg of adverts target kids.

PARLI Debate

Fogarty, Matthew (*16)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 204
Gov: 22 Sundararaman - Elmhirst
Opp: 14 Fong - Geller
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: MAT FOGARTY

Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 22	Team Code #: 14
Prop Speaker #1 Elmhirst pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Geller pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Sundararaman pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Fong 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 voice, very clear
- Take more time to build case
(First speaker was only 2.5 min)

Opp 1:
Good structure
Needs more passion + presence

Prop 2:
Good structure
Push harder on their points
(be more aggressive)

Opp 2:
Good voice
Nice story about woman with hole

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Freedom of speech + impracticality of change not addressed.

PARLI Debate

Fogarty, Matthew (*16)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 204
Gov: 23 Deng - Luo
Opp: 22 Baxter - Nam
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: MATTHEW FOGARTY

Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	22
Prop Speaker #1	LOU pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	BAXTER pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	DENG pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	NAM 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: LOU
Good passion, knowledge of rules, Long term vs Short term point was good.
Needs more evidence

Prop 2: DENG
Good structure, avoid the phrase "and stuff like that..."

Opp 1:
Good use of evidence
Good voice + poise

Opp 2:
Good structure
Good delivery

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop had good points, but OPP won because of evidence

The USFG should substantially increase regulation on advertising directed toward children

BURROUS, Eileen

PARLI Debate

~~Byrne, William (*20)~~
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 210
Gov: 14 Lee - Fairchild
Opp: 11 Arshad - Sankar
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Eileen Burrous

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 11	
Prop Speaker #1 Lee	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Sankar	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Fairchild	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Arshad	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good points; good supportive information, clear speaking. -

Prop 2: good points, good... supportive evidence - strong arguments, Logical development

Opp 1: polite, should listen to opponent better. argument a bit weak - clear speaking good eye contact

Opp 2: Argument lacks evidence. clear strong delivery. offer more concrete evidence / facts.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Good examples were offered for the Benefits of regulation of advertising reg. Points were relevant.

The USFG Should Substantially Increase Support for Nuclear Energy

BURROUS, Eileen

PARLI Debate

~~**Byrne, William (*20)**~~
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 210
Gov: 14 Lawrence - Privalov
Opp: 23 Eizner - He
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Eileen Burrous

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 23	
Prop Speaker #1 Lawrence	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Eizner	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Privalov	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 He	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 points, clear speaking. Good evidence good delivery - Better argument. Try to use more eye contact with judge & room.

Prop 2 Good clarification of points. Some arguments weak Money for schools not needed. good ideas. -

Opp 1: Argument was not clearly against. Needed to take a stronger stance against. Good speaking, Good questions.

Opp 2: Good points, good facts Points of info good.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Condello, Dave (*1)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 226
Gov: 23 Zhai - Khan
Opp: 22 Burrous - Blackenburg
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: DAVID CONDELLO

Judge's School Affiliation: ANALY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	23	Team Code #:	22
Prop Speaker #1	ZHAI pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	BURROUS pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	KHAN pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	VON BLACKENBURG 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: + GREAT POSTURE + POISE
- EYE CONTACT
+ STRONG POINTS, WELL PRESENTED
- RAN SHORT ON 1ST SPEECH (4 MIN)
+ GOOD JOB OF RE-STATING POINTS

Opp 1: + GOOD START, 1ST AMMENDMENT
+ EYE CONTACT
- A BIT TOO MUCH MOVEMENT
+ ADDRESSED + REFUTED PROP POINTS SYSTEMATICALLY + WELL
+ SUMMATION COVERED ALL POINTS WELL
- CITED NO ACTUAL FACTS TO SUPPORT POINTS

Prop 2: + PASSIONATE! GOOD TONE.
+ GOOD ORGANIZATION TO RESPOND TO OPP'S POINTS
- LESS LOOKING @ NOTES, LOOK UP MORE.
- SHORT - (4 MIN)

Opp 2: + NICE JOB OF SUPPORTING PROP CASE 1ST, THEN REFUTING OPP CASE.
- SLIGHTLY RATTLED, THEN PULLED IT TOGETHER. WILL IMPROVE W/ PRACTICE
+ EYE CONTACT

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

BOTH TEAMS MADE SOME GOOD POINTS AND SOME WEAK POINTS. BOTH ARGUMENTS COULD USE MORE FACTUAL SUPPORT. THE PROP TEAM PRESENTED THE STRONGER ARGUMENT.

PARLI Debate

Condello, Dave (*1)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 226
Gov: 14 Woo - Melman
Opp: 22 Harris - Marr
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: DAVID CONDELLO

Judge's School Affiliation: ANALY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	22
Prop Speaker #1	MELMAN pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	HARRIS pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	WOO pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	MARR 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:
+ CLEAR STATEMENT OF CONTENTIONS
- EYE CONTACT
- VERY SHORT (3 MIN) 1ST SPEECH
+ CLEAR STRONG VOICE
+ NICE REFUTING OF FUKISHIMA

Opp 1:
+ DEFINED TERMS SINCE PROP DID NOT
+ CITED FACTS FOR ENERGY COST
+ ADDRESSED PROP POINTS WELL
- EYE CONTACT VS READING NOTES
- BRIEF (4 MIN) - 1ST SPEECH
+ GOOD RECAP + SUMMATION OF ARGUMENTS - SHORT 2ND SPEECH

Prop 2:
+ STRONG START, GOOD TONE
+ REFUTED OPP RE: CHERYNOBL.
- EYE CONTACT VS NOTES
- SHORT (3 MIN)

Opp 2:
+ REFUTED PROP CONTENTIONS
+ CITED ALT ENERGY OPTIONS
+ CITED JAPANESE MELT DOWN
- EYE CONTACT VS NOTES
- SHORT (3½ MIN)

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP USED FACTS + ALT. ENERGY OPTIONS TO REFUTE PROP ARGUMENTS. BOTH TEAMS DID VERY WELL FOR NOVICES + WILL DO MUCH BETTER W/PRACTICE

PARLI Debate

Sawhney, Sakina (*7)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 202
Gov: 20 Afzal - Kelly
Opp: 14 Holwitz - Kay
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Sakina Sawhney

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 20		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Kelly	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Holwitz	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Afzal	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Kay	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

The US fed Govt should substantially increase regulations of ads targeting children.

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

Prop 1: Kelly :- Speech, delivery was good, contentions can be more organized and easy to flow. Provide stats. Viagra not targeting children as opp said. Can have interpretation which is about Ads on vast medias. cannot deny freedom of pres.

Prop 2: Good speech, eye contact
• Use google.
• Can organize a bit since the actual topic was not clearly addressed. ads "targeting children"

Opp 1: Greg Holwitz (Some people cannot afford $8/month).
① Bias: cannot be able to pick up bias.
② Contention - refuted - do not understand own contention :- Freedom of pres - Provide stats - Ads targeting children are not of viagra etc.

Opp 2: Good delivery and analysis. Good examples of parental control. Need stats (examples when you say daytime TV). organize your thoughts in connection with your examples. You had some good points.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Analysis and evidence was more weighed on AFF's side. AFF provided statistics showing ads which can be harmful for kids. Although Opp had many points that they could have expanded on, not evidence was provided for the costs etc.

12 or younger what is regulation ??
made public or promote.

① Biased opinion ⇒
promote a product.
example - cigarette ewertias.
(ess helpful. etc.

② Parents are not able to control
90% → children shows - PG 13 + R-Rated ??
Youtube ads. → re repercussions.

Pre frontal cortex.

① Bias :-

// Question
how does it create bias ✓ good question
(aff - not able to answer).

PARLI Debate

Sawhney, Sakina (*7)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 202
Gov: 1 Schloten - Condello
Opp: 2 Fickinger - Williams
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Sakina Sawhney

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 1		Team Code #: 2	
Prop Speaker #1 Schloten	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Fickinger	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Condello	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Williams	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

The USFG should substantially increase support for nuc. energy.

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

Prop 1: Good voice projection eye contact
- nuc → none attainable
- cost + wind turbine cost +
- safety. – dams can be dangerous.
- can be closely monitored.

ER → point not refuted by Neg.

Prop 2: Provide – statistics to support your evidence. Good speakers.

Less costly – example.

ER – less power.

overall a bit better analysis.

Opp 1: Good voice projection / delivery.
- NOT substantially
- very costly to build
- Have your thoughts organized since you have some great points.
- Nuclear energy plants are unsafe as odd Aff's contentions addressed. Provide stats data / study for your points.

Opp 2: Good voice projection eye contact.

Cost will be there

Provide more clear analysis on topic and include evidence with date / statistics to have better argument. avoid redundancy.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Although neither side provided any substantial evidence, Aff side was better at analyzing the topic, and they delivered their thoughts and points & better common knowledge facts.

PARLI Debate

~~Eppanapali, Vanaja (*11)~~
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 200
Gov: 14 Lyons - Wyszynski
Opp: 7 Bardalai - Rangwala
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jeffrey McKinney

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	7
Prop Speaker #1	WYSZYNSKI pts 26.5	Opp Speaker #1	Bardalai pts 27.0
Prop Speaker #2	LYONS pts 26.0	Opp Speaker #2	Rangwala 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: Prop Speaker was very nervous during first round but recovered well in second. Clearly articulated plan and contentions

Prop 2: Reinforced original contentions well.

Opp 1: Effectively went through Prop contentions and provided refutations.

Opp 2: Good roadmap, and good organization related to undercutting contentions.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

~~Eppanapali, Vanaja (*11)~~
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 200
Gov: 18 Raven - Fischer
Opp: 20 Ahmadi - Phan
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jeffrey McKinney

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 18		Team Code #: 20	
Prop Speaker #1 Fischer	pts 26.0	Opp Speaker #1 Phan	pts 26.0
Prop Speaker #2 Raven	pts 27.5	Opp Speaker #2 Ahmadi	pts 26.5

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: Prop Speaker #1 was nervous but still presented clear contentions.

Opp 1: Good clarification of definitions. Good focus on alternative energies.

Prop 2: Prop Speaker #2 was well spoken and focused on supporting contentions laid out by Prop #1.

Opp 2: Clear restatement of issues with understanding of primary points.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Whitmore, Robin (*14)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 207
Gov: 20 Alam - Nguyen
Opp: 18 Nash - Thrasher
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Robin Whitmore

Judge's School Affiliation: 14

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:		Team Code #:	18
Prop Speaker #1	Alam pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Nash pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Nguyen pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Thrasher 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 set of evidence. Would have liked to hear better explanation of funding aff.

Opp 1: great set of contentions and you argued well for them. Good use of POI.

Prop 2: Great refutation stating not all ads are on TV! Be careful of using "like" & playing with sleeves.

Opp 2: Great speaking ability and persuasiveness. Fantastic refutations of contentions

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The opposition clearly stated their contentions and clearly refuted the Proponents

PARLI Debate

Whitmore, Robin (*14)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 207
Gov: 23 Samra - Yim
Opp: 26 Sheridan - Sappington
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Robin Whitmore

Judge's School Affiliation: 14

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 23		Team Code #: 26	
Prop Speaker #1 Samra	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Sheridan	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Yim	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Sagansten	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 clear points of contention! Try to not read word for word.

Prop 2:
Good defense when you stated that waste was only a part of the issue, the pros outweigh cons.

Opp 1:
great enthusiasm, but you need to maybe giggle less. Also would be good to refute each of your opponents contentions.

Opp 2:
Good research & evidence and great ~~rebuttal~~ argumentation, especially about the newness of nuclear energy.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Better job of coming up with contentions and refuting the other side's contentions Much more polished.

PARLI Debate

Jacobs, Joel (*3)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 224
Gov: 1 Ochoa - Chand
Opp: 26 Goody - Sherman
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Berk

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:		Team Code #:	26
Prop Speaker #1 Ochoa	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Goody	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Chand	pts 24	Opp Speaker #2 Sherman	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: This is a policy res, not value. Consider using evidence.
Very passionate, clear speaking style
Don't end strong: don't trail off/pack up while still speaking
Xmas excitement was new in rebuttal.

Prop 2: U don't need to reread the res.
Focus on attacking the counterplan, not restating arguments the Opp agreed with.

You don't need to "extend all the points my partner made." If a couple are particularly important, then talk about them.

Opp 1: Explain why it matters that it's a policy round, e.g. that there should be a plan (which Prop doesn't give) and Opp can run a counterplan
U are right about lack of plan, but that's not your case; make the arg in the context of attacking Prop case.
Be reluctant to use Nazi analogies.
Work on eye contact. Counterplan should have agent of action, timeline, details, etc.

Opp 2:
Watch the rocking back and forth
Harms of ads not so important given counterplan. Focus on why ban is better than reg.
Need to respond to economy disadvantage raised by Prop.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp counterplan captured all net benefits of plan and went further.
Prop: talk to your coach about how to handle a counterplan.

PARLI Debate

Jacobs, Joel (*3)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 224
Gov: 2 Galvan-Carty - Lisy
Opp: 20 Valle - Pollard
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Berk

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	20
Prop Speaker #1	Lisy pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Valle pts 25
Prop Speaker #2	G-C pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Pollard 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: Say "US federal govt," not USFG - at least the first time.
Need more contentions.
Need evidence

Prop 2: A POI is not an extended dialog.

Opp 1: Avoid pronouns - "It is not a crisis right now."
The debt? Energy.
Need evidence re alternative energy options.
Unclear why US debt matters if both sides are spending money on energy.

Opp 2: Need to support arg that nuke energy pollutes.
Conclusion should be as forceful as rest of speech.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Gov argues effectively that nuclear is more efficient and productive than alternatives. Both are non-polluting.

Regulations on advertisements targetting children.

PARLI Debate

Keshav, Sineesh (*23)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 208
Gov: 14 Kerr-Stein - Lee
Opp: 11 Wang - Lin
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: SINEESH KESHAV

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON ACADEMY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	Kerr-Stein pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Lin pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Lee pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Wang 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: Kerr-Stein

+: good delivery
+: handled POI in 1st minute well
-: FFC?
-: Some points well made, others not well thought out
:consistency

Prop 2: Lee

-: Not Organized
- 300mm: refute not clear
- USFG as enforcer: did not address POI adequately
+: Confident delivery

Opp 1: Lin

+: Good POI
+: Topicality point
+: Great point on educational websites
+: Good examples
-: Delivery could be smoother

Opp 2: Wang

+: Good delivery
-: Argumentation did not address refuter adequately
+: Good point on funding

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

- Better arguments
- Topicality not refuted well

PARLI Debate

Keshav, Sineesh (*23)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 208
Gov: 14 Rettenmaier - Pineda
Opp: 20 Jerez - Moran
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: SINEESH KESHAV

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON ACADEMY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	20
Prop Speaker #1	Pineda pts 25	Opp Speaker #1	Jerez pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Rettenmaier pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Moran 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: Pineda

+: delivery was good
+: good final argument.
-: Too much reliance on notes
- brief

Prop 2: Rettenmaier

+: good refutes
+: good delivery
-: brief.

Opp 1: Jerez

+: good arguments
-: eye contact
+: good refute.
-: Refute Final was a repeat

Opp 2: Moran

-: Refute to tracking not convincing
+: Good refute on jobs
+: Confident delivery

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

> Better argumentation
> Better delivery
> More direct addressing of points

PARLI Debate

Lacombe, Victor (*25)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 221
Gov: 14 Chao - Wang
Opp: 2 Hemerling - Barnett
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: LACOMBE

Judge's School Affiliation: 25

USFG ↑ ADVERTISING TARGETING CHILDREN
Regulation OF

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 2	
Prop Speaker #1 WANG	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 HEMERLING	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 CHAO	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 BARNETT	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:

Plan- labelling, TV ads, 3 months.

Prop 1: 1) More money = benefit
2) benefit to adults
3) health of children
Good outline, kept to points
good eye contact

Prop 2: 1) Adults have money
2) problem: resolution
3) help Adult Co's, hurt Toy Co.'s
cont 1) TAX benefit
Restated original arguments to
Brought up disapproval 3rd contention

Opp 1: 1) already available
2) Freedom of speech
3) parents job, more harm than good
4) Some companies with (2c)
Confident speaker, clean presentation of argument, but must argue to benefit of Government best of individual.

Opp 2: 1. Harm to employees if Toy Co's
2. Freedom of speech if not harmful
3. Unemployment
Good speaker, uses hands a lot.
Keep to your outline and you will do well

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

REASON FOR DECISION: OPP refuted AFF contentions and brought forth more & stronger points of their own in this "plan" type debate.

PARLI Debate

Lacombe, Victor (*25)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 221
Gov: 14 Chan - Foley
Opp: 7 Maitra - Aggarwal
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: LACOMBE

Judge's School Affiliation: 25

USFG ↑ SUPPORT FOR NUCLEAR ENERGY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	7
Prop Speaker #1	CHAN pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	AGGARWAL pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Foley pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	MAITRA 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:

PLAN 1yr recycled URANIUM subsidies

Prop 1: 1. URANIUM Reliable, 24°
2. 11→ 8kt WIND more $
3. NUKES on STORE
4. SAVES LIVES - EARLIER

Clear flow 4 solid points

Plan vs status Quo

Prop 2: Roadmap good
Convincing speaker, very nice summation.

Opp 1: 1. UNSAFE, Prob. overrun
2. WIND & SOLAR more efficient than NUKE
3. ARMS ESCALATION
Possible HARM from Extraction
4) Negative costs
Good evidence forceful speech pattern
Good Semantics Inevitably misfunction

Opp 2: Roadmap, nice handling of Pro's
? excess energy from Nuke = cheaper => harm economy. Could have developed more specific numbers/dis-utilities

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

REASON FOR DECISION: AFF's PLAN was well defended. Opp countered well but had no counter other than status quo and did not have enough mag impacts to offset Pro's (+) points.