McCabe, Linda (*27) Round 4A 3:45pm Room 227 Gov: 11 Chippa - Cherukuri Opp: 5 Hinchcliff - McKinney	Judge's Name: Linda M Cabe
Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: Wind Sor High School
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) pts	
Prop Speaker #2 ( We ( u K u ( ) pts2	Opp Speaker #2 M King N-2 pts 25
	ased on the following scale:  29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)  <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Indaina Critaria
offered during the debate	Judging Criteria  fectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments  efficiently the debaters support arguments with
evidence—which may include fac	ts and references to authority as well as general knowledge d effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
• Points of Information: How rele	vant and effective were the questions and the answers speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
Courtesy: How courteous and res	pectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
each debater:	r compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
rop 1: a policymotion, defining the mechanism, but there was no ration for whythe USFG needed \$378 for regulated language, such as "other things."	alegiver Slippery slope argument is abit hyperbolic for me lations. Limiting ads will not lead to political unrest - anarchy suchas
that: Mention of toyst/videogomes to fleshing tout as a reason to include, will first speech you had time to do so Please your papers, to the lectural effect speak: Your to project a little more. I to project a little more. I come wiltime. B Good refutation	twill black something of the third will mind and
OF Neg's contentions.  TEAM CODE #: or	Proposition wouth hand movements of rings the Abit distracting, Good to note toxs/video open argument not expanded by aff Weakargum (Propositopp) wins this debate. about junk food consume by touther I not diabatic. Anecdatal evidence the grasp of how cases
REASON FOR DECISION: Opp had a Strong	er grasp of how cases for t convince
hyperbolic statem	er grasp of how cases even though I disagreed witheir ents

McCabe, Linda (*27) Round 4B 3:45pm Room 227 Gov: 14 Duan - Kim Opp: 20 Le - Rather Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's Name: Linda M Cabe  Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor Hich School
PROP  Team Code #:  Prop Speaker #1 Duan Dephn pts 26 Op	Team Code #:
V. + 1 2-	pp Speaker #2 Ppts 8
27 = Good (but possibly not good er	standing 28 = Very Good nough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	20 # Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior g Criteria
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively to offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently evidence—which may include facts and reference.</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effective by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective the control of the control</li></ul>	by the debaters support arguments with erences to authority as well as general knowledge ely the debaters respond to the arguments made effective were the questions and the answers n organized, communicative style that is pleasant
each debater:  you did a rice set up for the debate  Prop 1: Stating your plan funding  mechanism and timbric 1st speech  set up your arguments in favor of nuclear  and anticipated opponent arguments. Your  2nd speech included new arguments in  regionse to your opponent's counter Plan.  You weren't Pood, but you should have been.  Prop 2: You did not refute with neg's  Contentions as you should have. Your  speech was unorganized and hard to follow  Asking relatived? to opponents is 5+ range.  Your holters speaking style will improve will  TEAM CODE #: 20 on the follow	Good wention of the top of the your special of the special of

HERMAN, Ray (\*13) **PARLI** Debate Fulop, Anna (\*24) Round 4A 3:45pm Room 222 Gov: 14 Ng - Huang Opp: 3 Berck - Adams Parliamentary Debate/Novice Judge's School Affiliation: **PROP** Team Code #: Team Code #: Opp Speaker #1\_ Berck Prop Speaker #1 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) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior 26-25 = Fair24-20 = PoorJudging 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: SEEMED LIKE BRILLIANT THINKING THAT WAS NOT DISCIPLINED. BE WARY OF OOD POINT CITING PERSONAL EXPORIENCE. Opp 2: ASKING KOP PROOF IS GOOD. HOUNZ YOUR OWN IS RETTOR

TEAM CODE #: \_\_\_\_\_ on the \_\_\_\_\_ wins this debate.

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

BATTER BRUANIZED ARCHINENTATION, PULLED POINTS OF OBERTY AND "SOCIAL DAMAGE" WITHOU FALLING TO FREEDOM OF SPEEZIF

PARLI Debate    Parlimentary   Parli	26 26 e behavior
Prop Speaker #1	26 26 e behavior
Prop Speaker #1	e behavior guments
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  Judging Criteria  Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the anoffered 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 to the other side  Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the argument by the other side  Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the anse Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that and easily understandable	e behavior guments
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  Judging Criteria  • Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the anoffered 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 to the other side  • Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the argument by the other side  • Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the anse Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that and easily understandable	e behavior guments
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  Judging Criteria  • Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the anoffered 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 by the other side  • Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the argument by the other side  • Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the anse Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that and easily understandable	guments
<ul> <li>Judging Criteria</li> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the at offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general leading. How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the argument by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the ansience. Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that and easily understandable</li> </ul>	guments
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the an offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general leading. How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the argument by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the anset Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that and easily understandable</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general less that the other side.</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the anset Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that and easily understandable.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general leading. How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the argument by the other side.</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the anset Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that and easily understandable.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the argument by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the anse Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that and easily understandable</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the ans</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that and easily understandable</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the ans</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that and easily understandable</li> </ul>	nts made
• <b>Delivery:</b> How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that and easily understandable	wers
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judge	-
	es
Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improve	omant to
each debater:	ement to
Prop 1: Excellent opening Opp 1: Good opening	that
not as great on the de lost steam in the	Anal
dose but enough to Speech, Good idea	to swife
close but enough to Speech, Good iden win, Don't syou at to "cost herefit" to "gran	test impac
the end but they had impose	tras wel
the end / but they had impose	
Prop 2: USE your fine wisely   Opp 2: LIKED THAT YOU BROW	1. HT 11P
USE YOUR HIME WISELY LIKED THAT YOU BROW	dans
YOU can restate points citerroby, sitem is	11785 . 2 12120
In anothe way or as a BMPHASIZED THAT AN	11) 01000
TEAM CODE #: 23 on the HPF wins this debate.	INGIR SIP
You can restate points citerropyl, ston LD in another way or as a EMPHASIZED THAT AND TEAM CODE #: 23 on the HEF wins this debate. DATA  REASON FOR DECISION:	
MORE ORGANIZED, STRONGER DATA POINTS A	•
QUESTIONS ON ALLEPTABLE LOVEL OF SOFET	va wron

USFG Shad Sustaidly **PARLI** Debate Brown, Peter (\*27) increese regulation &

Round 4A 3:45pm Room 220 Gallettissy tagety children Judge's Name: PETER Brand

Gov: 4 Thomas - Raiston

One: 3 Comments. Opp: 2 Greenwall - DuPuy Judge's School Affiliation: Parliamentary Debate/Novice **PROP** OPP Team Code #: Team Code #: Prop Speaker #1 Palsh pts 27 Opp Speaker #1 Greens Opp Speaker #2\_ No P4 Prop Speaker #2 To-9/ pts 79 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) 24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior 26-25 = FairJudging 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: Opp 1: + Strang voice - broken speech Prop 1: + speaks clear

+ took Pol's

Con not als P.O. In first or
last minute of speak Opp 2: Good Voice + species clear + Good refutations Prop 2: + Good job taken pots and workstry off trade + Good refitation TEAM CODE #: 4 on the Pop wins this debate.

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: The pop referred all points points of the opp.

The opp shope contentions.

The USFG should substantially increase Supposed for nuclear energy **PARLI** Debate Brown, Peter (\*27) Round 4B 3:45pm Room 220 Gov: 5 Wu - Ayalon Opp: 20 Byrne - Pareja Judge's School Affiliation: Parliamentary Debate/Novice Team Code #: 5 Team Code #: 20 Prop Speaker #1 Ayalon pts 27 Opp Speaker #1 Hareje \_\_pts\_?7\_ Opp Speaker #2\_Burnel Prop Speaker #2 W Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior **Judging Criteria** Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate • Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters/respond to the arguments made by the other side • Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: + spakes clear + flows nice Opp 1: + Strong voice + cap: end speaker Opp 2: + Energetic Specker + UKD co-plate time slot perhally Prop 2: + Very calm and collected/ speaker +Casol use of time

TEAM CODE #: \_\_\_\_\_\_ on the Prop wins this debate.

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Both siles drapped contention. Prop made alefandia

Opp dialot really regate the left in the Prop

up with afternoteplan. For that I water for the Prop

up with afternoteplan.

Prop Speaker #1	Clark, Stacy/Wallis (*26) Round 4A 3:45pm Room 203 Gov: 14 Stroumza - Chen Opp: 20 Mart - Andola Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's Name: 4000 Affiliation: 4000 Affiliation:
Prop Speaker #2 4 YOUWIM pts W Opp Speaker #2 MWW pts II  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 29 = 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 their and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side • Points of Information: 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 courtous 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: + Cowres plan  + towards towards  - problements  - propulation  - Contention Ielathon to anything of the plan of the	PROP M	/a -
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  Jugging 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 courtous 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: + Courtery Plan  + Courtery Plan  + Courtery Plan  + Courtery Plan  + Contention Telathry to part in delivery  + Contention Telathry to part in the part in delivery  + Contention Telathry to part in the part in delivery  + Contention Telathry to part in the part in delivery  + Contention Telathry to part in the part in t	Prop Speaker #1 Men pts 4 O	pp Speaker #1pts_27
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: + Courtes Plan  + Worker's Township  - Content on Telation to anything of the plan of the prop 2: + Contant on Telation to anything of plan of the plan of t	Prop Speaker #2 4 V DV W pts V	Opp Speaker #2 MW pts 17
26-25 = Fair  24-20 = Poor  Juging 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 courtous 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: + Cowres, plan  + Cowres, plan  - Contact to the filterial to the following	30 = Perfect  29 = Out	standing 28 = Very Good
• 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: + Courtes plan  + 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: + Courtes plan  + Courtesy: How plans to all, the fact of the plans of t		
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 courts ous 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: + Courtes plan  + Courtesy: Township  + Courtesy: Township  + Courtesy: Township  - Contact on relating to adventising an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable  • Courtesy: How courts ous 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 plan  + Courtesy: Township  - Contact on relating to adventising an order of the plane of the p	Judgin	ng Criteria
Prop 1: + Coweys plan  + Westers towns  + Eye Contact to all,  Mindring opposition  Prop 2: + I dentified gaps in  opposition  Prop 2: + I dentified gaps in  opposition  Prop 2: + Then the gaps in  opposition  Opp 2:  Opp 3:  Opp 4 wind to pare in delivery  opposition  Opp 2:  Opp 3:  Opp 4 wind to pare in delivery  opposition  Opp 2:  Opp 3:  Opp 4 wind to pare in delivery  on the prop wins this debate.  TEAM CODE #:  Opp 1: + Good eye contact  opp 4 in delivery  opp 2:  Opp 3:  Opp 2:  Opp 3:  Opp 4 in delivery  opp 4 in delivery  opp 4 in delivery  opp 4 in delivery  opp 5 in delivery  opp 4 in delivery  opp 4 in delivery  opp 5 in delivery  opp 5 in delivery  opp 4 in delivery  opp 5 in delivery  opp 6 in deliv	<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and reasonable.</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effective by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in a and easily understandable</li> </ul>	the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments tly the debaters support arguments with ferences to authority as well as general knowledge vely the debaters respond to the arguments made effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
+ WWACTV5 towns  TEAM CODE #: 10 on the Prop of the in delivery  + WWACTV5 towns  + Word pace in delivery  + Contention relating to adventising unclease  - Contention relating  -	each debater:	
+ WWACTV5 towns  TEAM CODE #: 10 on the Prop of the in delivery  + WWACTV5 towns  + Word pace in delivery  + Contention relating to adventising unclease  - Contention relating  -	Prop 1: + Compres plan	Opp 1: + Goodeye contrut
Prop 2: + I dentified gaps in Opp 2: adventising an olement of the pace in delivery of the proposition on the proposition of th	+ www.tervs towards	+ boodpace in delivery
Prop 2: + I dentified gaps in Opp 2: adventising an olement of the pace in delivery of the proposition on the proposition of th	+ exe contact to all,	
touteurs to both pace in delivery  touteurs touteurs  TEAM CODE #: 14 on the 1000 wins this debate.  The properties of the delivery  The properties of the particular of the p	million opposition	_ Contention relations to
TEAM CODE #: 14 on the prop wins this debate.  TEAM CODE #: (Prop or Opp)	Prop 2: + I dentified gaption	Opp 2: Cand page in delivery
TEAM CODE #: U on the prop wins this debate.  TEAM CODE #: (Prop or Opp)	+ Frontrue-lusy to hollon	of outhors oban-
(Prop or Opp)	+ willows	+ During prop's rebutal may
(Prop or Opp)	TEAM CODE #: U on the	wins this debate. Parti VVLCs
The prop & presented goved analysis and their analysis of the topic wasclear & bersvasive.	REASON FOR DECISION:	n or ( )nn )
and Their analysis of the opinion	The prop & prese	ented governd analysis
	on d 'Their analy bersvasive.	615 UT TIVE 1 11 0 0000

	1 MALI Debate
Clark, Stacy/Wallis (*26) Round 4B 3:45pm Room 203 Gov: 2 Lanzone - Hubinger	Judge's Name: 4 My CARLY Judge's School Affiliation: 4000000 Andew
Opp: 14 Situ - Zhang	amous Andon
Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP	OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #: Ц
Prop Speaker #1 HVbnyew pts 25 Prop Speaker #2 WMVone pts	Opp Speaker #1 41th pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 MWVINE pts 15	Opp Speaker #2 WMM pts 25
Please award each speaker points based	l on the following scale:
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	good/enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	/
/	adging Criteria
• Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate	vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
,	iciently the debaters support arguments with
evidence—which may include facts ar	nd references to authority as well as general knowledge
	fectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	and effective were the questions and the answers
• <b>Delivery:</b> How well the debaters speal and easily understandable	k in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
,	tful the debaters were to opponents and judges
- Courtesy. How confident and respect	fur the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater:	empliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
a No Accordate	la .
Prop 1: + Auticulate	Opp 1: + Versuusive examples
/ , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	An whise
- Long day yes, but INIAF av	through
De no converse tot think about to alancing  delivery pace wholeshort to  get/through intormation  Prop 2:  + Artivalate	delate to contain
delivery pace whetebrote	- Exe contact
get/through intormation	/#oints
Prop 2: + AVTIVVIAte	Opp 2: + Ethort to convey passionately.
De la laut	passionately.
vone day yes, but	
_ Think about being courted	by Carlow rough NPS
y Prolegienal Throughout net	tale - Keview pauli riles
TEAM CODE #: on the	(Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	(Prop or Opp)
The Anal	+ NEWACH A PERIOR
ING THIS	1 . o m. v.
analysis.	treamled a persuasive
ī	

Zaheer, Affan (*8) Round 4A 3:45pm Room 228	Judge's Name: Affar Zaheer  Judge's School Affiliation: Dullin High
Gov: 26 Clark - Flanagan Opp: 23 Roth - Yue	
Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: Dublin High
PROP Team Code #:26	Team Code #: 23
Prop Speaker #1 Flanason pts 28	Opp Speaker #1
Prop Speaker #2 Clack pts 24	Opp Speaker #2 ye pts 24
27 = Good (but possibly not good	the following scale:  atstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)  <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and result of the Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful</li> </ul>	deferences to authority as well as general knowledge ively the debaters respond to the arguments made defective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges diments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: great delivery a poise Sood courtee arguments: main logic was weak, suspent to build story on the resolution a you can do bellee Prop 2:	Opp 1: Great opening, as arguments  a paint. Very niety stated.  Nice closing. over all good fob
delivery a connectivity in your	Opp 2: Please Slow down as you speak. You will be more impading with Slower & controller delivery.
TEAM CODE #: 23 on the	opp wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	were belter. Prop team did to defending the nesolution.

	1 ANDI Debate
Zaheer, Affan (*8) Round 4B 3:45pm Room 228	Judge's Name: Affer Take
Gov: 7 Mohiuddin - Sharma Opp: 25 Lacombe - Appel	suage s rame.
Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's Name: Affer Zohee  Judge's School Affiliation: Dullin High
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #: 25
My ihuddi	1000
Prop Speaker #1 Shadrage pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 pts 28
Prop Speaker #2pts_27	Opp Speaker #2 Shipping pts 27
Please award each speaker points base	<u> </u>
	= Outstanding 28 = Very Good
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
J	udging Criteria
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effect</li> </ul>	ively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
	ficiently/the debaters support arguments with
	and references to authority as well as general knowledge
	ffectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	/
	at and effective were the questions and the answers
	ak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
<ul><li>and easily understandable</li><li>Courtesy: How courteous and respect</li></ul>	etful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer coeach debater:	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: good stating arguments	Opp 1: Overt courter reguments,
Signal State of State	highlighting visks, a offering
Should emphisize more on cost	another alternate solution w/
us output compried to alterate	loccivista somo essí
Source of enewsy	less visk a some costs. Nice alosing
Prop 2:	Opp 2: good examples a Mice
Good examples, arguments	team work supporting each
close debate other side	
came out more compelling wy	
TEAM CODE #: 25 on th	OPP mine this debate
	(Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	12 . Ita Resolution
opp arguments were	compelling opposing the Resolution
- hearing in	which after to solution.

	PARLI Debate		
Baetkey, Kerri (*22) Round 4A 3:45pm Room 225 Gov: 2 Colbert - Clark	Judge's Name: Baetkey		
Opp: 7 Kaura - Gajula Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: SMHS		
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:		
Prop Speaker #1 Colbert pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Gajula pts 26		
Prop Speaker #2 Clark pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Kaura pts 27		
	n the following scale: Putstanding 28 = Very Good d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior		
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficie evidence—which may include facts and</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful</li> </ul>	ting Criteria  by the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments  centrally the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made  and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant  the debaters were to opponents and judges  pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  group of bords all around.  Opp 1: I liked when you brought up freedom of speech a government legitimacy. You also brought up that ads are changings. You were that ads are changings. You were calm aclear - work on your fluency t calm aclear - work on your fluency t eye contact. Your closing could be stronger.  Opp 2: I liked when you said it could bead Opp 2: I liked when you said it could bead to good ideas too! You also gave facts about the economy by stating Toys R Us and video game sales. That topped to		
	the Win!		
(Prop or Opp)			

The opp effered 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!

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

Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Gold Stein pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Scott pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Kniswaswamyts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Any Sovose 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 depaters 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 Tupressed with overall knowledge and debate factics! Great job!

Prop 1: You were calm, precise and matter of fact. Your natural cadence is very trust worthy a 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 vice flow and strong arguments. I liked your examples regarding health + environment. You asked good questions as park of your speech. Opp 2: Ex. "Why do we need more thor?" Outfils. You had good points. I liked "Eventhe when you referenced the trash Socks!" island (but it didn't relate) and then you brought up Croatia which was a year example.

TEAM CODE #: On the Prop or Opp) wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:

Goldstein layed if all out so clearly + then Krishnaswamy was emphatic, clear and added the Info. on fatalities related to all vs. wramium. They were so organized + precise,

PARLI Debate Nash, Jennifer (\*18) emifer NOS Round 4A 3:45pm Room 223 Gov: 25 Owen - Coscarelli Judge's School Affiliation: Mant gamery High School Opp: 23 Wei - Zheng Parliamentary Debate/Novice Team Code #: Team Code #: Prop Speaker #1 Opp Speaker #1 Opp Speaker #2 Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

24-20 = Poor

26-25 = Fair

Judging Criteria

<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

• 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 God Style, good, clear each debater: God examples, cited Opp 1: Speaking Style. Work Prop 1: Ox Specific examples, word m' Using words. But Addressed POI words less. Need from opponet well. acknowledge/opposing Summary after slight Dami Strop Stuble reputal. Prop 2: God Goto Supporting santner's arguments. God opponent well. Used Open sentence, summation could moother. TEAM CODE #: 25 on the PISP wins this debate. REASON FOR DECISION: Prop team Used evidence better, nalysis and argumentation was more clean. Prop

both teams. There is known

team needs to acknowledge opposing team on

improvement, as Both teams very courteous.

God styles for

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

		, ,
	10 - 1	• \ ~~ !!
	$(V \cap A \downarrow C)$	
Judge's Name:	Ulmifer	NIU 8' I

Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomeny High School

Famamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Attituation.
PROP 4	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 O'Raffery pts 28  Prop Speaker #2 Figuria pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Kwang pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Fi gucuoa pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Too pts 26
	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Iging Criteria ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
<ul> <li>evidence—which may include facts and</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effective by the other side</li> </ul>	iently the debaters support arguments with differences to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
<ul> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable</li> </ul>	ind effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ul the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Specific Source for evidence, cited work on fitter Using filler words less.	statements.
restating of contention points	used more evidence in other points. Need more eye contact.
TEAM CODE #: on the	WGP wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION: Overall (1)  WOS DEHEN. OPP#2 rice &	Style, Prop#2 good Style.

	a liething	PARLI Debate	
Sutton, Jim (*14) Round 4A 3:45pm Room 206 Gov: 22 Caramucci - Tarletor	alverting forgetting	Judge's Name: TIM	SHon
Opp: 23 Cheng - Wei Parliamentary Debate/Novice	1 a l de	Judge's School Affiliation:	owell
PROTeam Code #:	OP 22	OPP て	3
Prop Speaker #1		Opp Speaker #1	pts
Prop Speaker #2	vomuci pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Ve i	pts_27
		the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good l enough to qualify for elimination ro <20 = Reserved for rude or inapp	
	Judg	ing Criteria	
offered during  Evidence: How evidence—whi  Argumentatio by the other side Points of Information  Delivery: How and easily under Courtesy: How Using the above ceach debater:	reasonably and effectively the debate vappropriately and efficiench may include facts and n: How directly and effectle rmation: How relevant and well the debaters speak in erstandable vacourteous and respectful riteria, please offer comparison.	y the debaters analyze the topic and the type of the debaters support argument references to authority as well as go tively the debaters respond to the add effective were the questions and an organized, communicative sty the debaters were to opponents are bliments and/or suggestions for i	ts with eneral knowledge arguments made  the answers ele that is pleasant ad judges  mprovement to
Prop 1: Need to contact with pal prop 2: Hon't notes. Good joints, too hast. Marle has green examples of dd. TEAM CODE #:_	bod all speeds  read for your  A prech was  are included  bod, largerors  (23) on the	Opp 2: Excellent greece wie. Very well or Good fourt that it will and and or on a confidence of the contropp)  wins this debate.  Opp 2: Excellent greece a last or on a contropp wins this debate.	
REASON FOR DEC deflect to d ads for Larp) o lads decision-	cision: Off were adde whether and that was making Part	oporopp)  con ad is jood  thing ad wid	t that it! " or "bad" (et;

nullar

Sutton, Jim (*14) Round 4B 3:45pm Room 206 Gov: 23 Wang - Zhu	Judge's Name: Tim SHOV
Opp: 27 Cohen - Lemenager Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP	OPP <sub>7</sub> 7
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Wang pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Chen pts 76
Prop Speaker #2 Zuv pts 24	Opp Speaker #2 Lem enager pts 25
Please award each speaker points based 30 = Perfect 29 =	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not go	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	lging Criteria
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate</li> </ul>	rely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• • • • •	ciently the debaters support arguments with
<del>-</del>	d references to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
• Courtesy: How courteous and respects	ul the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer coreach debater:	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
B 1 T	
or have of it year, face. But the	Opp 1: freshy the a bet welodonational ord heritant-and then so went over time.  Very wed tous on wary sines is selected—prod runnary.
I toble and vedd ham on yste I now have makin the Be fire	Vary wed been on worky solver in
Prop 2: you were clearly revous, I shouldn't have been, you had	of Opp 2: (wood 10 int) but need to star with a part token of opponents agreent, you would about wood of widea
I recognize and whereath but	you number about wo of nuclear
of their lots fluter so worms of	Prop or Opp)  Wins this debate.
TEAM CODE #: (13) on the	(Prof) wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION: AND In all	Prop or Opp)
I and la Asudu int to I	more hody on ve reach will make
our land a death of the	may in ve fear all mile

Team Code #:  PROP Team Code #:  Prop Speaker #1 Luk	Fernando, Kurukulusooriya (*4) Round 4A 3:45pm Room 201 Gov: 14 Luk - Tserennamid	Judge's Name: Kurukulasoonya Jemando Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop 0/ Dowl
Prop Speaker #1 Luk pts 29 Opp Speaker #1 Tony pts 27  Prop Speaker #2 Serennampts 27 Opp Speaker #2 Light an 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 Opp 1: Fred the Contact Suggest delivery the Speak clearly when your are given fine Speaker opportunity. The Speak Reserved opportunity of the Speaker opportunity of the Speaker opportunity of the Speaker opportunity. The Speaker opportunity of the Speaker opportunity opportunity of the Speaker opportunity of	Opp: 20 Fong - Ligutan Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop Dowd
Prop Speaker #2 Serennamapts 27 Opp Speaker #2 Lightan 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 Opp 1: Good type Contact  Suggest beffer as the Contact  Suggest beffer as the Contact  Suggest beffer as the Contact  Toward Like it you could are free speak in the following the speak clearly when you are given the Speak clearly when you are given the Speak clearly when you are first in the first of the following the speak contact.  Prop 2: Good in Contact  Opp 2: Good in the factor of the following the contact of the following to the following the following to the following the following the following to the following to the following		
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, Opp 1: Gred trye tentact  Suggest better eye trutact  Suggest better eye trutact  While telivery the Speak clearly when your are given for the speak clearly when your great are given for the speak clearly when your great are given for the speak clearly when your great are given for the great are greatly to the great are greatly to the greatly that are greatly the greatly that the greatl	Prop Speaker #1 Luk pts 29	
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to quality for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor 20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior  Judging Critria  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 Opp 1: Fred life Contact Suggest before eye contact While delivery the Speak Speak Leady when your are given the Speak Prop 2: Good in the Contact Opp 2: Good introduction on regarding the point, Apod my contact.	Prop Speaker #2 Serennamid 2-	7 Opp Speaker #2 Lightan pts 27
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, Opp 1: good live contact  Suggest before any contact  Suggest before any contact  Speak clearly when your support arguments with evidence in the point of the speak contact  Opp 2: good live contact  Opp 2: good introduction on regarding the Speak contact  Negating the point of the speak contact  Opp 2: good introduction on regarding the point of the speak contact  Opp 2: good live contact  Opp 2: good live contact  Opp 3: good live contact  Opp 4: good live contact  Opp 2: good live contact  Opp 3: good live contact  Opp 4: good live contact  Opp 4: good live contact  Opp 4: good live contact  Opp 5: good live contact  Opp 6: good live contact  Opp 6: good live contact  Opp 7: good live contact  Opp 8: g		<u> </u>
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. Opp 1: good erge contact  Suggest better eye contact  Suggest better eye contact  Speak clearly when gour  Are given the Speech  Prop 2: good eye contact  Opp 2: good introduction and  Negating the point;  Prop 2: good eye contact  Opp 2: good introduction and  Negating the point;  Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments of the arg		
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 Opp 1: Good life Contact when your while delivery the Speak clearly when your and you have your fact that the first your could be delivered the Speak clearly when your fact you have your fact that you have your fact you have your fact that you have your fact you have your fact that you have your fact you when your fact you want you have your fact you want you		
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:</li> <li>Prop 1: Very good Speaker. Opp 1: good try contact of the properties of the properties of the properties of the properties.</li> <li>Prop 2: good try contact opposite the delivery for speak clearly when going fine speak.</li> <li>Prop 2: good try contact opposite the properties of the properties.</li> <li>Prop 2: good try contact opposite the properties.</li> <li>Prop 2: good try contact opposite the properties.</li> <li>Prop 2: good try contact opposite the properties.</li> </ul>	20-23 Tan 24-20 Tool	120 Reserved for fude of mappropriate behavior
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 opp 1: good laye contact while delivery has speak clearly when your are given the Speak clearly when your are given the Speak clearly when your are given the Speak contact.  Prop 2: good interest contact opp 2: good includation on pleasant oppositely the contact of the speak	J	ludging Criteria
<ul> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:</li> <li>Prop 1: Very good Speaker Opp 1: Good life Contact of your could like if you could be delivery the Speak clearly when your are given the Speak clearly when your are given the Speak</li> <li>Prop 2: Good life Contact Opp 2: Good instruduction on Pleasant of the Speak Contact of the</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effect</li> </ul>	tively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
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 opp 1: Good life contact of your contact of the support of		
<ul> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:</li> <li>Prop 1: Very good Speaker Opp 1: Good laye Contact of your could be the respective of the speak of your could be the super contact of your could be delivered the speak clearly when your are given the Speak</li> <li>Prop 2: Good eye contact Opp 2: good instruction on pleasant opposite the speak of your contact of your c</li></ul>		
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 Opp 1: good live contact.  Suggest before eye contact. I would like it you could while delivery the Speak clearly when your are giving the Speak.  Prop 2: good eye contact.  Opp 2: good introduction on pleasant.  Prop 2: good introduction on pleasant.	•	· -
<ul> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:</li> <li>Prop 1: Very good Speaker Opp 1: good live contact of your could like it you could like it you could like it you could while delivered the Speak clearly when your are given the Speak clearly when your are given the Speak</li> <li>Prop 2: good eyel contact Opp 2: good includation on pleasant opportunity the point of your contact.</li> </ul>	<del>-</del>	receivery the debaters respond to the arguments made
<ul> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:         Prop 1: Very good Speaker. Opp 1: Good laye Contact.         Suggest before eye contact. I would like it you could like it you could while delivering the Speak clearly when your are giving the Speak.     </li> <li>Prop 2: Good eye contact. Opp 2: Good introduction on pleasant.</li> <li>Opp 2: Good introduction on pleasant.</li> </ul>	<b>▼</b>	nt and effective were the questions and the answers
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, Opp 1: good life contact.  Suggest before life contact. I would like it you could while delivering the speak clearly when your are given the Speak.  Prop 2: good life contact. Opp 2: good included in management of the point.  Prop 2: good life contact. Opp 2: good included in management of the point.  Prop 2: good life contact. Opp 2: good included in management of the point.		
Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:  Prop 1: Very good & peaker. Opp 1: Good live Contact.  Suggest better live contact. I would like it you could while delivering the speak clearly when you are giving the speak.  Prop 2: Good light contact. Opp 2: Good instruduction on pleasant.  Opp 2: good light contact.  Opp 2: good instruduction on regating the point.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Prop 1: Very good speaker, Opp 1: Good eye contact.  I suggest better eye contact. I would like it you could while delivering the speak clearly when your are giving the speak.  Prop 2: good eye contact. Opp 2: good introduction on pleasant. Depoint, good eye contact.	• Courtesy: How courteous and respec	ctful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Prop 2: good eye contact Opp 2: good introduction on regating the point, good eye contact.	anch debatem	
Prop 2: good eye contact Opp 2: good introduction on regating the point, good eye contact.	Prop 1: Very good Speaker I Suggest better eye on while delivering the	opp 1: Good like it you could like it you could speech speak clearly when you
		0 0
	Prop 2: good eye contac	t Opp 2: good introduction on
	Pleasant.	negating the point;
REASON FOR DECISION: Yearn (14) delivered a better argument heir topic. They are better organized. They exectively lipsed their topic well.		good eye cartact.
REASON FOR DECISION: Yearn (14) delivered a better argument heir topic. They are better organized. They exectively limed their topic well.	TEAM CODE #: on the	ne Prop wins this debate.
heir topic. They are better organized. They effectively limed their topic will.	X	(Prop or Opp) a better argument
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	heir topic. They are ber	Her organized. They effectively

ound 4B 3:45pm Room 201	Judge's Name: Kumkulasoonya Jemando
ov: 14 Bystrom - Gast pp: 8 Zaheer - Chaudhri arliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop Dowd
PROP Team Code #: 14	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Bystrom pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Chaudhri pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Last pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Zahler pts 29
27 = Good (but possibly not §	ed on the following scale:  = Outstanding 28 = Very Good good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)  <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
<ul> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and effection evidence—which may include facts a</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevanted belivery: How well the debaters speatand easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respections</li> </ul>	ficiently the debaters support arguments with and references to authority as well as general knowledge affectively the debaters respond to the arguments made at and effective were the questions and the answers ak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant actful the debaters were to opponents and judges compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	- I a facts he matine
Prop 1: Very good Speaker good eye contact Very pleasant	
Prop 2: good eye constact	Opp 2: Very good speaker.  delivers facts flawlersly
	Propor Opp)  8 Clearly won the debate though  Tran 8 delivered more facts
TEAM CODE #: on th	

Policy-prodem DeWitt, Jane (\*14)

Round 4A 3:45pm Room 205

Gov: 23 Ho - Prashanth Opp: 12 Murdock - Santana appropriation + years of problem + saution PARLI Debate

lane DeWitt Judge's Name: <

entary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation:		
PROP Team Code #: 23	OPP Team Code #:   2		
Prop Speaker #1 December 11 pts 28.5	Opp Speaker #1 MW 1664 pts 28		
Prop Speaker #2 # Prushunth pts 17	Opp Speaker #2 San tuna pts 27		
Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:			

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Yery Good

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

26-25 = Fair24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

### Judging Criteria

• Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate

• Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge

• Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side

• Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers

**Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable

• Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Substantially increase the regulation of advertising targeting children. Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

good pacing + artculate. Caxis good if not completely proven Did give some examples struts as endure, but she was but not 100% convincing. Didnot Strongly counter parent purchasing \*
invasion angument
Prop 2: A bit disorganized - did not refute content ins directly, got a bit gide tracked - Freedom & speech became cruel to advernoe to children, activicadiacon una good way. TEAM CODE #: OPP

Opp 1: Good job refuting Prop's contentions, ok ion lent uns for own side. Good speaker, good pacing. Evidence her contentions not completely strong. Pefritalianthat pavents control purchasing good pt. Cunturarquiment to Props content mo. Opp 2: A bit disorganized in presentation

The disrupts free market argument is good but how that leads to monopolics + crashing cronomics is a bit 7 a street. Just loss 7 marketshare

9 arguments but made good points.

on the 12 wins this debate. due w 1055 7 advert sing (Prop or Opp) by a hair would have been enough. (Prop or Opp) by a hair

### **REASON FOR DECISION:**

Overall made a stronger + more concrete last and had beller refutation to Pizps contentions.

PARLI Debate Policy DeWitt, Jane (\*14) Round 4B 3:45pm Room 205 lane Dewitt Judge's Name: Gov: 2 Archibald - Hohmeyer Opp: 27 Campanella - Petruska Parliamentary Debate/Novice Judge's School Affiliation: PROP Team Code #: Team Code #: pts Vo Prop Speaker #1 Avzlubald Opp Speaker #1 ( a Mpanella Prop Speaker #2 Hohmener Opp Speaker #2 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) 24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior 26-25 = Fair**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 1 + build selbautomaked privarplants Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Wandful each debater: 4 Spialleys are Strong Prop 1: 14st dan't suppress laugh = When the trochicing I dia - got to bell it no matter what. Usele tend to the understandability Sof opps case fund 3 ok as aplay-3 Prop 2: alsixspectful ? Didn't really refuse gPKs

Lontentions-xist reflicted

Said it Wouldn't

TEAM CODE #:

en vatultahond. Never D.

Opp 1: Organized, passimate speaker. Good job not getting distracted by topicaling issue - you slated it but went in to your plan, & Good points good use Zeridence-Where was fukushimas Opp 2: Calm + ouslemanic in speech. good job laying it all out again + Calinty islablishing why their plan work, work, noting their they provided no Restablished loved have safe nuclear, just enidence and supporting own contentions. 27 wins this debate. Favor u debute of the day!

planet

REASON FOR DECISION: PROP had an idea that would make safty + health concerns obsolete, but provided no evidence that we will have the technology to be able to build a Tullear paver plant to on another planes + getenergy back wearch. OPP pointed out Weaknesses without Props case + built strong case for themselves.

# PARLI Debate Fogarty, Matthew (\*16) Round 4A 3:45pm Room 204 Gov: 22 Sundararaman - Elmhirst Judge's Name: MAT FOGARTY

Gov: 22 Sundararaman	- Elmhirst	_	ne: 100 AL
Opp: 14 Fong - Geller Parliamentary Debate/N	lovice	Judge's Scho	ool Affiliation: MIRAMONTE
Team Code #:	PROP 22	Team Co	OPP de #:
Prop Speaker #1	Elmhird pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Geller pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Sundaravamps 27	Opp Speaker #2_	Fong pts 27
Please award	l each speaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = 0		
<b>26-25</b> = Fair	27 = Good (but possibly not good 24-20 = Poor		fy for elimination rounds) ed for rade or inappropriate behavior
	Jud	ging Criteria	
•	How reasonably and effective aring the debate	ely the debaters a	inalyze the topic and the arguments
	: How appropriately and effici	iently the debater	rs support arguments with
evidence-	—which may include facts and	references to au	thority as well as general knowledge
_		ctively the debate	ers respond to the arguments made
by the oth  • Points of		nd effective were	e the questions and the answers
			communicative style that is pleasant
•	understandable		
• Courtesy	: How courteous and respectful	al the debaters we	ere to opponents and judges
Using the abeach debater	<del>-</del>	pliments and/o	r suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1:	/	Opp 1:	•
food voice, v	ery clear	Good S	touchuse
	ne to/build case	Needsn	lore pursion + prenence
int Speaker	warfonly 2.50 min	.)	
Prop 2:		Opp 2:	·
Good Stricter		Good ve	rue
M harder on l		Nice sto	ny about woman with hole
e more aggron			$\partial$
TEAM CODE	E#:   4 on the _		this debate.
REASON FOR		Prop or Opp)	
Freedom of		entit odila	& change not addressed
9/ /			

Fogarty, Matthew (\*16) Judge's Name: MATTHEW FOGART Round 4B 3:45pm Room 204 Gov: 23 Deng - Luo Opp: 22 Baxter - Nam Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE Parliamentary Debate/Novice **PROP** Team Code #: Team Code #: Opp Speaker #1 BAXTEN Prop Speaker #1 Opp Speaker #2 NAW Prop Speaker #2 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<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior 24-20 = Poor**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 debater's 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 depaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1:100 Good passion, knowledge of Good we of evidence bood voice + poise rules, Long termus Short terms point was good. Needs more evidence Prop 2: DENG Good structure, avoid the phrase "and stuff like that. ...

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

**REASON FOR DECISION:** 

Prop had good points, but OPP won because of lindence

The USFG-showld substant	PARLI Debate Toward children
<del>Byrne, William (*2</del> 0)	
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 210 Gov: 14 Lee - Fairchild	Judge's Name: Ellen Burrous
Opp: 11 Arshad - Sankar Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>San Marin High</u>
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1pts_27	Opp Speaker #1 San Kar pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Fairchild pts28	Opp Speaker #2 ATShad pts 27
Please award each speaker points base	d on the following scale:  = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	udging Criteria
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effects offered during the debate</li> </ul>	ively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
<u> </u>	iciently the debaters support arguments with
	nd references to authority as well as general knowledge
	ffectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
<ul> <li>Points of Information: How relevant</li> </ul>	and effective were the questions and the answers
• Delivery: How well the debaters spea	k in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and respec	tful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer co	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	1. aulite should between to
Supportive information, clea	Opp 1: Rolete, Should listen to opponent better, argument a
Supportive information, clear	Thomas server ackyairs
Speaking, -	bit weak - clear speaning
Special in to 1	bit weak-clear speaking good eye contact
Prop 2: good points good	Opp 2: Argument lacks evidence.
Supporting enidence - strum	g Clear string delivery offer.
arally of the state of the state of	g clear strong delivery offer more concrete gridence / facts.
Suppostive evidence - stron arquinents, Logical developments	in the serious to the terms of the serious to the s
lu .	^ <b>V</b> · <b>C</b>
DEACON FOR DECISION O	(Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	xamples were office to the
serverus of Regulation of	ette wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) (Xamples Werl Hered for the adventising reg. Points were
rulliant,	

the USF C Should Substantial	y inviewe support for nuclear energy	
BURROUS, Eileen	PARLI Debate	
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 210 Gov: 14 Lawrence - Privalov Opp: 23 Eizner - He Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's Name: <u>Elleen Burrous</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>San Marin High</u>	
PROP	OPP	
Team Code #: 14	Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 LAWNING pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 2/2/10/ pts	
Prop Speaker #2 Prival pts 20	Opp Speaker #2pts	
Please award each speaker points based of		
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)	
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior	
Jud	ging Criteria	
<ul> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant at Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable</li> </ul>	ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges	
Using the above criteria, please offer comeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to	
Prop 1: Good points, Clear Speaking, Good avidence good delivery-Better avgument. They to use more eye contact with judge of room,  Prop 2: Good clarification of points, Isame arguments yeak Money for Schools Not releded, good ideas, -		
TEAM CODE #: on the wins this debate.		
REASON FOR DECISION:		

	PARLI Debate
Condello, Dave (*1) Round 4A 3:45pm Room 226 Gov: 23 Zhai - Khan Opp: 22 Burrous - Blackenburg	Judge's Name: DAND CODDELLO
Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: ハトAレソ
Team Code #: PROP 23	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 ZHA1 pts 2	
Prop Speaker #2 KHAU pts 2	Opp Speaker #2 BLACKENBURGpts 26
Please award each speaker points bas 30 = Perfect 2	sed on the following scale: 9 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly no	ot good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
<ul> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and evidence—which may include facts</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevand belivery: How well the debaters spand easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and resp</li> </ul>	efficiently the debaters support arguments with and references to authority as well as general knowledge effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made ant and effective were the questions and the answers beak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant sectful the debaters were to opponents and judges  compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  COOD STRET, AMMEDIANS  Opp 1: + EYE CONTACT  OPP 1: + EYE CONTACT  AMMEDIANS  OPP 1: + EYE CONTACT  OPP 1: + EYE CONTACT
SREECH (4 mis)	+ SYSTEMATICALLY + WELL + SUMMATICAL CONSPECTO ALL POINTS WELL
+ GOOD /JOB OF RE-STATING	75 101075
	PROP CASE 157, THEN REPUTING
SOME WEAK POINT	NAME SOME GOOD POINTS AND  S. BOTH ARGUENBUTS COULD  IL SUPPRET THE PROP TEAM

Condello, Dave (*1) Round 4B 3:45pm Room 226 Gov: 14 Woo - Melman Opp: 22 Harris - Marr Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's Name: Name: AAALY
Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge S School Attituation. (VV - V - )
Team Code #: PROP	Team Code #: 22
Prop Speaker #1 MELMA pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 HARRIS pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Uos pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 MARR pts 27
Please award each speaker points based of	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair <b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	ging Criteria
offered during the debate	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
<del>_</del>	ently the debaters support arguments with
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
	ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side  Points of Information: How relevant a	nd effective were the questions and the answers
	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
<ul> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful</li> </ul>	al the debaters were to opponents and judges
The shoot of the short of the s	
each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
+ CLEAR STATEMENT OF	+ DEFINED TERMS SINCE PROP DID NOT + CITED RAWS POR GUERCY COST
Prop 1: CONTENTIONS	Opp 1: + ADDRESSED PROP POLITS LIGHT
- E-15 CONTACT (3 MIL) STAGE	- ETS CONTACT US READING MOTOS
- NEWY SHOW (3 MM) SPAGE	
+ NICE REPUTING OF FURISHIM	A GOOD RECAP + SUMMATION OF
· ·	ARGUMENTS - SHORT ZUD SREECH
+ STRONG START, GOOD TOME	+ RUFUTSD PROP CONTENTIONS
Prop 2: + REFUTED OPP RES	Opp 2: + CITED ALT ENERGY OFTIONS
CHERTHOBL.	GLOS STEM DEBLASA ASLT DOWN
- EYE COLTACT US MOTES	- EYE CONTACT US MOTES
- SHORT (3 MIN)	- SHORT (342 mis)
TEAM CODE #: 22 on the	
(P REASON FOR DECISION:	rop or Opp)
	ALT. ENERGY OPTIONS TO REPUTE
trop Argumbuts.	BOTH TEAMS DID WERY WELL
FOR NOVICES + L	SILL DO MUCH BUTTER W/PRACTICE

4A 3:45pm Room 202 20 Afzal - Kelly		Judge's Name: Cakka	Cawhaly
14 Holwitz - Kay amentary Debate/Novice		Judge's School Affiliation:	DVHS.
PROTERENT ROOM PROCESS AND A COMMAND AND AND A STATE OF THE STATE OF T	n en general negletæt flætte kommunekten i henne og att i staten i skillen en sen og en staten. Det en sen sen	OPP	Commission and a distribution of the state of the commission of the state of the st
PROP Team Code #:		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Kelly	pts_ <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #1 Holung	pts_ <u></u>
Prop Speaker #2	pts_ <u>27</u>	Opp Speaker #2 Kary	pts <u>LD</u>
Please award each speaker	points based	on the following scale:	A ka ka pingangangangangangan panahara ka ka ka panahara a ka
		Outstanding 28 = Very Good	
		od enough to qualify for eliminatio	
26-25 = Fair 24-20	$0 = \mathbf{Poor}$	<20 = Reserved for rude or in	nappropriate behavior
		lging Criteria	
		ely the debaters analyze the topi	ic and the arguments
offered during the debate		. /	
<del>-</del>	•	iently the debaters support argu-	
		dreferences to authority as well	
	irectly and effe	ctively the debaters respond to	the arguments made
by the other side			
<ul> <li>Points of Information: ]</li> </ul>	How relevant a	and effective were the questions	and the answers
• <b>Delivery:</b> How well the	debaters speak	in an organized, communicative	e style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	, -		•
• Courtesy: How courteou	us and respectfo	ul the debaters were to opponen	ts and judges
	, -		· •
Using the above criteria, pl	lease offer con	antiely increase regr apliments and/or suggestions i	for improvement to
each debater:		1	Child
	/		
Prop 1: Kelly: - Speed	delivery.	Onn 1: 444	Sompeople canda \$810 able to pick up br
The special series	por will	off weg Holwitz	318/
good, contentiais ck	n be mac	· ( Bras : Carrot Se	able to piece up br
	wto Gow	2 10 10 0 000 make	led - An not unde
provide stato.  Niege nor tagilis che opposid. Can karefirte	0 - 8 - 200 .	S Contened 1491	ited-dond unde
M. Viene nor Carelin Ch	ildrewen.	own caterlas: - Pr	ecden of him.
Opposid Can have inte	pretitie	Provide state- Ad	s largely children
assume not one	rast medias	- Mr of Viagnocic.	
Prop 2: Good Speech	, eye can	East Upp 2: Good delovery a	nd analysis.
« lise google.	•	Good evamples of paren	cal control. Need sta
· Can organize a bit	Since The	Cexamples when your	ay daythie TV).
ltopic was not clear		- A	in conjuction with your
	V	examples. You had son	egood points.
largeting children			• •
tangeting children			•
TEAM CODE #: 20	on the _		•
TEAM CODE #: 20	(1	AFF wins this debate. (	Low point wind.
TEAM CODE #: 20	(1	AFF wins this debate. (	Low point wind.
TEAM CODE #: 20  REASON FOR DECISION: A	(1 Inalysis an	AFF wins this debate.	Low point wind.  e weighted on AFF's

ads

What is regulated ?? 12 or yough was is need to public or provole.

O prais I gravior - product.
example - exquest cuestics.
less herfel. ct.
3 basets are 10t able to control

90% -> Children's shows - PG13 + R-Rated ? Contula ads. + 12 represensións.

he forth enter.

O Bio:

// Grestoi

how dow to create bies o good question (aff-not able to answer).

Round 4B 3:45pm Room 202	Judge's Name: Sakera Sawhrey
Gov: 1 Schloten - Condello Opp: 2 Fickinger - Williams	
Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP	OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #: 2
Prop Speaker #1 Schloten pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 <u>Fickinger</u> pts <u>1</u> ) Opp Speaker #2 Williams . pts <u>1</u> )
Prop Speaker #2 Condello pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Williams . pts 17
Please award each speaker points based	<u> </u>
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair <b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Ju	dging Criteria
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effective</li> </ul>	vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
<ul> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficiency</li> </ul>	ciently the debaters support arguments with
evidence—which may include facts an	d references to authority as well as general knowledge
·	ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	and effective were the questions and the answers
	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
	ful the debaters were to opponents and judges
The USFG Should Substantially Using the above criteria, please offer co	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
Prop 1: Good voice projection ese	Opp 1: book voice projection/delneing.
· Cost 4. Word Turbue cost 7	· very costly to build
"Safety" - dans can be dangerous	· Lave your thenge to Organized since you
· Can be closely wornland.	hape some great points.
ER-) point not refuted by Neg.	Aft's contentions addressed. Provide state
speakers: brande-statisties speakers: to support your evide Ex-avsig power.	Opp 2: Bood voice projecte data/study
speakers. to support your evide	va executact.
Less costin- example. ~/	Cost will be There points.
ER-lising powen.	movide more clear analysis on Topic and
ornall doit better analysis.	Include evidence with date / statistics to have better agravent. avoid xellation day of AFF wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION: although	reither side previded any Entstantial
evidence, Aff side was be	etter at analysis the Tonis and Their
delivered Their Thought and	etter at analyzing the topic, and They do shite a setter common knowledge facts

	1711CE1 Debute
Eppanapali, Vanaja (*11)  Round 4A 3:45pm Room 200  Gov: 14 Lyons - Wyszynski  Opp: 7 Bardalai - Rangwala  Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's Name: Teffrey McKinney  Judge's School Affiliation: Campdinds
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #: 7
Prop Speaker #1 WTSZ (WSCI pts 26.5	Opp Speaker #1 Bas dalax pts 27.0
Prop Speaker #2 LTONS pts 26.0	Opp Speaker #2 Rangiala pts 27.5
	n the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Juds	ging Criteria
<ul> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficience evidence—which may include facts and</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant ar</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectfure</li> </ul>	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge cively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Prop Speaker was very inervans during first round but recovered well in second. Clearly articulated plan and confentions	Opp 1: Effectively went through Prop Contentions and provided refutations.
Prop 2: Reinforced organal contentions well.	Opp 2: Good roadmap, and good organization related to undescutting contentions.
•	OPP wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	

Eppanapali, Vanaja Round 4B 3:45pm Room 200 Gov: 18 Raven - Fischer Opp: 20 Ahmadi - Phan Parliamentary Debate/No				me:Teffrey ool Affiliation:	McKinney	
Team Code #:	PROP	* 1, 215.17	Team Co	OPP ode #: 20		
Prop Speaker #1_	Fisher	_pts_26.0	Opp Speaker #1_	Phan	pts_ <u>26</u> .O	
Prop Speaker #2_	loen	_pts <u>27.5</u>	Opp Speaker #2	Ahmadi	pts_24.5	
	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					
		Ind	ging Criteria		,	
offered du  Evidence: evidence— Argument by the othe Points of I  Delivery: and easily Courtesy:	tation: How directer side Information: How How well the deba understandable How courteous and the criteria, please	y and efficited facts and the facts and effect of the facts and effect of the facts and respectful to the facts and respectful the facts and respectful to the facts and r	ently the debate references to an etively the deba and effective were in an organized all the debaters were pliments and/o	ers support argument uthority as well as ters respond to the re the questions and communicative so were to opponents and or suggestions for	ents with general knowledge arguments made and the answers tyle that is pleasant and judges	
Prop 1: Prop Nervous b Clear Conte	Speaker#1 out still prese outions.	was onted	1 /		tion of us on alternative	
well spoke on support	Specific #2 w on and focus orting content by Prop#1.	num's	points.			
TEAM CODE REASON FOR			rop or Opp)	s this debate.		

Whitmore, Robin (*14) Round 4A 3:45pm Room 207 Gov: 20 Alam - Nguyen Opp: 18 Nash - Thrasher Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's Name: Rubin Wmtmore  Judge's School Affiliation: 14
PROP	OPP _
Team Code #:	Team Code #: \\ \lambda \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\
Prop Speaker #1 Navyen pts 27  Prop Speaker #2 Navyen pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Nash pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Nau Yes 27	Opp Speaker #2 Thrasher pts 28
	atstanding 28 = Very Good
	enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judgi	ing Criteria
<ul> <li>offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and reaction. How directly and effect</li> </ul>	of the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments  ntly the debaters support arguments with eferences to authority as well as general knowledge ively the debaters respond to the arguments made
	d effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer comp each debater:	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Good set of evidence. Would have liked to hear better. explination of funding abble	opp1: great set of contentions and you argued well for them. Good use of POI.
Prop 2: great refution Stating not all ads are on TV! Be careful of using "like" & playing with sheeres.	Opp 2: Great speaking ability and persulasiveness. Fantastie returns of Consenting
TEAM CODE #: 18 on the	op or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION: The opposition clear	arter stated their contention

Whitmore, Robin (*1 Round 4B 3:45pm Room 207 Gov: 23 Samra - Yim Opp: 26 Sheridan - Sappir Parliamentary Debate/Nov	ngton	Judge's Name: Robin Whitmore  Judge's School Affiliation: 14
P	ROP	OPP 2 la
Team Code #:		Team Code #: $2\varphi$
Prop Speaker #1	Samra pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Sheridan pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Yim pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Sapanston pts 27  Opp Speaker #2 Sapanston pts 27
Please award ea	ach speaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = 0	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27		d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair	24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Jud	ging Criteria
offered during Evidence: He evidence—we evidence—we by the other Points of Interpretable Delivery: He and easily un	ow reasonably and effective ing the debate low appropriately and effici- which may include facts and tion: How directly and effect side formation: How relevant and ow well the debaters speak inderstandable	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges
		pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 2:  Good do  YM Stated  Was only  ISSE, He T  TEAM CODE #:  REASON FOR D  Better	tor word.  Jense when  I that waste  I a part of the  Bros outweigh a  ECISION:  OBJECTION:	rop or Opp)  To a up with antentims
	more poles	2 other sides contentions Led.

Jacobs, Joel (\*3) Round 4A 3:45pm Room 224 Judge's Name: Gov: 1 Ochoa - Chand Opp: 26 Goody - Sherman Parliamentary Debate/Novice Judge's School Affiliation: PROP OPP Team Code #: Team Code #: modd! Prop Speaker #1 Opp Speaker #1 Ze(Man Prop Speaker #2 Opp Speaker #2 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) 24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior 26-25 = Fair**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 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 folicy round, e.g., each debater: Prop 1: This is a policy res, not valve. Consider using evidence. that there should be a plan Lwhich Very possionate, clear spenking Opp can run a counterplan Vare right about worlbook of plan, but that's not your case; make the arg in the context of attacking Pap case. Xmas exchanent was new in replic he rejustant to use Work on eye contact. Conterplan Lould have grant of action, Prop 2: U don't need to repeat the res. Watch the rocking back and Focus on attacking the downterplan, not restating arguments the Opp agreed with MAHARMS of alls not so important given counterplan. Focus on why bun is better than Need to respond to economy discitranting raised by frog. on the (Prop or Opp) **TEAM CODE #:** wins this debate. REASON FOR DECISION: Opp counterplan captured all not benefits of plan and went further.

Prop: talk to your coach about how to handle a counterphn.

Jacobs, Joel (*3) Round 4B 3:45pm Room 224 Gov: 2 Galvan-Carty - Lisy Opp: 20 Valle - Pollard	Judge's Name: Oncobs	
Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation:	
PROP Team Code #:	7 Team Code #: 0PP	
Prop Speaker #1	pts 27 Opp Speaker #1 Valle pts 25	
Prop Speaker #2	pts_0 Opp Speaker #2 Vollard pts_27	
30 27 = Good (1	ker points based on the following scale:  0 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good  but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)  1-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior	1
	Judging Criteria	
<ul> <li>Evidence: How approve evidence—which may</li> <li>Argumentation: How by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information</li> <li>Delivery: How well the and easily understands</li> <li>Courtesy: How court</li> </ul>	nably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments pate operiately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with y include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge we directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made in: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers he debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant able seous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges	
anala dalandari	, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to	
Prop 1: Say "US federal of at least the first time." Need more contentions. Need evidence	Need CVidence re alternative energy options. Undoor why Us debt matters of both sides a	i(l
Prop 2: A POI is Act o	Conclusion should be as forceful as rest of	y pollutes. - Speech.
REASON FOR DECISION  Then allernatives, Bo	on the Prop wins this debate.  (Prop of Opp)  I: Gov argues effectively that nuclear is more efficient and postular are non-polluting.	odutive

V	Regulations or	r PARLIDE	lisements bate	tangettus
Keshav, Sineesh (*23 Round 4A 3:45pm Room 208 Gov: 14 Kerr-Stein - Lee	3)	Judge's Name:	NEESH	KESHAV
Opp: 11 Wang - Lin Parliamentary Debate/Novi	ce	Judge's School Aff	filiation: SAN	RAMON ACADEM
P Team Code #:	ROP 14	Team Code #:_	OPP   11	
Prop Speaker #1	Kerr-Steinpts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Lin p	15 <u>2</u> 8
Prop Speaker #2	Lee pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Wang /	pts_27
Please award ea	ach speaker points based on 30 = Perfect 29 = Ou	_	/	
27 :	= Good (but possibly not good	~	• /	
<b>26-25</b> = Fair	<b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for	rude or inappropri	ate behavior
	Judgi	ing Criteria	<i>Y</i>	
_	ow reasonably and effectively	the debaters analyz	ze the topic and the	arguments
offered durin	_	-41414-1-4-1-4		41.
	ow appropriately and efficient which may include facts and re			
	tion: How directly and effect			
by the other s	side		-	
	formation: How relevant and	,	-	
	ow well the debaters speak in nderstandable	an/organized, comi	nunicative style tha	at is pleasant
-	low courteous and respectful,	the debaters were to	opponents and jud	lges
·	/			
Using the above each debater:	e criteria, please offer comp	liments and/or sug	gestions for impro	ovement to
Prop 1:	er-Stein	Opp 1:	<u>in</u>	
	delivery	+: G.	red POI	
+: hand	lled POI in 1st	+: Top	xicality po	ent educational websites
min	ute well	+: Gre	eat point on	educational
-: FFC	of others not well	+ : Go	ou examples	-
. some points well m	hade, others not well thought out consistency	- ' D-		d be smoother
Prop 2: Lo	: Consistency	Opp 2:	Jang	
300 mm refu	ite not clear	+ ; G	ood delvery	٥ ، ، ، ،
الالتار مم عما	bores : clad and	- ; <b>♦</b>	Argumentate	on did not
1. Cordida to	addess Pol adeg	velely "	adohus ref	futer adequately
TEAM CODE #:	thought out consistency  te not clear  forcer: dud not address Pol adleg  elivery on the (Pro	Opp wins this	od pout tilebate.	n funding
REASON FOR D	(Pro ECISION:	op or Opp)		
_	Better angu	ments		
	Topicality n		ed well	

	PARLI Debate
Keshav, Sineesh (*23) Round 4B 3:45pm Room 208 Gov: 14 Rettenmaier - Pineda	Judge's Name: SINFESH KESHAV
Opp: 20 Jerez - Moran Parliamentary Debate/Novice	Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON ACADEN
Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #: 20
Prop Speaker #1 Pineda pts 25	Opp Speaker #1 Jerez pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 ReHenmaier pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Monaw pts 26
27 = Good (but possibly not good	the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ing Criteria
<ul> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:</li> </ul>	ntly the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge rively the debaters respond to the arguments made deffective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges
Prop 1: Pineda	Opp 1: Jerez
t: delivery -: Too much volume volume or notes  ! good final - brief angument.  Prop 2: Rettermare  +: good refutes  +: good delivery  -: brief  TEAM CODE #: 14 on the	t: good arguments  -: Rejute  -: Rejute  +: good rejute  Opp 2: Moran  -: Rejute to tracking  not convincing  +: Good rejute on jobs  Prop wins this debate.
(Pro REASON FOR DECISION:	op or Opp)
> Better angi	imentation
> Better del	t addressing of points
7 More duce	t addressing of points

Lacombe, Victor (*25) Round 4A 3:45pm Room 221		Judge's Name	e: LACONS	F
Gov: 14 Chao - Wang Opp: 2 Hemerling - Barnett Parliamentary Debate/Novice USFは、1 ADVELTISING TARGET  PROP	ine cui	_	_	
Regulation OF PROP		wre n	ΛDD	BBCB, W. C. at 1 C. Augustiniug BBCBCBCBCBCBCBCBCBCBCBCBCBCBCBCBCBCBCB
Team Code #:		Team Cod	OPP 2	
Prop Speaker #1 WANG	pts <u>27</u>	Opp Speaker #1	<i>temercing</i>	pts_ <i>_28</i>
Prop Speaker #2 C #A O	pts <u>27</u>	Opp Speaker #2_	BARNETT	pts 27
Please award each speaker point 30 = Perfe 27 = Good (but possil 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Po	ct <b>29</b> = Or bly not good	itstanding 28 = enough to qualif	= Very Good by for elimination ro	•
	Judg	ing Criteria		
• Analysis: How reasonably and offered during the debate • Evidence: How appropriately evidence—which may include • Argumentation: How directly by the other side • Points of Information: How and easily understandable • Courtesy: How well the debate and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and  Using the above criteria, please each debater:  Prop 1:   Prop 1:   More More of the above of the abov	and efficie facts and r y and effect relevant and ers speak in d respectful	ntly the debaters eferences to autively the debated an organized, of the debaters we liments and/or	s support argumenthority as well as gers respond to the actions and communicative stylere to opponents are suggestions for in the communications are suggestions and communicative stylere to opponents are suggestions for in the communicative suggestions are suggestions for in the communicative suggestions for interesting suggestions suggest	ats with general knowledge arguments made the answers yle that is pleasant and judges
Prop 1: 1) herefit to assure 3) heath of chiefer of chiefer of chiefer of posterie, Kapa y p	en voints	4)	Some Congrass	lea presentation of
good eye contact		Com	beed of	included.
Prop 2: 13 A duth have more problem = resolution. 3 help Adud (95'5, hunt	Taylo ?'s	2. 1	minimunical	reach of Tay (B') reach of medhermful unposed.
Restated original arguments Brought up alrephent 3 com TEAM CODE #: 2	on the	Keep		contliné a dyan
REASON FOR DECISION: Ορ	Pro) P Netw	op or Opp)	contestion	is anal
REASON FOR DECISION: OF brought forth more in this plan's type	e sol	oneges p	W fe chara	ark ours

Lacombe, Victor (*25) Round 4B 3:45pm Room 221	1
Gov: 14 Chan - Foley	Judge's Name: LACOMBE
Opp. 7 Maitra - Aggarwal	Judge's School Affiliation: 25
Parliamentary Debate/Novice USFG 1 SUPPORT FOR NUCLEAR ENG	RG
PROP	ØPP _
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 CFAN pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Aggat WAL pts_38
Prop Speaker #2 Foley pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 MATTRA pts 27.5
Please award each speaker points based on	
	itstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
20 20 1411 21 20 1001	Treserved for rade or mappropriate semavior
Judgi	ng Criteria
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively</li> </ul>	the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficien	
,	eferences to authority as well as general knowledge
by the other side	ively the debaters respond to the arguments made
•	l effective were the questions and the answers
1	an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	, ,
• Courtesy: How courte ous and respectful	the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer comp	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	Opp 1: 3 ARMS ESCALATION
Plan 120 resched Jeanium 18 ubsidies	1 2 wind & SOIAR more effected the 100kg
Prop 1: 1. URANIUM Ralindie, 24°	Opp 1: 3. ARMS ESCALATION
Clear Hour 2. 11 - 8	Possible HARM from
4 solutions 3. Notices en Starte Lives - Continue	I success of success follow
	Good ex color from
flor vo status Que	
	Opp 2: Readmap, mice hardling of pails 3 19 xcc on ang from Nike = cheaper = Tharm 19 xcc on ang from Nike = cheaper = Tharm
Prop 2: looknay good	Opp 2: Pradmap 1 Noke = cheaper = Tharm
speaker, very med	28 xcc 3 c. 16 197 from 6 wangled out
Commercy	
Conumeing speaken, very mee	que fin mules des asters
TEAM CODE #: on the	PROP wins this debate.
(Pro	p or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION. HTT 3 PTAN	mutes other than claim quo
well but had no	PROP wins this debate.  Opp or Opp)  was well defended. Opp combine  outer other than claim quo  some my ast to offer their
and alid not have another	8. 9
(+) points.	