PARLI Debate

Fernando, Kurukulusooriya (*4)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 301
Gov: 16 Stephen - Miskelley
Opp: 14 Yee - Morrell
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Kurukulasooriya Fernando
Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

PROP 16		OPP 14	
Team Code #: 16		Team Code #:	
Prop Speaker #1 Miskelley	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Morell	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Stephen	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Yee	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:

Team 16

Prop 1: Very good introduction your speech has clarity. Very good conclusion.

Prop 2: You responded opponents arguments well. Good eye contact. Clear speech.

Team 14.

Opp 1: I liked the fact that you introduced your self in the beg. It nice if you can slow down a little.

Opp 2: Good Introduction.

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Team (16) provided more evidence including facts & references. They also responded well to the arguments made by Team (14). Team 16 also had a better delivery. Therefore I think Team (16) won the debate

PARLI Debate

Fernando, Kurukulusooriya (*4)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 301
Gov: 27 Inman - Young
Opp: 11 Munshani - Baveja
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Kurukulasooriya Fernando

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	27	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	Inman pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Baveja pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Young pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Munshani pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Your speech has clarity. I was a little confused about the conclusion at the end. You can really attract the audience when you speak.

Prop 2: I liked the fact that you pointed out how universal health care is & taxation money will go to important services. I would like if you can slow down a little when you speak.

Opp 1: Your examples are great on financial collapse in Mexico & Asia. Your speech has clarity - You are a good debator.

Opp 2: I would like if you can speak clearly. I was not able to follow your speech well. I liked the fact that you attempted to support arguments with evidence.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Team 27 delivery is good. They spoke clearly &

PARLI Debate

Cuddihy, Odessa (*5)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 528
Gov: 22 Mubarack - Troup
Opp: 2 Stamm-Kirk - Brogan
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Odessa Cuddihy

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	22	Team Code #:	2
Prop Speaker #1	Nathan Troup pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Katie Stamm pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Bilal Mubarak pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Olive Brogan pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Spoke well and clear good research and information. very well organized

Opp 1: Provided great evidence on conclusion Spoke a little too fast but was clear to speak and understand

Prop 2:
did not convince me where they would spend tax $ well argument and organized

Opp 2: provided great information was confident responded well to partner and Prop

TEAM CODE #: ~~22~~ 2 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP was more convincing of how the concluded and did very well with information

PARLI Debate

Cuddihy, Odessa (*5)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 528
Gov: 6 Morehead - Andrews
Opp: 27 Skarr - Escarcega
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Odessa Cuddihy

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	6	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	Max Moorhead pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	JP Escarcega pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Andrews pts 25	Opp Speaker #2	Anna Skarr pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: spoke well, with good argument, was not clear who would take the burden of the issue.

Prop 2: was not prepared well lost in train of thoughts/ notes

Opp 1: very well prepared facts and information was effective. spoke very quickly but was clear

Opp 2: Team ~~were~~ was well organized had good references and data

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP was well prepared provided great argument in a clear manner with facts.
Prop was not well prepared did not provide enough information to convince me on their case

The USFG should significantly increase regulation of cryptocurrencies like Bitcoin

PARLI Debate

Lawrence, James (*14)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 230
Gov: 4 Walsh - Moser
Opp: 17 Sweeney - Hsieh
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: James Lawrence

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:		Team Code #:	
Prop Speaker #1 Moser	pts 25	Opp Speaker #1 Sweeney	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Walsh	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Hsieh	pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: (+) Well presented (-) look up more

Speech for all crypto to link to currencies

Regulate currencies - hard to argue for economic stability overall.

Prop 2: (+) good delivery
Excellent eye contact.

Opp 1: (+) Very clear speaking style. (+) Clear presentation
(+) Well organized arguments
(-) POI - 2 first very similar.

Opp 2: (-) Initially rushed - slowed down well
(-) too much "right" at end.
(+) good clear arguments.

TEAM CODE #: 17 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: The prop failed to demonstrate a feasible implementation and oversold regulation to control currency.
Opp argued well that regulation as proposed not able to implement, not able to affect much trade. Perhaps regulate transfer cryto currency to regular currency.

Moser

Prop

Regulate crypto currency

Legislation or all crypto

TF too
Instead - not

Net benefit - US

1) Illegal trade
Regulation ↓
Evidence - Org control both
US could + society suffer
POI:

2) Controlled currency / Money
No stability to currency
- overspent
Could obtain Companies
- Implicit - economic stability
Less poverty, less banks
(A reach for limit to employ
all crime, poverty

(+) Regulate

POI - How US regulate it.
- Sweeney.

Sweeney

Opp

Morality -
Cryptocurrency - not all
international and only
- Note - mathematical
- not all evil
Judge - harness tools
Regulatory difficulties

1) Little reason to use.
- little effect on economy
Bitcoin - not currency economy

2) little harm.
More crime w/ wire
transfer

3) Ford or Bitcoin
- Slight to other

4) ~~Hard~~ Difficult to implement
Secure transfer -
Not answerable to courts
- Right to privacy

5) All advantages lost
if regulated.

Rebuttal 1) - not able to enforce
△ Illegal trade
most common stability
POI - # 2) Drug trade prior.
Regulate US - or
2)
(+) Closer.

Welsh

Prop

Introduction.

Response to doc -
Opp agrees - almost all evil + bad

Algorithm - Plan but to Opp
algorithm - overstated

POI - Point you gain once

Rebuttal - Introduction
Org control - promote crime, terrorism
→ Not all

2) Difficult to implement
→ go into algorithm - Not crime
but see this

3) Illegal trade
Just look at amounts, who

4) Control economy.

POI -
- anonymity
- Deterrent

(+) Good Opp control
Clear distinction

Hsieh

Opp.

Truly Address
"Right" at all

1) Crime - not much crime

2) Economic &
Money value transactions w/ markets
Value - not stable

Opp argument
1) Not much harm.
- If shut down

2) Fast - Bitcoin may go
Ex. franchise.

Definition - "almost always"
- not correct
Formula - not close today.

(-) "Right"

(+) Crypto
Control
Slowed

Sweeney

Privacy aspect
Definitions -
Cryptographic techniques
not rewrite

1) Implementation
Not addressed
- Public transaction
but private parties

2) Org Crypto
Cryptography - can use
- fundamental right to privacy
(CW)

Org Control - minor users
Most cash.

Implementation - not shown
how.

Net harm - fundamental right
Percent - low org finances

Moser

Thanks

Definitions -
Not mention cryptography
initially

Not benefit US.

- Economic Stability -
Regulation steer

- Algorithm -
says does not change
to theft

Weighing
Security over privacy

Future - no economic crime
- less crime.

Usfg tax financial transactions

PARLI Debate

Lawrence, James (*14)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 230
Gov: 4 Cunningham - Yau-Weeks
Opp: 27 Ernst - Davis
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: James Lawrence

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 4		Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 Cunningham	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Ernst	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Yau-Weeks	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Davis	pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

*All excellent.

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

Prop 1: (+) clear delivery
Excellent statistics/evidence

(-) Dropped problem with having local/state gov. regulate all financial transactions.

Prop 2: (+) good eye contact, clear.

oversold the prop
"will remove income inequality"

Opp 1: (+) very clear.
Excellent delivery - Best modulation or tone
Comfortable style

Opp 2: (+) good delivery

USA to industry - not salient to financial tax

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

REASON FOR DECISION: OPP argued well, and slightly better than the other side, which oversold the benefits
Either team could win with an argument about benefits or harms to holding stocks/bonds for longer, avoiding financial churn. Prop could win by stating it would improve markets efficiency - buy and hold.
Very well argued on both sides - a tough call.

Scrum.

Cat rangleau

Clegg
Ernst

Sophie
You-weeks

Christophe
Davis

Ernst

Commission

Policy roundel

Def - current
Financial trn - stocks + bds

Tax - 10% tax bracket / graduate
UCFG. Net benefit

1) Economic collapse
- Inequality;
Inf - faster growth

CWH 1% 40% wealth
stocks market - real estate in weeks
CWH - 65% for top 10
Ex State Gdp.

PoI - 1 - top

2) Economic growth market top 20 Billion/yr by 2015
CWH can be
- Create jobs - more money to economy.

(I)
Clear,
Excellent Facts
Literature

Thanks
Refute
Border Pres
Description - cede
Net benefit

1) Economic Collapse
Time - Developed vs Developing.

US - different
legislation /

10%
Wealth pg 75% of US pop.
→ tax pay leave. ←
Moderation:

PoI - 80% of Approval
2) Growth - $ for developers
Is now right -

Burden proof -
"Lack of free market not so free"

2) Financial Threat - not true
Self-regulation

3) State + local prefer to USFT (I)
Excellent eg.

A) Economy fragile Context
Now - "Keller"

B) Discourage US Pub Companies
PoI - Why
Pays.

(+)
Clear
Well argued.
Excellent modulation

Sophie
You-weeks

DEconomic Collapse
Inf -
No limit to wealth leaving -
"Solve income inequality"

2) Growth -
- Money in economy
"trickle down" to low class.

- Formal money to economy
"Corporate taxes unless forced"

- If No action
"will always have income inequality" unless tax tax

Route:
Fragile economy

Private companies - have stocks
(but not transactions)

(-) oversell
tax tax will fail income inequality

Christophe
Davis

Roadmap
Rewrite Prop

Burden of proof.

1) Economic Collapse
Is 75% or tax
Argue graduated tax does affect Rich more.

Inf study - not reported
Developing vs developed
US on its own. (not

2) Growth -
$20 billion/yr
Jobs + companies - overseas
US Auto industry - not bailout
due to financial tax.

PoI - tax American Corporate - in US + jobs

Neg Case:
1) Bad time -
now slow steady growth

2)

Burden of proof -
Take away freedoms.
State

(+) Bad eye Context

Ernst

Step Back.
Few Quotes

1) Is Now the Right Time.
Fr - ASAP -
- TPP, China economy collapse.

2) Who -
66% press state should vs fed
Police health.

3) Effect of taxes
- Tax - not good for us
- Only top 10%

"Cannot jeopardize relationship with new"
Taxes - would lead to job loss

4) Risk -
Benefit - "maybe"

Commission

Tax - appropriate tax bracket

Affect - everybody affect with more

1) Companies leave -
Auto industries -
Companies stayed + stocks in US.

2) Private companies
- Say private stock
(Not actual transaction)

3) Leave
CWH says they will not leave

Disputed points:
2008 collapse
was - Less

Company tax -

Not comfortable
Fed gov vs State gov.

USFG Should increase reg of crypto currency **PARLI Debate**

Brown, Peter (*27)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 306
Gov: 14 Katz - Huynh
Opp: 11 Deshpande - Lingampalli
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Peter Brown

Judge's School Affiliation: Wichita

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 11	
Prop Speaker #1 Katz	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Deshpande	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Huynh	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Lingampalli	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
+ Strong voice
+ Good body language
- Did not completly define resolve

Opp 1:
+ Good flow
+ clear speaker

Prop 2:
+ Good refutes
+ Took POI and stayed on track
- Assumed we knew what resolve was

Opp 2:
+ Big voice
+ Confident speaker

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The opp was able to refute all points successfully. The prop did not define the resolution until 2nd speaker.
* Both teams utilized the clock great *

USFG should impose tax on financial transactn

Brown, Peter (*27)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 306
Gov: 2 Holt - Mizin
Opp: 7 Mattegunta - Nandakumar
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Peter Brown

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 2		Team Code #: 7	
Prop Speaker #1 Holt	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Nandakumar	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Mizin	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Mattegunta	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 confident speaker
+ Told opp how to debate
+ Took charge of round

Prop 2:
+ Addressed opponent directly
+ Refuted all points
+ Pointed out dropped contentions

Opp 1: + speaks clearly
+ Very personal speaker
- Dropped contentions

Opp 2: + Good voice
- Need to use clock better.
- Stopped at 3:20 and did not take P.O.I

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The prop sucessfully refuted the opp and the opp dropped many contentions.

PARLI Debate

Ambrose, Mrs (*24)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 307
Gov: 27 Malfavon - Hulett
Opp: 7 Alvarez - Baluja
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Sheila Ambrose

Judge's School Affiliation: SRV

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #: 7	
Prop Speaker #1 Malfavon	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Alvarez	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Hulett	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Baluja	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Spoke a little fast. Good job on rebuttal/ wrap up.

Opp 1: Good job outlining pts. A little more organized in rebuttal.

Prop 2: Great job pointing out flaws in opponents case.

Opp 2: Spoke a little fast. Clearer outline. Attack pts. one by one rather than on.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop supported their plan. Opp did not show how plan did not work.

PARLI Debate

Ambrose, Mrs (*24)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 307
Gov: 11 Kurada - Datta
Opp: 2 Rubsamen - Partsuf
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Sheila Ambrose

Judge's School Affiliation: SRV

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 11		Team Code #: 2	
Prop Speaker #1 Datta	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Partsuf	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Kurada	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Rubsamen	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Did a great job outlining pts

Opp 1:
Excellent outlining pts + refuting opponents pts

Prop 2:
Excellent flow on pts + counter pts.

Opp 2:
Sounded too aggressive in tone. Pts. were good.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp was able to take holes in Prop. arguments & show where Prop did not prove their plan

PARLI Debate

Deng, Bo-Liang (*23)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 526
Gov: 3 Wolf-Jacobs - Nagarajan
Opp: 5 Jia - Jiang
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Bo-Liang Deng

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	5
Prop Speaker #1	Wolf-Jacobs pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Jiang pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Nagarajan pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Jia pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: well organized and delivered the points. direct respond to the arguments

Prop 2: reasonable analysis directly and effectively respond the ~~the~~ points of opp. well organized and delivered

Opp 1: P1. slow down, showed respectful to the opponents and judge

clear delivery the points/ on the 2nd round, the speach ~~is narrate was~~ ~~well~~ is more better than the 1st time

Opp 2: well organized and delivered direct respond to the arguments

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

clear outline the points

PARLI Debate

Deng, Bo-Liang (*23)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 526
Gov: 14 White - Hall
Opp: 16 Aguilera - Zhou
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Bo-Liang Deng

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	16
Prop Speaker #1	Emily Hall pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Zhou pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Thomas White pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Aguilera pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

I Prop 1: well organized and easy to understand, well delivered. showed respect to other people provided evidence to support.

IIII Opp 1: direct and effective respond to the points made by the other side provided relevant answers and facts to support

III Prop 2: provided effective answers to the questions. delivered the points.

II Opp 2: direct respond to the questions very well delivery the debate, and easy to follow up.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
very good organized and delivered very well

PARLI Debate

Lanzone, Shannon (*2)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 529
Gov: 16 Kapoor - Berger
Opp: 3 Curl - Aghadjian-Newbrough
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Shannon Lanzone

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 16		Team Code #: 3	
Prop Speaker #1 Kapoor	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 D. Curl	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Berger	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 A. Newbrough	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
-Great analysis & evidence
-fantastic roadmap for how regulations are used work
-Your nerves settled over time and your thoughts became clearer when you relaxed.

Prop 2:
- Slow your speech & breathe!
- Your knowledge of facts, evidence and rebuttal points are great but hard to keep up with

Opp 1: Excellent delivery, eye contact, body language
-Loved the road map of what you were going to say
- strong arguments
- perhaps clearer evidence

Opp 2:
-Another great road map for the judge to follow
- interesting & informative with complicated facts

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** opp **wins this debate.** (Prop or Opp) — cleared in 16 role over time

REASON FOR DECISION:

The opposition laid out a clearer set of facts and counter-arguments to the prop's motion. Both sides dealt beautifully with a complex scenario, but the opposition presented a more compelling case for the motion to fail.

PARLI Debate

Lanzone, Shannon (*2)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 529
Gov: 4 Basrai - McKenna
Opp: 16 Banisadr - Weiner
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Shannon Lanzone

Judge's School Affiliation: Berkley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	16
Prop Speaker #1	Basrai pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	Banisadr pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	McKenna pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Weiner 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: Nervous quick speaking hindered the speaker from laying out a clear roadmap of facts and arguments, but she recovered beautifully and responded well during rebuttal.

Prop 2: Excellent presentation, tone, pace and use of parliamentary rules. Would have liked to hear clearer facts and pla

Opp 1: Excellent roadmap of counter-arguments and opposition facts. Great presence, pace, eye contact, manner. Beautiful joke on final rebuttal of dealing with topicality conflict.

Opp 2: Very impressive mastery of facts and logic, but nervous movements and laughing at his opponent took away from the positive tone of the debate overall.

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The prop simply failed to assert a compelling set of facts or arguments to support its assertion, and the opposition responded to the the props arguments plus provided many more in reply. -SLP

PARLI Debate

Fogarty, Matthew (*16)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 229
Gov: 4 McAvoy - Hester
Opp: 5 Siu - Moore
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: MAT FOGARTY

Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	5
Prop Speaker #1	HESTER pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	SIU pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	MCAVOY pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	AUDREY pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
GOOD SET UP + STRUCTURE
GOOD VOICE + EYE CONTACT
I LIKED YOUR FINAL SUMMARY

[AVOID NOISE AS OTHERS ARE SPEAKING)

Prop 2:
GOOD STRUCTURE
POINT BY POINT REFUTATION GOOD.

[AVOID NOISE]

Opp 1:
SLOW DOWN YOUR WORDS - MAKES IT HARD TO FOCUS WHEN YOU TALK TOO QUICKLY
GOOD REFUTATION
BUT WEAK ORIGINAL ARGUMENTS (ECON COLLAPSE). NOT CLEAR WHY REG ⇒ COLLAPSE.

Opp 2:
LITTLE EVIDENCE ON HOW WORLD ECONOMY WORKS & CURRENT ROLE OF BITCOIN
GOOD EYE CONTACT.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
WEAK POINTS FROM NEG

PARLI Debate

Fogarty, Matthew (*16)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 229
Gov: 14 Chin - Rosenfeld
Opp: 27 Chu - Fraga
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Mat Fogarty

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 ROSENFELD	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 LUKE	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 CHIN	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 BEN	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 LIMITED SCOPE & TOPIC
- DID NOT EXPLAIN WHY 2% TAX WOULD REDUCE BAD DEBT
- LIKED HOW YOU STARTED WITH HISTORICAL SETTING (CRASH)

Prop 2:
- GOOD DEFENSE OF THE TOPICALITY
- TOO MANY POIS (SIT DOWN)
- CONFUSED BETWEEN DEBATING MORTGAGE VS STOCKS, AFF CAN SET TOPIC

Opp 1:
- AGREE THAT TOPIC WAS VERY NARROW
- GOOD POINTS FOR STOCK TRANSACTIONS BUT
- DID NOT ADDRESS MORTGAGES.
- BLIND FAITH IN BENEFITS OF CAPITALISM NOT A STRONG POINT

Opp 2:
- GOOD VOICE + CONFIDENT
- TOPIC WAS SO CONFUSED
- 2016 point WEAK.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
TOPICALITY DEFINED THIS DEBATE. AS BOTH TEAMS WERE ARGUING FOR DIFFERENT THINGS. PROP'S TOPIC WAS SKEWED + NOT FAIR BUT OPP HAS TO FLEX AND ADDRESS THEIR POINTS.

PARLI Debate

Geter, Emerald (*20)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 428
Gov: 27 Galli - Girimonte
Opp: 3 Cramer - Griffin
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Emerald Geter

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	27	Team Code #:	3
Prop Speaker #1	Galli pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Cramer pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Girimonte pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Griffin pts 30

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 eye contact.
- Speaking rushed, some words unable to understand.
- Sidebars mid-speech.

Prop 2:
- Move away from the use of uh, um and basically.
+ Great tone, pacing + eye contact.

Opp 1: - Be careful with your hands, 1/2 the time they are bouncing infront of you, distracting
+ Great tone and pacing.
+ Great job refuting points.
+ Great speech organization.
+ Great job expanding on previous points.
+ Great POI

Opp 2:
+ Commanding tone
+ Very organized speech
+ Great use of teammates POI

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

They were very organized, and very clear. Refuted all claims made by the PROP.

PARLI Debate

Geter, Emerald (*20)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 428
Gov: 2 Booth - Pracar
Opp: 13 Cummings - Ellsworth
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Emerald Geter

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 2		Team Code #: 13	
Prop Speaker #1 Booth	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Ellsworth	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Pracar	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Cummings	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: [illegible]
+ Captivating speech.
+ Clear sources for facts.
+ Very organized speech, very organized flow.

Prop 2:- Very fast speaking, some words hard to understand.
+ Great refuting using facts + sources.
+ Great use of strategic POI

Opp 1: + Clear roadmap and great organization.
+ Great tone, pacing and eye contact.
+ Great refuting.
- Claims made with no facts to back them up.

Opp 2:- Use of "Um" too much
+ Very organized speech.
- Facts without sources.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

They were very clear with facts and sources for each claim. They successfully refuted OPP.

PARLI Debate

Wang, Yipin (*11)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 303
Gov: 27 Amato - Ringstrom
Opp: 14 Sutton - Moon
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Wang, Yipin

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: Gov 27		Team Code #: ~~Gov~~ Opp 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Amato	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Sutton	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Ringstrom	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Moon	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
A lot of good information

Opp 1:
Very good presentation skills. clear & good speed.

Prop 2:
~~Very~~ stay on topic very good, very confident

Opp 2:
excellent volume and speaking rate

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop team is more persuading to me.

PARLI Debate

Wang, Yipin (*11)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 303
Gov: 14 Lustig - Gerenrot
Opp: 27 Rosenthal - Dondero
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Wang, Yipin

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	Gov 14	Team Code #:	Opp 27
Prop Speaker #1	Gerenot pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Dondero pts ≥9
Prop Speaker #2	Lusting pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Rosenthal pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
excellent presentation and speech, very clear

Opp 1:
very good eye contact, ~~very good~~ excellent presentation skills

Prop 2:
good variation of tone ~~and~~

Opp 2:
good information, good speech

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp have ~~more~~ good points. team a lot of

PARLI Debate

Rajani, Seema (*7)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 302
Gov: 14 Cohen-Simayof - Drake
Opp: 26 Kornfein - Stromberg
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Seema Rajani

Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: Gov 14		Team Code #: Opp 26	
Prop Speaker #1 Drake	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Kornfein	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Cohen-Simayof	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Stromberg	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Clear in some parts not all.
Reasonable analysis of topic.

Opp 1:
Great use of tone of voice gestures and eye contact.
Made effective counter agreements. - responded well.

Prop 2:
Satisfactory analyzes the top.
Fluency was satisfactory and reasonable fluency

Opp 2:
Content is clearly logically organized.
Responded effectively made by the other side.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Great / Effective presentation with spontaneous arguments with evidence.

PARLI Debate

Rajani, Seema (*7)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 302
Gov: 11 Meswani - Harith
Opp: 4 Murphy - DeWitt
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Seema Rajani

Judge's School Affiliation: DHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	4
Prop Speaker #1	Meswani pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Murphy pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Harith pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Dewitt 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:
Clearly & logically organized
Great vocal control
provided consistency
Sited references when
presenting evidence / provides
arguments to support.

Prop 2:
Speaker has arguments / evidence & effectively presents them.

Opp 1:
Contributes effectively to the spontaneity of debate.

Opp 2:
Reasonable analysis of arguments - need more

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Excellent presentation + arguments with evidence.

USFR SHOULD REGULATE MORE ON BITCOIN

PARLI Debate

Sundararamen, Siva (*22)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 309
Gov: 27 Shimizu - McDowell
Opp: 4 Figueroa - Choy
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: SUNDAR RAMASAMY

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN HIGH SCHOOL

PROP	OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 COURTNEY McDowell pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 CHOY pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 SHIMIZU pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 FIGUEROA pts ~~26~~ 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:

Lots of points. Excellent clashes, strong. Prop 1: pointed out how it would benefit U.S. if it properly regulated, pointed out what the consequences are if not regulated. Clear, talked about hackers as well. Prop 2: very good articulation, definitely liked use of technology. Not recorded rapidly to Opp questions. Talked about additional agency, good facts. Focused a lot at market. Good posture.

Exceeded time limit, good arguments. Very minimal eye contact, always looked at the notes. could have been much clearer. put many points but not very organized. Opposed with Aff points about hacking but not with facts, most of them are assumptions. Opp 2: good start. Mentioned and refuted good points with Aff. could've given strong response to Aff points. Little confusion while proposing points. Gave no facts on other countries' hacking as well. Good eye contact.

TEAM CODE #: McDowell and Shimizu **on the** Aff **wins this debate.**
(Prop) or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop1 backed up with many points. Able to handle the opp's questions and concerns though the opp also provided nice points. But Aff scored little more from the presentation perspective.

USFCA should impose a tax on financial transactions

PARLI Debate

Sundararamen, Siva (*22)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 309
Gov: 11 Yoo - Liu
Opp: 14 Yan - Yan
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: EDWARD KUMKUMIAN

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MATEO HIGH SCHOOL

PROP	OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Yoo pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 YAN pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 LIU pts 25	Opp Speaker #2 YAN pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good presentation. Clear explained the topic well. Provided background statistics. Maintained all the rebuttals. Having material easily. Made a perspective how an issue benefits others. Less points on the comparatives.

Prop 2: Managed the OPP's points and questions, used the time "1" more. Stated it is not going to impact a lot. Explained how it would work in short term and long term. Nice look at both sides. Good job.

Opp 1: Good stance. Talked about how it would impact small businesses and middle class. Used AFF's point on stable and rated a good statistics mentioned reinforcements with other women. Talked on how it would help deliver the purchases easily point. Clear presentation.

Opp 2: Pointed out how the impact on rich would in turn impact small and medium business. Provided facts on Walmart data. How it would avoid creating new jobs, so many people lose jobs. Presentation could have been better

Some solid points

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams put good points. Opp clearly stated about the negative impacts for the additional tax on financial transactions

PARLI Debate

Villa, Paul (*6)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 308
Gov: 16 Ginsburg - Zhou
Opp: 11 Ganguli - Sanghvi
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Paul Villa

Judge's School Affiliation: College Park

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 16		Team Code #: 11	
Prop Speaker #1 Zhou	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Ganguli	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Ginsberg	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Sanghvi	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: You really need to sign post. I hear the word impact once and never hear link or warrant. Your topic knowledge is very limited. Very well spoken and organized though.
Way too long on Uniqueness. Excellent rebuttal!

Prop 2: Amazing answer to CP. probably will win the debate from it. You need to learn the terminology (Nonuniques, turn) to save a lot of time. I think perm was also a super easy win.

Opp 1: Very well sign posted and organized. Very well spoken. I need a lot more analysis on your IL and I level. In rebuttal I need you to actually weigh impacts. Analysis is super generalized.

Opp 2: I think you are just so far behind before your speech. The aff has totally convinced me that your team knows what bitcoin is/does.

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Aff wins due to 0 offense from Opp. The CP is not effective

PARLI Debate

Villa, Paul (*6)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 308
Gov: 16 Fogarty - Pister
Opp: 27 Nevin - Hatcher
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Paul Villa

Judge's School Affiliation: College Park

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 16		Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 Pister	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Hatcher	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Fogarty	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Nevin	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Great Structure. I need more impact quantifying. You just say "impact V" or "impact N" give me a way to weigh impact. where is your plan analysis...

Prop 2: Good attempt at saving plan text. You can't freeze when they ask a simple question about imports. I think you are just behind going into MG

Opp 1: Great arguments on the plan. You need to give me a criteria that is not two completely different things. You need to just pick your winning argument in the rebuttal and go all in. Also let me know which criteria to evaluate the voters under.

Opp 2: perfect. You said exactly what I needed to hear and when you were done talking you sat down. That is how it is done. You are mean though so no 30 for you.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote on plan ~~Sprite~~ Vagueness.

PARLI Debate

Nash, Jennifer (*18)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 527
Gov: 7 Yu - Makineni
Opp: 26 Saxena - Duncan
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: _____

Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomery High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 7 Yu- Makineni		Team Code #: 26 Saxena- Duncan	
Prop Speaker #1 Yu	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Duncan	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Makineni	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Saxena	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good support of facts. Slow down speaking speed, hard to understand. Be

Opp 1: Good presentation.

Prop 2: Excellent summation. Addressed points well.

Opp 2: Addressed arguments well.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Nash, Jennifer (*18)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 527
Gov: 13 Sinha - Herman
Opp: 14 Wilcox - Sutton
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: _____

Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomery High School, Santa Cruz

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	13	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Herman pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Wilcox pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Sinha pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Sutton pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Better job of presenting + supporting evidence.

Opp 1: Good job of presenting points, good evidence.

Prop 2: Good summation.

Opp 2: Good job addressing points Good points.

TEAM CODE #: 13 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Evidence presented was better job than opposition, but all speakers did a good job.