PARLI Debate

Whitmore, Gerald (*4)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 526
Gov: 16 Aguilera - Zhou
Opp: 11 Kurada - Datta
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Gerald Whitmore

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	16	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	Zhou pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Amir Datta pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Aguilera pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Sachil Kurada pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: good use of humor to begin. Strong use of current excerpt re Ted Cruz. Well organized analysis of topic

Opp 1: Well defined and use of topicality to undermine Aff. Relied a great deal of information in the time given

Prop 2: Strong ability to engage the judge. Steady did not allow the Opp to undermine flow with POI.

Opp 2: Focused on topicality and brought considerable evidence to contention

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
This was a tough decision. Both teams presented extremely well. The opp use of and emphasis on topicality was exceptional. They were also able to present evidence that more successfully supported their contention

PARLI Debate

Whitmore, Gerald (*4)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 526
Gov: 27 Skarr - Escarcega
Opp: 14 Katz - Huynh
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Gerald Whitmore

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #:	
Prop Speaker #1 Escarcega	pts 29.5	Opp Speaker #1 Katz	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Skarr	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Huynh	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:

Beautiful opening to set the

Prop 1: Style for his contentions His opening utilized a story telling narrative that was emotionally and visually engaging. A strong delivery of an eloquent presentation. Used 2 POIs which were damaging to the opp

Prop 2: A strong and assured presentation Very successful analysis of resolution. Well organized points of resolution affirmation

Opp 1: Started to attack the Aff well but did not elaborate and utilize example to effectively create attacks. Utilized good examples of Cold War & N. Korea to support contentions. Try to manage anxiety more successfully

Opp 2: Struggled to defend contention Seemed to inadvertently acknowledge the affirmations were true. Some examples were self defeating ie N. Korea

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The win was given to the Aff due to their well organized and thorough use of evidence, thoughtful contentions and ability to undermine the arguments of the opp. Their presentation and delivery was exceptionally engaging.

PARLI Debate

Miller, Jon (*14)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 230
Gov: 5 Siu - Moore
Opp: 16 Ginsburg - Zhou
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Jon Miller

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 16	
Prop Speaker #1 Siu	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Zhou	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Moore	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Ginsburg	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:
+ compelling argument that process is ignored as is free speech
– conduct by majority vs. minority control of filibuster system
+ other speakers are not heard during filibuster

Prop 2:
– if doesn't "tread on small man"
– points did not follow from examples

Opp 1:
+ good point: ruling majority, respect for minority
+ increase in bills passed in UK w/ introduction of filibuster
+ promotes compromise to reach filibuster threshold

Opp 2:
+ allows minority to resist majority

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
opp: more compelling and consistent arguments, presented clearly.
prop: claim of tyranny of the majority didn't make sense

PARLI Debate

Miller, Jon (*14)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 230
Gov: 27 Nevin - Hatcher
Opp: 2 Booth - Pracar
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Jon Miller

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	27	Team Code #:	2
Prop Speaker #1	Hatcher pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Booth pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Nevin pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Pracar 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 points in favor, w/ evidence
MAD ⇒ no nukes in cold war
China's hegemony ⇒ treaties
more hard power → more soft power

Prop 2: hard time following arguments, too fast!
Rebuttal: interesting showed "safety"

Opp 1:
+ MAD: forces retaliation & attacks
mistakes are inevitable, leads to large scale war
+ MAD: western view only
Russia high chance of war because Russia thought they could win a nuke
− : don't understand the urge to war
+ : good argument that deterrence/treaties have held, avoided war
(western model?)

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Initial arguments the strongest, and held up throughout

PARLI Debate

Firsov, Oleksandr (*5)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 428
Gov: 27 Chu - Fraga
Opp: 16 Kapoor - Berger
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: FIRSOV, OLEKSANDR

Judge's School Affiliation: CAMDO

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #: 16	
Prop Speaker #1 Fraga	pts 30	Opp Speaker #1 Kapoor	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Chu	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Berger.	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: Nice vocabulary use, Dictionary VS. CNN was a nice touch

Opp 1: A bit more attention to opposition's POIs

Prop 2: Good analysis of opp arguments

Opp 2: need to organize ones records, to be able to find them during speach.

TEAM CODE #: 3 27 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
close match but on Prop better interactivity

PARLI Debate

Firsov, Oleksandr (*5)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 428
Gov: 26 Saxena - Duncan
Opp: 27 Inman - Young
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: FIRSOV, OLEKSANDR

Judge's School Affiliation: CAMDO

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 26		Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 SAXENA	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 INMAN	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Duncan	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 YOUNG	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
Good points, speach. Could use more elaboration w/ facts, samples

Opp 1:
Nice ref. to Clinton's gov-t for state debt

Prop 2:
interesting reference to borrowing policy of US state

Opp 2:
+ in addition to good factual review used a proper touch of emotions.
+ interesting association of flushing $ into toilet.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP team had more arguments and elaboration, less repeating.

PARLI Debate

Sankaram, Nandakumar (*7)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 302
Gov: 27 Rosenthal - Dondero
Opp: 2 Holt - Mizin
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: SANKARAN

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	27	Team Code #:	2
Prop Speaker #1	DONDERO pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	HOLT pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	ROSENTHAL pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	MIZIN 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:
Strong debater, wished You provided more evidence to support your case.

Opp 1:
Strong debater both in the speeches and in concise POIs. Lots of evidence to support your arguments. Eg: 3/5, 1951 bill

Prop 2:
Good support for your partner.

Opp 2:
Good delivery and effectively re-inforced your teams arguments.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Enjoyed a spirited debate. Very close but Opp wins purely on providing more overall evidence.

PARLI Debate

Sankaram, Nandakumar (*7)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 302
Gov: 14 Yee - Morrell
Opp: 4 Walsh - Moser
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: SANKARAN

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 4	
Prop Speaker #1 MORRELL	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 WALSH	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 YEE	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 MOSER	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 job of using your opening and closing arguments in different/opposite ways - arguing for balance of power and against unbalance.

Prop 2:
Good delivery, methodical analysis of all of Opp 1's points.

Opp 1:
Your point about proxy war was Very effective rebuttal to "incentive against warfare". I felt you and your partner could have re-inforced and capitalized on it better.

Opp 2:
Consider taking at least 1 POI and use it to your advantage. Makes for a more lively debate.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop laid out a defensible case and effectively rebutted Opp's arguments about proxy wars and cold war. Also Opp didnt fight enough when Prop kept claiming Opp only provided evidence of Syria in their case;

PARLI Debate

Bulger, Cindy (*24)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 306
Gov: 16 Banisadr - Weiner
Opp: 7 Yu - Makineni
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley H/S

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	16	Team Code #:	7
Prop Speaker #1	Yu pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Banisadr pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Makineni pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Weiner pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good use of context. I spend less time repeatly explaining

Opp 1: Good use of examples to support position.

Prop 2: You are ~~yelling~~ yelling - Don't need to be so loud to make your points.

Opp 2: Good presentation but be careful of attitude when addressing opponents

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
This was tough because both teams did a great job. In the end the all team made a better case that a filibuster is not consistent with our idea of majority rule.

PARLI Debate

Bulger, Cindy (*24)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 306
Gov: 4 Murphy - DeWitt
Opp: 14 Cohen-Simayof - Drake
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Murphy pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Cohen-Simayof pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	DeWitt pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Drake pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: You use the words "um" "right" & "like" a little too much.

Prop 2: Too many "ums" but well organized and presented

Opp 1: eye contact - You were looking behind. organization is good. beautiful your emotion doesn't go to anger starting to raise your voice.

Opp 2: Nice organization watch the use of "um"

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

All upheld their definition of the prop. better And I did not buy into the pride and patriotism argument that the neg. put forward.

PARLI Debate

Lacombe, Victor (*25)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 529
Gov: 2 Rubsamen - Partsuf
Opp: 27 Malfavon - Hulett
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: LACOMBE

Judge's School Affiliation: 25

ON BALANCE USSENATE Filibuster Rules ARE INCONSISTENT WITH DEMOCRATIC VALUES.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	IRENE PARTSUF pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	MALFAVON pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	RUBSAMEN pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	CECELIA HULETT 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: Democracy = equality

Prop 1: 1. VOICE UNIVERSALLY
2. UNDERMINE DEMOCRACY & INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Clear cogent argument for 2 contentions. Did not tie Democracy to equality clearly

Very nice Summaries

Prop 2: Clear, speaker, strong solid voice, good flow & response refutation & rebuttal of contentions.

Opp 1: counter
1. Impact - missed hook Nottelmann.
2. Everyone can filibuster
a. Freedom of speech
b. Small impact

Impacts
speech
: VALUE. EQUAL Right to Speak Filibuster

Opp 2: . x free speech
. filibuster quiz, tie.
. Ipsen can only by stopping bill
very strong speaker. Clear thinker.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: AFF had stronger contentions they defended better and had good flow. Opp did not counter the contentions as effectively as they could have (tough speakers 2 mins on the right track.

PARLI Debate

Lacombe, Victor (*25)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 529
Gov: 7 Alvarez - Baluja
Opp: 11 Yoo - Liu
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: LACOMBE

Judge's School Affiliation: 25

MAD MAKES THE WORLD A SAFER PLACE

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	7	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	ALVAREZ pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Liu pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	BALUJA pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	YOO pts 28

FACT

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: 1. No H_2 Bomb since WW2
2. Short & Long term Radiation -
3. Domestic Political -
4. Planned Southern Philippines
Good speaker

Prop 2: - Deterrents important
- He, it happened yet
- Nice flow, good speaking voice

Opp 1: Impact - Nuclear only
- Rogue countries NK
- Escalation, I strikes
- Nuclear tests
1. Escalation - I trillions
2. Accidents - Catastrophic
clear, thorough, argumentative very good points
Imbalance of power

Opp 2: - Escalation = Lowering
- RTB - Example, Cuba
- Leverage on Human Rights
- create, terrorism in weak states
Strong word presence, clear flow!

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

REASON FOR DECISION: OPP - Challenged Defined terms but still defended arguments them. Debated their points more effectively - AFF can win solely because there hasn't been a nuclear bomb since Hiroshima.

PARLI Debate

Brogan, John (*2)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 301
Gov: 7 Mattegunta - Nandakumar
Opp: 4 Basrai - McKenna
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: John Brogan

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	7	Team Code #:	4
Prop Speaker #1	Mattegunta pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Basrai pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Nandakumar pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	McKenna 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:
Very effective speaker, little reliance on notes. Good focus on issue

Prop 2:
Good responses to Opp.

Opp 1:
Spoke very fast but was understandable because she spoke in loud, clear voice. Some points loss on fast speaking I could not follow

Opp 2:
Good retreat (explanation) of Democratic Party vs. principles of Democracy

Too much reference to notes, looking down while speaking loses impact

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The opposition got off track when they did not at the outset clarify the distinction between the Democratic Party and the democratic principles. This was remedied by Opp. 2 but it lost them time.

PARLI Debate

Brogan, John (*2)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 301
Gov: 27 Ernst - Davis
Opp: 13 Sinha - Herman
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: John Brogan

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #: 13	
Prop Speaker #1 Ernst	pts 30	Opp Speaker #1 Herman	pts 30
Prop Speaker #2 Devir	pts 30	Opp Speaker #2 Sinha	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 eye contact, general presentation skills
Closing with very persuasive

Opp 1:
Excellent, confident presentation
Smart use of phrase "nuclear proliferation" vs charged term "very smart."

Prop 2:
Great presenter.
Use of Hiroshima example excellent

Opp 2:
Spoke with little reference to notes.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Very close decision but Closing Summary by Team 27 raises new point of 70 years of no world war excellent

On balance the US Senate filibuster values are inconsistent w/democratic values.

PARLI Debate

Skarr, Teresa (*27)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 303
Gov: 11 Munshani - Baveja
Opp: 6 Morehead - Andrews
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Teresa Skarr

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	6
Prop Speaker #1	Baveja pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Morehead pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Munshani pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Andrews 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: Baveja
+ good clear speaker, good rebuttal but contradicted time of 2nd speaker
Δ very fast on def of democratic values - I didn't catch it.
Δ explain why examples given support your side, not just list them off.

Prop 2: Munshani
~~+ good logic, clear speaker, good~~
+ good speed, addressing ea. point
Δ use numbering/organization

Opp 1: Morehead
+ good logic, clear speaker, good cadence
Δ State why their def wasn't fair. Rebuttal somewhat off topic

Opp 2: Andrews
+ very clear, good logic, explanations, upholding own case and "T"
Δ Dropped 3rd Aff contention wrap up with support for democratic values still upheld.

Case could be stronger if you discussed benefits of delaying controversial votes - 51-50 vote against ASAP) still democracy even your def.

Govt very powerful, filibusters check on that. Examples would help.

TEAM CODE #: 6 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Very close round, but Aff 2nd speaker focused on delays caused by filibusters which Opp explained is still consistent with democracy. "T" was also on Opp side. I missed 1st Aff def b/c too fast but 2nd Aff inserted "US" to democratic values without adequate support.

On balance, MAD makes the world a safer place

PARLI Debate

Skarr, Teresa (*27)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 303
Gov: 2 Stamm-Kirk - Brogan
Opp: 16 Stephen - Miskelley
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Teresa Skarr

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	16
Prop Speaker #1	Brogan pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Miskelly pts 28.5
Prop Speaker #2	Stamm-Kirk pts 29.5	Opp Speaker #2	Stephen 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: Brogan
+ good framework, good points, good ending back on judging criteria
Δ watch your speed - very fast. I lost your "reign of terror" point. You look up from your notes w/ just your eyes and it's a bit disconcerting - rotate your head.

Prop 2: Stamm-Kirk
+ Excellent speech, excellent refutations and logic.
Δ watch speed also, more engaging examples, vs. just reciting them both cases.

Opp 1: Miskelly
+ Excellent explanations, very clear, good examples and logic.
Δ work on better refutations and/or manage time better. Watch speed - also quite fast.

Opp 2: Stephen
+ excellent cadence, easy to follow, good upholding of own case
Δ relate back to judging criteria and explain refutations better in those terms.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Very close, excellent round. You are all extremely bright and knowledgeable. At end of round, first 2 Aff contentions were still standing and I agreed reason for less likely nuke war was due to MAD, as pointed out in Aff rebuttal.

PARLI Debate

Roberson, Sam (*20)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 309
Gov: 3 Cramer - Griffin
Opp: 14 Chin - Rosenfeld
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Sam Roberson PB

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

PROP 3		OPP 14	
Team Code #:		Team Code #:	
Prop Speaker #1 Cramer	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Chin	pts 30
Prop Speaker #2 Griffin	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Rosenfeld	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: good job you spoke very well and clearly with no pauses great eye contact good job!

Prop 2: good job you spoke clearly but try to use your time more effectively and keep more eye contact.

Opp 1: Both of you did an amazing job you spoke very clearly and were explaining while speaking! you were able to clearly express your case and refute points in an organized manner good job!

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Dropped points by the aff as well as new points/information brought up by aff in last speech.

PARLI Debate

Roberson, Sam (*20)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 309
Gov: 11 Deshpande - Lingampalli
Opp: 3 Wolf-Jacobs - Nagarajan
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Sam Roberson

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	GOV 11	Team Code #:	OPP 3
Prop Speaker #1	Deshpande pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Wolf-Jacobs pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Lingampalli pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	nagarajan 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: Very good job both of you sporte very well but try to analyse the resolve in a way to better your speech and think on your toes when something is introduced that you were not prepared for make sure to take into account everything your opponent says

Prop 2:

Opp 1: good job but try not to make so many pauses when speaking try to coherently organ your thoughts so your idea will be clear an concise.

Opp 2: very good job speaking work on more eye contact

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Vauge terms "Mutually assured destruction" PROP based only on nuclear war and fail to refute any of the examples present about other "assured destructions" by OPP

PARLI Debate

Eppanapali, Vanaja (*11)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 229
Gov: 14 Sutton - Moon
Opp: 22 Mubarack - Troup
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Vanaja Eppanapalli

Judge's School Affiliation: IHS. Fremont

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 22	
Prop Speaker #1 Sutton	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Mubarack	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Moon	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Troup	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: He is very good at explaining clearly, but not up to the expectations to compete with opp team. Very good Speaker.

Prop 2:

Opp 1: Very strong speaker with clear voice and stable speaker.

Opp 2: Enjoyed debate with a little humorous examples. And clarity about the topic.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp team has brought up very good points to debate and had clarity about topic. Both speakers presented very well.

PARLI Debate

Eppanapali, Vanaja (*11)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 229
Gov: 14 Yan - Yan
Opp: 4 McAvoy - Hester
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Vanaja Eppanapalli

Judge's School Affiliation: IHS. Fremont

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	4
Prop Speaker #1	YAN. B pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Mc. Avoy pts 30
Prop Speaker #2	YAN.C pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Hester. 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: Started very well, but did not get the actual topic to the debate. Very clear about what he was speaking

Prop 2: Needs more preperation and. little more strong voice.

Opp 1: Very strong voice, and clarity about topic and clear speaking and explanation.

Opp 2: Strong vocabulary and good speaking skills, understands the topic very well.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp is very strong and clear about the topic, and expressed very clearly during their debate.

PARLI Debate

Tunnell, Nanny (*17)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 528
Gov: 4 Figueroa - Choy
Opp: 14 Lustig - Gerenrot
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell

Judge's School Affiliation: MUHS

PROP (affirm)		OPP (resa)	
Team Code #: 4		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Figueroa	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Lustig	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Choy	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Gerenrot	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: Balance us filibuster rules

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:
- Delivery (need to stand straight)
+ Delivery (good pace, projection, good body language)
+ Evidence (good organization + examples)
- analysis (should of gone into more arguments about options to filibuster)
+ good summary

Prop 2:
- Delivery (need to slow down speech)
+ Evidence (good specific cases)
- Argumentation (need to use summary more often to tie examples together)

Opp 1: + Delivery (good eye contact, good + natural movement, good use of notes & memorization)
+ Courtesy (good mannerism)
+ Evidence (better definition to help make a point)
- Delivery (need better organization & intro need to intro less argumentative)
+ Argument - (good discounting on efficiency) clearer points

Opp 2:
+ Delivery (strong natural speaking mannerisms)
+ Argumentation (positive response to questions)
+ Analysis (good buildup)

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Better analysis on the topic and definition
- Good passionate delivery and argumentation.

PARLI Debate

Tunnell, Nanny (*17)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 528
Gov: 13 Cummings - Ellsworth
Opp: 16 Fogarty - Pister
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell

Judge's School Affiliation: MUHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	13	Team Code #:	16
Prop Speaker #1	Ellsworth pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Pister pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Cummings pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Fogarty 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

Balance mutually assured destruction makes safer

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

(value), net benefit

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

Prop 1:
+ Delivery (very personable)
- Evidence (more specifics + sparse examples would of been helpful)
+ Argumentation (structured good links)
+ courtesy

Prop 2:
- Delivery (use less "um", need better eye contact)
+ Argumentation (good response to question)
- analysis (need better organization)

Opp 1:
+ Evidence (good examples + good links between us/Russia to other smaller conflicts)
+ Delivery (good projection + mannerisms + good pace), good organization
+ argumentation (addressed all contention very complete)

Opp 2:
+ POI - (good questions)
+ Delivery (very precise use of language, good pace + mannerisms)
+ Evidence - good use of facts
+ Argumentation of economic burdens + globalization is strongly presented
+ Analysis = great depth + assimilation of facts

* Team should show options if nuclear is not used!

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

- used better evidence and arguments
- well organized
- great delivery

PARLI Debate

Kapoor, Ram (*16)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 527
Gov: 11 Ganguli - Sanghvi
Opp: 27 Amato - Ringstrom
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: RAM KAPOOR

Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 11		Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 GANGULI	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 AMATO	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 SANGHVI	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 RINGSTROM	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: LOGICAL ARGUMENTS, GOOD PRESENTATION

Opp 1: PASSIONATE DEBATER, MISINTERPRETED DEMOCRATIC DECISION

Prop 2: VERY STRONG DELIVERY, RESPONSE TO POI WAS GOOD.

Opp 2: GOOD DELIVERY

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

MORE THOROUGH SETUP AND REFUTATION OF OPPONENT'S VIEWS.

PARLI Debate

Kapoor, Ram (*16)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 527
Gov: 14 Wilcox - Sutton
Opp: 27 Shimizu - McDowell
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: RAM KAPOOR

Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	SUTTON pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	McDOWELL pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	WILCOX pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	SHIMIZU 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: EXCELLENT SETUP.
– GOOD REFUTATION

Opp 1: ELOQUENT SPEAKER
BUT LESS COGENT ARGUMENT

Prop 2: FINE SPEAKER,
GOOD POI's

Opp 2: LOGICAL REFUTATION
BUT LIMITED IMPACT

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
POWERFUL SPEECHES AND STRONGER ARGUMENTS

PARLI Debate

Li, Caroline (*23)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 307
Gov: 3 Curl - Aghadjian-Newbrough
Opp: 11 Meswani - Harith
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Caroline Li

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	Curl	Opp Speaker #1	Meswani
pts	30	pts	29
Prop Speaker #2	Aghadjian-Newbrough	Opp Speaker #2	Harith
pts	29	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 critical thinking
- Superb speech delivery
- knows own materials well
- Convincing points

Prop 2:
- strong/persuading arguments/evidence.
- analysis well done

Opp 1:
- strong delivery.
- strong arguments
- relevant examples presented
- please just slow down a bit.

Opp 2:
- provided strong evidence
- critical thinking applied in speech

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

- logical way of getting into an argument with milestones/agenda discussed at first
- provide macro view of team's proposition to the impact on country/citizens
- strong performance in overall debate critical thinking/analysis throughout.

Caroline Li

Data Mining Assignment

Age	30	Income	3
Marital Status	Married	Number of Children	2

PARLI Debate

Li, Caroline (*23)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 307
Gov: 26 Kornfein - Stromberg
Opp: 4 Cunningham - Yau-Weeks
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Caroline Li

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	26	Team Code #:	4
Prop Speaker #1	Stromberg pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Yau-weeks pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Kornfein pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Cunningham 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:
- delivery very strong
- logical arguments with solid examples
-

Opp 1:
- speech was logical
- good eye contact
-

Prop 2:
- Solid speech delivery
- strong evidence for arguments

Opp 2:
- critical thinking manifested in speech
- relevant/pertinent arguments with strong support.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

- Stronger evidence & arguments
- critical thinking

U.S. filibustering rules are inconsistent with democratic

PARLI Debate

Burrous, Eileen (*22)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 308
Gov: 5 Jia - Jiang
Opp: 27 Galli - Girimonte
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Eileen Burrous

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 Jia	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Galli	pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 Jiang	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Girimonte	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Try to slow down a little. Voice should raise & lower to show points. Well prepared. Facts clear

Prop 2: May have gone off track with discussing bills in too much length. Polite & clear - good speaker

Opp 1: Argument not as effective to support filibustering. Got a bid confusing.

Opp 2: Gave clear presentation, good examples, seemed well prepared. Polite

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Made clear points of how filibustering obstructs the effectiveness of gov. Specific facts provided evidence. good delivery. clarified fact vs policy

Resolved in Balance mutually assured destruction makes world safer place

PARLI Debate

Burrous, Eileen (*22)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 308
Gov: 17 Sweeney - Hsieh
Opp: 14 White - Hall
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Eileen Burrous

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	17	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Sweeney pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	White pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Hsieh pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Hall 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: Very well prepared clear examples. Clearly explained, polite.

Prop 2: Work on eye contact. Not as prepared.

Opp 1: Good examples, courteous good questions. well prepared. effective input, added information. Relevant questions good delivery

Opp 2: good Questions. Very clear good eye contact - supports arguments. Good delivery, hand gestures useful.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Very clear analysis, good evidence great delivery. Respectful of other debaters.