		PARLI Debate
Whitmore, Gerald (*AROUND 2A 11:15am Room 526 Gov: 16 Aguilera - Zhou Opp: 11 Kurada - Datta Parliamentary Debate/Var		Judge's Name: Ge/ald Whitnore Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd
**************************************	Conference of the second of th	Books Commission (できながら、Books as NAS 241 Har sandaff的である。 。 A 23 Standaffine of Arma (Commission Ambrilla
Team Code #:	PROP	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1	Zhov pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Aniv Datta pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	tguilera pts29	Opp Speaker #2 Scalil Kurda pts 29
		the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good lenough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	T3 -	in - Cuitania
<ul> <li>Evidence: Fevidence - Argumenta by the other</li> <li>Points of In</li> <li>Delivery: Heand easily use</li> <li>Courtesy: Fevidence - Courtesy: Fevidence - Courtesy</li> </ul>	ow reasonably and effectively ng the debate How appropriately and efficie which may include facts and r tion: How directly and effect side formation: How relevant and ow well the debaters speak in nderstandable How courteous and respectful	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments  Intly the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made  d effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant  the debaters were to opponents and judges  pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each dehater:  9000 Unc  Prop 1: Stron  1c Ted Cru  Grislysis	of humor to begin, y von of current except z. Well organized of topic	Well defined and use of topicality.  topp to under mine Aff. Reliu a  topp lighted deal of information in  the time given
Prop 2: Strong the judge allow the Color than CODE #		off wins this debate.
REASON FOR E This UKS Well. Th They we Successf		Both terms presented extremely and emphisis on topicality was exceptional extention

Whitmore, Gerald (\*4) Round 2B 11:15am Room 526

Gov: 27 Skarr - Escarcega Opp: 14 Katz - Huynh

Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Geald Whitner

Judge's School Affiliation: 13 is hop O'Dowd

Team Code #:	PROP		Team Co	<b>OPP</b> de #:	
Prop Speaker #1	Es carcega	pts <u>295</u>	Opp Speaker #1	Kgtz	pts <u>27</u>
Prop Speaker #2	SKarr	pts <u>29</u>	Opp Speaker #2_	Huynh	$\frac{1}{\frac{26}{26}}$

### 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 = Fair24-20 = Poor

<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

#### **Judging Criteria**

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

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Becutiful opening to set the Opp 1: Started to attack the Aff well but did not eksperte and utilize example to affectively create attacks. Utilized about examples of Cold Warth Kores to Prop 1: Skye far his contentions 1110 opening utilized & stury telling nerretive that was enotionally and visually engasin support contentions. Tr. to manage anxiety more successfully opp 2: Struggled to defend contention of Seence to inadvertently acknowledge the affirmation were true. Some Very Successful analysis &f resolution. Well organized examples were self defecting is points of revolution affirmation on the <u>OrOy</u> wins this debate. (Prop or Opp) TEAM CODE #: The win was given to the Aff duc to their well organized and thorough use of evidence, thoughtful contentioning and ability to undermine the grownests of the opp. There presenting and delivery was exceptionally engaging. **REASON FOR DECISION:** 

Miller, Jon (*14) Round 2A 11:15am Room 230 Gov: 5 Siu - Moore	Judge's Name: Jon Milly
Opp: 16 Ginsburg - Zhou Parliamentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation: LONELL
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 SIU pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 2 Lov pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Mooks pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Gusbus pts 27
	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficie evidence—which may include facts and</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant are</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak is and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful</li> </ul>	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1:  + competing a meet that profess  - is in the speech  - conjuced to majority us month  + other speakers are not heard  dury lillidustiff not heard  Prop 2:	Opp 1:  + pool pond: rule ho majority, respect for minor  + incresse in bills pessed in UK m/  notatudian of fillibration  + ponoles compromise to reach fillibration  freehold  Opp 2:
- Advesory Atreed unsmall month - points did not follow for examples	+ allows must by resist majorishy
TEAM CODE #: on the	<u>Oρρ</u> wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:  ORP: more compelling and con.  PROP: Claim of tyram,	of the majority didn't make serve

Miller, Jon (*14) Round 2B 11:15am Room 230 Gov: 27 Nevin - Hatcher		Judge's Name	: In Mile	<u>r</u>	
Opp: 2 <u>Booth</u> - <u>Praca</u> r Parliamentary Debate/Varsity		Judge's Schoo	Affiliation: LOWE	LC	
PROP Team Code #:	27	Team Cod	OPP	Principal and the state of the	
Prop Speaker #1 Nated	<u>v</u> pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Book	pts_ <u>28</u>	
Prop Speaker #2	$\sim$ pts $\overline{27}$	Opp Speaker #2_	Pracor	pts	
	eaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = 0 d (but possibly not good 24-20 = Poor	Outstanding 28 = od enough to qualify	Very Good	•	
	Jud	ging Criteria			
<ul> <li>Evidence: How appendence—which no evidence—which no evidence which no evide</li></ul>	propriately and efficing include facts and low directly and effection: How relevant a lather debaters speak	ently the debaters references to auti ctively the debate and effective were in an organized, c	support argument hority as well as ge rs respond to the ar the questions and communicative styl	es with ceneral knowledge rguments made the answers le that is pleasant	
Using the above criter each debater:	ria, please offer com	/ pliments and/or	suggestions for in	nprovement to	
Prop 2:- hard - time  Grantals  Relibel: harmithan	following soft pour	Opp 2:4: 9=	lose scale wisher or high charles	Whable, leads he was because they wald win the way to be the wald win the way the he was the way	'K
TEAM CODE #:		Prop wins t	his debate.		
reason for decision	on: agun-als A	rop of Opp) will L Synnfesy,	, and hel	d se show	Too

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

Judge's Name: FIRSOV, OLERSANDR

S Kapoor - Berger entary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation: CAIUPO
PROP Team Code #: 2 7	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Fraga pts 30	Opp Speaker #1 Kapook pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Chu pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Berber. pts 27
	the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judgi	ing Criteria
<ul> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and respect to the appropriately and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful</li> <li>Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:</li> </ul>	eferences to authority as well as general knowledge ively the debaters respond to the arguments made deffective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges diments and/or suggestions for improvement to
a rice to sch	Co opposection's POL's
Prop 2: Good and lises of OPP a Eguments	Opp 2:  Need to organize occu  records to be able to find  then during speach.
TEAM CODE #: $\frac{3}{2}$ on the $\frac{6}{2}$	

REASON FOR DECISION: close metch but on Prop better interactivity

Firsov, Oleksandr (*5) Round 2B 11:15am Room 428 Gov: 26 Saxena - Duncan Opp: 27 Inman - Young	Judge's Name: FIRSOV, OLEKSAWDR
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation: CAMDO
PROP Team Code #: 2 6	OPP Team Code #: 2 7
Prop Speaker #1 SaxENA pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 INMAN pts 28 Opp Speaker #2 40006 pts 19
Prop Speaker #2 Puncan pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 40VNG pts 49
27 = Good (but possibly not good	n the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good denough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude of inappropriate behavior
Judg	ging Criteria
<ul> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficie evidence—which may include facts and r</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant an</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful</li> </ul>	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made deffective were the questions and the answers of an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: bood points, speach. Could use more elabora- tion w/ fasts, souples	Opp 1: Nice ref. to Chin to A's gov-t. fore state Debt
Prop 2: interesting reference to borrowing policy of us state	Opp 2:  + in addition to Good factual reven used a paper touch of emotions, interesting association of flighing into toilly.
REASON FOR DECISION:	op or Opp)  arguments and elaborations,
less prepeating.	, and the control of

Sankaram, Nandakumar (*7) Round 2A 11:15am Room 302 Gov: 27 Rosenthal - Dondero	Judge's Name: SANKARAN
Opp: 2 Holt - Mizin Parliamentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation: D V H ら
PROP 2.7	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 DONDER 0 pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 HOLT pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 ROSENTHAL pts 27	Opp Speaker #1         HOLT         pts 29           Opp Speaker #2         MIZIN         pts 28
Please award each speaker points based o	AND CONTROL OF THE STATE OF THE
	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	
Jude	ging Criteria
•	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
<u> </u>	ently the debaters support arguments with
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
	tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	/
•	nd effective were the questions and the answers
	n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
Courtesy: How courteous and respectfu	l the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	-
Prop 1: Strong debater, wished You provided more endence	Opp 1: Strong debater both in the speeches and in concise POIs. Lots of evidence to support your arguments. Eg: 3/5, 1951 bill
y movided more endence	and in concise POIs. Lots of Exidence
1 C + Valor Case:	to support your arguments. Ig. 73,
to support your Case.	1951 16211
Prop 2:	Opp 2:
Prop 2: Rood support for your partner.	Opp 2: Good delivery and effectively ve-inforced your teams arguments.
TEAM CODE #: 2 on the (Pi	of P wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	rop or Opp)  ate-Very close but Opp wins purely  evidence-
Enjoyed a sprinter out	evi den ce.

Sankaram, Nandakumar (*7) Round 2B 11:15am Room 302 Gov: 14 Yee - Morrell	Judge's Name: SANKARAN
Opp: 4 Walsh - Moser Parliamentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 MORRELL pts 28 Prop Speaker #2 YEE pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 WA LSH pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 YEE pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 MOSER pts 27
	utstanding 28 = Very Good d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
Judg	ging Criteria
<ul> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficie evidence—which may include facts and a Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant an Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:</li> </ul>	references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made d effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Great job of using your Opening and closing argument in different opposite ways - arguing for balance of power and against unbalance.  Prop 2: Grosd delivery, methodical analysis of all of Opp 1's Points.	
	PROP wins this debate.
·	cose and effectively rebutied off's are and cold war. Also off didnt or claiming off only provided evidence of

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

Judge's Name: Cindy Bulger

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

mentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley
PROP Team Code #: 16	OPP
	Opp Speaker #1_Ban   Saarpts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Mavaneni pts 18	Opp Speaker #2 Weine pts 28
Please award each speaker points based of	<del>-</del> /
	Outstanding 28 \neq Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	, -, -
Jud	lging Criteria
Analysis: How reasonably and effective	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
	iently the debaters support arguments with
	references to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	curvery the debaters respond to the arguments made
,	and effective were the questions and the answers
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and respectful	ul the debaters were to opponents and judges
The state of the s	P 4 W 4 6 1
each debater:	apliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	1
Prop 1:	Opp 1: and we in examples
and executive ispend less	to support position.
time repeated explaining	The purpose pourses .
Prop 2: you my yelling -	Opp 2: god presentation, but be could g attitude when addressing
Diritinued to be as loud	of attitude when addressine
to make your points.	O CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR
	DP μου είνει ε
TEAM CODE #: $  \varphi  $ on the	Prov wins this debate.
(F	Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	les of all a great the ten the end
This was tough belause both	teams oud a great Job In the End
the all team made a bother	case that a fillipustr is not consisted

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

**Parliam** 

Judge's Name: Cindy Budges
- Daniel Valla HS

entary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation: San Kallah Valla I
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Murphy pts 37	Opp Speaker #1 Cohen - Samay of pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Delai H pts 7	Opp Speaker #2 Drake pts 29
Please award each speaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = 6	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
.Jud	lging Criteria
	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
evidence—which may include facts and	iently the debaters support arguments with I references to authority as well as general knowledge
by the other side	ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
,	and effective were the questions and the answers
,	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	m an organized, communicative style that is preasure
,	ul the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	apliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1:	Opp 1: lye contact - you were looker
You have the words him:	heard organization 15
You use the words "um." right + "lyke" a little too	Opp 1: eye contect - you were looking begind. organization is good. because your emotion
much.	drewit go to anger
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Starting to raise you voice.
Prop 2: Ton many " het	Opp 2: harry man
mall and	opp 2. Ma organzatur water
Prop 2: Too many "unis" but well organized and presented	Opp 2: New organzatur water like us of "un"
	wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	Proport Opp)

Att would shew definition of the prop. better and I and not buy into the priviard patriotism argument that the neg. put forward.

	ibe, Victor (*25)	1
	11:15am Room 529 Rubsamen - Partsuf	Judge's Name: AUMBE
0 07	Malfarian Liviott	
Parliam	Team Code #:	Judge's School Affiliation:
	ENBRUANCE USSENATE FILIBUSIALIU	1-5 ARE INCONSISKUT
HTIW	DEMOCRATIPEDP VALUES.	/ OPP
	Team Code #:	Team Code #: 27
	TDENL	
	Prop Speaker #1 PARTSUF pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 MALFAVON pts 27
	·	CECEU A
	Prop Speaker #2 RUBAMEN pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 HULETT pts 28
	pto	pus <u>s v</u>
	Please award each speaker points based o	in the following scale:
		Outstanding 28 = Very Good
		d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	$\sqrt{20}$ = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judy	ging Criteria
	• Analysis: How reasonably and effective	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	offered during the debate	-,
	<u> </u>	ently the debaters support arguments with
		references to authority as well as general knowledge
		ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
	by the other side	
	• Points of Information: How relevant ar	nd effective were the questions and the answers
	• Delivery: How well the delaters speak i	n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
	and easily understandable	• •
	,	l the debaters were to opponents and judges
	courses, trace courses and respective	i are decaters were to opposition and judges
	Using the above evitoric places offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	and debates. On the same of the confinence of th	priments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	Prop 1: 2. UNDERNINE PEMOERALY INTERNATIONAL PILOTE	Opp 1: 2. Everyon con filiberton
	- I. VOILE WHITE ISSALLY	1. Tryposed 1 / lituraly
	Prop 1: 2. UNDERKINE PEMOCRACE	Opp 1: 2. Everyore con from
	INTERNATIONAL	a. Freedom of Speech speech
Cles	cogant archiver two	bo. Small inpost VALVE. EQUAL RIGHTER Speak Filiburger
tru s	interior. Defe not the lemiera	ð†
to 29	nality chapy	
1/2		
N Prog N	Prop 2: Ckar, Openher, ding	Opp 2: - fyluster quis, time
	Prop 2: Span, Spanson,	Opp 2: - filester quisting
لفلعج	wire, good flow &	- I person can haly by stopping abite
loque	centions.	very scan speaker claim thinker
, R	C. Time	The state of the s
2 50		
	^	
	TEAM CODE #: on the	Prop wins this debate.
		rop or Opp)
	REASON FOR DECISION: ACE L. O	Store of the the defended
-	A M.	stronger contentions they defended
hette	in and had good to	w. Opp and man counter
A	contract or all the	as they sould have though
-Che	s exercises	as they apular have though
	a land of the control of	NORWY CONT.

Lacombe, Victor (*25) Round 2B 11:15am Room 529	Judge's Name: LACOMBE
Gov: 7 Alvarez - Baluja	Judge's Hallie. 4 105/1/18
Opp: 11 Yoo - Liu Parliamentary Debate/Varsity  MAD MICES 764	Judge's School Affiliation: 25 2010 ASAFER MACE
PROP	/ OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Alvale7 pts 28	/
Prop Speaker #2 BALUJA pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 pts 28
FACE Please award each speaker points based on	the following scale:
30 = Perfect  29 = Ou	atstanding 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
_ /.	~
, ,	ng Criteria
	the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
<ul> <li>offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficient</li> </ul>	atly the dehoters support organization
	eferences to authority as well as general knowledge
	ively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	avery the debaters respond to the diguments made
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	l effective were the questions and the answers
	an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
<b>∀</b>	the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer comp	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: 2. Short flotten hadron -	- A - Nuclear ONly
1. NO 112 Banker Lahaton -	Inner
Prop 1: 2. Short hat all parties of the published	Opp 1: - Rogue Cauther NK  - Essentation, 128 51 de
4. Planed pouthing, Philipman	- Estentation,
4. Planed hours	-Nuclear tests
Good Ereated	1. ESCALATION - ! TRILLING
	2. Accidents - CATASTROPHIC
/	clear, Thorough, argument i very good paints
Prop 2: - Detal lens in patient	Totalore of poment 5 Language Opp 2: - Exceloring
- He, it happened get	Opp 2 Example, CubA
- He, I gm	· Leverage on themas Repts
- out hos - peaking vario	creates terrorism in weeks tates
nice flow, pass -realing vario	Strong word presence, clear flours
	OPP wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION: 500 CO. I	por Opp) large of Defined terms but still
	1/)
alle trale . Aff a sil uin	3 what because these heart been a
Suria Herore	uma.

Brogan, John (*2)	11 2
Round 2A 11:15am Room 301 Gov: 7 Mattegunta - Nandakumar	Judge's Name: John W DV ORGO
Opp: 4 Basrai - McKenna Parliamentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation: Bently
PROP 7 Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Mateguite pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Basrai pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Namka Kumpts 29	Opp Speaker #2 McKenna pts_XK
Please award each speaker points based o	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	- · · · /
Jud	ging Criteria
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effective</li> </ul>	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
	ently the debaters support arguments with
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
	ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side  Points of Information: How relevant as	nd effective were the questions and the answers
	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
•	I the debaters were to opponents and judges
	accessed water of better and languages
Using the above criteria, please offer com each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
cach devater.	
Prop 1:	Opp 1: Spokevery fast but was
Very effective spraker,	to understandable because
uttle reliance on utes. Good toars Prop 2:	La mais and able section
title reliance on	The spoke in Und Clear Vole
To Good Loans	te loss of fast
The state of the s	Some Points loss on fast co Opp 2:
Prop 2:	Opp 2:
) Doe	Good retreat (explanation) of Demo cat
Good responses to Opp.	Los versen about is brinciples?
	Lemocracy
0	
7	Drive 100 mich 100 miles 100 miles
TEAM CODE #: on the	Too much sufference to hotes_ rop or Opp) wins this debate. Looking down while speaking lose
PEASON FOR DECISION.	rop or Opp)
The section:	Track when they and me at the
in abbreamon & of	It to The Democratic Party and
it clarify The distinction.	trach when they did not at the between the between the Democratic Party and was remedied by Opp. 2 put it lost
democratic principles This	was remedied sy pp.
us time	·

Brogan, Jonn ("2) Round 2B 11:15am Room 301 Gov: 27 Ernst - Davis	Judge's Name: Shn Brough
Opp: 13 Sinha - Herman Parliamentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP Team Code #: 27	Team Code #: 73
Prop Speaker #1 EV wt. pts 30	Opp Speaker #1 4 e Viman pts 30
Prop Speaker #2 Devil pts 3p	Opp Speaker #2 Sinha pts 29
Please award each speaker points based 30 = Perfect 29 =	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair <b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Juc	dging Criteria
	rely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
<u> </u>	ciently the debaters support arguments with
	d references to authority as well as general knowledge
<ul> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effective by the other side</li> </ul>	ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
•	and effective were the questions and the answers
	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and respectf	il the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer coneach debater:	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Pron 1:	Onn 1:
Excellentage contact, seneral treelentation shills	Opp 1: Excellet confident inuda
the sentation stylls	Presentations Inuda
of the very	ture 9 that were
Closing with very	Smart use for atom it team
/ /	Dery smart.
Prop 2:	Opp 2: 1 Herence
Prop 2: Creat Tresuter. Hivoshima 000	Stroke with which
real Privosh ma USB of Hivosh ma exceller	t to notes.
VSB Hivoshima eller	
	La rip:
TEAM CODE #: 2 on the	
REASON FOR DECISION:	Prop or Opp)
11 en u cluse decis	raises new point of 70 raises new point of 470
J. T. 27	raisex new point of a plant
My ream of	and hard by excellent

Ream 23 11-15am Reim 23cs  Opp. 5 Morehead - Andrews  Parliamentary Debate/Varsity  PROP  Team Code #:  Prop Speaker #1	karr, Teresa (*27)	mic views		are inconsistent
Opp.: Morehead - Andrews Parliamentary Debate/Varsity  PROP Team Code #:  Prop Speaker #1   DAYLUA   pts I   Opp Speaker #1   MoreVla of   pts I   Prop Speaker #2   Mustanding pts I   Opp Speaker #2   MoreVla of   pts I   Prop Speaker #2   Mustanding pts I   Opp Speaker #2   MoreVla of   pts I   Prop Speaker #2   Mustanding 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 effectively 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 of the proposity for the standard of the proposity for the standard of	ound 2A 11:15am Room 303		Judge's Name: Jevs	a Skarr
Prop Speaker #1   Language pts 27   Opp Speaker #1   Movenhal of pts 27   Prop Speaker #2   Mustam pts 27   Opp Speaker #1   Movenhal of pts 28   Please award cach speaker points based on the following scales  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 effectively 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 sheak 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 how each debater:  Prop 1: Lavella	pp: 6 Morehead - Andrews		Judge's School Affiliation:_	Windsor Hs
Prop Speaker #2 Mushami pits At Opp Speaker #2 Marilus pits 28  Please award each speaker points based on the following scaler 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 <0 = 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 effectively 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 taken and each debater:  Prop 1: Delivery: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges  Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement taken and each debater:  Prop 1: Delivery: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges  Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement taken and each debater:  Prop 1: Delivery: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges  Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement taken and each debater:  Prop 1: Delivery: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges  Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement taken and each debater:  Prop 1: Delivery: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges  Opp 2: Morit		OP		6/
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 telemony and contact in the contact of th	Prop Speaker #1_B	aveya pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Morehed	rek pts 27
30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <0 = 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 take make a control of the courtesy of the co	Prop Speaker #2	usham pts 27	Opp Speaker #2_	ÚS pts 28
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <0 = 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 tal Magnach debater:  Prop 1: Daveling  Good State of the state of the support for the support	Please award eac		<b>9</b>	1
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 make each debater:  Prop 1: Lavely  Prop 1: Lavely  Opp 1: Morehad  Clear speaker, 500  Prop 2: Municipal symmetric for a factor of the content of t	27 =		_ , ,	
• 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 tah my each debater:  Prop 1: Dall M. Good State + good logic, characters are all the property of the pr			- · · /	
• Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the dobaters 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 tah my each debater:  Prop 1: Dayl M. Grod State + good logic, characters and lawing controlled the following controlled to the controlled		Jud	ging Criteria	
• 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 only each debater:  Prop 1: Lave the strength of the st	• Analysis: Hov		·	opic and the arguments
• 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 taken the cach debater:  Prop 1: Early well to develop the debaters were to opponents and judges  Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement taken the cach debater:  Prop 1: Early well to the debaters were to opponents and judges  Opp 1: Morchad Clear speaker, 500  Opp 1: Morchad Clear speaker, 500  A that why their dey wasn't fait when the cach debate to t		_		
• 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 taken the action of the control	• Evidence: Ho	v appropriately and effici	ently the debaters support arg	guments with
Prop 1: Lave was a contraction of the state	evidence—wh	ch may include facts and	references to authority as we	ell as general knowledge
• 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 any each debater:  Prop 1: Dave were the questions for improvement to any each debater:  Prop 1: Dave were the questions for improvement to any each debater:  Prop 1: Dave were the questions for improvement to any each debater.  Opp 1: Morehad clear speaker, soo compositions to the composition of		-	tively the debaters respond t	o the arguments made
• 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 My each debater:  Prop 1: Dave M. Grod Spake + good land Control of Lear speaker, 500 delay of clear speaker, 500 very fast on delay of clear of the mount of control of the control of	▼	/		
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 my each debater:  Prop 1: Bayen   Prop 1: Bayen   Opp 1: Morehad   Opp 2: Andrews  Silvential somewhat the topic   Opp 2: Andrews  Opp 3: A		,	<u>-</u>	
Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement top my each debater:  Prop 1: Parklya  Prop 1: Parklya  Opp 1: Morchad  Opp 1: Morchad  Clear speaker, 800  Author of chart  A good clear speaker, 800  Prop 2: Man Sham  A prop 2: Man Sham  A prop 2: Man Sham  A prop 3 and speaker  Opp 2: Andrews  TEAM CODE #: (a on the Opp wins this debate.  REASON FOR DECISION:  Opp 2: Andrews  Opp 2: Andrews  Opp 2: Andrews  Opp 2: Andrews  Opp 3: Andrews  Opp 3: Andrews  Opp 3: Andrews  Opp 4: Opp 3: Andrews  Opp 5: Andrews  Opp 6: Andrews  Opp 6: Andrews  Opp 6: Andrews  Opp 7: Andrews  Opp 6: Andrews  Opp 7: Andrews  Opp 6: Andrews  Opp 7: Andrews  Opp 8: Andrews  Opp 8		<i>/-</i>	in an organized, communicat	ive style that is pleasant
Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement top my each debater:  Prop 1: Baylin  Prop 1: Baylin  Opp 1: Morehad debaying controversal in a speaker, 500  Prop 1: Morehad debaying controversal in a speaker, 500  Prop 1: Morehad debaying controversal in a speaker, 500  A state why their def wasn't fair support your gird, not instruction of the prop 2: Andrews  Prop 2: Munichal and speaker somewhat the topic speaker for case and 'T'  We number of organization  Dopped 3rd fly contention whap up with support for whap up	<b>₹</b>	/	1.1. 1.1.	
Prop 2: Mun Sham ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan Prop 2: Mun Sham ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan by or advisoring to the proper spend speed, addressing ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan upholding orun case and 'T"  Use number / Organization  TEAM CODE #: 6 on the OPP wins this debate.  REASON FOR DECISION:	•	/ -	••	<b>.</b> .
Prop 2: Mun Sham ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan Prop 2: Mun Sham ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan by or advisoring to the proper spend speed, addressing ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan upholding orun case and 'T"  Use number / Organization  TEAM CODE #: 6 on the OPP wins this debate.  REASON FOR DECISION:	Heing the above	ritaria plago offar com	nliments and/or suggestion	s for improvement tol south
Prop 2: Mun Sham ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan Prop 2: Mun Sham ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan by or advisoring to the proper spend speed, addressing ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan upholding orun case and 'T"  Use number / Organization  TEAM CODE #: 6 on the OPP wins this debate.  REASON FOR DECISION:	each dehater	incria, picase offer con	pinnents and/or suggestion	Case Could be small so
Prop 2: Mun Sham ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan Prop 2: Mun Sham ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan by or advisoring to the proper spend speed, addressing ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan upholding orun case and 'T"  Use number / Organization  TEAM CODE #: 6 on the OPP wins this debate.  REASON FOR DECISION:	cacii devatti.		. 1	you discussed berativote.
Prop 2: Mun Sham ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan Prop 2: Mun Sham ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan by or advisoring to the proper spend speed, addressing ea. print + Very Clear, Good losic, explan upholding orun case and 'T"  Use number / Organization  TEAM CODE #: 6 on the OPP wins this debate.  REASON FOR DECISION:	Prop 1: Bayen	i, /	Opp 1: Marchead	College Clay Clay
Values - I didn't ocatch (1)  Lexplain why examples given ist support your gird, not just list flow off.  Prop 2: Mun Shawi flow off.  Prop 2: Andrews  Opp 2: Andrews  Use number / Organization  TEAM CODE #: 6 on the Opp wins this debate.  REASON FOR DECISION:	$\alpha \sim 1 \sim 1000$	KACK I A A SOM	er i a and value.	lear spine, join
Values - I didn't casch (1)  Lexplain why examples given ist support your gird, not just list from off.  Prop 2: Mun Sham them off.  Prop 2: Mun Sham the good open of the string democracy of the string of the strin	Presental but a	what ched simocratic	1 Cadence	(, a >
Prop 2: Mun Sham from off.  Prop 2: Mun Sham from off.  Prop 2: Mun Sham fear good  Prop 3: Andrews  Prop 4 good speed, addressing ea. print  Whap up with Support for up the support for a speaker focused on delays	very fast on of	Vil bratch it.		
Support your did, not just our off.  Prop 2: Munsham along good  Spend Spend, addressing ea. print + Very Clar, Good logic, leplan  Use number / Organization  TEAM CODE #: 6 on the OPP wins this debate.  REASON FOR DECISION:  REASON FOR DECISION:  Name of the organization of the organi	valles - I and	moles anvenior	1 State was someth	
Prop 2: Mun Sham des got Opp 2: Andrews  Spood Speed, addressing ea. print + Very Clear, Good logic, explan  Use numberry or case and 'T'  Was up believed and the content or  Whap up with support for  Whap up with support for  Whap up with support  REASON FOR DECISION:  REASON FOR DECISION FO	explain way of	de not just us al	" Kepinia ""	(510) yote and alay
Prop 2: Marchan Speaker Good logic, expland by Speaker for what constant on the Proposed 3rd fly consenting wins this debate.  REASON FOR DECISION:  REASON FOR DECISION:  Name of the proposed of the consenting wins this debate.  REASON FOR DECISION:  Name of the proposed of the proposed of the consenting what who cash constant constan			' I	777711 104
Use numberry organization   Dropped 3rd All contenting of the Content of the C	Prop 2: 17VVV	a Save los got	Opp 2: Marions	a logic explanat
Use numberry / organization   A Dropped 3rd All contention what up with support for what up with support for what will support for what will support the (Prop or Opp)  REASON FOR DECISION:  REASON FOR DECISION:  All 2nd Speaker focused on delays	the topic first	dressing ea. poin	H + Very clear, go	case and T"
Use numberry / Organization   A Dropped 3rd Py content on whap up with support for whap up with support for whap up with support for who catic values (Prop or Opp)  REASON FOR DECISION:  REASON FOR	byood Spega, a	,	I upholousy on	001 2000
REASON FOR DECISION:	10.01	la animation		v. In this
REASON FOR DECISION:	Lse numbering	10 Cycord	What we we	SHA SHUDDOV PE LANGE
REASON FOR DECISION: 2nd Speaker focused on delays	TEAM CODE #:_	on the _	wins this debate.	Lithogratic whold
Very close round, but Aff 2nd speaker focused on delays	REASON FOR DE	CISION: .	Top of Oppor	
1 Dunlayand in Chill	M. Close non	nd, but All ?	na speaker focu	isea on delays
Carried In L'Illa, Clear MANITA UND SAFACURED DES 8100.		Libriclese WM	ich Opp Stplan	ned is Still."
Caused by filibusfers which opp explained is still consistent with denociacy." T" was also on Opp side I missed 1st Aff dely be too fast put 2nd Aff inserted "his" to dem	rused by t	h. Junnerall	1-11/1/21 2/20	on oop side.

On balance, MAD makes the i	Norld a Safer Place PARLI Debate
Skarr, Teresa (*27) Round 2B 11:15am Room 303 Gov: 2 Stamm-Kirk - Brogan	Judge's Name: Thresa Skarr
Opp: 16 Stephen - Miskelley Parliamentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation: WINDLOT HS
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Bugan pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Mi Skelly pts 28, 5
Prop Speaker #2 Stamm Kirkpts 29.5	Opp Speaker #2 Stephen pts 28
	utstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	l enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ing Criteria
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate</li> </ul>	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficie	, ,
<ul> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effect</li> </ul>	eferences to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
<ul><li>by the other side</li><li>Points of Information: How relevant and</li></ul>	d effective were the questions and the answers
<ul> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in</li> </ul>	an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
<ul><li>and easily understandable</li><li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful</li></ul>	the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Brosan	Opp 1: Miskelly very clear,
+ good framework good points	+ Excellent up planted logic.
A watch your speed very fast. I lost your "reign of terror" point.	D Work on belles refutations and dot manage time better. Watch speed - also quite fast.  Opp 2: Stephen once easy to follow
you look up from your notes Whash your your and this a bit disconcertify-rotate byes and it's a bit disconcertify-rotate.	manage time seller also quite fast.
HEXcellent speech, excellent	I excellent carding of ain card
A watch speed desso more angaging A wamples, vs. just machining them both	D relate back to judging criticia and upplain rejutations better Prop wins this debate.
	wins this debate. TO
Very close, excellent ro	ina you are are sorrious y
bright and knowledgea	were Still Standon and I alreed
Mason for less likely mike	und. You are all extremely be. At end of round, were Still Standing and I afrew was due to MAD, as pointed out in All rebutted.
•	U- U- V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V

Roberson, Sam (*20) Round 2A 11:15am Room 309	Judge's Name: Sam howerson To
Gov: 3 Cramer - Griffin Opp: 14 Chin - Rosenfeld	Judge's Ivaille. Show I was 150
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP3	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 <u>Cramer</u> pts <u>20</u>	_
Prop Speaker #2 Con'thm pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Rosenfeld pts 30
Please award each speaker points based	,
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	Iging Criteria
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate</li> </ul>	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
<u> </u>	iently the debaters support arguments with
	l references to authority as well as general knowledge
<ul> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effe by the other side</li> </ul>	ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
<b>▼</b>	and effective were the questions and the answers
	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
Courtesy: How courteous and respectful	ul the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	apliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: 900d TOW	Opp 1: Le gh Both of While Sparky and Spark of God Port Ready and Spark of Spark opp 2:22 to Port of P
tarpy & spoke very	Opp 1: Le an Both of while starty and of Clearly and Jou hand really and oblight of Opp 2:7 & refuse Ree 3! I have start and s
well and clearly with no	18 Me Char a Shi 10
Purses great eye contact	I was the say of the say
1000,1061	Opp 2: " to function of the Space of the Spa
Prop 2:	Opp 2:2 r Pur Ree 3. In the Span
de good Job yousporse	Jone Day Jane
More officially and becomer en	re the se the septiment
- 011 GOT IVIQ area 1 rap 11.010 eye	Opp 2: ? r refuse Regard was applied by your applied of the applie
TEAM CODE #: on the _	wins this debate.
(F REASON FOR DECISION:	Prop dr Opp)
<b>∽</b>	he aff as well as new points/information
Porought up by affin last	
- 1 10 70	<b>U</b> y <b>U</b>

	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 Team Code #: (20V)	Team Code #: OPP 3
Prop Speaker #1 Deshpante pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 WOLF-TacobS pts 27 XIII
Prop Speaker #2 Lingam Palli pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Nagarayan pts 28
	on the following scale:  Outstanding 28 = Very Good  od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)  <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficience—which may include facts and argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant a Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful</li> </ul>	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments iently the debaters support arguments with directerences to authority as well as general knowledge extively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges
each debater:	apliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
REASON FOR DECISION:	Off wins this debate. Prop or Opp)
Nuclear ware and fails to refuse a	ed destruction" from facked only on

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: HS. Fremont
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #: 22
Prop Speaker #1 Sutton pts 28	
	,
Prop Speaker #2 MOOh pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 YOUP pts 28
27 = Good (but possibly not go 26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	Outstanding 28 = Very Good bod enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<ul> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficience evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant a Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable</li> </ul>	ciently the debaters support arguments with direferences to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant full the debaters were to opponents and judges
each dehater	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: He is very good at explaining clearly, but not up to the expectations to compete with opp team. Very good	decr voice and. Stable speaks.
Speaker. Prop 2:	Opp 2: Enjoyed debate with a little humorous examples. And clarity chart the topic.
REASON FOR DECISION: TOpp to	Propor Opp) eam has boargut up very grod eate and had clarity about the speakers presented very well.

		I ARLI Devate	
Eppanapali, Vanaja Round 2B 11:15am Room 229 Gov: 14 Yan - Yan Opp: 4 McAvoy - Hester Parliamentary Debate/Va		Judge's Name: Vanaga  Judge's School Affiliation: I	Eppanapalli HS. Fremont
Team Code #:	PROP	OPP Team Code #:	
Prop Speaker #1_	YAN B pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 MC - AVOY	pts_30
Prop Speaker #2_	1/4/N.C pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Hester.	pts
	7 = Good (but possibly not good 24-20 = Poor	utstanding <b>28</b> = Very Good I enough to quality for elimination	
<ul> <li>Evidence:</li> <li>evidence—</li> <li>Argument</li> <li>by the othe</li> <li>Points of I</li> <li>Delivery:</li> <li>and easily</li> </ul>	ring the debate How appropriately and efficie -which may include facts and reation: How directly and effect or side Information: How relevant and How well the debaters speak in understandable	y the debaters analyze the topic ntly the debaters support argum eferences to authority as well a tively the debaters respond to the d effective were the questions an an organized, communicative the debaters were to opponents	nents with as general knowledge arguments made and the answers atyle that is pleasant
each debater:  Prop 1: Stan  Ald not g  to the deb	- /	and explana	voice and clar and clears peak him.
Prop 2: Necde and li voice. TEAM CODE REASON FOR	more preperation He more strong	Opp 2: Strong Vo	caloulary and go lls, understand eng well. I clear about why during
	•		

Tunnell, Nanny (*17) Round 2A 11:15am Room 528	Judge's Name: Danny Tunnell
Gov: 4 Figueroa - Choy Opp: 14 Lustig - Gerenrot Parliamentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's Name: Nanny Lunnell  Judge's School Affiliation: MUHS
PROP (affirm) Team Code #:	OPP (いらな) Team Code #: 14
Prop Speaker #1 Figure 1000 pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Listing pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Choy pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Genen wt pts 28
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good Alicharder rules od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<ul> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficience evidence—which may include facts and</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant a</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable</li> </ul>	iently the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments iently the debaters support arguments with I references to authority as well as general knowledge actively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges
each debater:  Prop 1:  Delivery (need to sturd strutght)  the livery (good pack projection for  birdy (anguery)  Tenderse (good cranization of gove into me  Argument schout optives to Allibertic  Prop 2:  Delivery (need to slow down speed  tevident good slow down speed  tevident good spendie cases)  Argumentation (need to use Comman  more often is the examples to  treatmen)  TEAM CODE #:  On the  REASON FOR DECISION:	- Delivery (need better organization of intro less into need to intro less into need to intro less intro need to intro less intro need to intro less introductions) on efficiency chearen points on efficiency chearen points the living (strong neutronal smalling mone) of the transmentation (position negronal to questions of the Aralasis (good buildup)  Opp wins this debate.  Prop or Opp)  We topic and definition
- bound pussioncette a	letinon and armontation.

Tunnell, Nanny (*17) Round 2B 11:15am Room 528	Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell
Gov: 13 Cummings - Ellsworth Opp: 16 Fogarty - Pister Parliamentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation: MU HS
PROP Team Code #: 13	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Ellswuth pts 2	9 Opp Speaker #1 Pister pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Cumm Ing pts 5	Opp Speaker #2 Fugarty pts 29
Please award each speaker points ba $30 = Perfect 2$ $27 = Good (but possibly not)$ $26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	sed on the following scale:  Balance nathol (2) = Outstanding 28 = Very Good assured electrical electric
	Judging Criteria
<ul> <li>offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and evidence—which may include facts</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relev</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters spand easily understandable</li> </ul>	ectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments efficiently the debaters support arguments with s and references to authority as well as general knowledge effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made ant and effective were the questions and the answers beak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant begtful the debaters were to opponents and judges
(value) net konetite	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Team shoul show options if nucleur is TEAM CODE #: 16 on  REASON FOR DECISION:  - used better evidence  - well organized	opp 2:  + POI - Court pustions)  regrettin) + Delivery (way precise use of language)  regrettin) + Delivery (way precise use of language)  rightin) + Endere - good us of thets  rot use! + Argumentation of economic burdens to  the Opp wins this debate.  (Proport Opp)  + Agranges & = Shout Jepths
- avect deliver	

Kapoor, Ram (*16) Round 2A 11:15am Room 527 Gov: 11 Ganguli - Sanghvi	Judge's Name: RAM KAPOOR
Opp: 27 Amato - Ringstrom Parliamentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE
PROP	OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #: 27
Prop Speaker #1 GANGULI pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 AMATO pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 RINGSTROM pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 SANGHUI pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 RING STROM pts 27
	athe following scale: atstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rade or inappropriate behavior
Judgi	ing Criteria
<ul> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and resolved the other side</li> <li>Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant and</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable</li> <li>Courtesy: How courteous and respectful</li> </ul>	the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments on the debaters support arguments with efferences to authority as well as general knowledge ively the debaters respond to the arguments made of effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges of th
Prop 1: LOGICAL  ACQUARTS  GOOD PRESCUTATION	Opp 1: PASSIONNETE DEBATER, MISINTERPRETED  OGMOCRATIC DERNISION
Prop 2: VERY STRONG DELIVERY , RESPONSE TO POIL WAS GOOD.	Opp 2: Good Oblivery
——————————————————————————————————————	pp or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	
MORE THOROUGH	SETUP AND REFUTATION
OF OPPONENT'S VIEWS.	

Kapoor, Ram (*16) Round 2B 11:15am Room 52' Gov: 14 Wilcox - Sutton Opp: 27 Shimizu - McDo Parliamentary Debate/V	owell	Judge's Name: RAM KAPOOR  Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE	
Team Code #:	PROP 14	Team Code #: 2-7	
Prop Speaker #1_	SVTTON pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 McOower pts 28	
Prop Speaker #2	WILCOX pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 SHIM (20 pts 27	
	27 = Good (but possibly not good 24-20 = Poor	utstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior	
		ing Criteria	
offered du  Evidence: evidence—  Argumen by the othe Points of I  Delivery: and easily Courtesy:  Using the aboreach debater:	ring the debate  How appropriately and efficient which may include facts and retation: How directly and effective side  Information: How relevant and How well the debaters speak in understandable  How courteous and respectful ove criteria, please offer comp	the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments antly the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge rively the debaters respond to the arguments made at effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges bliments and/or suggestions for improvement to	
Prop 1: Ex	CEUGHT SATUP.	Opp 1: ELOQUENT SPEANUR.	
	/	Opp 1: ELOQUENT SPERMEN.  BUT LESS COGENER ARGUMEN	7
Prop 2:	NE SPEARIN,	Opp 2: LOGICAL REPUTATION	
4000	NE SPEARER,	BUT LIMITED IMPACT	
REASON FOR	DECISION:	PROP wins this debate. op or Opp)  es Ano STRONGER	

Li, Caroline (*23) Round 2A 11:15am Room 307 Gov: 3 Curl - Aghadjian-Newbrough Opp: 11 Meswani - Harith Parliamentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's Name: <u>Caroline Li</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>San Kalum</u> Academy
Talliamentary Debater variety	The state of the s
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:
	Opp Speaker #1 Meswan: pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Aghadjan - Newsonsh 29	Opp Speaker #2 Harith pts 29
Please award each speaker points based on	
	ststanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judgi	ng Criteria
<ul> <li>Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate</li> </ul>	the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficient	ntly the debaters support arguments with
11 1	eferences to authority as well as general knowledge
	ively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	1 - 66 - 46 41
	l effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	an organized, communicative style that is picasant
<u> </u>	the depaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: critical thicking	Oppliane delivers.
· superb speech delivery	Oppdirong delivers.  strong arguments
· knows own materials/well	relevant examples presented
Convincing Points Prop 2:	please just slow down a bit.
Prop 2:	Onn 2:
· strong/persuading/arguments/ evidence.	. provided strong evidence
evidence.	critical thicking applied in speech
· analysis well done  TEAM CODE # 3	critical thinking applied in species
	Nuina thia dahata
TEAM CODE #: on the	wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	argument with milestones/asende discussions to the impact on country/citizens
. logical way of getting into an	argument will at first
provide macro view of team's is	possition to the impact on country criteria
· Strong performance in averall de	apposition to the impact on country/citizens bate criteal + the fing/ analysis throughout.

Dur Rayon Hoslemy

Mandan Walendary MARKER

of state of species of spirit of spirit of spirits

Then Barralam mad smooth.

Convincing Points

o strongs providing on guments of everlance continue in the contract

expensions grows had shown .

speak for simulation as bess.

featured examples proceeding.

strong defined.

especialism posible himself resulting.

is social was of yorking him in sugarners with militaria appraise discusses

saids increasing in marger valuation of the linguit on turning contract.

	PARLI Debate
Li, Caroline (*23) Round 2B 11:15am Room 307 Gov: 26 Kornfein - Stromberg	Judge's Name: Caroline Li
Opp: 4 Cunningham - Yau-Weeks Parliamentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon AcadeM J
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Stromberg pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Yan-week pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Kornfein pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Cunning ham pts 29
Please award each speaker points based	<u> </u>
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
$26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	· · ·
Ju	dging Criteria
<ul> <li>offered during the debate</li> <li>Evidence: How appropriately and efficevidence—which may include facts an</li> </ul>	ciently the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments  ciently the debaters support arguments with  d references to authority as well as general knowledge  cectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
<ul> <li>by the other side</li> <li>Points of Information: How relevant</li> <li>Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable</li> </ul>	and effective were the questions and the answers  k in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant  ful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer cone each debater:	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: _ delivery very strong	Opp 1: speech was logical
- logical arguments with so light	- god eye contact
examples	_
Prop 2:	Opp 2: - critical thinking manifested it
- Solid speech delivery	Coll
- strong endence for arguments	- relevant/perthent arguments with
TEAM CODE #: on the REASON FOR DECISION:	(Prop or Opp) wins this debate.

· Stronger evidence à arguments critical thinking in satisfic

In River Acobemic

2/2 Manual Co. 2.7 SIDMMONE 

PA MANIAMAN Normal ! 25

recording the <del>formulation of the property of </del>

Busys hope secretor tiogical arguments with solid

- special was losical

or installation published learning - relevant pertoheur manner support

Though solving and manual solving

- solid speach devision

. From Englance for medianesself.

rrous, Eileen (*22) nd 2A 11:15am Room 308 /: 5 Jia - Jiang		Judge's Name: <u>Ellen Burrous</u>
c: 27 Galli - Girimonte liamentary Debate/Varsity		Judge's School Affiliation: San Mar In High
PROTECTION Team Code #:	<u></u>	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1	<u>a</u> pts <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #1 Galli pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 1	ang pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 GIFI WINTE pts 27
Please award each		on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
<b>27</b> = G <b>26-25</b> = Fair		od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)  <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
20-25 – Fall		ging Criteria
<ul><li>evidence—which</li><li>Argumentation</li><li>by the other side</li></ul>	n may include facts and How directly and effect	iently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
<ul><li>Delivery: How wand easily unders</li><li>Courtesy: How</li></ul>	well the debaters speak standable courteous and respectfu	and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges appliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
• Delivery: How wand easily unders • Courtesy: How  Using the above crieach debater:  Prop 1: Try trs  Uttle, Voice  I lwn to Sh	well the debaters speak standable courteous and respectful teria, please offer com	on an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges appliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  Opp 1: fraument not as effective to support fill bustering. Coot a bid Confusing.
• Delivery: How and easily underson and easily underson courtesy: How Using the above critical debater:  Prop 1: Try to Shall you to Shall prepare Prop 2: May have the discussing ength, Polite of Speaker	well the debaters speak standable courteous and respectful teria, please offer com  I way a way a speak of the com  I should raise who points.  I facts clew  Le gove on the courted bills in the much clear - board	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges inpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  Opp 1: fraument not as effective to support fill bustering. Got a bid Confusing.  Opp 2: gave clear presentation, got examples, seemed well prepared.
• Delivery: How and easily unders • Courtesy: How  Using the above criceach debater:  Prop 1: Try to Shall he was to Shall prepare  Prop 2: May have also was a peakle.  Prop 2: May have a peakle.  Prop 2: May have a peakle.  Prop 2: May have a peakle.  TEAM CODE #:	well the debaters speak standable courteous and respectful teria, please offer com  I way please offer com  I should raise was points.  I all all all all all all all all all al	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges  inpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  Opp 1: fraument not as effective to  Support fili Bustering. Got a bid  Confusing:  Opp 2: Gave Clear presentation, gove  Examples, seemed well proportion  Politic
• Delivery: How and easily unders • Courtesy: How  Using the above criceach debater:  Prop 1: Try to Shall he was to Shall prepare  Prop 2: May have also was a peakle.  Prop 2: May have a peakle.  Prop 2: May have a peakle.  Prop 2: May have a peakle.  TEAM CODE #:	well the debaters speak standable courteous and respectful teria, please offer com  I way please offer com  I should raise was points.  I all all all all all all all all all al	on an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges appliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  Opp 1: fraument not as effective to support fill bustering. Coot a bid Confusing.

nd 2B 11:15am Room 308	Judge's Name: Fileen SUV OUS
v: 17 Sweeney - Hsieh	Judge's Name: Eileen Surrous
o: 14 White - Hall liamentary Debate/Varsity	Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin High
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 SWEENLY pts 20	$\frac{1}{1}$
Prop Speaker #2 HSIEh pts 26	11 11 20
Please award each speaker points base	ed on the following scale:
	= Outstanding 28 = Very Good
$27 = Good (but possibly not g)$ $26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
20 20 1 441 21 20 1 001	20 Reserved for face of mappropriate continue
	udging Criteria
	tively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate  • Evidence: How appropriately and eff	ficiently the debaters support arguments with
••••	and references to authority as well as general knowledge
	ffectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	at and effective were the questions and the answers
and easily understandable	ak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
• Courtesy: How courteous and respec	etfyl the debaters were to opponents and judges
	that the desires were to oppositions and Judges
The state of the s	
	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:  Prop 1: Very Well prepared Clean examples. Clearly explained, polite.	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  Opp 1: Good examples, courtains  good questions, well prepared,  effective in put, added information  Relevant questions good delivery
each debater:  Prop 1: Very Well prepared Clean examples. Cleanly explained, polite.	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  Opp 1: Good examples, courteurs  good questions, well pre part di  effective in put, added information  Relevant greations good delivery
each debater:  Prop 1: Very Well prepared Clean examples. Cleanly explained, polite.	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  Opp 1: Good examples, courteurs  good questions, well pre part di  effective in put, added information  Relevant greations good delivery
each debater:	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  Opp 1: Good examples, court evers  good questions, well pre part di  effective in put, added information  Relevant greations good delivery
each debater:  Prop 1: Very Well prepared Clean examples. Cleanly explained, polite.	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  Opp 1: Good examples, courtains  good questions, well prepared,  effective in put, added information  Relevant questions good delivery
Prop 1: Very Well prepared Clear examples. Clearly explained, polite,  Prop 2: Work waye contact Not as prepared.	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  Opp 1: Good examples, courtains  good questions, well prepared.  Relevant questions good delivery  L. Opp 2: good Questions. Very clear  good eye contact - supports  arguments. Good delivery, hand  gestimes useful.
Prop 1: Verywell prepared Clear examples. Eleanly explained, polite.  Prop 2: Work ways contact Not as prepared.	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  Opp 1: Good examples, courtains  good questions, well pre part di  effective in put, added information  Relevant prestions good delivery  -, Opp 2: good Ouestions. Very clear  good eye contact - supports  arguments, Good delivery, hand  gestimes useful,
Prop 1: Verywell prepared Clear examples. Clearly explained, polite.  Prop 2: Work ways contact Not as prepared.	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  Opp 1: Good axamples, cowderns  good auestions, Well pre part di  effective in put, added information  Relevant acceptions good delivery  - Opp 2: good Questions. Very clear  good eye contact - suprivits  arguments, Good delivery, hand  gestimes useful,
each debater:  Prop 1: Very Well by e pared Clear examples. Clearly explained, polite.  Prop 2: Work in eye contact Not as prepared.	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to  Opp 1: Good examples, cowdevus  good questions, well pre part di  effective in put, added in foremutil  kelevant questions good delivery