

School uniforms should be mandated K-12
PARLI Debate

Michelle Place (*15)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 136
Gov: 10 Chan - Foley
Opp: 12 Burrous - Marr
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: MICHELLE PLACE

Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEY

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 12

Prop Speaker #1 CHAN pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 BURROUS pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 FOLEY pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 MARR pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Well spoken, clear points, organized, good eye contact.

Prop 2:

Good speaker, well prepared.

Opp 1: Spoke well, organized and good format

Opp 2: spoke well, concise and organized.

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the GOV wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Well organized points with good supporting evidence and clear redirection of opponents points.

CHAN	BURROWS	FOLEY	MARR	BURROWS	CHAN
<p>① Education distraction symbols does time *</p> <p>- no documentation</p> <p>- consistent grades.</p> <p>② Bullying - gangs - equality students</p>	<p>→ dress code New enforcement exist ? less time</p>	<p>→ dress code prepared students for life engagement is still present → does come time</p> <p>→ not all but removes one aspect</p> <p>→ removed individual differences.</p>	<p>→ POI - loose education time.</p> <p>→ no change</p>	<p>→ dress code ?</p> <p>→ problem with teacher</p> <p>→ no change or worsens it. more reading.</p> <p>→ unique to humans.</p>	<p>→ study</p> <p>→ SC case</p>
	<p>→ still wear color. don't help poor.</p>	<p>→ Supreme of rules</p> <p>→ problem in teachers.</p>	<p>→ POI - loose education time.</p> <p>→ no change</p>	<p>→ problem with teacher</p> <p>→ no change or worsens it. more reading.</p> <p>→ unique to humans.</p>	<p>→ study</p> <p>→ SC case</p>
	<p>① Freedom of expression group rather than individuals</p> <p>② Impartial</p> <p>③ Money handing</p> <p>④ Don't stop bullying reading.</p>	<p>→ wardrobe</p> <p>→ less cheaper than normal clothing decreases.</p> <p>→ costs more like no use outside of school. reading</p>	<p>→ POI - loose education time.</p> <p>→ no change</p>	<p>→ problem with teacher</p> <p>→ no change or worsens it. more reading.</p> <p>→ unique to humans.</p>	<p>→ study</p> <p>→ SC case</p>
	<p>→ still wear color. don't help poor.</p>	<p>→ Supreme of rules</p> <p>→ problem in teachers.</p>	<p>→ POI - loose education time.</p> <p>→ no change</p>	<p>→ problem with teacher</p> <p>→ no change or worsens it. more reading.</p> <p>→ unique to humans.</p>	<p>→ study</p> <p>→ SC case</p>
	<p>① Freedom of expression group rather than individuals</p> <p>② Impartial</p> <p>③ Money handing</p> <p>④ Don't stop bullying reading.</p>	<p>→ wardrobe</p> <p>→ less cheaper than normal clothing decreases.</p> <p>→ costs more like no use outside of school. reading</p>	<p>→ POI - loose education time.</p> <p>→ no change</p>	<p>→ problem with teacher</p> <p>→ no change or worsens it. more reading.</p> <p>→ unique to humans.</p>	<p>→ study</p> <p>→ SC case</p>

Year round school schedule is beneficial.
PARLI Debate

Michelle Place (*15)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 136
Gov: 3 Szeto - Keychenko
Opp: 10 Dickerman - Millar
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: MICHELLE PLACE

Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEY

Team Code #: PROP 3

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 SZETO pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 DICKERMAN pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 KEYCHENKO pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 MILLAR 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 speaker, good
voice projection, a
little flustered at the
end.

Prop 2:
good speaker
and organized

Opp 1:
good speaker, stayed
on topic, well presented

Opp 2:
good speaker, good
organization

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Well presented arguments with evidence and
reputed gov plan well.

SZETO

DICKERMAN

KEYCHENICO

MILLAR

DICKERMAN

SZETO

FACTUAL NET BENEFIT

① Education cost over summa

75% - LINK

evidence

steeped after breaks

② Teachers - higher pay

(?)

→ need break

→ Continuity of education

→ does will not change

→ long break.

→ same pay
summer pay would be gone.
less money.

→ need vacations more frequently

→ Teachers
Jobs
training
summer ahead.

→ same hrs would during year.

→ ? wages

① Need time to unlearn, programs, need money.

② another job for teachers

③ distraction of breaks.

④ need summer ahead to get ahead.

→ jobs, internships

→ Jobs - more money.

- distraction of breaks

- summer ahead.

This house believes Un-Americans should be mandated for K-12 schools

PARLI Debate

Arna Katewa (*12)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 139
Gov: 13 Murdough - Donaldson
Opp: 10 Eng - Ying
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Arna Katewa
Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin High School

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: <u>13</u>	Team Code #: <u>10</u>
Prop Speaker #1 <u>Murdough</u> pts <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #1 <u>YING</u> pts <u>29</u>
Prop Speaker #2 <u>Donaldson</u> pts <u>27</u>	Opp Speaker #2 <u>ENG</u> pts <u>27</u>

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:
construction - good composition, clearly stated points. I think you could have built up the arguments better.
 Rebuttal: *came back stronger, but needed to discuss the opp. more clearly.*
 Prop 2: *clearly.*
You had good points with clear attack on Negations contentions.

Opp 1: *construction: very clearly defined the terms, attacked the affirmation very well & built up their own contentions very clearly. Nice eye contact, volume & great delivery of speech. very focused.*
 Rebuttal - *very well done! summed up both sides very well & had stronger arguments*
 Opp 2: *is makes NEGATIONS clear.*
Good and friendly start. Once you started with your arguments - they came out stronger. But you ran out of time, it would need a little bit more organization.

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both teams did a good job presenting their arguments, but OPPOSITION team came up with stronger arguments & supported their contentions in a methodical and clear manner, about freedom of speech, LGBT/religious beliefs & importance of school.

PARLI Debate

Julianna Phillips (*2)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 142
Gov: 5 Chang - Stuart
Opp: 10 Lee - Goldstein
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Julianna Phillips

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd.

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 Annie Stewart pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Jacob Goldstein pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Aria Chang pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Garrett Lee 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: Stewart.

Great speaker, good points made. Mental illness is broad,

difficult topic, due to more than stress, if stress even plays any role. So

Prop 2: Chang.

Good clear speaking. Organization good.

that is a tough one to weigh.

Opp 1: Goldstein

Good points, effective arguments and elaboration.

Opp 2: Lee

Responded very well to arguments, very clear, concise. Well organized arguments

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

This debate was very difficult to judge because both teams were very good, very convincing. Analysis was reasonable and effective.

schedule is outdated, year round schedule.

Stewart

1) based on Farming system. 19th century.

45% to 15% more worked than

2) more like advertisement

3) breaks spread out through rest of year

- learning loss over summer - interrupted

hardness over summer

healthcare.

- same environment oppressive.

- mental illness - physical chemical or of brain.

- plan out breaks more easily: 1

Q still costs \$ more unmanageable when one spread out, not all at once.

Goldstein

did not identify who it students

still valuable, work or pursue interest develop

not necessarily farming

transition fairly easy

Q why is 2 was better than short breaks.

A entire day off.

much less stress longer break

in Japan - kids worked so much outside

low suicide/mi. in Europe due to other factors

1) kids happier after long rest.

2) pursue personal interests - intellectual - socialize.

3) summer school important for some kids to catch up.

Chang

controlling by opp. examples for own ptr.

1) summer stressed in terms of why college resume. More balanced schedule.

2c) retain info thru repetition at yr long

3 c) summer school not vrtal: can fit in over short breaks.

Q: 3 wk on 3 wk off less school time?

A: no, same number of days but distinct differences.

1. Technology/changes in farming no in

2. Most jobs need 365 full time. No shock to system

3. mental health "break"

Lee

relate content, support over.

1) taking away summer for devote to one subject, full effort. college look for two

2) stress still exist during breaks - less self explanation

3) college is transition not by sudden shock.

3) summer provides stress-free gap

1) Switzer in Japan - no time to decompress

2. no chance to take stress class in summer

3. summer school. failed subject. take away valuable opportunity to get ahead. stress work. thriving this group.

Goldstein

3/3 is not stress free

commitment longer needed

Need 6-10 at 1

low income families still need non-profit free camps organized around summer

can actually support family for 2 mo. + contribute to family.

Stewart

containing run structure pin

1c) if reform implemented, shifts would change.

2c) Japan example ↓ due to parental pressure

3c) stress vs work contradictions points

interactions can be proper and more frequent.

transition is very difficult, lead to mental illness (but not proven)

summer school not necessary if students could catch up over multiple times over the year.

work for family inter-acting if they avoid farmers.

frequency before would benefit. test due to time to decompress.

PARLI Debate

Janet Chang (*4)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 137
Gov: 10 Lee - Lichtmacher
Opp: 8 Murdock - Shotwell
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Janet Chang
Judge's School Affiliation: Dougherty (DVHS)

The United States Federal Government ~~should~~ believes that school uniforms should be mandated in K-12 schools.

PROP 10 OPP 8

Team Code #: 10

Team Code #: 8

Prop Speaker #1 Lee pts 28.5

Opp Speaker #1 Murdock pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Lichtmacher pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Shotwell pts ~~25~~ 25.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: ^{① 3=40 (too short?)}
^{② 4=50}
 Analysis: Not very clear, bully #
 Evidence: Not clear
 Argumentation: Good points!
 Information: Not enough
 Skills: Good skill to respond the argument.
 Courtesy: eye contact proper, good.

Opp 1: ^{① 6=20}
^{② 5=01 wear uniform mean}
 Analysis: be who they are! / difference are wrong. #.
 Evidence: economic stress?
 Argument: Distiny ability to express yourself!
 Information: repeat information!
 Skills: eye contact proper, tone & speed are good.
 Courtesy: Voice proper. ✓

Prop 2: ^{① 6=50}
 Analysis: Don't take away expression.
 Evidence: America don't lack of express yourself.
 Information: School is for learning.
 Skills: a bit nervous
 Courtesy: ok

Opp 2: ^{① 4=50}
 Analysis: just one point / repeat Opp 1's point.
 Evidence: No food so no money to buy uniform.
 Argument:
 Information:
 Skills: nervous / Not so much eye contacts.
 Courtesy: ok

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the PROP wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

- ① Team work: better ~~than~~
- ② Delivery skills: #10 is a bit better.
- ③ Evidence: #10 got more support points.

This house believes the year round school schedule is beneficial.

PARLI Debate

Tina Donovan (*3)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 140
Gov: 6 Mao - Tong-Seely
Opp: 10 Liu - Fu
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: TINA DONOVAN
(DAVID)

Judge's School Affiliation: CAMPOLLAND

Team Code #: PROP 4

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 Tong-Seely pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Liu pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Mao pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Fu 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: **FANTASTIC PRESENCE + GREAT ANALYSIS**

- GREAT INFO + FRAMING OF THE ISSUE
- EASY TO FOLLOW LOGIC

MAYBE PRESENT A BIT MORE EVIDENCE

Opp 1: **o GREAT REFUTAL AND FANTASTIC SUMMARY OF OTHER ARGUMENT**

- GOOD POI
- OPPOSITION REBUTTAL COULD HAVE BEEN MORE CLEAR, BIT

Opp 2: **SHORT**

Prop 2: **GOOD SPEAKER, IN A GOOD WAY**

- ARGUMENTATION WAS A BIT HARD TO HEAR

Opp 2: **ENGAGING SPEAKER**

- EVIDENCE + ARGUMENTATION WAS "SPUTTY" SOME WAS HARD TO FOLLOW

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

- CLEARER ARGUMENT ON THE BENEFITS OF A LONGER BREAK TO CATCH UP MAEL, REST, ETC. (EASIER POSITION TO DEFEND). ALSO DROTE MORE SPEAKER POINTS, DID NOT CONVINCED THIS WOULD BE EQUAL

POOP

(3)

MAD

JASMIN

LIU

FU

LIU

JASMIN

VABE
GOOD DEF

48/12-1

OTMADINUM
IS OUT DATE
STUDYING
LOOS over +
SUMMER

OTAMON S NIGHT

GET MORE
HLED w/

EST
- MORE POSITIVE
EXPANSE +
- 202

GOOD FARE

3) - PRADEFA
YEAR NOWD
- MORE PREPARE

SOCIETY BARR
FRAN BARR

LESS STRESS

SOURCE
GREAT REFURM
OF POINTS

1) STRESS RELIEF
WITH SUMMER
- NO BARRAZ

- LESS STRESS
BETTER

2) ALLOW FOR
SUB OUT
EXPANSE

3) ALLOWS FOR
CARE UP
SUMMER SCHOOL

EXCELLEN
ANALYSIS
HARD

GOOD POT

3 NO NO LESS
STRESS REDIF
TITAN 2

HANDLED POT
WELL

LIVABILITY +
STUDY - GOOD
EVIDENCE

- SHAN
GOOD

WEEK ON
CARE UP

GOOD BUDGIE
USE

WEEK ON AN
HARD NO MAKE
ALCAR

GOOD REFURM
BRACING -
SDRAGON
CONVINCING

DEYO STUP
- COULD HAVE
BEEN STRONGER

- CONVINCING
- SOME ANCHORS
HARD TO FOLLOW

- MARRIES A BIT

STUDY PAPER
MORE EVIDENCE
CONVINCING
- FACILITATE

A BIT SHAN
SIMPLER
COORDINATE
GONE ONE
MARRIES SEATS

VARY CAN
EASY TO
FOLLOW

1) STRESS

2) PRA FORME

3)

29

29

28

27

28

29

This house believes that the year-round school sched is beneficial.

PARLI Debate

Patricia Zaballos (*2)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 116

Gov: 12 Baxter - Nam

Opp: 10 Morgenstein - Kerr-Stein

Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Patricia Zaballos

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

Team Code #: PROP 12

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 Baxter pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Nick Morgenstein pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Nam pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Chloe Kerr-Stein 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...
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 clear speaker. Appreciated that speaker took time w/ points + set arguments up with a "story".

Opp 1: Nice delivery. Focus on making strong arguments.

Prop 2: Clear + logical arguments. Good responses to opp's points.

Opp 2: Dynamic speaker. Some arguments could be better supported.

TEAM CODE #: 12 on the prop wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very close round! Impressed w/ level of debate for both teams. I believe that the prop team's argument offered the most net benefits and that those benefits were well supported. Opp dwelled a bit too much on importance of summer jobs, I believe.

This house believes that school uniforms should be mandated for K-12 schools.

PARLI Debate

Patricia Zaballos (*2)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 116
Gov: 13 Barton - Saghati
Opp: 10 Ng - Huang
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Patricia Zaballos
Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

Team Code #: PROP 13 Team Code #: OPP 10
Prop Speaker #1 Barton pts 28 Opp Speaker #1 Ng pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Saghati pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 Huang 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: laid out plan very clearly. Dynamic speaker. Try to work on taking time + speaking more fluidly.

Opp 1: Very clear, logical speaker. Easy to follow. Be careful of dropped points! (simplifies student life)

Prop 2: Nice delivery. Some responses to opp could be stronger.

Opp 2: Clearly responded to prop's points, but responses were somewhat repetitive.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Very close round! Both teams impressively on point, easy to follow. I believe prop made a stronger argument and supported their argument more completely. Opp was a bit more repetitive + dropped the point of simplifying student life.

PARLI Debate

Bill Windsor (*6)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 133
Gov: 10 Stroumza - Chen
Opp: 5 Vafai - Wan
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Bill Windsor

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington HS

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 Chen pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Vafai pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Stroumza pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Wan 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 Team carries these arguments:

Prop 1:

- ① Summer activities: the all-year academic calendar better provided for low-income families - strong argument
- ② Teacher experience: the all-year calendar emphasizes for teachers to teach the curriculum and focus on teaching year-round - strong argument.

Prop 2:

- ③ PROP Team carries the argument on procrastination, that teachers will enforce academic progress schedules and can use new technologies to do this.

OPP Team

Opp 1:

- PROP team's presentation style and speed were very professional.
- But OPP's perspective on using summer break time were slanted toward off new communities - not applicable or feasible in lower-income communities, as PROP points out.

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the PROP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: PROP carries the most important arguments, detailed above.

YR round 2000:

PARLI Debate

Manning Sutton (*1) - cont.
Round 1B 9:00am Room 134 - NO ext. breaks
Gov: 10 Yan - Sun - started, none
Opp: 13 Clawson - Schade - FED met
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Sutton
Judge's School Affiliation: _____

Team Code #: PROP 10 Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 SUN pts 28 Opp Speaker #1 CLAWSON pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 YAN pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 SCHADE pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: CLEAR, ARTICULATE
GOOD HAND MOVEMENTS
in opening.
- ALL STUDENTS VS. ELITES
GOODS.

Prop 2: ARGUMENTS were
all generally persuasive
- Teacher Pay less logical Arg.

Opp 1: - GOOD arguments w/
Internships, Job, College visits.
- MAKING more \$ BY Teachers
WAS effective, could have been
expanded to talk about HIGHER
PAY... REQUESTED teachers = better
Opp 2: - Khan Academy argument ok, ED.
BUT THEY COUNTERED WELL WITH
THE "EUTISM" ARGUMENT.
- Relax, Decompress was good,
but could have been
even better...

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the PROP wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

This house believes that school uniforms should be mandated for K-12 schools

PARLI DEBATE

Ceslavs Belinskis (*3)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 135
Gov: 10 Lyons - Wyszynski
Opp: 13 Corbett - Bohannon
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Ceslavs Belinskis

Judge's School Affiliation: CAMPOLINDO HS

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Wyszynski pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Spencer Corbett pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 LYONS pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Alex Bohannon 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: - Disruptive Msgs in classroom
- Teachers' implicit bias
- Discrimination
- Organized and well structured

Opp 1: - Roadmap ++
- Clear Definitions
- Questions well handled
- Refuted well
- Great delivery
- Cost is high
- Great Evidence

Prop 2: - Removing sources of Distract
- Little rushed delivery
- Great evidence
- Disruptive Msgs furthered
- Better environment
- Reference to flow
- Well structured

Opp 2: - other bias exist besides uniforms
- Well paced delivery
- Creativity not affected
- Points restated well
- Roadmap well structured.
- Well defended.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Well structured speech, well paced.
Great use of sources

This house believes that the year-round school schedule is beneficial.

PARLI Debate

Scott Engstrom (*13)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 141
Gov: 10 Tran - Vainberg
Opp: 11 Jicha - Thrasher
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Scott Engstrom
Judge's School Affiliation: SRV

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 11

Prop Speaker #1 Amber Tran pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Clifton Thrasher pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Yael Vainberg pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Ann Jicha pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Amber Prop 1: (28)

Nice pace and clear distinction of each of your arguments.

This role requires strong persuasion - a passion & connection to the argument will make your excellent speaking skills that much more effective.

Yael Prop 2: (29)

Excellent speaking & presentation.

Be confident that you are that good speaker and allow for pauses in between your thoughts instead of "um"s.

Clifton Opp 1: (29)

Excellent presentation of your case and point by point refutation!

Strong use of evidence to back up your claims.

Ann Prop 2: (25)

Fantastic inventory & comprehension of the issues on both sides of the argument.

A little too rushed - don't let your excitement get in the way of the points. Make sure to address judge & more than opponents.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The Prop team argued for significant benefits of their position by advocating more spread out & smaller breaks vs 1 long summer break. Con did an excellent job of refuting these arguments. Both sides brought ^{credible} evidence to support their positions. Ultimately, Prop did not persuade that the benefits of spreading the school yr. outweighed the lost benefits of a summer season.

This House believes that the year round school schedule is beneficial.
PARLI Debate

Ceslavs Belinskis (*3)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 135
Gov: 10 Woo - Melman
Opp: 16 Cohen - Hall
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Ceslavs Belinskis

Judge's School Affiliation: CAMPOLINDO HS

PROP Team Code #: 10 **OPP** Team Code #: 16
Prop Speaker #1 Leah Melman pts 28 Opp Speaker #1 Chase Cohen pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Sofia Woo pts 28 Opp Speaker #2 Chase Cohen 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: stated and defined resolution well
stated Advantages clearly
showed Impact.
Lack of clear evidence.
Presented as a value case.

Opp 1: Refuted All advantages well. Defined well.
Great Use of sources.
Convincing Argument. Well structured.

Prop 2: Defended their Advantage.
Sources used vaguely.
Students would not fall behind in studies.
Benefits to low-income families.
Teachers would be paid year-round.

Opp 2: Great argument as to no funding plan was not clearly presented.
Weakened PROP argument logically and argumentatively.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Well argued and delivered. Great analysis.

This house believes that the year-round school schedule is beneficial.
PARLI Debate

Arna Katewa (*12)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 139
Gov: 6 Wang - Darukhanawalla
Opp: 13 Madsen - Engstrom
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Arna Katewa

Judge's School Affiliation: San Maria High School.

Team Code #: PROP 6

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Brian Wang pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Jack Engstrom pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Malcolm Darukhanawalla pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Gustavo Madsen 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:

construction - Great start & clarity in speech, it was structured well, but could have spent a little longer to elaborate the points you made.

Rebuttal: nicely done! had a great point of bringing up the positive effects of Prop 2: stronger convention & benefit.

Nice speech, started refuting the opposition well, but could have made or rebutted your contentions stronger.

Opp 1: construction: great speech, well organized. clearly stated ~~over~~ the contentions & had good arguments. Very well done with refuting the affirmation & then building your case.

Rebuttal - it was a great rebuttal - very well structured & backed up with arguments.

Opp 2: Great speech. well organized - attacked the affirmation well & then rebutted the Negation's case nicely.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Both teams did a great job, but ultimately it came to the rebuttal that the opposition made - gave it away in their favour. Great contentions & arguments were made on both sides.

PARLI Debate

Bill Windsor (*6)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 133
Gov: 12 Gersh - Fields
Opp: 16 Campanella - Brown
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Bill Windsor

Judge's School Affiliation: Irrington HS

Team Code #: PROP 12

Team Code #: OPP 16

Prop Speaker #1 Fields pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Campanella pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Gersh pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Brown 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

Resolution:

This House believes that school uniforms should be mandated in public schools.

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

PROP TEAM carries all arguments:

Prop 1:

① helping students to feel included / bridging economic gap feelings, front school uniforms.

② Helping support LGBT exclusions and bullying.

Suggestions:

Prop 2:

correctly asserted that OPP did not show the reasons for the causality in their 'violence' evidence - you should attack that harder/amplify your arguments, eg. - causality, significance, study methodology, and relative impact vs. gun gang violence argument.

TEAM CODE #:

16

on the

OPP

wins this debate.

③

OPP proposed to Judiciary Committee. Net Benefit to Society.

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP carries the most important arguments, discussed above.

OPP TEAM carries the arguments:

① Effect on school violence - this was the biggest impact topic in this debate. OPP team successfully argues and introduces evidence that:

② 2007 study: School uniforms led to ↑ 14 deaths per school per year. This argument held at the end of the debate. (But I suggest in a bold claim to also introduce more explanation)

Opp 2: and support

③ Southern TX University: ↑ 12% disciplinary action / rebelliousness
④ Barrow / V.Tech: "school uniforms had a negative effect on academic achievement. ↓ academic achievement"

OPP

School Uniforms

- Public - USA
- required by
- K-12

PARLI Debate

Manning Sutton (*1)
 Round 1A 9:00am Room 134
 Gov: 13 Ambrose - Oller
 Opp: 3 Jiang - Jia
 Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: MANNING SUTTON

Judge's School Affiliation: BHS, Berkeley

Team Code #: PROP 13

Team Code #: OPP 3

Prop Speaker #1 AMBROSE pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Jiang pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 OLLER pts 25

Opp Speaker #2 Jiang 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:
 - CNN evidence OK, BUT a BIT WEAK...
 - Rebuttal Good @ end.

Opp 1: ~~SHOULD~~ COULD HAVE REBUTTED CNN EVIDENCE.
 > CLEAR / CONCISE
 > BULLYING still will happen = good, persuasive

Prop 2:
 - GOOD use of ~~NYT~~ NYT evidence.
 - Could have expanded on Bullying arguments.

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Janet Chang (*4)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 137
Gov: 13 Bodisco - Ransweiler
Opp: 14 Owen - Coscarelli
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Janet Chang

This house believes that the year round school system is beneficial.
Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS.

PROP

OPP

Team Code #: 13

Team Code #: 14

Prop Speaker #1 Sarah Bodisco pts 29.5

Opp Speaker #1 Rachel Owen pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Mia Ransweiler pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Ashley Coscarelli 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:

Ⓛ 3:40
 Prop 1: Analysis: ^{Ⓛ cheaper airfare @ help teacher preparation.} Limit forget material. ^{Ⓛ keep motivated.}
 Evidence: Use #. personal experience
 Argumentation: x
 Information: Summary skill is good.
 Skills: Calm voice, clear, time control is good.
 Courtesy: good
 Ⓛ 6:15
 Prop 2: Analysis: ok
 Evidence: review points
 Argument: ok
 Information: repeat.
 Skills: too much hand gesture.
 Courtesy: good.

Ⓛ 6:45 Ⓛ 3:30
 Opp 1: Analysis: ^{Ⓛ quality of education from teacher, so need break!} make time for teacher to prepare
 Evidence: ^{Ⓛ for parent = need a break, too.}
 Argumentation: ^{Ⓛ year round system hard for student to adjust college.}
 Information: relevant and effective.
 Skills: Voice is not firm sometimes.
 Courtesy: good.
 Ⓛ 6:40
 Opp 2: Analysis: good skills
 Evidence: clear. ^{but some point are not true?}
 Argument: Directly & effectively.
 Information: Tried to answer all the questions Prop.
 Skills: express clearly. ^{raised.}
 Courtesy: good manner. excellent.

TEAM CODE #: 13 on the Prop wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:

- Ⓛ Speaker #1 expressed points clearly & firm on Team #13
- Ⓛ Opp #1 on Team 14's rebuttal run can be firmer (voice, ~~and~~ ^{express} evidence, argument points)
- Ⓛ Team work on Team #13 is a bit better.

PARLI Debate

Julianna Phillips (*2)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 142
Gov: 11 Raven - Sweeney
Opp: 6 Shaik - Gnanakumar
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Julianna Phillip

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd.

Team Code #: PROP 11

Team Code #: OPP 6

Prop Speaker #1 Brendan Sweeney pts 30

Opp Speaker #1 Karthik Gnanakumar pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Nash Raven pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Akheel Shaik pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Sweeney Prop 1: Very clearly stated points, debater Sweeney spoke in analyzed topic well, proposing uniform pieces, funding for uniforms not from schools, and benefits to community. Very reasonable, effective arguments. Great organization + delivery of clear point

Opp 1: Gnanakumar
Points stated clearly but not always elaborated effectively. The alternate funding proposal (Robin Hood Tax) was ignored while insisting on cost to schools so that point was irrelevant - need to take on the POI. Some good arguments proposed, however

Raven Prop 2: Clear, pleasant, easy to understand style. provided further details to existing points without going off topic.

Opp 2: Shaik
One tip may be to look up from the paper when speaking, more often. Speak out to the room. Several strong points made, e.g. no evidence that teachers ever judge badly based on clothing.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop team analysis was more convincing, arguments were tight. Opp was not refuting them with enough depth and specificity.

School uniforms - mandated for K-12 students

Sweezy

- general uniform template per school
- K-12
- 3 pairs free pant, shirt, shoes
- tax "Robin Hood"
- states pay too
- 5 yrs. req.
- class's sin/stigma
- bias of teacher.
- 1) help low income families
- 2) \$ better spent on supplies
- 3) gangs prevented from exposing youth by dress
- school spirit
- cohesive student body

Gnaraktumar

- reputation
- Co. water policy
- bias teachers not based on ability, but by communication
- gangs appear in poor schools
- less more to do w/ valuing fragmentation school
- school more likely if students wear what they want - better school spirit
- * like freedom of expression, restricts
- LG SD parents like for not keeping dresscode
- * some students w/ gender issues are
- bias against even when 2 ways to dress; divides students
- * more \$ for schools
- * 330k minimum.

Paren

- 1) Robin Hood Tax, intertransmission between banks. state education dept implements this
 - equality
 - less classism
 - \$ gang color.
- 2) teacher bias. judging. privilege
- 3) gang. prevent gang requirement at schools.
- 4) LGST. - unisex uniforms. not gender specific
- 5) LGST really wear whatever I want anyway
- 6) Uniformity can create school pride.

Shank

- along beach U.S.D
- found there was no improvement
- still abhorrent
- uniforms can still show they are rich
- no research that teachers judge by dress
- dress code is energy to control gang color
- no transsexual bias
- "no gender?"

~~Sweezy~~

- still school spends \$?
- some of individuality
- like a dress code with some restrictions.

Sweezy

- 6 second gen'l judgment value.
- possible negative
- reduce \$ spent for families for school supplies
- value of professionalism
- school spirit ↑
- when cohesion in community. boost → advocacy.
- no new points to replicate these points
- opponents point.
- UNISEX.
- access to allow personal touching
- not making schools pay.

PARLI Debate

Scott Engstrom (*13)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 141

Gov: 3 Wu - Ayalon

Opp: 6 Mandal - Zheng

Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name:

Scott Engstrom

Judge's School Affiliation:

SRV

School uniforms should be mandatory

PROP

OPP

Team Code #: 3

Team Code #: 6

Prop Speaker #1 Kyle Wu pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Udayan Mandal pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Roni Ayalon pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Frank Zheng 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...
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: Kyle 29

Points well outlined. Good structure. Did not address fashion industry arg. Very good persuasive speaking. Be careful about using the debate rules as a reason for not being able to make a point.

Prop 2: Roni 28

Well organized arguments. Well done to call out your opponents weaknesses & make them address them. Try to limit using "like". Did not address fashion industry arg.

TEAM CODE #: 6

Opp 1: Udayan 27

Will done addressing each Prop point and reframing arguments. Did not address bullying. Be careful about "so on & so forth". Implies you lack details.

Opp 2: Frank 27

Several good arguments that poked significant holes in the arguments made and exposed omissions on their side. Did not address their key contention: bullying

on the Opp. wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Both sides agreed to a net benefits test. Both sides then made a convincing argument that was not well refuted by the other. Prop argued lack of uniforms leads to bullying & suicide (not refuted at all). Opp argued that the taxes to pay for the uniforms & loss of fashion industry jobs would lead to no net benefits. I found the OPP argument more convincing.

**MANDARRO SCHOOL UNIFORMS
PARLI Debate**

Tina Donovan (*3)
 Round 1A 9:00am Room 140
 Gov: 6 Lin - Lee
 Opp: 13 Woerner - Woerner
 Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: TINA DONOVAN
 (DAVID)
 Judge's School Affiliation: CAMPOLINDO

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: <u>6</u>	Team Code #: <u>13</u>
Prop Speaker #1: <u>Ryan Lee</u> pts <u>27</u>	Opp Speaker #1: <u>Woerner (Kieran)</u> pts <u>27</u>
Prop Speaker #2: <u>Aaron Lin</u> pts <u>25</u>	Opp Speaker #2: <u>Woerner (Liam)</u> pts <u>26</u>

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 ANALYSIS
BUILD STRONG LOGICAL FLOW
 • SPEAKING WAS A LITTLE FAST

Opp 1: GREAT PRESENCE/ENGAGING
ZEROED IN ON THE ISSUE OF THE DEBATE FREEDOM
 • MAKE SURE FACTS ARE ACCURATE

Prop 2:
 • STRONG EVIDENCE
 • LOGIC/ANALYSIS A LITTLE HARD TO FOLLOW ON THE INTO DEBTS/BLACK MARKET

Opp 2:
 - GOOD PRESENCE
 • GOOD RECAP OF MAIN POINTS
 • ISSUE OF COST NOT AS CLEAR

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

- EFFECTIVE ARGUMENT OF FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION
- PROP LOGIC/ANALYSIS WAS A LITTLE HARD TO FOLLOW / NOT CONVINCING
- PROP FAILS TO ADDRESS OPP POINTS ON FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

RYAN
LIFE
①

Friend
②

Answer
③

Life
④

Friend
⑤

RYAN
⑥

SOCIAL WELFARE
INDIVIDUALS
STUDENT

② SAFETY
LEADY TO
BETTER STUDENT

③ BETTER STUDENT
BETTER JOBS
BETTER ECONOMY

④ SAVES \$
LESS ON
CLOTHES

⑤ BUYING &
REDUCED
"ALL THE SAME"
SAFETY
"BUY US POOR"

~~⑥~~
③ LABEL MARKET?

GN SAT AVOID
GREAT EVIDENCE
NEAL SOUND
LOGIC

LITTLE FAST
27+

Policy Debate
STUDENTS
TEACHING
DO

JUST ONE
MONEY IN

NO LINK
TO BUYING

④ FREEDOM OF
EXPRESSION
② GENDER
⑤ DRESS CODES

④ MONEY EXPEND

CODE AT
DRESSAGE
ENGAGING
27

'ONE MORE' Movement
SUNT WASH
DONT NERD MORE FREEDOM
"HAVE BEUR"
"SEXIST" DIDNT
DONT FOLLOW
GLOBALIZATION

DO UO C DITHANS.
TED MANY JUST
DIDNT CRITIKES

70% FROM CLOTHING
DIFFERENT
90% NERD

POVERTY
LITTLE WASH!

FACTS
GOOD ANSWER TO THIS

LITTLE FAST
GOOD DOT

26
MORE ON THIS

RIZ
STUD THE A
PUM

NO NEAR SAFETY
SAVE MONEY
ONE MONEY COST

FREEDOM OF
SOPHOMORE
KIDS HAVE NIGHTS
TOO

MONEY COMES
FROM SOME
KID ARE

DIVORCED FROM
MILAN

① F O R E
② DRESSING
PLACED
③ COST OF MILES

CLEAR RECORD
26+

"IT'S B' WITSH"
ALGUE IN W/

* FREEDOM OF
EXPRESSION
* \$ CARES
FORM
Somebody

EMERGENCE
WAS A LITTLE
WEAK

SCHOOL WITNS
MS

-> THE LIT
BOUTION
NOT CRASHAL

* WITFENS
LOSS LESS

* SAFETY VS
INDIVIDUALITY

* OUTSIDE US

* SAFER ENVIROMENT
MORE FOCUS

* THE OTHER SIDE
IDRS

GREAT SUMMARY

night make right

PARLI Debate

Emma Sutton (*8,1)

Round 2A 11:20am Room 137
Gov: 13 Madsen - Engstrom
Opp: 10 Chan - Foley
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Sa Han

Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett

Team Code #: PROP 13

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 Engstrom pts 26

Opp Speaker #1 Chan pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Madsen pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Foley pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: 1st contention was a little messy, needed a clearer explanation. Nice rebuttal, good smooth pace.

Opp 1: Opening was a bit rushed (maybe you were nervous?) slow down a bit to make it smoother. Excellent examples to refute their case. Good use of questions.

Prop 2: Good extension - you rebuilt arguments instead of just repeating. 1st minute is protected - you could have ignored his question.

Opp 2: Good specific examples, nice refutation. Need better organization, you were a little hard to follow.

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the Opp wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)

don't have to show NEVER type

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very tough topic for AM, but created a good case. Neg raised excellent issues though what is night was result of evil actions? AM's arguments that police brutality & enviro. destruction are getting better even w/ sufficiently strong to overcome neg's specific examples.

Might makes Right
power and obligated to help the less fortunate

Marcie Schade (*13)
Round 2A 11:20am Room 136
Gov: 10 Dickerman - Millar
Opp: 6 Lin - Lee
Parliamentary Debate/JV

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Marcie Schade

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley High

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 6

Prop Speaker #1 Millar pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Ryan Lee pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Dickerman pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Aaron Lin 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: Millar did a great job of making eye contact and was very professional. Argued that less inequality in the world made up worse global issues. ALSO addressed rebuttal. topicality argument.

Prop 2: Dickerman did a very nice job of maintaining composure. He refuted the topicality argument and the points the opponents presented.

→ recommend slowing down his speech.
Opp 1: Lee immediately argued that there was a topicality issue and that there was no time for a debate or have prepared for the debate. presented good evidence for his own definition, but not that of the Prop.

Opp 2: Lin also argued the topicality argument. He was very professional and made good eye contact. Effectively argued his points, but not that of the Prop.

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

After careful review, I have decided that the opposing team did not convince me of the topicality argument that they presented to me. I found in favor of the Prop because they were able to refute both arguments presented.

This House believes that might makes right
Santa Rosa

PARLI Debate

Jeff Owen (*14)

Round 2A 11:20am Room 135

Gov: 10 Eng - Ying

Opp: 6 Wang - Darukhanawalla

Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Jeff Owen

Judge's School Affiliation: Santa Rosa High School

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 6

Prop Speaker #1 YING pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Brian Wang pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 ENG pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Malcolm Darukhanawalla 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: Excellent job defining the resolution

Opp 1: Good job stating this was a fact based round

Prop 2: Good job staying on topic

Opp 2: Good job defining "right"

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop of Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

This ~~round~~ round ~~was~~ hinged on the definition and sticking with the definition of the round. Gov did a better job

PARLI Debate

Rob Stone (*2)

Round 2A 11:20am Room 134
Gov: 10 Lee - Goldstein
Opp: 11 Raven - Sweeney
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: ROBERT STONE

Judge's School Affiliation: BISHOP O'DOWD

PROP
Team Code #: 10

OPP
Team Code #: 11

Prop Speaker #1 Jacob Goldstein pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Brandon Sweeney pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Corrett Lee pts 28.5

Opp Speaker #2 Nash Raven 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 statement of contentions and application. Strong response to POI. Excellent use of Greece as an example, but that set a trap for you that you did not respond to well.*

Prop 2: *Road map could have been stronger. Good refutation that aid is always exploitive. Great response should have been stronger.*

Opp 1: *Good use of POI for definitions. Excellent points about international help has hurt Greece. Initial arguments about imperialism/colonialism, but failed to connect those arguments to aid given for moral reasons. Good argument as to purpose of a state to benefit its own citizens.*

Opp 2: *Good use of historical examples. Good argument that funds are better used at home. But argument about individual donations and NGOs were off point.*

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: *Extremely close. PropONENTS argument was less well organized, but propONENTS did a slightly better job exposing the weaknesses of OppONENTS arguments, and emphasizing a moral imperative to aid others. OppONENTS use of historical examples and libertarian concept of the state were excellent, but were not responsive to the moral imperative arguments of PropONENTS.*

PARLI Debate

Ajay Nanda (*4)

Round 2B 11:20am Room 142
Gov: 6 Mandal - Zheng
Opp: 10 Lee - Lichtmacher
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: ATAJ NANDA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

Team Code #: PROP 6

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 MANDAL pts 25

Opp Speaker #1 LEE pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 ZHENG pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 LICHTMACHER 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: Remained open to questions and a healthy dialogue.

REB: Lot of passion but lacks objectivity

Prop 2: Confident Start, Direct objective attacks on opposing team's argument. Allowed & responded well to questions.

SUGGESTION - Focus more on 'objectivity' than 'emotion'

Opp 1: Confident opening with clear definitions. Very specific example of addiction.

Very impressive use of POIs against the other team.

REB: Very compelling rebuttal based on topic.

Opp 2: Honed in well on losing vs. Not losing at all. Specific & Confident rebuttal based on examples. Confident Delivery.

SUGGESTION - Introduce light moments. Do not make your speech 'too' heavy.

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Both the teams were very passionate in their arguments but the OPP team did a better job of staying on the topic and providing objective rebuttals.

Might makes right.

PARLI Debate

Rajul Doriwala (*6)

Round 2A 11:20am Room 116

Gov: 10 Liu - Fu

Opp: 2 Odeste - Figueroa

Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Rajul Doriwala

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington HS

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 2

Prop Speaker #1 Liu pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Figueroa pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Fu pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Odeste 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: Liu 27

Opp 1: 27

Prop 2: 27

Opp 2: ~~27~~ 29

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1 - Opp. were able to emphasize intention
 - 2 - Prop interpreted Might = responsibility based on Spiderman quote. But opp. successfully refuted that.
- Outcome

This house believes that it is better to have loved and lost
to have never loved at all

PARLI Debate

Jeff Owen (*14)

Round 2B 11:20am Room 135
Gov: 10 Morgenstein - Kerr-Stein
Opp: 13 Ambrose - Oller
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Jeff Owen

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon High School

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Chloe Kerr-Stein pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 McCain Oller pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Nick Morgenstein pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Ross Ambrose 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: Clared it a the definition

Opp 1: well laid out points & counter points

Prop 2: Using debate as an example was excellent

Opp 2: Excellent discussions of points & follow through

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
this is a tough topic both sides did well

This house believes that it is better to have loved & lost than to never have loved at all.

PARLI Debate

James Nam (*12)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 140
Gov: 10 Ng - Huang
Opp: 6 Mao - Tong-Seely
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Jimmy Nam

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 6

Prop Speaker #1 Ng pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Tong-Seely pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Huang pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Mao 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: *Excellent management of time and outlining your case. The examples you used about humanitarian tragedies is very relevant. Rebuttal: Your points were well articulated, but you seemed frustrated by your opponents & that takes away from your credibility.*

Opp 1: *Good job stating the benefit of love needs to outweigh the cost of the loss relative to no love.*

Rebuttal: *By this point it was clearer to me what your team was arguing.*

Opp 2: *Great job reinforcing your positions - particularly how the world is reflected in literary (fictional) works. 3*

Good job reiterating teams' points I couldn't tell if the fictional stories helped or hurt you.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Resolution: This house believes that might makes right.
PARLI Debate

James Nam (*12)

Round 2A 11:20am Room 140
Gov: 6 Shaik - Gnanakumar
Opp: 10 Stroumza - Chen
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Jimmy Nam

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

Team Code #: PROP 6

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 Karthik Sranakumar pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Chen pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Akheer Shaik pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Stroumza pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Great job organizing your outline with the main points of your argument - very easy for me to note & follow.

Rebuttal: Good job reminding me that Prop 2: the Negation did not address some of our arguments directly.

Good job reiterating your points and discussing the checks on power from more powerful forces.

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the Opp wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

Opp 1: Best point about how too much power can lead to detrimental situations - police abuse & dictatorships. I was expecting more direct responses to the affirmations arguments since you still have quite a bit of time in your speech. Rebuttal: Linking Racism & Stereotypes to a power struggle: needed a little more explanation for me.

Opp 2: Good job arguing how the power of the US helped in WW2, but wasn't so helpful in the Middle East. Also bringing up your teams arguments on dictatorships & police brutality.

REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Opp~~ Negative argument about the abuse of too much power being problematic ~~was~~ was strongest.

Better to have
loud and lost.

PARLI Debate

Marcie Schade (*13)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 136
Gov: 3 Jiang - Jia
Opp: 10 Yan - Sun
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Marcie Schade

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley High

Team Code #: PROP 3

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 Brigitte Jia pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Eric Sun pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 N/A pts _____

Opp Speaker #2 Clayton Yan pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Brigitte is extremely professional. She is very confident and presents her argument as such. She presented valid facts and into personal experience and also showing research she had done.

Prop 2: I would recommend slowing down a bit, but overall, I think she presented a very strong argument.

Opp 1: Eric speaks very clearly and concisely. He has a very calm demeanor. Makes good eye contact and is very professional. He made valid points to refute Brigitte's argument. He could have used more factual evidence.

Opp 2: Clayton also was very professional and polite. He spoke very clearly and did a nice job of breaking down the argument and explaining all of his points. I would recommend having more factual evidence to argue his side.

TEAM CODE #: 3 on the Prop wins this debate. factual evidence to argue his side.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Although both teams did a great job, Team # 3's argument was very compelling and presented in such a professional, well researched way that I have to vote for her.

PARLI Debate

Ajay Nanda (*4)
Round 2A 11:20am Room 142
Gov: 16 Campanella - Brown
Opp: 10 Tran - Vainberg
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: AJAY NANDA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

Team Code #: PROP 16 Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 CAMPANELLA pts 26 Opp Speaker #1 TRAN pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 BROWN pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 VAINBERG 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 opening with definitions
REB: Good start figuratively stepping back

Opp 1: Clear rebuttal of the definition of "Right". Specific and confident counters to PROP's examples of War & Blame. Excellent Use of Statistics. Full Use of REB: Provided clear challenges based on stats.

Prop 2: Good Light opening. Specific counters and confident delivery. Responded well to challenge.
SUGGESTION -> Opening was too short.

Opp 2: Confident & impactful delivery. Specific examples like Iraq war, Cuba & Latin America.
SUGGESTION -> OPP2 could have allowed 1-2 P.O.I.s. It's a sign of healthy argument, inject some humor to make it interesting.

Prop 2 was more focused on Rebuttal
TEAM CODE #: 10 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The opp laid out clear Rebuttals with stats & examples. They also went on to pose a clear challenge to PROP & put the burden of proof on them which they could not quite meet.

Ducobi Anderson
Alisha Eastop (*5)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 141
Gov: 8 Murdock - Shotwell
Opp: 10 Woo - Melman
Parliamentary Debate/JV

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: *Ducobi Anderson*

Judge's School Affiliation: *Head Royce*

Team Code #: **PROP**
8

Team Code #: **OPP**
10

Prop Speaker #1 *Murdock* pts *27*

Opp Speaker #1 *Melman* pts *28*

Prop Speaker #2 *Shotwell* pts *26*

Opp Speaker #2 *Woo* pts *29*

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: *great analysis!*

Opp 1: *Literal application
of skills and everything*

Prop 2: *good job!*

Opp 2: *Loved the rebuttal*

TEAM CODE #: *10* on the *opp* wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Because they conceded (1)

PARLI Debate

Rob Stone (*2)

Round 2B 11:20am Room 134
Gov: 13 Woerner - Woerner
Opp: 5 Chang - Stuart
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: ROBERT STONE

Judge's School Affiliation: BISHOP O'DOWD

Team Code #: 13 **PROP**

Team Code #: 5 **OPP**

Prop Speaker #1 Woerner (Kieran) pts 29.5

Opp Speaker #1 Stewart, Annie pts 29.5

Prop Speaker #2 Woerner (Liam) pts 20

Opp Speaker #2 Chang, Aria 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:

Kieran: Prop 1: Excellent statement of the resolution and presentation of contentions, but slightly rushed. Great use of personal experience to support contention. Good technical points as to dropped arguments, but weak final finish - should have restated your strongest points.

Liam: Prop 2: Accepting opponents def. of love weakened your position. Slow down, several points were not clearly stated because you rushed. Good attempt to attack Opp's failure to refute Prop. but not convincing.

Annie Opp 1: Very good opening statement and redefinition of love as limited to romantic love was brilliant tactic. Excellent relation of medical issues to heart break, but robot example was a little off-point. "Ignorance is bliss" was an excellent point. Great use of personal experience to support contention.

Aria Opp 2: (Applies to both Annie and Aria) Good attempt to support contentions with facts. Argument about endorphins was awkward. Excellent points about abusive relationships. Good presentation, calm demeanor.

TEAM CODE #: 13 on the Prop. wins this debate. by the narrowest of margins.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very close competition. Prop had better command of rules of debate. Opp. had an extremely compelling argument based on personal experience. Opp's redefining "love" was a great tactic. Prop's complaint about late entry of new info gave them the narrowest of edge. Intro of poem by Opp's was brilliant, "drop the mike" moment.

PARLI Debate

Ellen Lee (*10)

Round 2B 11:20am Room 133
Gov: 13 Corbett - Bohannon
Opp: 12 Baxter - Nam
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Ellen Lee

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell HS

Team Code #: PROP 13

Team Code #: OPP 12

Prop Speaker #1 Spencer Corbett pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Baxter pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Alex Bohannon pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Nam pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Clearly defined all terms,

Supporting evidence for pts 1-5 and 7 were strong. The "regret" argument was not as strong.

Aff Rebuttal: superb connection made between love of the individual and build it to support the love in a relationship.

Prop 2: Strong and supportive "plan of attack" addressed the oppositions points, deft use of opponents examples

1st Negation

Opp 1: Did not until the 2nd AFF provide the definition of a term in the resolution ("Love"). Defined the other two terms well.

Neg rebuttal

Arguments in voting issues were so much better. Concise, deliberate, good examples "think Switzerland"

Opp 2: Very swift in understanding the gaps and clarifications needed to further support OPP 1's (Baxter's) original points

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The AFF's arguments in support of the resolution were clear and rang through each cycle of the debate. The evidence were on topic and the AFF's Ability to turn a contention of the opposing (Neg) team and build it to support the AFF's argument was masterful.

PARLI Debate

Ellen Lee (*10)

Round 2A 11:20am Room 133
Gov: 14 Owen - Coscarelli
Opp: 12 Gersh - Fields
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Ellen Lee

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell HS

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 12

Prop Speaker #1 Rachel Owen pts 26

Opp Speaker #1 Gersh pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Ashley Coscarelli pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Fields 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 DEFINITION of terms could have underscored the intelligence argument more w/ a more description in the evidence. More eye contact w/ the judge in delivering points could have been more helpful.

Prop 2: The judge appreciate the swift and effective move to provide further clarification of the AFF'S POINTS. Did well in challenging Opps points.

Opp 1: Strong Analysis of topic supported by clear examples. Systematic and disciplined approach. The introduction of Opps points scated towards broad generalizations, e.g., "Diplomacy saves lives." Appreciated the analytic approach and also the confusion in defining terms.

Opp 2: Did a good job supporting and clarifying Opp 1's points.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Clearly this was a difficult resolution. The net benefits of the opposing or neg team were stronger than the prop or aff team.

It is better to have loved and lost
than to never have loved at all

PARLI Debate

Mark Cabasino (*9)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 139
Gov: 12 Burrous - Marr
Opp: 3 Wu - Ayalon
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: CABASINO

Judge's School Affiliation: ⑨

Team Code #: PROP ⑫

Team Code #: OPP ③

Prop Speaker #1 BURROUS pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 WU pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 MARR pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 AYALON 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 job fleshing out your 5 contentions with good examples under each one. Good recap in last speech. Good clear delivery. Use tags/labels for rebuttals in 3rd speech (AFF 4c, Neg 3c, Neg rebuttal of AFF 2c, etc).

Prop 2: Good job recapping/expanding your own case, Good use of AFF 1c to refute NEG 3c. Elaborate more on THEIR rebuttals to your case (eg rebuttals Opp 1 rebuttals).

Opp 1: Good articulation of your own contentions and good rebuttals down the flow chart of AFF's contentions. Good focus on other aspects of undefined "love" to broaden debate scope. Clarify 3rd speech voting issues, with less time.

Opp 2: on rebuttals in 3rd speech.

Good rebuttals throughout — rebuttals about "magnitude" on AFF 3c profitability and "adoptions upon banks" on AFF 4c evolution were particularly effective. Very strong speech delivery throughout.

TEAM CODE #: ⑫ on the ③ wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: Prop wins based on the strength/development of the AFF case. While neg had good rebuttals (particularly Opp 2 speaker), the Neg case itself was less convincing than the AFF case. Neg 1c snowballed (loss → depression → suicide), Neg 2c repeated parts of Neg 1c, and Neg 3c is tough to support (experience doesn't matter?!). Prop needs work on rebuttals in 2nd + 3rd speeches.

Might makes right.

PARLI Debate

Mark Cabasino (*9)

Round 2A 11:20am Room 139
Gov: 11 Jicha - Thrasher
Opp: 13 Murdough - Donaldson
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: CABASINO
Judge's School Affiliation: (P)

Team Code #: <u>PROP</u> <u>(11)</u>	Team Code #: <u>OPP</u> <u>(13)</u>
Prop Speaker #1 <u>THRASHER</u> pts <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #1 <u>MURDOUGH</u> pts <u>27</u>
Prop Speaker #2 <u>JICHA</u> pts <u>29</u>	Opp Speaker #2 <u>DONALDSON</u> pts <u>22</u>

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

Both sides could use more specifics

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

Prop 1: Good examples in 1C, and good recap in 3rd speech. Try to add more examples into 2C and 3C.

(3C repeated 1C's examples.)
Good clarity of speaking (delivery).
Prop 2:

Good rebuttals throughout your speech. Good clarification of your definition to use it against opp.
Good points about Hitler. Good strong delivery

TEAM CODE #: (11) on the

Opp 1: Good job on rebuttals during speech 1. Interesting light/dark analogy in concluding speech. Good

neg case, though I would add a 3C. Also object to definition if you disagree w/ it.

Opp 2: Good arguments for checks + balances; and good focus on flaws in a dictatorship. Good focus on masses and on your definition of power. Expand rebuttals and rebut in order down the flow chart.

wins this debate.

(Prop or Opp) PROP

REASON FOR DECISION:

Delivery was stronger and clearer on Prop side. Case was more developed on prop side. Rebuttals were more thorough on prop side. Neg did a good job pressing the issue of contradictions, but should've objected to the definition and redefined the resolution.

"Better to have loved & lost"

PARLI Debate

Emma Sutton (*8,1)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 137
Gov: 16 Cohen - Hall
Opp: 13 Barton - Saghafi
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Sutton
Judge's School Affiliation: John Snett

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: <u>16</u>	Team Code #: <u>13</u>
Prop Speaker #1 <u>Cohen</u> pts <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #1 <u>Barton</u> pts <u>27</u>
Prop Speaker #2 <u>Cohen</u> pts <u>28</u>	Opp Speaker #2 <u>Saghafi</u> pts <u>27</u>

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 listing of types of love, but need to show why they ~~are~~ outweigh loss. If neg had raised earlier, you might have lost.

Prop 2: Excellent speech! Good, clear speaking style "Retained memories" was a new argument!

Opp 1: Good organization, be careful Tough topic for neg - not to punch the podium

A basic point was good, but you lost it when you turned it into "wait until later". Will it ever be safe to be gay in the west-east? AA successfully argued that "wait" is not the same as "never".

Nice, smooth speech, Opp's argument didn't work

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

REASON FOR DECISION: "Love is Lost" argu didn't really come together until INR, which is too late. Should have raised it earlier, as it was a very good argu for the nego. Abuse/danger argu was also good, but not enough. Definitions go AA, as does opp's argu that they put an end to really arguing "never" - neg is arguing to wait. the same

better to have loved and lost, than to ~~have ever~~ never have loved at all.

PARLI Debate

Rajul Doriwala (*6)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 116
Gov: 5 Vafai - Wan
Opp: 13 Bodisco - Ransweiler
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Rajul Doriwala

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Andrew Wan pts 26

Opp Speaker #1 Jaroh Bodisco pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Ashken Vafai pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Mia Ransweiler pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Opp 1:

Prop 2: very passionate, simple, effective.

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

- prop team's reasoning, passion, ...
- opp team focused too much on debate technicalities than making their arguments.

Ducobi Anderson

PARLI Debate

Alisha Eastep (*5)

Round 2A 11:20am Room 141
Gov: 13 Clawson - Schade
Opp: 3 Szeto - Keychenko
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Ducobi Anderson

Judge's School Affiliation: Head Royce

Team Code #: PROP 13

Team Code #: OPP 3

Prop Speaker #1 Jack ClOSSon pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Ariana Szeto pts ~~28~~ 28

Prop Speaker #2 Mat Schade pts ~~24~~ 24

Opp Speaker #2 Lauren Keychenko pts ~~29~~ 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: *More confidence in what you're talking about*

Opp 1: *Just Relax when you're speaking you sound a little flustered.*

Prop 2: *^*

Opp 2: *Make sure you keep eye contact with your judge.*

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Argument on ~~Prop~~ was really strong

PARLI Debate

Regina Muccillo (*2)

Round 3A 2:00pm Room 135
Gov: 10 Chan - Foley
Opp: 13 Corbett - Bohannon
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Regina Muccillo

Judge's School Affiliation: ODOWD

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Chan pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Spencer Corbett pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Foley pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Alex Bohannon 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

low point win

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: Chan - good voice projection clear set up. Remindor - If there was any possibility could have been more factual

Opp 1: Very Articulate. Enjoyable to listen to, believable. Solid facts refuting Aff 1 pts. great tie

Prop 2: good job aligning arguments to facts strong voice, polite

Opp 2: Alex - chose not to allow questions which may have given other team a leg up. Solid pt - If one country is not at peace, the world is not at peace

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Although the arguments were very strong on both sides the final comment - ending war is possible in infinite time cannot be disputed.

Violent video games make children more likely to engage in violence.

PARLI Debate

Regina Muccillo (*2)
 Round 3B 2:00pm Room 135
 Gov: 12 Baxter - Nam
 Opp: 10 Dickerman - Millar
 Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Regina Muccillo
 Judge's School Affiliation: Odond

Team Code #: PROP 12

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 Baxter pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Dickerman pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Nam pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Millar 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: Clear on terms.
Clear descriptions.
Beautifully presented.
Perhaps more eye contact helps sincerity

Opp 1: Clearly explained opposing arguments. Very articulate.
Suggest do not lean on podium.
Repeating claims & explaining was helpful

Prop 2: Clearly explained opposing arguments.
Articulate.
Suggest you don't lean on podium. It swallows you up.

Opp 2: Solid facts reinforced claims.
Not sure the argument of mental illness/disorder was placed correctly.

great posture
 strong voice
 passionate. Strongly
 argument to teach
 resolution through other forms

TEAM CODE #: 12 on the PROP wins this debate.
 (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Fact - prove brain develops til age 25.
development argument was strong

Handwritten text at the top of the page, possibly a title or header, including the word "MORNING" and "MORNING" written upside down.

Handwritten text in the upper left quadrant, possibly a name or address.

Handwritten text below the first block, possibly a date or time.

Handwritten text in the middle left section.

Handwritten text below the middle left section.

Handwritten text in the middle right section.

Handwritten text below the middle right section.

Main body of handwritten text, consisting of several lines of cursive script.

Handwritten text block on the lower left side, containing several lines of cursive.

Handwritten text block on the lower right side, containing several lines of cursive.

Handwritten text block at the bottom left, possibly a signature or closing.

Handwritten text block at the bottom right, possibly a signature or closing.

Vertical handwritten text on the far right edge of the page.

Final handwritten text at the bottom center of the page.

PARLI Debate

Devandra Kumar (*6)

Round 3A 2:00pm Room 116
Gov: 3 Szeto - Keychenko
Opp: 10 Eng - Ying
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: DEVENDRA KUMAR

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON

Team Code #: PROP 3

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 LAUREN pts 25

Opp Speaker #1 CHRISTOPHER pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 AERIE pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 JULIANA 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:

LAUREN
 Prop 1: Readings from notes
 No strong justification but only examples
 Did not use all time
 Second round was better
 put emotional point on positive things
 Prop 2: — started well but did not finish well

CHRISTOPHER
 Provided justification
 Opp 1: Clarity
 Presented real scenario & practical
JULIANA
 Continued well where Prev Partner left
 Opp 2: Moral analogy was excellent
 current example & human nature explained

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

provided justification & both partners complimented each other well. Provided good analogy & practical scenarios.

PARLI Debate

CC Zhang (*15)

Round 3B 2:00pm Room 133
Gov: 10 Lee - Lichtmacher
Opp: 11 Jicha - Thrasher
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: CC Zhang

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley School

violent video games make children more likely to engage in violence.

PROP
Team Code #: 10

OPP
Team Code #: 11

Prop Speaker #1 Matthew Lee pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Cliff Thrasher pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Paul Lichtmacher pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Ann Jicha 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: He was very well prepared and speaks with confidence

Opp 1: Very well organized easily understood.

Prop 2: speak little too fast!

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

1) Analysis: effectively 2) Evidence: strong evidence
3) Argumentation: clearly 4) POI: relevant 5) Delivery: very clear & easily understood 6) Courtesy: respectful.

Violent Video Games make children more likely to engage in violence.

PARLI Debate

Susie Barton (*13)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 137
Gov: 12 Gersh - Fields
Opp: 10 Liu - Fu
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name Susie Barton
Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley High

Team Code #: PROP 12 Team Code #: OPP 10
Prop Speaker #1 Gersh pts 28.5 Opp Speaker #1 Liu pts 28.5
Prop Speaker #2 Fields pts 26.5 Opp Speaker #2 Fu pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:
30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good eye contact - strong clear voice - Good opening arguments
Good command of refuting and challenging opps pts.

Opp 1: Good points, good eye contact
good refutes, good pointing out their team had more facts than the pro

Prop 2: Some good points - violence is not just mass shootings. Good eye contact. Try not to fidget with hands.

Opp 2: Good refutes, good eye contact - confident in opinions - repeated a couple of facts, look into judges eyes when shaking hand

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very close debate. OPP side good with proving the pro side did not have enough substantial evidence of violence besides the mass shootings

Violent v. Game = more Viol

PARLI Debate

Manning Sutton (*1)

Round 3B 2:00pm Room 141
Gov: 13 Bodisco - Ransweiler
Opp: 10 Morgenstein - Kerr-Stein
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: SUTTON

Judge's School Affiliation: BHS, BERKELEY

Team Code #: PROP 13

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 Bodisco pts 25

Opp Speaker #1 Kerr-Stein pts 25

Prop Speaker #2 Ransweiler pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Morgenstein 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, Easy to follow
 But arguments weren't as strong as opp.
 - Rebuttals evidence would have helped

Prop 2:
 - Strong close

Opp 1: Good evidence introduced
Forgot C4 - Promotes Racism...

Opp 2: Clear Rebuttals, Effective

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the Opp wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Proposition had a hard time proving their case - Rebuttals were strong from opposition

PARLI Debate

Manning Sutton (*1)

Round 3A 2:00pm Room 141
Gov: 6 Wang - Darukhanawalla
Opp: 10 Ng - Huang
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: SUTTON

Judge's School Affiliation: BHS, BERKELEY

Team Code #: PROP Ce

Team Code #: OPP 10

Prop Speaker #1 WANG pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 NG pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 DARUKHANAWALLA pts 25

Opp Speaker #2 Huang 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:

WANG

Prop 1: well presented 1st opening
- clear
- organized

Good economic arg
could have been more exploited

DARUK...

Prop 2:
- A little hard to follow is it

condill

Opp 1:
- Clear
- Rebuttals logical

Opp 2: good use of hands
A LITTLE hard to follow,
but good team work

TEAM CODE #: OPP on the 10 wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPPOSITION showed a lot of good examples.

World Peace is Obtainable

PARLI Debate

Susie Barton (*13)
 Round 3A 2:00pm Room 137
 Gov: 10 Stroumza - Chen
 Opp: 3 Jiang - Jia
 Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name:

Susie Barton

Judge's School Affiliation:

San Ramon Valley High

PROP
 Team Code #: 10

OPP
 Team Code #: ~~10~~ Jiang - Jia #3

Prop Speaker #1 Chen pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Brigitte Jia pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Stroumza pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 same other team member sick pts

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 eye contact.

Good conviction in coming across
 Sincerely believing in her comments,
 Could add more content to speeches

Prop 2:

Great eye contact and hand gestures. Responded/Refuted arguments very effectively.
 Opp's arguments - Good new contention. Excellent.

TEAM CODE #: 3

Opp 1:

good eye contact - organized arguments

Opp 2:

Very knowledgeable with history many historical facts
 good points about North Korea's perception of peace and other cultures perceptions of peace
 Good job refuting Prop 2 points. backed up by many examples
 Good ending

on the Opp arguments Wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very good use of historical facts, Decisive - Summary
 passionate - knowledgeable - Argued effectively against pro's points

PARLI Debate

Jeff Owen (*14)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 142
Gov: 10 Yan - Sun
Opp: 16 Campanella - Brown
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Aff:

Res: Violent Video Games make children more likely to engage in violence

Judge's Name: Jeff Owen
Judge's School Affiliation: Santa Rosa High School

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 16

Prop Speaker #1 Eric Sun pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Tyler Campanella pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Clayton Yan pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Riley Brown pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Great job stating what kind of round and defining. Studies cited was well done

Opp 1: Good job restating case & providing other studies

Prop 2: Good job restating cases and reiterating your case

Opp 2: Good job stating other studies and reiterating the Supreme Court case

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very close round. Citing Supreme Court case was the tipping point. Next time state the actual case

Jeff Owen (*14)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 142
Gov: 6 Mao - Tong-Seely
Opp: 10 Lyons - Wyszynski
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Res: World peace
is attainable.

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Jeff Owen

Judge's School Affiliation: Santa Rosa High School

PROP 6
Team Code #: _____

OPP 10
Team Code #: _____

Prop Speaker #1 Justine Tong-Seely pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Samuel Lyons pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Kevin Mao pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Sofia Wyszynski 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 presentation on definition of topic

Opp 1: Good presentation on stating historical

Prop 2: Good presentation on citing precedents

Opp 2: Good presentation continuing flow and continuing to cite history

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

while Prop stated "attainable" was in the future they did not do as effective a job of proving past history was in decline of future

PARLI Debate

Lin Jie Wu (*3)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 140
Gov: 10 Tran - Vainberg
Opp: 12 Burrous - Marr
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Lin Jie Wu

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo.

Team Code #: PROP 10

Team Code #: OPP 12

Prop Speaker #1 Tran ~~Burrous~~ pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Burrous pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Vainberg ~~Marr~~ pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Marr pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Does well in defining the terms early. Does well in framing the issue and ~~framing~~ the procedure. Has good analysis of counterarguments. Needs less filler words, and ~~not~~ have better argument structure. Good eye contact.

Opp 1: Makes good arguments ~~and~~ and addresses prop's arguments properly. Needs to work on delivery; less filler words. Went over time, ~~no~~ need better argument structure, & use of Slippery slope fallacy makes closing argument unconvincing. Good volume.

Prop 2: Good volume, eloquent speaker. Needs to cite own sources if you're going to make argument that opposition did not cite evidence during POI. Other wise good analysis.

Opp 2: Needs better preparation, good supporting analysis, and addresses key points, but need to better analyze counter arguments.

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Better use of debate framing, more convincing arguments,

Resolution: World peace is attainable

PARLI Debate

CC Zhang (*15)

Round 3A 2:00pm Room 133
Gov: 10 Woo - Melman
Opp: 5 Vafai - Wan
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: CC Zhang

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley School

PROP
Team Code #: 10

OPP
Team Code #: 5

Prop Speaker #1 Leah Melman pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Ashken Vafai pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Sofia Woo pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Andrew Wan 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:

Opp 1: He responded the arguments effectively, and had strong evidence to support his arguments.

Prop 2: She had efficient evidence to support her arguments

Opp 2:

TEAM CODE #: 10 on the prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

1. Analysis: great. 2. Evidence: efficient. 3. Argument: made clear. 4. POI: clear. 5. Delivery: easy understand. 6. Courtesy: respectful.

PARLI Debate

Kashyap Sharma (*4)

Round 3B 2:00pm Room 139

Gov: 3 Wu - Ayalon

Opp: 13 Clawson - Schade

Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: KASHYAP SHARMA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS, San Ramon

Team Code #: PROP 3

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Wu pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Clawson pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Ayalon pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Schade 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: Definition, evidences
Good Energy, Delivery

- Try to finish speech on time.
- Please check with Team/Judge & then start. Improve Rebuttal

Prop 2: Good delivery, POIs

- Try to check if every body is ready.

Opp 1: Good Evidences & delivery & Arguments

Please be intopic present. Try not to forget which team you belong :-)

Good Rebuttal

Opp 2: Good in delivery. Try to Take adv. of full time: Work on arguments

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

I think Affirmation team ~~put more~~ did analysis and opp team provided proven data. It was tough to decide. Based on delivery & more POI, I think Prop team is winner.

PARLI Debate

Kashyap Sharma (*4)

Round 3A 2:00pm Room 139
Gov: 13 Barton - Saghafi
Opp: 6 Mandal - Zheng
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: KASHYAP SHARMA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS, San Ramon

Team Code #: PROP 13

Team Code #: OPP 6

Prop Speaker #1 Barton pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Mandal pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Saghafi pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Zheng 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 delivery, excellent argument, evidence were excellent

Opp 1: Excellent delivery, POI, arguments, evidence.

Prop 2: Excellent delivery, Evidence

Opp 2: Excellent delivery, POI, arguments, evidence.

Please do not check experice with Judge.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Base on Evidence and Counter arguments I think Opp. Team won by margin. It was tough Competition.

PARLI Debate

Lin Jie Wu (*3)

Round 3A 2:00pm Room 140
Gov: 6 Lin - Lee
Opp: 5 Chang - Stuart
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Lin Jie Wu

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo.

Team Code #: PROP 6

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 Lin pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Chang pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Lee pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Stewart 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: Coherent arguments, Good volume, but needs work on having less filler words like "uh" + "um". Good level of preparation, Good counter argument analysis,

Prop 2: Great delivery, very eloquent. Proper analysis of counter arguments, Good use of modern examples and evidence.

Opp 1: Good understanding of how to frame the issue. Good level of counterargument analysis. Needs better preparation I feel. Good delivery, good eye contact, courteous, Great point of order brought up.

Opp 2: Good analysis of counterarguments, but needs to work on delivery, Way too many "uhs" and "ums" crowd the delivery, making speech choppy.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Good use of debate procedure weaved into resolution definition argument, had more convincing evidence.

PARLI Debate

Devandra Kumar (*6)

Round 3B 2:00pm Room 116
Gov: 2 Odeste - Figueroa
Opp: 13 Woerner - Woerner
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: DEVENDRA KUMAR

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON

Team Code #: PROP 2

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Odeste pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Woerner (W) pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Figueroa pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Woerner (L) 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: APPLIED good body language
Provides justification & confident
Good examples provided

Opp 1: Stressed on evidence point
on spot correct assessment
provided data
Second round bit repetitive

Prop 2: Didn't provide data
to back claim
Clarity on definition, was able
to justify his school showing example
talked about surveys but not
specifics

Opp 2: Repeated first partner points.
was able to justify ~~W~~ EA data

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

provided clarity with evidence. excellent in catching points from live discussions and justify. Prop could not provide enough data to prove their point

World Peace is attainable.

PARLI Debate

William Lee (*10)

Round 3A 2:00pm Room 134
Gov: 11 Raven - Sweeney
Opp: 13 Madsen - Engstrom
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: William Lee

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL

Team Code #: PROP 11

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 Brandon Sweeney pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Jack Engstrom pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Nash Raven pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Gustavo Madsen 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 confidence
 - Strong speaker
 - Persuasive
 - Articulated arguments in a succinct/concise manner
 - Great presence @ podium
 - Work on eye contact

Opp 1: - Good/strong presentation
 - Clear delivery
 - Pointed out many/solid examples of ongoing conflict in world ≠ periods of peace
 - Articulate

Prop 2:
 - Good presentation & delivery
 - Good effort rebutting + restating position + definition
 - Articulate + well spoken

Opp 2: - Good arg. that Gov't narrow of definition ^{has too}
 - Concise & succinct arguments
 - Good pace
 - Articulate delivery

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Definition as offered by Gov't too narrow to be meaningful. Tough argument for Gov't to make. What is "peace" if it can't be experienced by living population. But good/creative arg. re. existence of "peace" during 1st-54 days after nuclear armageddon. Thinking that pd, conflict would still exist and that doesn't = peace. Good job on both sides. Very impressed.

William Lee (*10)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 134
Gov: 13 Murdough - Donaldson
Opp: 8 Murdock - Shotwell
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: William Lee
Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL

Team Code #: PROP 13
Prop Speaker #1 Murdough pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Donaldson pts 28

Team Code #: OPP 8
Opp Speaker #1 Murdock pts 27
Opp Speaker #2 Shotwell pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:
30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: - Good eye contact
- Resulted in a connection when not looking down at notes the entire time.
- clear + succinct delivery of arg.
- Good, strong projection
- confident delivery

Opp 1: - Good delivery of arguments
- Creative arguments on a weaker position opp. Liked correlation ≠ causation.
- would start w/ your contention of rebutting Gov't (would be more effective)
- Work on slowing down - seemed rush
- Pause between major arguments

Prop 2: - Good eye contact
- Good delivery + rebuttal
- Strong pted rebuttal for opp 1

Opp 2: - Good eye contact
- well organized
- Good delivery of rebuttal + reaffirming arguments

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Gov't had more persuasive/stronger arguments in support of their position + the proposition they were arguing for. Opp's arguments did not wholly refute Gov't prop by pointing to other possible "cause" leading to violence. Opp 2 effectively conceded pt when stating that violent video games also contribute to violence along w/ media influences. Good job by everyone!

PARLI Debate

Kimberley Haulk (*12)

Round 3B 2:00pm Room 136

Gov: 13 Ambrose - Oller

Opp: 14 Owen - Coscarelli

Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name:

Kimberly Haulk

Judge's School Affiliation:

San Marin

Violent video games make children more likely to commit violence

PROP

OPP

Team Code #: 13

Team Code #: 14

Prop Speaker #1 Ross Ambrose pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Rachel Owen pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 McCain Oller pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Ashley Coscarelli 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...
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: Speaking style is direct and effective. Well laid out content and points of information

Rebuttal

Good summary but missed opportunity to oppose.

Prop 2: Effective use of voice and authoritative style of delivery. Personal example compelling yet flattened in facts and sources

Opp 1: Excellent delivery with voice fluctuation and eye contact. Courteous to partner and opposing team

Rebuttal

Well organized rebuttal with specific facts

Opp 2: Analysis includes evidence and procedural contentions. Good job refuting their points one by one.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Team 14 provided better negation in facts than opponents in arguments for resolution Prop missed oppd turn to counter arguments of opponents and sources