Novice Parli Debate

Preliminary Round Results

	,												
Asher Lanzone		13C			17C			8B		0.0/0	_	4	
4A Bentley School		W	0*		Ļ	0*		W	0*		۲ ۰	• 1	
Jeremy Hubinger	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0			0
Stephen Giverts		8B			17A			17C		0.0/0	4	_	
4B Bentley School		W	0*		Ļ	0*		Ļ	0*		•	· Z	
Dylan Han	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0			0
Pranav Anand		15A			17B			14H		0.0/0		_	
5A Dougherty Valley HS	ı	W	0*		L	0*		L	0*	•	1 •	· Z	
Arnav Gupta	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0			0
Tanya Agarwal		14F			15E			15A		0.0/0		^	
5B Dougherty Valley HS		W	0*		W	0*		W	0*		5 •	· U	
Divija Maitra	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0			0
Ingrid Hsu		14E			15A			15E		0.0/0	4	^	
5C Dougherty Valley HS		L	0*		L	0*		W	0*	•] •	• 2	
Divya Sharma	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0			0
Faris Bokhari		8D			15D			17B		0.0/0	_	4	
5D Dougherty Valley HS		W	0*		W	0*		L	0*		۷ .	- 7	
Naval Patel	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0			0
Humza Khan		14D			15B			17A		0.0/0		_	
5E Dougherty Valley HS		W	0*		W	0*	ŀ	W	0*		3 ·	. U	
Hemakshat Sharma	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0			0
Ansuman Bardalai		8A			14H			14G		0.0/0			
5F Dougherty Valley HS		W	0*		W	0*		W	0*		3.	- 0	
Mohsin Rangwala	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0/0			0
Naya Murdock		_14A			8B			14F		0.0/0	4		
6A John Swett HS		L	0*	:	W	0*	1	L	0*	•	1 •	- 2	
Briana Bazile	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0			0
Peter Santana		_14G			_8E			15D		0.0/0			
6B John Swett HS		L	0*	1	L	0*		L	0*) .	- 3	
Dale Jones	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0/0			0
Marviona Green	i	17B			_8A			15B		0.0/0	_	_	
6C John Swett HS		L	0*		L	0*		L	0*		D .	- 3	
Raezhelle Madison	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0			0
Alexia Ainsworth		_5F			6C			13B		0.0/0	_		
8A Maria Carrillo HS	ļ	L	0*		W	0*		W	0*	7	2 .	- 1	
Joseph Cusenza	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0			0
Marcus Navarra		_4B			_6A			_4A		0.0/0	_		
8B Maria Carrillo HS		L	0*		L	0*		L	0*) ·	- 3	
Trenton Nguyen	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0/0			0
William Schoeffler		_15C			_14E			14D		0.0/0	_		
8C Maria Carrillo HS		L	0*	Ì	L	0*		W	0*	ļ '	1 .	- 2	
Trevor Nguyen	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0/0	_		0
Claire Yin		5D			_14C			_14B		0.0/0	_	_	
8D Maria Carrillo HS			0*		L	0*		L	0*		D,	- 3	
Hannah Tan	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0	•		0
Mara Albers		13A			6B			13C		0.0/0	_	_	
8E Maria Carrillo HS		ı	0*	ļ	W	0*		L	0*	'	1 .	- 2	
Katie Pell	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0	•	_	0
Brian Burrous	† —	8E		<u> </u>	14G			14A		0.0/0			
13A San Marin HS	1	W	0*		L	0*		L	0*	'	1	- 2	
Max Von Blankenburg	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0	•	_	0
Ryan Blanchard		15E			_14F			_8A		0.0/0			
13B San Marin HS	1	W	0*		L	0*		L	0*	1 '	1	- 2	
Mackenzie Elmhirst	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0/0	_		0
Ashok Sundararaman		4A			14B			8E		0.0/0	_		
13C San Marin HS	1	L	0*		W	0*	1	W	0*	1 :	2	- 1	
Matthew Baetkey	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*		0*	0.0*	*	0*	0.0/0	_		0
Emily Ibanez Arroyo	†	6A		\Box	16A			13A		0.0/0	_		
14A Sonoma Academy	1	W	0*		L	0*		W	0*		2	- 1	
Gracie Mendoza	0.0	Gov	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0/0			0

Novice Parli Debate

Preliminary Round Results

Oibana Hasana		474	_		120			90		0.00			—
Gibran Hassan		17A ■	0*		13C	0*		WD W	0*	0.0/0	4	2	
14B Sonoma Academy	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0/0		Z	0
Alyssa Goody	0.0	15B	<u> </u>	0.0	8D		0.0	15C		0.0/0			<u> </u>
Claire Stephens		W	0*		W	0*		W	0*	0.0/0	2	n	
14C Sonoma Academy	0.0*		0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*		0*	0.0/0) -	U	0
Lola Flanagan	0.0	Opp 5E		0.0	15C		0.0	Opp 8C	U	0.0/0			
Owen Clark		3E	0*		150	0*		∎°C	0*	4	n	2	
14D Sonoma Academy	0.0*	<u>L</u>	0*	0.0*	<u>L</u>	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0	J -	J	0
Allan Farfan Canales	0.0*	Gov 5C	0	0.0	Opp 8C		0.0	16A	U	0.0/0			씍
Elias Keen		W	0*		۱ÃĬ	0*		W	0*	0.0/0	2	Λ	
14E Sonoma Academy	0.01		0*	0.0*	AA	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0) -	U	0
Jacob Kowalick-Allen	0.0*	Opp 5B	U.	0.0	Gov 13B	<u> </u>	0.0	6A		0.0/0			ᆜ
Reece Stromberg		108	0*		W	0*		Ŵ	0*	0.0/0	2	4	
14F Sonoma Academy	0.01	L	0*	0.0*		0*	0.0*		0*	0.0/0	- ک	ı	0
Anna Miller	0.0*	Gov 6B	U	0.0	Opp 13A		0.0	Opp 5F		0.0/0			_
Nina von Raesfeld		W			W	0+		■	0.0	0.0/0	2	4	
14G Sonoma Academy			0*			0*	200	L	0*	000	- ک		_
Hugo Sappington	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0			0
Lana Green	1	17C			5F	^-		5A	^+	0.0/0	2	4	
14H Sonoma Academy		W	0*		Ļ	0*		W	0*	000	८ -		
Maya Nichols	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0/0			0
Draper Dayton		5A		}	5C			_5B		0.0/0	A	2	
15A Sonoma Country Day School		Ļ	0*		W	0*		Ļ	0*		1 -		
Ben Alexander	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0/0			0
Bruno Coelho		14C			5E			6C		0.0/0	4	2	
15B Sonoma Country Day School		L	0*		L	0*		W	0*	'	1 -	Z	_
Cyrus Siegel	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0/0			0
Ellie Ramos		8C			14D			14C		0.0/0	^	4	
15C Sonoma Country Day School		W	0*	l	W	0*		Ļ	0*		Z -	1	_
Natalie DiCicco	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0	_		0
Hannah Farkas		16A			5D			6B		0.0/0	4	^	
15D Sonoma Country Day School		L	0*		L	0*		W	0*	١ '	1 -	Z	_
Paige Cabral	0.0*		0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0/0			0
Jordan Hendrickson		_13B			_5B			5C		0.0/0	_	^	
15E Sonoma Country Day School		L	0*		L	0*		L	0*		บ -	· 3	_
Sean O'Connor	0.0*		0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0/0			0
Richard Reid		15D			14A			14E		0.0/0	^	4	
16A St. Joseph Notre Dame		W	0*		W	0*		L	0*		2 -	. 7	
Chris Gerlach	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0/0			0
Chase Cohen		14B			4B			_5E		0.0/0	_	4	
17A Windsor HS		W	0*		W	0*	1	L	0*		2 -	٠ ٦	
Nikolas Lemenager	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0*		0*	0.0/0			0
Tyler Campanella		6C			5A			5D		0.0/0		_	
17B Windsor HS	İ	W	0*		W	0*		W	0*	;	3 -	. 0	
Trae Petruska	0.0*		0*	0.0*	_	0*	0.0*		0*	0.0/0			0
Abby Little		14H			4A			4B		0.0/0	_	_	
17C Windsor HS		L	0*		W	0*		W	0*	1	Z -	. 1	
Noah Wagner	0.0*	Gov	0*	0.0*	Opp	0*	0.0*	Орр	0*	0.0/0			0

Prop Speaker #1 Chase Cenen pts 28 Prop Speaker #1 Chase Cenen pts 28 Prop Speaker #2 Nicholas Lemusuag fis 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 effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts find references to authority as well as general knowledge • Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side • Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers • Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: Very Politic, Clear, organized Contentions of improvement to each debater: Prop 1: Very Politic, passionalic speaker, organized Contentions of Information with a galarial, Good Prop S. Amitial points in the startistic of the politic speaker of the prop S. I main startistic of the politic speaker of the prop S. I main startistic of the politic speaker of the prop S. I main startistic of the politic speaker of the prop S. I main startistic of the politic speaker of the prop S. I main startistic of the politic speaker of the prop S. I main startistic of the politic speaker of the prop S. I main startistic of the politic speaker of the prop S. I main startistic of the politic speaker of the politic sp	Hergenrather, Starr (*1) Round 1 9:00am Room 1 Gov: 17 Cohen - Lemenager Opp: 14 Hassan - Goody Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Staw Hergewather Judge's School Affiliation: Analy
Prop Speaker #1 Chase Cohen pts 28 Prop Speaker #2 Chickolas Lemense pts 28 Prop Speaker #2 Nicholas Lemense 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 <0 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior Judging Criteria • Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate • Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge • Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side • Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers • Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courtoous 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 polite, clear, good for rude or inappropriate behavior Opp 1: Very polite, passionale speaker, organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courtoous 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 polite, passionale speaker, organized, contentions greater, good for the property of the suggestion of the property of the proper	PROP	OPP
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 quality 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 courtous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: Very polite, clear, good 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 polite, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: Very polite, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 2: Opp 2: Very polite, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 2: Observed polite, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 2: Opp 2: Very polite, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 2: Opp 2: Very polite, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater of the please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater. Prop 2: Opp 2: Very polite, please offer compliments and/or suggestions		
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 quality 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 courtous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: Very polite, clear, good 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 polite, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: Very polite, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 2: Opp 2: Very polite, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 2: Observed polite, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 2: Opp 2: Very polite, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 2: Opp 2: Very polite, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater of the please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater. Prop 2: Opp 2: Very polite, please offer compliments and/or suggestions	Prop Speaker #1 Chase Cohen pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Aly SSa Goody pts 27
30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to quality for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <0 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior Judging Criteria • Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate • Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge • Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side • Points of Information: How directly 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 politic, clear york use Contact, but get fluskeed by the "rules" that twee pointed but by the oppose. Initial points of the prop solution of the prop solution of the prop solution. Prop solution of the prop solution of the prop solution. Prop 2: Olso very politic, on the English and eye contact, good prints. Remuttaled P.O.I. well. TEAM CODE #: ### on the Prop or Opp)	Prop Speaker #2 Nicholas Lemenage fits 28	Opp Speaker #2 Gibran Hassan pts 28
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor 20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior Judging Criteria • Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate • Evidence: How appropriately and effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge • Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side • Points of Information: How/relevant and effective were the questions and the answers • Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: Very polite, clear, organized "Contentions" 2st up. Total by the "rules" that twee points do by the "rules" that twee points do by the "rules" that twee points do by the opposite in the points of information. Well general, good electrical surface with the prop 5 + takes prop 5 + takes prop 2: Also very polite, or the European Science of the content, good prints. Research of the content		~ <i>/</i>
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 directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side Points of Information: How directly 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 Polite, Clear, organized, "Contentions" 3ct up. task by the "rules" that were pointed by the "rules" that were pointed by the "rules" that were pointed by the "pp.3. Initial points with the pp.3. Initial points with the prop 3. Initial points with the	27 = Good (but possibly not good	enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
• 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 development and effective were the questions and the answers • Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courtous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: Very polite, clear of the "rules" that were pointed out by the "rules" that were pointed out by the opp 3. Initial points out by the opp 3. Initial points Well spoken. Isomolite in Statistics Well spoken. Isomolite in Statistics Well out prints of information. Prop 2: Also very polite, Prop 2: Also very polite. TEAM CODE #: # 17 Prop or Opp) TEAM CODE #: # 17 Prop or Opp)	26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
• Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate • Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge • Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side • Points of Information: How development and effective were the questions and the answers • Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courtous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: Very polite, clear of the "rules" that were pointed out by the "rules" that were pointed out by the opp 3. Initial points out by the opp 3. Initial points Well spoken. Isomolite in Statistics Well spoken. Isomolite in Statistics Well out prints of information. Prop 2: Also very polite, Prop 2: Also very polite. TEAM CODE #: # 17 Prop or Opp) TEAM CODE #: # 17 Prop or Opp)	Judgi	ng Cylteria
evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge • Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side • Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers • Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: Very polite, clear good effectively the debaters respond to the answers Opp 1: Very polite, passionalt speaker, organized "Continuous" 3ct up the speaker, organiz	 Analysis: How reasonably and effectively 	
• 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 polite, clear, spot eye Contact, but gas flushed by the "rules" that were pointed out by the opp. 8. Initial points of the point of the points Reputable of the points Reputable of the points o	/	•
• Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers • Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable • Courtesy: How courtous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: Very polite, clear, organized "Contantions" 3ct up. to be the "rules" that were pointed out by the opp. 3. Initial points well appears which brake the Prop s train of tempts which brake the Prop s train of tempts. Suggestions for improvement to each debater: Opp 1: Very polite, passional speaker, organized "Contantions" 3ct up. to be up the prop s train of tempts. Learned to be the Prop s train of tempts. Same that Opp 2: The appears to check if I was ready. Pelite 3rd eye contact, good Printo. Remuttaled P.O.I. well. TEAM CODE #:	 Argumentation: How directly and effecti 	
• 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 politic, clear, organized by the "rules" that were pointed out by the "rules" that were pointed out by the opp. 8. Initial points well applien. Prop 9. Information was general, good ly Contact. Kept bringing up rules of the out prints of information. Prop 2: Also very politic, TEAM CODE #: TEA	•	l effective were the questions and the answers
Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: Very polite, clear, good eye contact, but got flushered by the "rules" that were pointed out by the opp. 8. Initial points out got flushers. Broken. Brought in Satisfies Clearly laid out points information. Prop 2: Also very polite, TEAM CODE #: TEAM	Delivery: How well the debaters speak in	•
Prop 1: Very polite, clear, god eyl contact, but got flushered by the "rules" that were pointed out by the opp. 3. Initial points well spreen. Brought in Statistics Vlearly laid out prints of information, Prop 2: Also very polite, TEAM CODE #: TEAM CODE #: Prop 1: Very polite, passionalt speaker, organized "Contentions" "set up that Information was general, good ley Contact. Kept bringing up rules" Outpermater which broke the Prop s train of Feinglet. Samestra Opp 2: If forget to check if I was ready. Points. Rebuttaled P.O.I. well. TEAM CODE #: Prop on the Prop or Opp)	Courtesy: How courteous and respectful to	the debaters were to opponents and judges
out by the "rules" that were pointed out by the opp. 8. Initial points by the opp. 8. Initial points by the opp. 8. Initial points by the opperate points of learning to the opperate which broke the Prop. 8 than of the out points of information, of the opperate which broke the Prop. 8 than opperate to check if I was ready. Prop 2: Also very polite, Pelite 300d eye contact, good points. Resultated P.O.I. well. TEAM CODE #:	, ,,	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
by the "rules" that were pointed out by the opp. 8. Initial points well oppear. Brought in Statistics and which broke the Prop s train of Learny wild out points of information. Prop 2: Also very polite, TEAM CODE #:	Prop 1: Verypolite, clear,	Opp 1: Very polite, passionale speaker,
out by the opp. 8. Initial points well spoken. Propositive Statistics Clearly will out prints of information, Prop 2: Also very polite, Points. Rebuttaled P.O.I. well. TEAM CODE #:		aganusa Contentions Set up.
Prop 2: Also very polite, Opp 2: Forgot to check if I was ready Polite, good eye contact, good Points. Reputtaled P.O.I. well. TEAM CODE #: From on the Prop or Opp) PEASON FOR DECISION.		Information was general, good
Prop 2: Also very polite, Opp 2: Forgot to check if I was ready Polite, good eye contact, good Points. Reputtaled P.O.I. well. TEAM CODE #: From on the Prop or Opp) PEASON FOR DECISION.	out by the oppis. Initial points well govern. Brought in Statistics	auguernate which broke the Props train
TEAM CODE #: on the Propor Opp) Points. Resultated P.O.I. well. Propor Opp)	Prop 2: also very polite,	Opp 2: Toy of to check if I was ready
TEAM CODE #: on the Property wins this debate. # 17 (Prop or Opp)	, ,	Polite good eye contact, good Points. Resuttaled P.O.I. well.
DEACON FOR DECICION.	TEAM CODE #: on the	Propins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION.	DEACON FOR DECICION.	
Let that from team, even though they apparently broke	Felt Heat Prop. team,	even though they apparently broke

Thomas, Jackson (*1) Round 1 9:00am East13 Gov: 15 Farkas - Cabral Opp: 16 Reid - Gerlach		Judge's Name:		
Novice Parli Debate		Judge's School Affilia	ition:	
PROP Team Code #:	15	Team Code #:	OPP 16	
Prop Speaker #1		Opp Speaker #1	pts_28	
Prop Speaker #2	pts_ <u>75</u>	Opp Speaker #2	pts <u>28</u>	
_	peaker points based or 30 = Perfect 29 = Or od (but possibly not good 24-20 = Poor	utstanding 28 = Very I enough to qualify for eli		or
	T., 4	/ in a Cuitania		
- 4 1 1 11	/-	ing Criteria	the topic and the arguments	
 offered during the Evidence: How an evidence—which is evidence—which is horizontal by the other side Points of Information: How we and easily understantal 	debate opropriately and efficie may include facts and r How directly and effect ation: How relevant and ell the debaters speak in	ntly the debaters suppore references to authority a tively the debaters resp d effective were the qu n an organized, commu	ort arguments with as well as general knowled, ond to the arguments made estions and the answers inicative style that is pleasa	ge
Using the above crite	eria, please offer com	oliments and/or sugge	stions for improvement to	D
each debater: Prop 1: (Food 51)	-	Onn 1: R ASS De	pent define the co to offer counter de e round in your favor or all debators)	and, it is
Prop 2: Pornts we and actually the or the owner. I wo electronic of contents of contents of contents of contents of contents of contents.	n the other tention To on the	O wins this deb	esponses to Aff n	ebutta)
	(Pro	op or Opp)		
than none of all the ASF closing	PN: Afns. In The futu 1. Oog work by	re, offer some def the value of impact. Aff di	finitions no matter when riterion, as hinted and nothing to off	de 1U

Meshulam, Phyllos (*1) Round 1 9:00am Annex1 Gov: 13 Sundararaman - Baetkey Opp: 4 Lanzone - Hubinger Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Phyllis Meshalam Judge's School Affiliation: Analy, Rue,
PROP Team Code #: 13	OPP Team Code #:4
Prop Speaker #1 Bactkey pts	Opp Speaker #1 Lanzone pts_
Prop Speaker #2 Sundarara Manpts	Opp Speaker #2 Hubinger pts_
	n the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective 	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
 Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant at Delivery: How well the debaters speak i and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful 	ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1:27 Vere professioned. En toward touch hove been a lest better, and refutation 7 opp. a bit stronger. Don't concede as Prop 2: 27 Also very professional. Bu aware 7 blinking - a list distrative. Wash & Mush.	Convincie. Be aware 7 Martions habit of finching rose boad refulation on power gred issues invocation vs. doubleon
(PI REASON FOR DECISION:	(Opp wins this debate. rop or Opp) Led refutations. Jook advantage

Scholten, Lynn (*1) Round 1 9:00am East15 Gov: 15 Coelho - Siegel Opp: 14 Stephens - Flana Novice Parli Debate	gan	Judge's Name:	Scholten Analy
Team Code #: <u>50</u>	propa Country Day	OPP Team Code #: <u>5のいの</u> か	ra Academy
Prop Speaker #1_	Brino Coethoris 240	Opp Speaker #1 (awe)	510 nurs 28
Prop Speaker #2_	CyruS Stoffus 26	Opp Speaker #2	man pts 27
		Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for eliminat	ion rounds)
	Jud	ging Criteria	
 Evidence: levidence Argumenta by the other Points of Ir Delivery: If and easily to Courtesy: Ir 	which may include facts and ation: How directly and effects side aformation: How relevant at How well the debaters speak anderstandable How courteous and respectful	references to authority as well ctively the debaters respond to and effective were the question in an organized, communication all the debaters were to oppone	Il as general knowledge the arguments made as and the answers we style that is pleasant and judges
Using the above each debater:	ve criteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions	for improvement to
Prop 2: 9700 Prop 2: 9700 Prop 2: 9700 TEAM CODE :	DECISION:	opp 1: A good enthosis Find peaking with hand move m wear your shoes opp 2: Wear your shoes opp 15 points gam by Enthorma IPP wins this debate. Trop or Opp) Ing Confidence Sworger Facts	ents all times! by inging back and untiming on on with your own po best speaker in room
	of presented	"Swonger Mas	

Porter, Wendy (*1) Round 1 9:00apr Eastrig Sparit Gov: 15 Hendrickson - O'Connor	Judge's Name: Wendy Abrer
Opp: 13 Blanchard - Elmhirst Ryan / McKenzie Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: <u>(isendy Abrter</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Analy</u>
чения выправления по при на п	OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Joedan Hendridgpts 20	Opp Speaker #1 Ryan Blanchard pts 28 (28) Opp Speaker #2 McKenzie Elmhing fots 28 (294)
Prop Speaker #2 Sean O'Connor pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 McKenzie Elmhintots 28 (294)
	utstanding 28 = Very Good
	l enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
20 20 1 411 27 20 1 001	120 Reserved for react of mappropriate behavior
9	ing Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate 	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficie	
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
by the other side	tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
•	d effective were the questions and the answers
- ,	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 compeach debater:	oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Define topic most clearly	Opp 1: Clearly stated or restated topic
Brought thought ful analysis	under discussion. Broughtlogical
Expand your contentions to	reasoning and support.
grovide Challengy to your opponent	There was time for you to speak discussion
provide Challenged to your opponents More formal presentation would	eye contact even with noks, between team
be appreciation	members Very
Prop 2: Provide more support	
for your position more agoingm	Strongest Speaker in development of issues surrounding topic - appreciated logical
Would 4 Ke more volume and	development Control appreciated logical
Cye Contact, Good poise under pressure TEAM_CODE #: 13 on the Open	development. Good rate of speech and eye turn off Cell! contact.
TEAM CODE #: $\sqrt{3}$ on the $\sqrt{3}$	oposition wins this debate. Extremely confident
(Pro	op or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	
Much clearer defined ar	guments and statement of topic, better
developed support for your opport	osition position.

ly Opp. speaker #2 and her ability to impress about space exploration being indispensable. to soving our planet and if not may allow for an escape to another planet was not retited nor even attempted. That's the single biggest ter opponents uon debate.

Young, Wendy (*17) Round 1 9:00am Room 3 Gov: 14 Clark - Canales Opp: 5 Khan - Sharma Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Wandy Young Judge's School Affiliation: Windson HS
00 , 21	Opp Speaker #1 Khan pts 26 Opp Speaker #2 Shara pts 25.5
27 = Good (but possibly not good	the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
 Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and reserved and effective by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful 	references to authority as well as general knowledge vely the debaters respond to the arguments made effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
Prop 1: EADAUS + good eye contact - need to de true terms in beginning + good arguments Prop 2: CLANK - work on eye contact - a hit more work on organizing + how gots	Opp 1: + good definitions + good evidence + good eye contact Opp 2: - Sood delivery would have he peel. - define society
(Pro	op or Opp) Tapin of information, very

Tom, Joyce (*7)
Round 1 9:00am Room 2
Gov: 14 Arroyo - Mendoza
Opp: 6 Murdock - Bazile
Novice Parli Debate

Judge's Name:_	JOV	ICE 7	01	V	
		1	•		

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWAL H

Team Code #:	PROP		Team Co	OP _P	minimized 1.00g alicera v 1000 vz650 49 000 bio vina
Prop Speaker #1_	Mendoza	_pts <u>26.5</u>	Opp Speaker #1	Bazile	pts_26
Prop Speaker #2_	Arroyo	_pts_ <i>28</i> _	Opp Speaker #2_		- 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 = Fair24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

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

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

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

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

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

Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

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

Prop 1: You made your points clearly and with a nice voice/pace Try using longuage that helps listener know you are transitioning to a new pt. Also, take time to/develop your ideas by using examples. Nice job! Prop 2: Your passion really comes thru. I like that... but you can slow down a little to emphasize your ideas. But speriment w pace. Good counter arguments - and you did a good job of reinforcisyour position

Opp 1: Very nice pace + strong voice.
As opp, I liked how you explicitly talked about your goals. Take the time to think about what you want to say. I'm listening to your ideas. Also, in your opening segment - BE SUPE to address the Props arguments. Nice job!

Very of the Sect walco Opp 2: I like your calm and clear delivery. You responded effectively to prop's arguments.
Nevertheless, I was more passeded by the
Props points - they points were I had a hard time understanding how fb promots AI.

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

Opposition's position was effective but ultimately outweished by PROP's position. Opps that country to PROP's points could be struger. PROP did a good Job of presenting points & countring opp's points.

Team Code #:

Opp Speaker #1

PROP

Malachowski, George (*1)
Round 1 9:00am East12
Gov: 14 Stromberg - Miller
Opp: 5 Agarwal - Maitra Novice Parli Debate

Team Code #:

Judge's Name: Georg	ę	Malachous	4
- 0	1		_
Judge's School Affiliation:	A	naly	

Prop Speaker #2	berg pts 28-	Opp Speaker #2	Maitra	$_{\rm pts}^2\mathcal{F}$
Please award each speak	•	_		
	= Perfect 29 = Ou	_	very Good for elimination roup	
-			for rude or inappro	
20-25 Tan 24-	20 1001	120 Reservee	r for rude of mapping	priate beliavior
		ing Criteria		
• Analysis: How reason		y the debaters an	alyze the topic and	the arguments
offered during the deba				
• Evidence: How appropriate the second of th				
evidence—which may				
• Argumentation: How	directly and effect	ively the debate	rs respond to the arg	guments made
by the other side		d affa dina mana	the avections and th	
Points of InformationDelivery: How well the				
and easily understanda	-	i an Organizeu, c	ommunicative style	uiat is picasain
• Courtesy: How courte	/	the debaters we	re to opponents and	indges
- Courtesy: 110 W Courte	rous una respectitur	the decators we	to to opponents and	Jaabaa
Using the above criteria, each debater:				
Prop 1: Excellent	106	Opp 1: Oug		job Sometimes of the jointed, herd gesture zins arguements, of hinds
ar st time!	Pradice	$\int h$		Sing time 1
elp ul nervus	Things	7101479	argueus.	1 11
م کر مام و کر کر	ye wastrot	the or	g cuization	94 +46
porture (/)	and exception	-ebuttals	urs disj	join tell
-, 4-1	بورير کې دی الاندا	One th	ing to vor	4 04 15
Duay 2		V 0 ~ 8	inpact 21	hard gesture
Prop 2: avel 5000	.ln 4 1.	Opp 2: G &	job organi	zing 4-quements
arguer. Excel	lent use	9008 ege	contact use	. of hind.
of Aone e var	الم بارهم	Could us	e more us-	iction 17 for
in speeches. Coul	d have	992 (04	Il be beHe	or addressin
tone of the solution of the so	20,3	1 3/2017/6	points of	eppositives, mg
TEAM CODE #:	on the	OPP wins t	his debate.) ś . ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' '
	(Pre	ဗ်p or Opp)		
REASON FOR DECISION:				doug
This was	very co	55 4 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ال علاما و	\(\frac{1}{2}\)
to the opp b	eing sligh	+19 be	mer orga	11262
REASON FOR DECISION: This was to the opp b	their	Cbsing	r-ghenge	7+
,	$T \sim T$		- ,	-

Nick Mizin PARLI Debate

Round 1 9:00am Room 103 Gov: 5 Anand - Gupta	Judge's Name: Nicholas Mizin
Opp: 15 Dayton - Alexander Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Pentley
PROP	OPP _
Team Code #:	Team Code #: 15
Prop Speaker #1 27 pts	Opp Speaker #1pts
Prop Speaker #2pts	Opp Speaker #2pts
Please award each speaker points based on	the following scale:
	utstanding 28 = Very Good
	enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ing Criteria
	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficient	
	eferences to authority as well as general knowledge
• Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side	ively the debaters respond to the arguments made
,	d effective were the questions and the answers
	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 compeach debater:	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
<i>p</i> .	la .
Prop 1:	Opp 1:
gavethan yer bally	gave Them
J /	gave them verbally
Prop 2:	Opp 2:
gare/then verbalk	gave the m
	I weekelde
	VERTIN
	Drag
TEAM CODE #: on the	Prop wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	Clearer
,	-
+ 11" (INE / Preser	e) arguments in a better,
more structured was, and	nighte the 177 side better.

Kenyon, Karen (*13)* Round 1 9:00am Room 107

Gov: 5 E Opp: 8 A Novice



nd 1 9:00am Room 107 /: 5 Bardalai - Rangwala	Judge's Name: Sierra Belden
o: 8 Ainsworth - Cusenza vice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Analy
PROP Team Code #: 5	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Bardalai pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Cusenza pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Ranguala pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Amsworth pts27
Please award each speaker points based on 30 = Perfect 29 = Ou	the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good
	enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	ng Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate 	the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficien	atly the debaters support arguments with
	eferences to authority as well as general knowledge
 Argumentation: How directly and effecti 	vely the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	effective were the questions and the answers
	an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
Courtesy: How courteous and respectful to	the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer compleach debater:	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: great intro speech, good	Opp 1: Great Presence + vivid examples
analysis leg summy y debate on last	Used. Remember to road map, & Refute
Speech. In first Speech terrember	opponents then dearly lay out your own points
to road map where you are going	and give a quick sunmary. Take Pot's
and summarise protects and refuting	and give a quick sunmary. The largest enthiss from other team if you have time. Great enthiss from other team if you have time. Great enthiss season! Good gestures! use of space thands. Ond 2: The 2nd Neg Speech is the hardest, you
apprents points!	stasmi epen gestoren ose g
Prop 2: Great Refutations and	Opp 2: The 2nd Neg Speech is the hardest, you
LAVA La TOLK TINUNI	points in the round, good job tatching the
10 3000	"will" part of topic, and Strengthening your
ntend of Speech. Great Job?	contentions.
_	wins this debate. p or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	
The Prop effectively reluted	the neg's points while 41.71
holdiers of their own mint	the neg's points while Sti71 s with good analysis + refutation
relating of their our point	s viin your vinigois + reportation

	PARLI Debate
Siegel, Mike (*15) Round 1 9:00am Room 109 Gov: 13 Burrous - Blankenburg Opp: 8 Albers - Pell Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Mile Siegel Judge's School Affiliation: SCDS
PROP Team Code #: \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Busines pts 281/2	Opp Speaker #1 Albers pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Blankenburg pts 26 1/2	Opp Speaker #2 Pell pts 27
	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Y., J	
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and effici evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant at Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful 	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges epliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: good eye contact Organized well Thought out delivery, good conclusion not sure if your suppose to tell the judge why you was? wiggles are a little distacting Prop 2: Very clear is stating goals of presentation. delivery was a little choppy Don't admit what you don't know	Stated source for facts veres effective other appenents were anecdotal lopinion based.
TEAM CODE #: 13 on the PREASON FOR DECISION:	PQOP wins this debate. Prop or Opp)

Prop Speaker #1 made at more organized and supported argument to Slightly edge the argument in Their furar

PARLI Debate Judge's Name: Mariah Noah Round 1 9:00am East10 Gov: 5 Hsu - Sharma Opp: 14 Keen - Kowalick-Allen Novice Parli Debate Judge's School Affiliation: Hall **PROP** Team Code #: Team Code #: Opp Speaker #1 Keen Opp Speaker #2 Kowalick-Allen pts28 Prop Speaker #2 Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior 24-20 = Poor**Judging Criteria** • Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate • Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge • Argumentation: How directly and effectively the 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: Opp 2: TEAM CODE #: on the

		11121 2 40410
Lustig, Robert (*7) Round 1 9:00am Annex2 Gov: 6 Santana - Jones John Swell Opp: 14 Raesfeld - Sappington Somme Quelent	Judge'	s Name: LU3 TI G
Novice Parli Debate	Judge':	s School Affiliation: Lowell.
PROP	t is the design to the contract of the second of the secon	ODD
Team Code #:6	Tea	om Code #: /4
Prop Speaker #1 Santana pts 27	Opp Speake	r#1 pts 27.
Prop Speaker #2 Jones pts 2	Opp Speak	er #2 pts 7
Please award each speaker points based 30 = Perfect 29 =		_ /
27 = Good (but possibly not go	_	• • /
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Re	served for rude or inappropriate behavior
Ind	lging Criter	ia
		ters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and effic	iently the de	baters support arguments with
evidence—which may include facts and	l references	to authority as well as general knowledge
_ ,	ctively the	lebaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	d offortion	versus the greations and the engreens
Points of Information: How relevant a Delivery: How well the debaters speak		ized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	iii aii oigaii	zed, communicative style that is pleasant
Courtesy: How courteous and respectf	ul the debate	ers were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	npliments a	nd/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Jobs essenting in the	Opp 1:	Endpoints about just bedry.
Flow of dear wey!		Para Celso good jourtabout.
But did not the This to 1/2000	,	alettle too forceful on the planet
reacond in the future is		dynicarpeet "- we're not in a porthon of coloning other planets.
Prop 2:	Opp 2:	Colordy other planets.
Good chalenging of opposition	>	Good four about vatteries
To start.		bloothat There is no other developer
But elaboration of pourso lela		But very redundant - gave speechtw wins this debate
" who were pay by her derrices in	applea -	But very redundant - gove speech Tw
But elaboration of pour lete "who were pay to her dereices" w TEAM CODE #: on the		wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION: Wit into ely 7	Prop or Opp)	Entroin was "who WILL impact society D's effort have more potential is the dress this.
201 "who NAS imported society	7" illes	DA effort have more polential in The
At D- TO Aff to dil	20 Tal	dress This,

PARLI Debate Stephan, Susan (*9) Round 1 9:00am Room 108 Judge's Name: 5, Stephan Gov: 8 Navarra - Nguyen Opp: 4 Giverts - Han Novice Parli Debate Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte PROP Team Code #: Team Code #: Opp Speaker #1 Prop Speaker #2 Marcus Navavants 28 Opp Speaker #2 Du lan Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior 26-25 = FairJudging Criteria Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate • Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge • Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side • Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to debate and debators close also act Opp 1: great work till cantasticebators! each debater: Really Prop 1: Opp 2: good mentioning negatives ef FB good adding Emuse's achievemental mention positive other side, At First

TEAM CODE #: _____ on the Opp wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: Refuted & (brought up) the negatives of Facebook - bullying, suicides.

they dight mention space X - if

it, don't help apporet.

vvang, Qian (Jessie) (*5) Round 1 9:00am Room 102 Gov: 8 Schoeffler - Nguyen Opp: 15 Ramos - DiCicco Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: PRANAN SHAHI Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS
PROP	OPP
PROP Team Code #: <u>Plania Cannil</u>	
Prop Speaker #1 Treven Nguye	n pts 25 Opp Speaker #1 Natoute Dicico pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 will Schoeff	La pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 Did not Show pts NA
30 = Per 27 = Good (but pos	ints based on the following scale: fect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good ssibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) Poor <20 = Reserved for rade or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
 Evidence: How appropriate evidence—which may inclu Argumentation: How direct by the other side Points of Information: How Delivery: How well the deb and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous a 	ly and efficiently the debaters support arguments with de facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge thy and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made were relevant and effective were the questions and the answers laters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges see offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1:	the hourd,
Prop 2: / + ve / Sounderl confide boexerted case real countered offp. be	in well,
Soverno. Cou TEAM CODE #: <u>Day Schoo</u>	on the OPP wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)
reason for Decision: ofop team laid a lon countered by the Pr	s teem impact which was not effectively team.

Blackmer, Susan (Round 1 9:00am East16 Gov: 8 Yin - Tan	*1)	Judge's Name: Susan Blackmer		
Opp: 5 Bokhari - Patel Novice Parli Debate		Judge's Schoo	I Affiliation: A raly f	<u>H</u> S
(A)	PRQP	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	7 OPP /	
Team Code #:	**************************************	Team Cod		
				DII
Prop Speaker #1	an pts_	Opp Speaker #1	tar pts_	Vatel
Prop Speaker #2	pts	Opp Speaker #2_	pts_	_ BoKha
Please award	l each speaker points based on		/	•
	30 = Perfect 29 = O	- ,	•	
26-25 = Fair	27 = Good (but possibly not good 24-20 = Poor		y for elimination rounds) I for rude or inappropriate bel	havior
	Judg	ing Criteria		
Analysis:	How reasonably and effectivel	, ,	nalyze the topic and the argun	nents
	ring the debate		, zo uso topio usia uso usgasi	
	: How appropriately and efficient	ntly the debaters	s support arguments with	
evidence-	—which may include facts and	references to aut	hority as well as general know	wledge
	station: How directly and effec			
by the oth	- /	iivoig line decate	is respond to the digaments in	naac
_	Information: How relevant an	d effective were	the questions and the answer	·¢
	How well the debaters speak is			
	understandable	n un organizea, e	ommunicative style that is pr	Casani
•	: How courteous and respectful	the debaters we	re to opponents and judges	
			or of the control of the second of the secon	
Using the ab	ove criteria, please offer comp	pliments and/or	suggestions for improveme	nt to
each dehater				
	spens menstion Musk	1 90		,
Prop 1: 2	5 /	Opp 1: $\angle \mathcal{I}$	1	nition 1
	opener	clear	examples; has	nsever
1 1- 1 4	in aldin Musk		,	
Odedni 1	Mergocer			
<i></i>				1 2000
Prop 2: \angle]	Opp 2: 20	some good	ay.
illand.	ma use of from	and.	\mathcal{O}	U
aug				
	ong., use of train			
	_			
TEAM CODE			his debate.	
	(Pr	op or Opp)		
REASON FOR	R DECISION:			

- 4 ×	PARLI Debate
المراق (المراق المراق المراق المراق المراق المراق المراق (المراق المراق	
Round 1 9:00am Room 111 Gov: 6 Green - Madison	Judge's Name: Brett Ainsworth Judge's School Affiliation: Maria Cazillo
Opp: 17 Campanella - Petruska	-
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Maria Carillo
PROP	OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 <u>Green</u> pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Campanella pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Petroleg pts 28
Please award each speaker points based or	n the following scale:
	utstanding 28 = Very Good
	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Inda	ring Criteria
	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	y the debuters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficient	ently the debaters support arguments with
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	references to authority as well as general knowledge
	tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
	d effective were the questions and the answers
	n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	the debetors were to amount and indeed
• Courtesy: How courteous and respectful	the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer com	oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each dehotory	
Spenish lowder Plense. You talk very sortly.	1
· Prop 1: Try and use more for your spenting time.	Opp 1: 6001 Dep conter conse
It possible tale a few mayers to minin. you set of	Good Agremma about misk and eco + space
Friet dobut but you need to hell me how to neigh it	Good and speech summerity LOHAS. You knows
2nd you need to mue type to 17ddrs) each agreent,	will have time so spon down and trice you time.
speech &	
Prop 2: book response to the Ofi, Tyle the to	Opp 2: 6001 reptation year tresponses to the prop ageneral
things about what very age. They are king about	Gent jus through time to talle about each ister
Global of Us mack.	
/ '	
TEAM CODE #: 17 on the	wins this debate.
	op or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	or opp/
	car agreements that were not refetted o

Mudish Margaria

Cumpuncila Petrolia

Andrew Community of the second
The state of the s

and the second of the second o

Tamminen, Paul (*1) Round 2A 11:00am Room 111 Gov 5 Agarwal - Maitra Opp: 15 Hendrickson - O'Connor Novice Parli Debate		Judge's Name:	Tamminen Analy
PROP		Team Code #: OPP	Control of the contro
Prop Speaker #1 Tonya 0	Iganual pts 28 (Opp Speaker #1 Jordan Hendri	Ason pts 2021
Prop Speaker #2 DIVIJA	Mitra pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Shapp Orac	ormor pts 25
 27 = Good 26-25 = Fair Analysis: How reason offered during the domain of the description of the desc	30 = Perfect 29 = Out I (but possibly not good 24-20 = Poor Judgit onably and effectively ebate propriately and efficier ay include facts and repow directly and effection: How relevant and I the debaters speak in adable arteous and respectful	atstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for eliminative can be received for rude or the debaters analyze the topology the debaters support arguments the debaters respond to an organized, communicative the debaters were to oppone the debaters and/or suggestions	inappropriate behavior pic and the arguments uments with I as general knowledge the arguments made s and the answers we style that is pleasant ints and judges for improvement to
Prop 1: Good clear and strong final: Prop 2: Good angular addressing of anguments TEAM CODE #: REASON FOR DECISION INTERNAL CONTROLLED TO THE ANGULAR	Notice on the Property of the	Opp 2: The lay or portion.	sides survents better back a forth grinner to arguments to a counter continued to the counter

Tamminen, Paul (*1) Round 2B 11:00am Room 111 Gov: 16 Reid - Gerlach	Judge's Name: MUTAMMYNOW
Opp: 14 Arroyo - Mendoza Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Rodald Reid pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Einly Thank anoto pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Chris Garlach pt 27	Opp Speaker #2 Cravic Mendoya pt 25
Please award each speaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = 0	n the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
$27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ging Criteria
offered during the debateEvidence: How appropriately and efficient	by the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
 Argumentation: How directly and effective by the other side 	references to authority as well as general knowledge tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
1	nd effective were the questions and the answers n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
Courtesy: How courteous and respectful	the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Lors of contract coherent angumentation and dutail.	Opp 1: Good, passionate argumentation And Slowing down a bit would focus
and dood summary response.	nie hardling of Questioning.
Prop 2: Good Film-through, egently Rebutton of NEBU	Opp 2: nie addition of arguments. Could have gone after AFF'S
argumant	arguments with more specific rebuttals.
TEAM CODE #: on the	wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION: Throw defund	op or Opp) To proportion a little questionable but Ted by NEG anway). Rept organization The did a butter job rebutting NEG point
supported problem will a	mad and a butter. Job reconting NEG point

Media ryva	in from terror attells. PARLI Debate
Fogarty, Matthew (*9) Round 2A 11:00am Room 102 Gov: 6 Murdock - Bazile	Judge's Name: MAT FOGARTY
Opp: 8 Navarra - Nguyen Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE
PROP 6. Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 WANA pts 2	6 Opp Speaker #1 NAVARKA pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 NGUYEN pts 2	Opp Speaker #1 NAVARRA pts 25 Opp Speaker #2 NGUYEN pts 25 ed on the following scale:
30 = Perfect 29	9 = Outstanding 28 ≠ Very Good
	good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
 Evidence: How appropriately and evidence—which may include facts Argumentation: How directly and by the other side Points of Information: How relevand easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respect 	efficiently the debaters support arguments with and references to authority as well as general knowledge effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers eak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer each debater:	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Very clear, 3 Strong points	Opp 1: Add an Color + Summary
Did not set up the topic, definition	take your time (only used 2 mins)
of.	address their points => add your own
Only used 3/7 minutes Prop 2:	Opp 2:
well organized, good parity.	same.
TEAM CODE #: 6 on t	he <u>PROP</u> wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	(Prop or Opp)
Opp failed to make strong	s points or fully address props points

Dev. evon	PARLI Debate
Fogarty, Matthew (*9) Round 2B 11:00am Room 102 Gov: 14 Hassan - Goody	Judge's Name: MAT HOGARTY
Opp: 13 Sundararaman - Baetkey Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: M (RAMOUTE
PROP 14	OPP 13
Prop Speaker #1pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 BAETK TY pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 type pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 SUNDAR ANAUpts 26
	n the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
$26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ging Criteria
	ly the depaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
	ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge
	etively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	/
,	nd effective were the questions and the answers
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandableCourtesy: How courteous and respectful	I the debeters were to enmonents and judges
Courtesy. How counteous and respectful	i the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Good parnion + confidence	Opp 1: Good to redefine as developing, not 3 hold Good points on China need better summary at end
Tule sointe chance a leas	Good points on China
Nake points cleaner - very verlappines (hour to inspensed) Prop 2:	need better summary at end
id not offer a clear plan (implement)	
Prop 2:	Opp 2: Good structure More summay needed
Start let store and server and	More surmay readed
Started strong & organized Allowed partner to control near end ou need to control points & own podium)	
TEAM CODE #: on the	wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION:	7 A / -
opicality oround 3" world"	or "developing" was a red having, in times and means not allied with learn about environment > meleons em (no dinumien of COZ or Aldal warning)
world actually is from cold we	lean about on immune to motor
ozone are not #1 inner facing	en (no discussion of CO2 or global warming)

Jackie Haller	berg	PARLI Debate
Sutton, Jim (*7) Round 2A 11:00am Room 1		Judge's Name: Jacke Hallerburg
Gov: 14 Raesfeld - Sa Opp: 13 Burrous - Blar Novice Parli Debate		Judge's School Affiliation:
F) To Nill public (diluteran sain set 1)	PROP ()	OPP
Team Code #:_	11 11	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #	1 try0 pts 28	Opp Speaker #1pts_26
Prop Speaker #	2	Opp Speaker #2/ Driam ptspts
Please awar	d each speaker points based on $30 = \text{Perfect}$ $20 = 0$	n the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good
	27 = Good (but possibly not good	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	S	ing Criteria
	: How reasonably and effectively uring the debate	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
		ently the debaters support arguments with
	- /	references to authority as well as general knowledge
by the otl	- <i>,</i>	tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
		d effective were the questions and the answers
<u> </u>	: How well the debaters speak ir y understandable	n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
	,	the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the ab		oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1:	. 1/ (1)	Opp 1: So glad Max worked through some of his
υ,	sy to follow	through some of MIS
	id out Contentions	herrowsness - Leep
O.	nd continued to refer to Hom	de lating (30)
Prop 2:	ery concise points,	Opp 2: good restatement of arguments; helped to
ν e	of to follow	grauments helped to
		Continue to all load 1 74
V	rganizer.	rop used understandable languages wins this debate.
TEAM COD		wins this debate.
REASON FO	R DECISION: (Pro	op fr Opp)
e /	ilways cucled!	back to the topic: images
e	addressed poin	back to the topic: media the topic: mages

Jackie	Hallerber	ŋ	PARLI Debate	/
Sutton, Ji	m (*7) - -)	Thatis the	1/1. h
	Dam Room 103 Ohens - Flanagan		Judge's Name: \\ JWYYE J/W	ufly
Opp: 8 Yin - Novice Parli	Tan	· (11 dia	to Judaya Sahlal ASSII asin An Ila	
140VICE I alli	Pengie FEW!	mictrowth over	The Judge's School Affiliation:	Control Company Control Contro
	PRO	Pall	OPP (P)	
Tear	n Code #:	20	Team Code #:	
Prop	Speaker #1	h pts 10	Opp Speaker #1pi	ts
Prop	Speaker #2	ire pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	pts
Ple	ase award each	speaker points based o	on the following/scale:	ow skarana
			Outstanding 28 = Very Good	
26	27 = G -25 = Fair	food (but possibly not goo 24-20 = Poor	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropri	ata hahari'an
20	-25 – Fall	24-20 - Poor	20 - Reserved for rude or mappropris	ate defiavior
		Jud	ging Criteria	
•	Analysis: How	reasonably and effective	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the	arguments
	offered during th			1
			ently the debaters support arguments wit references to authority as well as genera	
		-	ctively the debaters respond to the argum	-
	by the other side	,	our or a deciment respond to the diguin	11000
•	Points of Inform	nation: How relevant a	nd effective were the questions and the a	nswers
	_	/-	in an organized, communicative style tha	it is pleasant
	and easily under	/		
•	Courtesy: How	courteous and respectfu	al the debaters were to opponents and jud	ges
Usi	ng the above cr	iteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for impro	evement to
	h debater:	, ,	,	
_	_		1.	
Pro	p 1:	1 1 ha	Opp 1:	S
	· took gree	ut gare to be	· oragnized	. Q
	o Man 13		" liked Stats & Specific examy	7
	· articul	te,	Charlic exam	des I
	· Good cl	osing arguments	specific - in f	des trats
D		<i>y</i> . <i>y y y</i>		\sim
Pro	p 2:	e about topic	Opp 2:	26
	PASSIONAL	to	·organized	573
	·articula			use Terri
	· helped	bolster.		3 / =
	tean.	3 HOSHIV	Poso	To Et
TE	AM CODE #:	on the	rop of Opp) wins this debate.	2 / 8
REA	ASON FOR DECI		<i>-</i>	: 3+
	· Pasul	to Inlline	contentions / rebutteld	٠ ١٠
	الماليات ا	c brusht 1	contentions rebuttels	the te
	· muy	topic of		73
	· gave	CreTence	to opposing side's Cont	outins but &

Shifs, Wassa (*13)
Round 2A 11:00am Room 107
Gov: 14 Green - Nichols
Opp: 5 Bardalai - Rangwa
Novice Parli Debate

Wassa (*13) A 11:00am Room 107				Z	> <	11 . 12
4 Green - Nichols			Judge	's Name: 🚨	ころしく	H17)
Bardalai - Rangwa Parli Debate	ıla		Judge	's School A	ffiliation: $\frac{\sum_{\mathbf{t}}}{}$	IN MARIN
	PROP	AND CONTRACT OF THE CONTRACT O		e describeration at the	OPP_	Marie political and the extension of the
Team Code #:	14		Te	eam Code #:	: 4	
Prop Speaker #1	GREEN	pts_27_	Opp Speak	er#1 <u>BA</u>	MALAI	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	NICHOLS	pts_26_	Opp Spea	ker #2	LANGWAL	pts 28
Please award e	ach speaker poi	ints based or	the follo	owing sca	ile:	-96-48/31/31/30/31/30/31/30/31/31/31/31/31/31/31/3 -48/31/3-48/31/31/31/31/31/31/31/31/31/31/31/31/31/
	30 = Per	fect $29 = O$	utstandinį	$\mathbf{g} \cdot 28 = \mathbf{V}$	ery Good	
	= Good (but pos		_		/	•
26-25 = Fair	24-20 =]	Poor	<20 = R	eserved for	or rude or ina	appropriate behavior
		Y	: C-:4-			
• Amalousia, III	(•	ing Crite	/	41 4	
=	ng the debate	na effectively	y the debi	aters analy	yze the topic	and the arguments
	ng the debate low appropriatel	ly and efficie	ntly the	, ehatera a:	innort arailm	ente with
		•	• /			s general knowledge
	-		,		-	ne arguments made
by the other		,			,	
•	formation: Hov	v relevant ap	d effectiv	e were the	e questions a	and the answers
						style that is pleasant
	nderstandable					-
• Courtesy: H	How courteous as	nd respectful	the debat	ters were 1	to opponents	and judges
Using the abov each debater:	e criteria, pleas	e offer comp	oliments a	and/or su	ggestions fo	or improvement to
Prop 1:		/	Opp 1:			
110p 1.	H-0 0 18 61	٠١١ ٨٠٠٠	Opp 1.	179114	50610	seakn-
WZ. CHIL	ט פן נאדו	164 66311]			
MS. GMEN THOUGHTS	BUT A BIT	FNAGOR	9	V25	ic Thou	acht out-
_						
Prop 2:			Opp 2:			DYLAN DE
HAD GO	क्र तमा वक्	and Roll		NICE	CAILACI	e to shaking
607 A E17/						
ANTIVER HAP						
	_	-				
TEAM_CODE #	:	on the	op or Opp)	_wins this	debate.	
REASON FOR D	DECISION:	1 , 6(-==1	. (Զբ ն	1.255 01	The mi	ray singing ar
<i>c</i> ∧(• .	T)	CTIVANT	SXIND	nllli	LINAIS (INA GENOCIOE WETT
~~> \ \ \ 2	'Homsin s) A C C W IO (T	C MAIN	om of like
- 12 11 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	E CALIMATINE	ILUS AN	6W 1112 N	' トリハ	- riedini	11. 6/1 / 1/2-2

DON Shifs, f Round 2B

Gov: 17

Opp: 5 A Novice P **PARLI Debate**

s, Masha (*13) 2B 11:00am Room 107	Day (44) F
7 Campanella - Petruska `	Judge's Name: USN STITS
5 Anand - Gupta e Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MANN
PROP	OPP
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Com LANUA pts 2.C.	Opp Speaker #1 ANANA pts 25
Prop Speaker #2 15 TWSKA pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 64 TA pts 27
Please award each speaker points based on	- /
	utstanding 28 = Very Good l enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude of inappropriate behavior
Judg.	ing Criteria
	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficie	,
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
-	tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	d afficiency was the assessions and the analysis
	d effective were the questions and the answers an an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
•	the debaters were to opponents and judges
	The second secon
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1:	Opp 1: - Dew THOUGH IN YOU PLACE
DUNCOT TONIA MI STEEM	SMLL SIDEL WELL BUT THOUGHTS
HIS THOUGHTS DELL GOOD	JUST A RUT FRACIMIO
BUT STEAM KINGTED BILLY	
4 MIDWITZS - EDUNG THINE	
Prop 2: XVAND 20	Opp 2: > MAJE UALID (DINTS.
	SHOW A BIT MUM PASSION
Sweet THOUGHT DUT	A MONTH AMOUNT ANDRON
TEAM CODE #: 17 on the	
REASON FOR DECISION:	op or Opp)
DERY CLOSS BUT PROF	SAMULAN JISIFF CO ASSAB GOW P
THAT WITHOUT BUILDIN	has turn bureness governe and

FOR ENUMBARIATION LIES

Macpherson, Michele (*3) Round 2A 11:00am Room 108 Gov: 14 Keen - Kowalick-Allen Opp: 8 Schoeffler - Nguyen Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Michele Macpheran Judge's School Affiliation: Behneut
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Kowahu pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Nguyen pts 25 Opp Speaker #2 Schoeffle pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Kenny pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Schoeffle pts 27
Please award each speaker points based or 30 = Perfect 29 = O	the following scale: utstanding 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
Judg	ing Criteria
9	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficie	ntly the dehaters support arguments with
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
Argumentation: How directly and effect	ively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	d effective were the questions and the answers
	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 comp	oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	and or suggestions for improvement to
,	
Prop 1: + good significant	Opp 1: -) Good job menty valege to
Prop 1: + good signments + your temine Imparel3	Sylian.
a surfacts (Pice)	to deliver the whole
delivered I della	-> Work in first species
- Be careful formunication when speaks. Prop 2: 1 Grow Magnes to POI	Sylim. -> work to delvie the whole -> work to delvie the whole 1ist of contentias in first speech
Pron 2:	Onn? I Mut who course all the part
Prop 2: + Gogs reponse to POI	Opp 2: + txcellent job course all the paid + (200) argument that the wedan + (200) argument from the wedan - diready does refruin
+ good explusion of termina	Joes refruir
Impacts teg worth mild	Abbutyr already does refrain FROP wins this debate. Op or Opp)
TEAM CODE #	PROC wing this debate
TEAM CODE #: / 7 On the /	on or Onn)
REASON FOR DECISION:	ч
	with higher Net Benefit
(lea case mude u	Jiva Myn 12 Senty

Macpherson, Michele (*3) Round 2B 11:00am Room 108 Gov: 15 Dayton - Alexander	Judge's Name: Michele Macples
Opp: 5 Hsu - Sharma Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Relnert</u>
PROP .	OPP 75-
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Day to pts 27 O Prop Speaker #2 Alexander pts 26	pp Speaker #1 HSu. pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Alexader pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Sharma pts 27
Please award each speaker points based on 30 = Perfect 29 = Out	the following scale: standing 28 = Very Good
	enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
,	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judgir	ng Criteria
	the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
ĕ	the the debetors survey arguments with
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficient	
•	ferences to authority as well as general knowledge
·	vely the debater's respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
 Points of Information: How relevant and 	effective were the questions and the answers
• Delivery: How well the debaters speak in	an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the	he debaters were to opponents and judges
o di tonj v 110 % do di todab di di 105poolidi d	no products were to oppositions and judges
Using the above criteria please offer compl	iments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	ments and/or suggestions for improvement to
cach deparer.	
Dron 1.	Omm 1.
Prop 1:	Opp 1: · Exellet point on the fact that environment is gone, cannot be reclaimed
x Effective arguet that sevelying.	· Freellet por at an and be reclaimed
the scope is different in sevelying.	and won ment is gone, carrier
a talk to judge in that speak	e /com
ac falle 10 30 at	· 60
* Work on partner communication	
to make it something	
	Onn?
Prop 2: Casad point closing role of developing nature in polluly	Opp 2: . Good job elaboraty on the contextus by these oppor didn't adduce
a Good Bolk Coping 12 polled	. You Indicated that PPOP didn't address.
developing 1	. You have but I had note
· /	Your first danged done so that they had done so pointing pich
TEAM CODE #: on the Pl	200 wins this debate. of numar left vis to or Opp)
(Prop	o or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	1 the deflare for developing
In 1 Aft speech outh	and for the second
Time whate we	old = ettectually
parions Us, whom	id the defenus for developing

Low pt win.

Bhargava, Piyush (*5) Round 2A 11:00am Room 2 Gov: 15 Ramos - DiCicco	Judge's Name: PMUSH BHARGOM
Opp: 14 Clark - Canales Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: DJHJ
PROP Team Code #:15	OPP Team Code #: \4
Prop Speaker #1 DICICO pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Owen Clark pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 Allan Canales pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 OICICO pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Allan Canales pts 26
Please award each speaker points based of	
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ging Criteria
	ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficient	
	references to authority as well as general knowledge
• Argumentation: How directly and effective by the other side	fively the debaters respond to the arguments made
,	nd effective were the questions and the answers
	n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
•	I the debaters were to opponents and judges
- Courtesy. Now counted as any respective	and decitors were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Articulat Speaker.	Opp 1: Should have built more on
on more confidence. Stong	constitution argument. Didnit
dyris and excellent rebuttal.	address aff core argument on
should have addressed Opp.	Images creating "Terror"
Prop 2: Constitution aryunit.	Opp 2:
1100 2.	Deviated from the topic and
	actually agreed with Aff on Boston
,	marathon topic. Need to connect
	PROP wins this debate. back to cove a Juma
REASON FOR DECISION:	op or Opp)
clarky of argu	ment

Judge's Name: Pyujh Bharsa. Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS Team Code #: Y p Speaker #1 Ana Miller pts 29 pp Speaker #2 Strombor pts 27 pp Speaker #2 Strombor pts 27 the following scale: tanding 28 = Very Good hough to qualify for elimination rounds) 20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior g Criteria the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
p Speaker #1 Ana Miller pts 29 pp Speaker #2 Strombor pts 27 pp Speaker #2 Strombor pts 27 pe following scale: standing 28 = Very Good nough to qualify for elimination rounds) 20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior g Criteria
tanding 28 = Very Good rough to qualify for elimination rounds) 20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior g Criteria
tanding 28 = Very Good rough to qualify for elimination rounds) 20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior g Criteria
tanding 28 = Very Good hough to qualify for elimination rounds) 20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior g Criteria
g Criteria
<i>'</i>
he debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
erences to authority as well as general knowledge ely the debaters respond to the arguments made affective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant to debaters were to opponents and judges ments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Opp 1: Stromburg
Very pursuance and moving expenses of hands and gestures
Opp 2: Confront Speaker - Need to work on Flow
pp_wins this debate. or Opp) The argumt Hat economy most is lost won it. Teams could have

due better job of differentiaty as Aff supported env as well.

Griffin, Nona (*1) Round 2A 11:00am Room 1 Gov: 4 Giverts - Han	Judge's Name: Nonce Griffin
Opp: 17 Cohen - Lemenager Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Anal 4
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #: 17
Prop Speaker #1 Giver+5 pts 2	Opp Speaker #1 Cohen pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Han pts 2	Opp Speaker #2 Lemenager pts 27
27 = Good (but possibly no	sed on the following scale: 19 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good ot good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
•	Judging Criteria
 Evidence: How appropriately and evidence—which may include facts Argumentation: How directly and by the other side Points of Information: How relevant easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respective examples of the courtesy of the courte	Opp 1: courtesy: Not esh other team if it's their lat time or say I'm sany to team because you cheerly won! Analysis + evidence - hery strong to the mon point
TEAM CODE #: \7 on	Delivery: fidgeting was distractly Analysis: very strong, so newhat repetative evidence the OPP wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)
The opposition did a very jo	and used completed negrative to persuade you to

Griffin, Nona (*1) Round 2B 11:00am Room 1 Gov: 5 Bokhari - Patel Opp: 15 Farkas - Cabral Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: SZIFFIN Judge's School Affiliation: ANALY/WASHING
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #: 15
Prop Speaker #1 BOKITAR / pts 26	
Prop Speaker #2 PATEL pts Zle	Opp Speaker #2 CABRAL pts 26
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficiency evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effective by the other side Points of Information: How relevant a Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful Using the above criteria, please offer comeach debater: Prop 1: Could work on Clearer delivery, but argument 	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments dently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant all the debaters were to opponents and judges appliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: Deliver: More Confident delivery needed -points of argument were strong into receded Stronger delivery receded Stronger delivery receded Stronger delivery receded Stronger delivery
(F	- more concrete continued stated state

Ernst, Debra (*17) Round 2A 11:00am Room 3 Gov: 5 Khan - Sharma Opp: 15 Coelho - Siege Novice Parli Debate	el	Judge's Name: Debra Ernst Judge's School Affiliation: WindSov HS
		or a state of the contract of
Team Code #:	PROP	Team Code #: \frac{OPP}{5}
	Khan pts 29	<i>J</i> /
Prop Speaker #2	Sharma pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 COR pts 28 +
	27 = Good (but possibly not good	the following scale: atstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
offered du Evidence evidence- evidence- Argumen by the oth Points of Delivery: and easily Courtesy Using the abeeach debater Prop 1: We	How reasonably and effectively ring the debate How appropriately and efficient which may include facts and restation: How directly and effect er side Information: How relevant and How well the debaters speak in understandable: How courteous and respectful ever criteria, please offer compile throught out the deficient of the courteous and respectful ever criteria, please offer compile throught out the deficient courted throught out throught out the deficient courted throught out throught out the deficient courted throught out the deficient courted throught out throught out throught out through the deficient courted	the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments of the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge iverly the debaters respond to the arguments made an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges liments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: Great Speaking Style 10 gi cally laid out argument.
of Negs Prop 2: Neg little mo in speech ed each f made.	eded to have a re ammunition, but neatly address ownt that Neg had #:	Opp 2: Really Good formts to back - up your points. Great speaking style. Style. Wins this debate. Oppor Opp) I very well spoken speakers ant effort. However I am a cause they backed up their has speech.

Ernst, Debra (*17) Round 2B 11:00am Room 3 Gov: 8 Albers - Pell	Judge's Name: Debra Ernst		
Opp: 6 Santana - Jones Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Debra Ernst Judge's School Affiliation: WindSor 115		
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:		
Prop Speaker #1 AllerS pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Santana pts 27.		
Prop Speaker #1 Allers pts 28 Prop Speaker #2 Pell pts 28.5	Opp Speaker #2 700eS pts 27.5		
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)		
Ind	lging Criteria		
 Evidence: How appropriately and effice evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant a Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectiful Using the above criteria, please offer contractions 	iently the debaters support arguments with deferences to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant full the debaters were to opponents and judges appliments and/or suggestions for improvement to		
each debater: Prop 1: Albers. Succent definition of resolution. Maybe show name spoken (onger?	crafting your case.		
Prop 2: Pell. Good job hacking u your case.	opp 2: Jones Speak a little more slowly and annunciate. A few good points but not enough to overcome your opposition.		

reason for Decision: Aff had a bit more facts and good 109ic by Speaker#Z

Siema Belden

Raesfeld, Kathleen von (*14) Round 2A 11:00am Room 109 Gov: 4 Lanzone - Hubinger	Judge's Name: Sierra Belden	
Opp: 17 Little - Wagner Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Avaly	
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #: 17	
Prop Speaker #1 Hubinger pts	28 Opp Speaker #1 Liffle pts 28	
Prop Speaker #2 Lamone pts	28 Opp Speaker #2 wagher pts 28	
27 = Good (but possibly	based on the following scale: 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior	
	Judging Criteria	
offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and evidence—which may include fare. Argumentation: How directly and by the other side Points of Information: How relected to the debaters and easily understandable. Courtesy: How courteous and resulting the above criteria, please off each debater: Prop 1: Great delivered arguments, and analysis.	d efficiently the debaters support arguments with cts and references to authority as well as general knowledge and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made evant and effective were the questions and the answers speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant spectful the debaters were to opponents and judges for compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Opp 1: Great anthogasm + evidence + examples god Summery + refutations	
graments. Try to he of their points if you continue of the other of th	Cotators Opp 2: This is the hardest speech and go	

Raesfe

Round 2B Gov: 8 A Opp: 6 C Novice F

HOVE POILUDE	1 ARLI Debate
eld, Kathleen von (*14) 11:00am Room 109 Ainsworth - Cusenza Green - Madison	Judge's Name: Kathleen von Raesfeld Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy
Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Onoma Hladery
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Ains worth pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Madison pts27.25
Prop Speaker #2 CUSEnZo_ pts 27.25	Opp Speaker #2 <u>Green</u> pts <u>27</u>
	the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good lenough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ing Criteria
 Analysis: How reasonably and effectively offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficient 	y the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
	tively the debaters respond to the arguments made
• Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable	d effective were the questions and the answers an an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: + clear presentation,	Opp 1: Way to Be Brave!
well organized t excellent citing of sources	+ availar Laxinger connected to topic
3 /	+ Stronger Stock to both spectres Your conviction became stronger as you spoke more - You!
Prop 2: + love enthusia sm & passion	spoke more - Yay! + great work on a tricky topic Onn?
try to make abit of eye	Opp 2: + Very Brave to get up there + Drofessional lock, Clean & polished,
t followed argument well & excellent	t professional look, clean & polished, Stood up straight " try not to need a bit more eye whact is read noted
	prop wins this debate. op or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION: 2 arguments were dropped and su	pported again infinal speech-good argumentation
Challenging subject -	Excellent job staying with it to

Ainsworth, Laura Ainsworth (*8)	1 a 1/2 . 1/4
Round 3 1:30pm Room 102 Gov: 5 Anand - Gupta	Judge's Name: howa Ambroth
Opp: 14 Green - Nichols	11.5 ()
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
PROP_	OPP 1.1
Team Code #:	Team Code #: 14
4:34 Prop Speaker #1 Anand pts 27.5 Op	op Speaker #1 1/200 pts 29.5
1 2 1	Opp Speaker #2/ GNEEN 5:12 pts 30 - USE YOU
4:2 Please award each speaker points based on t	he following scale:
30 = Perfect 29 = Outs	standing 28 = Very Good nough to qualify for elimination rounds)
Needed to 27 = Good (but possibly not good en	78. 10 4
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <	20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior solid language to be wildly unasarable "
Mount a Counter-argument to its danger She discusses murderers and the Rule Judgin	
Law in Anglysis. How reasonably and effectively to	U U FII PFI I A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
Analysis: How reasonably and effectively t	the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	a can well?
Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently evidence—which may include facts and ref	ly the debaters support arguments with erences to authority as well as general knowledge ely the debaters respond to the arguments made
Argumentation: How directly and effective	ely the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	CAPOLAN
• Points of Information: How relevant and e	effective were the questions and the answers Extra Holds n organized, communicative style that is pleasant
Delivery: How well the debaters speak in a	n organized, communicative style that is pleasant them
and easily understandable	
• Courtesy: How courteous and respectful th	e debaters were to opponents and judges
Vote on the impliosion argument.	"lettinggo" has no link to Alcohol/Drugs. Green
each debater: 1 There one no Pr	ments and/or suggestions for improvement to made this clear to the clear to her
tach debater.	silv but your seems
Prop 1: Case has interesting. The	Opp 1: So, this was many strong. You
- A-DINIII DOUGH	Opp 1: So, this was many trong. You Construed The Unations were strong. You Construed
Willing to accept that, but tell willing to accept that, or argue	established several on case Constitution of the constitution of th
Willing to belly	established several or logical. st arguments that were logical.
	st arguments that a reasonable rang you also had a reasonable
where Jours came workings Detto	very you assessed which you expressed
a counter carro	ony for also had a reasonable for explained opp 2:
where four's came from not again. Where four's came from not again. Prop 7: Defourtion. Can have more argumentation	Opp 2: well. I am not sure how rounds world normally
Con have more as graner fation	unfold for your ten. You may want to
Struction of Since in 2 about 1607	Worklover Swiffling Places. Town
Voter. why / what makes it abusive?	"Implosion" arguments were really good.
Why are your definitions framework?	You had the to develop these hetter. Your
TEAM CODE #: on the	"Implosion" erguments were really good. P You had the to develop these hather. Your wins this debate. thinking is sharp.
Пор	or opp) 1 26-16 is not an argument. The
DOODIAGE GOVERS DIS and then to	e UPP/10001 and I dela avest 50
to justify or explain why someth	le OPP/NEG caved a wondida great job ling is abusive. NEG, yondida great job ling is a
identifying where ground 13 and	issitu really mattered. Why were then activities
organisats. In this case, lott	better? They never Build.

Africa to the deligning Middle 1:20 14.5 Figure. policies de 1 No. がいいか · Passill S. 1004 for which were O Zano No interment of the extension of the first projector to the wildly commonly of pull Fue in diaments is EXIEND End EXINAPHE -wall-I the on it inglested in formath " thingson is in his in his or house they are 2. A servery of the super of the servery of the to and the same some for your sander Little processing and 1995 wire Alferrat. I Adopt Take to a forth specific the office of faring one hear thomassins me that similar or which of the had a minimatile What for which was sure to be To regioned whethe for Experient remain Saman Japanes of Lames Topanion Wall Expenses College some of the west of marked mark the South of the contract confided in your some you may what the rained to good Designify green, about singly making it abolives More paper stone stoomers " wishpur sales sections and are the you and the to dove by state little found Physical and the med the complete of course of hills. Here the standing of the in the property of the propert or just estes. In from seat, Topical ty in the out what soil had continued

Masters, Claudette (*13) Round 3 1:30pm Room 3 Gov: 5 Agarwal - Maitra	Judge's Name: <u>lacedatte</u>		
Opp: 15 Dayton - Alexander South Market Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: San March		
Team Code #: PROP	OPP Team Code #: 15		
, , ,	Opp Speaker #1 Draper Day Day pts 26		
Prop Speaker #2 DIVIJa Mattapts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Ben Alexand Chis 25		
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good		
27 = Good (but possibly not good 26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior		
_	lging Criteria		
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate 	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments		
 Evidence: How appropriately and efficience 	iently the debaters support arguments with		
	references to authority as well as general knowledge		
by the other side	ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made		
•	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	al the debaters were to opponents and judges		
Using the above criteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to		
each debater: Polly to the wine	= Good Nolume and Dosture		
Prop 1: Good Job design	Opp 1: 6000 dob of addressu		
Propris Good Son Charles	Opp 1: 6500 of addiessur		
erms and presenting alcar, and guments. Slow down, and			
Dania an words aloggith ad	die i a con i la lanci a abli		
of variable 2- cook is admit so 600	MALLER WILL TECHNOLOGY NOT M		
Prop 2: up Stress con tool	of Pay attention to other teur		
Prop 2: up Stress con tool	Opp 2: You talked too much duy		
C FINAL LOSE P A C LAUGUELLA	1 interior and the respect		
guments. Great speaking	Distern, and be discreet when too municating with put fores.		
	Too many con the		
where I	Prop wins this debate. Juments.		
TEAM CODE #: 5 on the	Prop wins this debate. June of		
	Prop or Opp)		
REASON FOR DECISION:	definitions and aranne		
The pulled of oc.	pie. Opp did not use drows		
1 helly stunding to	pec. up are is the contract		
Idono - too much siere	sonal opinion		

Wells, Brendan (*1) Round 3 1:30pm East10 Gov: 15 Ramos - DiCicco	Judge's Name: Brendan Wells
Opp: 14 Stephens - Flanagan Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
Team Code #: 14	Team Code #: 15
Or Bookspeaker #1 Stephen 9 pts 75	Speaker #1 Dili Cc o pts 22
Orr Speaker #1 Stephen 9 pts 75 Orr Speaker #2 Flanagan pts 27	Speaker #2 No Show pts
Please award each speaker points based o 30 = Perfect $29 = 027 = Good$ (but possibly not goo 26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	n the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and efficience evidence which may include facts and 	ging Criteria ly the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments ently the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
 by the other side Points of Information: How relevant ar Delivery: How well the debaters speak i and easily understandable 	nd effective were the questions and the answers n an organized, communicative style that is pleasant I the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria, please offer comeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
stuttered and lost your place. While speaking without notes, you we prop? Even it out! and elequent out! Even to add interesting and relevant point of your substopping	
TEAM CODE #: 19 on the	<u>Oγρ</u> wins this debate. rop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION: 1 think the definit on both sides w human sacrifice b the nea showed t	ion debate got a little will ith examples like Hitler and etry thrown around Ultimately hat harm could come from aff did not sufficiently counter.

410 - 141 141 प्रमा Dreiter o 122 र मक्त्रीद्वार्थनेत् No Shaws Jesus Spanis or the second that the second e e describer a la companya de la c a taka ba sa may ya abbibiliya a bijan. galendo de sajoro de la la cara la Alemba. La compania de la caractería de la compania de la ina grapa tanàna na ao ao Maria ao Airi the your delivery was the least browner for sometimes student works while the property the result to head to speed from the form the form of the form o Who silly a top stadists 1 thrack the courters Expense Could consect there Atras report alled in Production site of the second

Took with the flat white countries

the will been made yourse

LUCAS Tamminen PARLI Debate -Raymond-Bill (*1) Round 3 1:30pm Annex1 Judge's Name: Gov: 5 Khan - Sharma Opp: 17 Cohen - Lemenager Novice Parli Debate Judge's School Affiliation: A **PROP OPP** Team Code #: 17 Team Code #: 5 Cohen Opp Speaker #1 pts 26 Prop Speaker #1 Shama pts 26 حالا نالا. Prop Speaker #2 Yhen Opp Speaker #2 pts US pts US Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: centident 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior 26-25 = Fair24-20 = PoorJudging Criteria • Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate • Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge • Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side • Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers • Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Prop 1: · chem + consise Opp 1: den't complain so much about the topic use of physica human geen voters more concise - the whole , to summarize in your fover tepie, /exp. since advocating that benefits of Opp 2: _ on the _ كى _ _wins this debate. TEAM CODE #: (Prop or Opp) REASON FOR DECISION: The technical victory goes to the Proposition, but the moral

reason for DECISION: The technical victory goes to the Proposition, but the moral victory is awarded to the apposition. The apposition presented a case that was far more subtle and original, even if they could not always articulate it with preasion. This, however, as the final Prop speaker possibed cut, makes a strong case for the superiority of "going barranos." In the end, a moduled but highly debi-

McNamara Lana (*1) Going Banans Vs Berng Corning
Gov: 13 Burrous - Blankenburg Judge's Name: LANA MCNAMARA Judge's Name: LANA MCNAMARA
Opp: 14 Arroyo - Mendoza Novice Parli Debate Judge's School Affiliation: EMHS.
Team Code #: OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Burrous pts 27,5 Opp Speaker #1 Wroyo pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Blanken lowypts 27 Opp Speaker #2 Mondo 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: Burrous Opp 1: Arroyo leaning in Stand straighter- interpretate descent
- clear, to the point, stand straight sensing despond
aid out/argument -clear, knows order,
nearly well argued , "professional"
Prop 2: Blanken burg Opp 2: Mendoza
- tried Something different - good support / reliteration
Tought for given opporting
- (needed more substance) definitions
TEAM CODE #: on the Opp wins this debate. (Prop of Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:
Stronger, clearer, well planned argument,
bour introld argument and then
Stronger, clearer, well planned argument, boys intro'd argument and then abandonned it.

Furrent. Morato/ Dimases. - butter / salt Light surface + supervor/ name of debate tendented -Stuple Town writing - Lec activity - meentay -- VI tammo + healthy or health truit (supposi Challenging status quex utilitariarion -> Contextual definition fruit us del of Vallace hearthm. violation! road map I stand straight smicide Cepression -mental health Shootings' Tres ンタルグス sáujuios sn (hzvas) OFTO - SET TEX. corn - unal plant. impact there ever maked and have box - Challenging definition challenge · command lanken by ro seek + hu time Rebuting - meladriametic be comes accepted. mental. ereates u Change Graffind instability

Young, Kathy (*1) Round 3 1:30pm Room 1 Gov: 14 Keen - Kowalick-Allen Opp: 16 Reid - Gerlach Novice Parli Debate	Judge's Name: Kathy Young Judge's School Affiliation: Analy H.S.
PROP Team Code #:	OPP Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Konalick-Allepts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Re i'd pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Kon pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 (se Clach pts 27.5
Please award each speaker points based	/ 9
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
$27 = Good (but possibly not go$ $26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 7 Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Juc	dging Criteria
 Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and Argumentation: How directly and effect by the other side Points of Information: How relevant at Delivery: How well the debaters speak and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectif 	ciently the debaters support arguments with deferences to authority as well as general knowledge ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges in pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: See med a bit nervous at first, but improved later Prop 2: Spoke with authority	Opp 1: Good eye Contact. Clear Organist against a difficult/landom i clear to argue. Opp 2: Erect speaking voice & mannerisms.
TEAM CODE #: on the REASON FOR DECISION:	Prop or Opp)
	rguments in lever of their ideas were too abstract for

		PARLI Debate
Round 3	, Sharon (*17) 3 1:30pm Roo(x2)	Judge's Name: Liffle
V'' \ Opp: 8	4 Clark - Canales 3 Schoeffler - Nguyen 9 Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor
	Team Code #: PROP	Team Code #:
	Prop Speaker #1 Canally pts 2	Opp Speaker #1 Sholl ll pts 28
	Prop Speaker #2 Clark pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 pts 2
	Please award each speaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = 0	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	27 = Good (but possibly not good	od enough to qualify for climination rounds)
	26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Jud	ging Criteria
	 Analysis: How reasonably and effective offered during the debate 	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
		ently the debaters support arguments with
		references to authority as well as general knowledge
	 Argumentation: How directly and effe by the other side 	ctively the debaters respond to the arguments made
	•	nd effective were the questions and the answers
		in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
	and easily understandable	/
	• Courtesy: How courteous and respectfu	al the debaters were to opponents and judges
	Using the above criteria, please offer comeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	Prop 1: + polite	Opp 1: + tried to give some organization to argument to courteous
	- need to offer roadme	w organization.
	+ good pace	, + courteous
EV	rding betterthan beginni	ng + good pace
	Prop 2: + Courtebus	Opp 2: + good pall
	+ godd Pace	- be respectful of the
	- organization	Classroom
	TEAM CODE #: on the_	- 17 -
	DEASON FOD DECISION.	Prop or Opp)
	ast did not o	Her a clear plan

Sharma, Kashyp (*5) Round 3 1:30pm Annex2 Gov: 8 Yin - Tan Opp: 14 Hassan - Goody		Judge's Name:	Kashy	ap Sharma
Novice Parli Debate		Judge's School	Affiliation:	DVHS
Team Code #:	OP	Team Code	OPP #: \4	Martin de arrango e en la composition de la comp
Prop Speaker #1	an pts 27	Opp Speaker #1_	Foody	pts 2 8
Prop Speaker #2	linpts_27	Opp Speaker #2	Hassan	pts 2 8
	speaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = 0 Good (but possibly not good 24-20 = Poor	Outstanding 28 = `od enough to qualify	Very Góod for elimination ro	unds)
		ging Criteria	,	•
 offered during to Evidence: How evidence—which with the other sides. Points of Information 	reasonably and effective he debate appropriately and effici th may include facts and the How directly and effect the mation: How relevant as	ely the debaters and tently the debaters so references to authoritively the debaters and effective were the	support argument ority as well as go respond to the a ne questions and	ts with eneral knowledge rguments made the answers
and easily unde • Courtesy: How	courteous and respectfu	al the debaters were	to opponents an	d judges
each debater: (outteious, Prop 1: Good - Could not propide - Not clear evid - Finished 1st Ro	ence	Opp 1: Very - utiliz	Good in	
(Spend Time in)	repartion next			1 1 0 1 <i>t</i>
Good andel Same thing not able to provi	ous, free Time octe but ablive as in prop#1		y Grovel d I in delive	abator & bartner
TEAM CODE #:	<u>)4</u> on the (P	wins thi	s debate.	
REASON FOR DEC				class defuntion
& evidones	, I would vo	te for opp	Team.	

growth ford with a light THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE A.S. C. Company of the Company of th 1.51 MIY' The second production The second of th Marine Marine in Joseph Long Mary Geral . I. debate - and out property support of objecting withing and find the control of the faction for Not clean while of Marchael and Spaped areas quitelly there must compression, and thousands) dery fivel history parties production of the second I the floor mis can grainly work to Johnson Departure of France, W. Dale have full-yell reads through that When well (AA) have I all i englances I would not for the Team.

Rangual	PARLI Debate
Sutton, Jim (*7) Round 3 1:30pm East12 Gov: 5 Bokhari - Patel	Judge's Name: SV Hon
Opp: 17 Campanella - Petruska Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: 60 Well
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Patel pts 25 Prop Speaker #2 Bokkavi pts 25	Opp Speaker #1 Confonella pts 28 Opp Speaker #2 Notry ka pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Bo Mavi pts 25	Opp Speaker #2 Netruka pts 27
Please award each speaker points based	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
$26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	- / · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Juc	dging ¢ riteria
	vely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the debate	
	ently the debaters support arguments with
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	d references to authority as well as general knowledge
by the other side	ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
,	and effective were the questions and the answers
	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understandable	, ,
Courtesy: How courteous and respects	ful the debaters were to opponents and judges
each debater:	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Patel-Port read Lon Prop 1: your notes - male	Carplarella you've rong to be a
ere contact with indu. Tus	good desated from the gooding
ere contact until pidge. Tus unlustes is too sport.	Up weld a conclusion to all
Addraif Don 4 read to	Conforella you've point to be a good or desate! Scort the good or position. The ord pod or position. The weed a conclusion to all your greecher. Petrista Wear a tie and
notes. You need to come up	Opp 2: Dan 4 cheu gun. Great
unt won forments. Walk	exploratory of your aversen
notes. You need to come of who work for need to come of white ord "un's."	gen that you didn't have
TEAM CODE #: on the	gren that you lide 't brose of the wins this debate. Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	- becare they vehted all
All or went and wal	le pool orpments Mil AR
and vist relate, For t	le pool orprisents Mil Affe his land of topic oll of you I more - hour has!!
should have SMILEY	/ Worl - howe her.

	PARLI Debate
Raesfeld, Kathleen von (*14) Round 3 1:30pm East13 Gov: 5 Hsu - Sharma Opp: 15 Hendrickson - O'Connor	Judge's Name: Kathleen von Raesfeld
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Ono Academy
THE SECTION OF THE PROPERTY SECTION CONTRACTOR AND ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPERTY	in this is a supplied to the transfer of the supplied to the transfer of the supplied to the s
PROP Team Code #: 5	OPP Team Code #: 15
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 HSU	pts 27.75 Opp Speaker #1 O'Conner pts 28
Prop Speaker #2_Sharm	pts 28.5 Opp Speaker #2 Hendrickson pts 27.5
	ker points based on the following scale:
	Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) -20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
20-25 – Fair 24	-20 – Poor
	Judging Criteria
• Analysis: How reason	nably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments
offered during the deb	,
	priately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with
	include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
-	v directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made
by the other side	
 Points of Information 	n: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
• Delivery: How well the	he debaters speak in/an organized, communicative style that is pleasant
and easily understand	1
• Courtesy: How court	eous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges
Using the above criteria	, please offer/compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
	definitions Opp 1: + business-like start - GREAT ", + infirst speech you really "chased down" + infirst speech you really "chased down"
Prop 1:	definitions Opp 1: + OUSINESS-TIRE STAIN "Chosed dawn"
Prop 1: + (ordial, good Smile)	+ infirst speech you really chased about
t excellent examples	* support the topic and points with support - yay! The topic and points with support - yay!
- status que point we	- remember to stay engaged and try not
to argument to look up - remember to look up	from rotes I wolf out the window I porsussive
+ great job supporting	partner Hanking manner and "Cool" Points personal
Prop 2: + excellent we cont	act Upp 2: assion and empothy for the
+ passion and conne	dian-to-the to-strong point-well done!
+ passion and some	asive maling theres of corny vs crazy and
real world were person	dish restating that + excellent beauty and make a complete
real world were persur + Smooth-transitions and goo	argumant of drawing out now you continue to smile, take a
TEAM CODE #:	on the Prop wins this debate. deep breath 3 pause
	(Prop or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION	mathy there are corny vs crazy and the djob restating the tax excellent example of corny vs crazy and the djob restating the tax and the corny of the drawing out how you can't make a cometack argument of the drawing out how you can't make a cometack are remember to smile, take a remember to smile, take
- Dropped argument th	at corny as not grow society Just the act of the
- & Trop Kept definition	n "alive"
Excellent 10b on a	"tricky" topic!!
	•

Fishlow, Dan (*9) Round 3 1:30pm Room 107	Judge's Name: FISHLOW
Gov: 14 Raesfeld - Sappington Opp: 5 Bardalai - Rangwala Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Mranonte
ENTRECTIONS FORMACCO AND ADMINISTRATION ADMINISTRATION ADMINISTRATION AND ADMINISTRATION	manufaction de la distribution de la description
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Sappington pts 27 Prop Speaker #2 Rasseld pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Bardakai pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Raes leld pts 21	Opp Speaker #2 Projute of pts 27
27 = Good (but possibly not good	the following scale: atstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judgi	ng Criteria
 Evidence: How appropriately and efficient evidence—which may include facts and respective to the other side. Points of Information: How relevant and the other side. Delivery: How well the debaters speak in and easily understandable. Courtesy: How courteous and respectful. 	the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments of the debaters support arguments with references to authority as well as general knowledge is vely the debaters respond to the arguments made of effective were the questions and the answers an organized, communicative style that is pleasant the debaters were to opponents and judges climents and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1: Sapantin	Opp 1: Portalai
eye contact, companiele, personale	strong speaker; a Sle to turn organic in their favor Good comman of the coun
Prop 2: Raespet	Opp 2: Ranguale
lifed some good/powers but	Sold spanier; good verce.
se erned necuros	
of not gute produce athing	
	wins this debate. op or Opp)
REASON FOR DECISION:	
Did a better jos of showy that not all inne	vation is settland stuck more closely
to The Mapric. Hard Topic to de Soute	

Vejby, Mara (*1) Round 3 1:30pm East15 Gov: 4 Lanzone - Hubinger	Judge's Name: Mara Vejby
Opp: 8 Navarra - Nguyen Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Analy
PROP Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Hubinger pts 2	9 Opp Speaker #1 Navara pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Lanzone pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 13 Vegugen pts 26
	t good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior Judging Criteria
 evidence—which may include facts Argumentation: How directly and oby the other side Points of Information: How releva Delivery: How well the debaters spand easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respect 	efficiently the debaters support arguments with and references to authority as well as general knowledge effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made ant and effective were the questions and the answers eak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant extful the debaters were to opponents and judges compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Prop 1:	Oppt: Be caretal not to drop
Consider defining the debat hetaphorically rather than literally nesot time. with make your case much easier to out Prop 2: s' manage	le points made by the Prop. These arguments head to be addresse.
Very tunny :	Both and Imicable debote. Well done and best high to all
TEAM CODE #: 4 on t	the Prop or Opp) wins this debate.
	as Prop's arguments and bett
their comments too	apostesof to apply in their favor.

Noah, Harrison (*1) Round 3 1:30pm Room 109 Gov: 6 Murdock - Bazile Opp: 14 Stromberg - Miller Novice Parli Debate		Name: Harrison N	001 h
(N. N. COLOR AN ARTHER HOME OF THE ARMS TO ARRANGE TO A COLOR AND	maken kan taun maken kan maken m	·	
PROP		OPP /	
Team Code #:	Team	Code #: 124	
-			
Prop Speaker #1 Bazile	pts 28 Opp Speaker #	1 Millet	pts_ <u>27</u>
Prop Speaker #2 Mwdoch	pts 28 Opp Speaker	#2 Stromberg	pts_ <u>30</u>
Please award each speaker point	ts based on the following to 29 = Outstanding	U ,	TO THE COLUMN AND THE PROPERTY OF COLUMN
	_	, -	4-\
27 = Good (but possion) 26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Posion$	oly not good enough to quot $<20 = \text{Rese}$	rved for rude or inap	
	I live Coite		
	Judging Criteria		
 Analysis: How reasonably and offered during the debate 	l effectively the debate	rs analyze the topic a	and the arguments
• Evidence: How appropriately	and efficiently the deb	aters support argume	nts with
evidence—which may include			
-			-
• Argumentation: How directly	and effectively the del	baters respond to the	arguments made
by the other side	/		
 Points of Information: How in 	,	-	
 Delivery: How well the debate 	ers speak in an organiza	ed, communicative st	yle that is pleasant
and easily understandable	-/		-
Courtesy: How courteous and	respectful the debaters	were to opponents a	and judges
- Courtesy 110 W Courtedate and		word to opponents a	ara Jaages
Using the above evitoria places	offen sempliments en	Vor suggestions for	improvement to
Using the above criteria, please	mier compliments and	nor suggestions for	improvement to
each debater:			
/	1		•
Prop 1:		u did a great	
Very eloquent and exhibit		our case. Try	and add
a quiet confidence.		implications	to Topicality
work on adding evidence	, that argum	ent1.	
will make your speeche	1) longer		
Prop 2:	1 Opp 2:	\ .a a \	what future as
Green job handling a to	ugh Clearly	you have a	bright future as
debak. Try/and add m	ore a spec	iner. Next Step	e I debated before
refutations on opponents	incinal 1	don't have to	rely on emotional
TEAM CODE #: 14	on the Or w	ins this debate.	blear, tocas an
REASON FOR DECISION:	(Prop dr Opp)	C	inalytics.
Hitler is war	se than shu	99ies.	

Noah, Mariah (*1) Round 3 1:30pm East18 Gov: 6 Green - Madisor Opp: 15 Coelho - Siege			Judge's Name:	Marian	Noan
Novice Parli Debate			Judge's School	Affiliation:	raly
Team Code #:	PROP O		Team Code	OPP 5	
riop speaker #1	Madison	_pts <u>27</u>	Opp Speaker #1	Siegel	pts <u>27</u>
Please award	Green	_pts <u>26</u> _	Opp Speaker #2	coetho	pts <u>9_7</u>
Please award Please award 26-25 = Fair 26-25 = Fair Analysis: offered du Evidence: evidence: evidence: evidence: offered du Points of Delivery: and easily Courtesy: Using the abite each debater Prop 1: Vesolution Prop 2: Your definitions Prop 2: Your deson't me That you was a criterial was TEAM/CODE REASON FOR	How reasonably as aring the debate How appropriatel—which may include tation: How direct er side Information: How direct er side Information: How well the debaunderstandable How courteous are the courteast and the courteast are the courteast and the courteast are the courteast ar	Jud nd effective y and efficie de facts and effective y and effective y and effective de facts and effective offer con Luc Luc Luc Luc Luc Luc Luc Luc Luc Lu	Outstanding 28 = od enough to qualify <20 = Reserved ging Criteria ely the debaters and entry the debaters are references to authorively the debater and effective were to in an organized, could the debaters were appliments and/or so opp 1: Opp 1: Opp 2: Opp 2: And Opp 2: And Opp 3: Opp 3: Opp 4: Opp 5: Opp 6: Opp 7: Opp 7: Opp 8: Opp 8: Opp 8: Opp 9: Opp 9	yery Good for elimination roun for rude or inappr alyze the topic and support arguments ority as well as ge is respond to the arguments of the questions and to mmunicative style to opponents and suggestions for in Ruk definit A don't the arguments s with eneral knowledge rguments made the answers that is pleasant d judges inprovement to tian s Make sense Your time panding to lear a gument;	

50 Meg 10.WS.

arzuments

GOING BANANAS IS BETTER THAN BEING CORNY PARLI Debate

Macpherson, Michele (*3) Round 3 1309m Room 13 1309m Room	
Opp: 7 Little - Wagner Novice Parli Debate PROP Team Code #: Prop Speaker #1 STEPHEN GNEXT to 27 Opp Speaker #1 ABBY LITTLE pts 28 Prop Speaker #2 DYLAN HAN pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 NOAH WASNER 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 Team Code #: Prop Speaker #1 STEPHEN GNEED to 27 Prop Speaker #2 DYLAN HAN 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 He 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 debater's 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 Speaker #1 STEPHEN GNESS ts 27 Opp Speaker #1 ABBY LITTLE pts 28 Prop Speaker #2 DYLAN HAN pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 NOAH WASNER 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 effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:	
Prop Speaker #1 STEPHEN ENEXPISE 27 Opp Speaker #1 ABBY LITTLE pts 28 Prop Speaker #2 DYLAN HAN pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 NOAH WASNER 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 effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:	
Please award each speaker points based on the folloying 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 effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:	
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 effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:	
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:	
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor 20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior Judging Criteria Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:	
Judging Criteria Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:	
Judging Criteria Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate Evidence: How appropriately and effectively the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:	
 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: 	
 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: 	
 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: 	
 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: 	
 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: 	
 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: 	
 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: 	
 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: 	
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:	
• 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:	
Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:	
each debater:	
each debater:	
During to Company to the Company to	
Prop 1: STEPMEN Opp 1: ABBY	
SOOD CALM DELIVERY, COULD CALM DIRECT DEMEANOR	
ISE MORE FACTS AND EXAMPLES 6000 USE OF FACTS BUT	
OD EYE CONTACT, NETED TO FURTHER	
EXPLAIN YOUR ARGUMENT	
Pron 2: AVI AN I	
Prop 2: <u>OYLAN</u> Opp 2: <u>NOAH</u> SOOD DELIVERY, WORK ON BEST SPEAKER IN GROUP, CAL	2)
	•
PEAKING FOR A LONGER CLEAR PREDENTATION.	
DECIOD OF TIME USE MORE MITTING EXAMITORS.	
PELIFIC EXAMPLES TO PROVE PONT	
TEAM CODE #: on the OPP wins this debate.	
(Prop or Opp)	
DELCON FOR REGISTON	
CAND THE BY BOTH SIDES BUT NOT MANY FACTS AS THIS WAS	
TO DO	
THAT A HILL OPINION HERALD PROTONENTS MADE THE MINITE	
JUST A FUN OPINION DEBATE. PROPONENTS MADE THE MISTAK USING A "CORNY" JOKE AS AN ARGUMENT FOR GOING "BANA OPPOSITION USED DICTIONARY DEFINITION OF CORNY TO ARGUE T	NA

SIDE AND EFFECTIVELY REBUTTED PROPOSITIONS ARGUMENT

Chen, Ming (*5) Round 3 1:30pm Room 103 Gov: 15 Farkas - Cabral Opp: 6 Santana - Jones	Judge's Name: Mry Chem
Novice Parli Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS
PROP Team Code #: 15	Team Code #:6
Prop Speaker #1 Faykas 24	Opp Speaker #1 Jones pts 24
Prop Speaker #2 <u>Cabral</u> pts 23	Opp Speaker #2 Santage pts 24
Please award each speaker points based	,
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	lging Criteria
offered during the debateEvidence: How appropriately and effic	ely the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments iently the debaters support arguments with I references to authority as well as general knowledge
 Argumentation: How directly and effective by the other side 	ectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers
and easily understandable	in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant ful the debaters were to opponents and judges
each debater: Suggest for	apliments and/or suggestions for improvement to dence 21 from a provide of agentificance pretty flow argument. Buth sides agentificance pretty weak.
Prop 1: 13's a hard dipid and I think you did at good	estavisi / Ler argunts
job analyzing the topic	9 desse en pridence &
However, there was very little	opp 2: Your argument that people to
Prop 2: arguments.	Opp 2: Your argument that there to be having different opinions leads to be
you that had a good	of sceration doesn't seem to be sceration doesn't seem to be
but didn't finish your speech TEAM CODE #: on the	Sceration doesn't seem to surported by empirical evidence supported by empirical evidence please anoider using your nine to the argunds wins this debate! any out fetter. Prop or Opp) Guiled to provide any courter argunt
REASON FOR DECISION:	Prop or Opp)
The opposing team that having new i'a	leas is bad Ruther the argumits
are grite weak of la	Propor Opp) failed to provide any counter argumts leas is bad. Ruther the argumts ack evidence.

Lake, Abby (*15) Round 3 1:30pm Room 108 Gov: 8 Albers - Pell Opp: 13 Sundararama Novice Parli Debate		Judge's Name: Abby Lake Judge's School Affiliation: SCDS
Team Code #:_	PROP	Team Code #: /3
Prop Speaker #	1 Albers pts 25	Opp Speaker #1 <u>Bact Key</u> pts <u>25</u> Opp Speaker #2 <u>Sundararaman</u> pts <u>25</u>
Prop Speaker #	2 Albers pts/	Opp Speaker #2 <u>Sundararaman</u> pts <u>2</u> 5
Please awar 26-25 = Fai	27 = Good (but possibly not g	Outstanding 28 = Very Good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	.Jı	ıdging Criteria
 Evidence evidence Argume by the ot Points o Delivery and easil Courtes 	luring the debate e: How appropriately and eff which may include facts an ntation: How directly and eff her side f Information: How relevant : How well the debaters spear y understandable y: How courteous and respect bove criteria, please offer co	iciently the debaters support arguments with and references to authority as well as general knowledge fectively the debaters respond to the arguments made and effective were the questions and the answers k in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant afful the debaters were to opponents and judges ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
TEAM COD	"um's" (") Strong until the strong until the stellast speech seemed very rushed and unformal on the or DECISION:	Some of your points trailed off Opp 2: **Expression during the Speech Speech Speech Speech Speech Some explanations culture. **Were a bit unchar ** watch "ums" **e Opp wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)
stronger	rebuttal tha	onable points and a slightly in the aftirmation.