Junhui Zhou (*14)
Round 1 9:00am Room 141
Aff: 3 Schulte - Pham
Neg: 18 Carillo - Rowe
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Jun Hui Zhou

Judge's School Affiliation: Pinole Valley

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 18	
Aff Speaker #1 Pham	pts 25.5	Neg Speaker #1 Carillo	pts 25.5
Aff Speaker #2 Schulte	pts 26	Neg Speaker #2 Rowe	pts ~~25.5~~ 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

GENERAL FOR BOTH SIDES

① Speaking Drills
② Look at judge when speaking
③ Don't slouch
④ Don't be monotone and engage w/ evidence.
⑤ Keep track of time. Use real timers or use verbation

Aff 1: – Have terminal impacts, solvency, and uniqueness.
– Why is multipolarism better for IR? As opposed to unilateralism.

Aff 2:
– Link chain specific
space debris → multilateralism how?
– Lacking offense and defense
– TAR lacking analysis

Neg 1: – Dropped appearance in block
– Lacking offense and defense
– CP and DA is a bad strat
– Need to clash. 2NR was only able to ask relevant questions in CX.

Neg 2: ~~– TAR lacking, need to use to generate offense and defense, did not do that.~~
– Defense on link chain is missing.
– Don't be xenophobic. Treated China as Third world in appearance game. (may be somewhat true) but your framing of China was xenophobic.

TEAM CODE #: 18 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Presumption –
Both sides lacked convincing offense and defense so I err negative.

– Impact calc in 2NR was inadequate. Can't just say nuclear war w/o link chain and internals.
Comparing impacts & impact calc.
Need a) Reasoning b) Scope c) Time Frame

Kathy Curran
~~Adam Ruamont (*6)~~
Round 1 9:00am Room 143
Aff: 18 Hernandez - Jacobs
Neg: 7 ~~Lee~~ - Salazar
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Kathy Curran

Judge's School Affiliation: Sacred Heart

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #:	18	Team Code #:	7
Aff Speaker #1	Hernandez pts 26	Neg Speaker #1	Salazar pts 26
Aff Speaker #2	Jacobs pts 26	Neg Speaker #2	Lee pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Herr
Aff 1: good closing statement: "vote aff" and you reminded us of other team's weakness
- handled computer glitch w/ calm
- need to know material/presentation well enough to respond to cross exam well

Aff 2: (Jac) good public speaking voice
- asked good questions in cross exam
- explain better why she was defining "engagement"
- good use of preptime
- know material so can respond well

Neg 1: (Sal)
good use of facts
strong questions/cross exam
need to more clearly relate speech to topic early on
good rebuttal speech - easily understood

Neg 2: (Lee) good public speaking voice
- good references to other team's claims
- excellent, clear & accessible argument and language
- good explanation on how debris doesn't pose a threat

TEAM CODE #: 7 **on the** Neg **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Clear argument that debris and was threat not great - and shouldn't neglect human rights concerns of China

Shehzaib Raees (*3)
Round 1 9:00am Room 211
Aff: 19 Hill - Ramm
Neg: 18 Lakritz - Tonda
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: SHEHZAIB RAEES

Judge's School Affiliation: COLLEGE PREP

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #:	19-Hill-Ramm	Team Code #:	18 Lakritz - Tonda
Aff Speaker #1 Hill	pts 28.9	Neg Speaker #1 Tonda	pts 28.1
Aff Speaker #2 Ramm	pts 28.7	Neg Speaker #2 Lakritz	pts 28.2

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 **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

→ Also, face the judge & CX, not your opponent

(3) very good CX answers and explanations keep up the good work! → Also, great questions

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

Aff 1:

(1) Try to look up a bit more because it gives you an air of confidence and also gives you a bit of a breath if you stumble

(2) Practice reading the 1AC more → you sounded good and more work and time will help you sound even better → you also stumbled less by the end so working out the first few kinks will make it spotless

(4) Don't let them talk too much in CX ask more specific strategic questions

Neg 1:

(1) Be sure to get the 1NC together during CX so you don't have to use prep and make sure that you have it in order during your speech

(2) Read the tag, cite, and highlighted text of each card → that makes flowing easier

(3) Be confident! → you sound really good when you read so don't be mad/sad when you stumble a bit or lose your place

(4) You should be prepping during the 2AC and CX of the 2NC → that saves prep for the 2NR and gives you time

(5) learn speech times and orders!!

Aff 2:

(1) More eye contact makes you look better perceptually so try to look up a bit more if you can → that also comes with more experience so don't worry

(2) Be sure to apply your case arguments to the DA → e.g. space conflict increases the risk of U.S.-China war

(3) try and use all three minutes minutes that you didn't use in the 2AC reading more impact defense is always nice and extending case args always helps you

(4)

Neg 2:

(1) Stand up taller when you speak → I know it's rough when you don't have a stand but it makes you look better perceptually

(2) Try to read your evidence in order → you read a topicality card in the DA

(3) you should be flowing the 2AC and 2NR more closely; you could have taken advantage of some strategic blunders + dropped impact defense or new internal links on the DA

TEAM CODE #: 19Hill-Ramm **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

→ in space cooperation resolves U.S.-China conflict in space → also, spills over to other areas of coop that resolves other conflicts

also, be respectful during the other team's speeches

Never laugh or make snarky comments if they just don't work

Edmund Zagorin (*7)
Round 1 9:00am Room 102
Aff: 3 Anderson - Prabandham
Neg: 18 Gothelf - Kassner-Marks
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Edmund Zagorin

Judge's School Affiliation: Head Royce

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: CPS		Team Code #: Sonoma Academy	
Aff Speaker #1 Anderson	pts 28	Neg Speaker #1 Gothelf	pts 28.5
Aff Speaker #2 Prabandham	pts 29	Neg Speaker #2 Kassner-Marks	pts 28.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1:
- Need to practice 1AC more
- Refer to 2AC arguments in 1AR

Aff 2:
- Need to answer NC arguments, not just extend aff case
- Frame the question of the debate in 2AR

Neg 1:
- Answer 1AC case advantages
- Impact analysis

Neg 2:
- Answer 1AR arguments directly
- Be cooperative when you say why counterplan = better

TEAM CODE #: CPS **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Counterplan harms cooperation and space, risk of nuclear war

John Ngo (*9)
Round 1 9:00am Room 202
Aff: 18 Sullivan - Galusha
Neg: 3 Chung - Gutierrez
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: John Ngo

Judge's School Affiliation: Same Logan

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #:	18	Team Code #:	3
Aff Speaker #1	Galusha pts 27	Neg Speaker #1	Gutierrez pts 26
Aff Speaker #2	Sullivan pts 28	Neg Speaker #2	Chung 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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: - good supp. evid.

Neg 1: both: need more detail explaining
- speaker #2: need to keep track of your reasons & evids.

Aff 2: Reasoning & supports (good)

Neg 2: good detail proof of argument.

TEAM CODE #: 18 **on the** Aff **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
- Quicker respond with reasons & evids + proof, clearly delivered the issue.

CURR

Tina carr (*19)
Round 1 9:00am Room 100
Aff: 10 Aye - Rosenberg
Neg: 3 dhaliwal - Otavka
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Tina CURR

Judge's School Affiliation: St. Vincents High School

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 10		Team Code #: 3	
Aff Speaker #1 Zoe R	pts 28	Neg Speaker #1 Mannat	pts 29
Aff Speaker #2 Kelly	pts 27	Neg Speaker #2 Ruby	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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1:

Neg 1: Very clear and well spoken good use of facts

Aff 2:

Neg 2: Very good cross examination

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** Neg **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Imaan Sidhu (*3)
Round 1 9:00am Room 101
Aff: 7 Patterson - Sozat
Neg: 9 Bacong - Siva
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Imaan Sidhu

Judge's School Affiliation: CPS

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: PS		Team Code #: BS	
Aff Speaker #1 Patterson	pts 27.3	Neg Speaker #1 Bacong	pts 28
Aff Speaker #2 Sozat	pts 27.6	Neg Speaker #2 Siva	pts 27.8

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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Try not to read evidence during CX

Aff 1: Good understanding of impacts

Timeframe credibility

You can't doubt on China accepting as we only need to invite them, but how would trade increase if they don't say yes.

Make sure to stand up in CX

Aff 2: Avoid cards in the 2AR

(You don't have to stand during your partners speech)

On then off

You read a Xi card that says TPP bad
No impact to trade
2AC is a little light on case debate
Establish an order and keep it

No TF (Congress) FIAT

Neg 1:

Good fan on the spot INC
Great CX

Good signposting
Good efficiency and Line by Line
Know the 4 parts of a DA: Uq, L, I/L, U

Try and poke some holes in these evidence

Neg 2:

You read some space cards that don't really apply
You read good cards but extend some INC cards
Threat vs War
You can use all of your prep
~~Read~~ Try and use all of your prep

Off then On

Avoid reading cards in your 2NR

Good line by line

TEAM CODE #: BS **on the** Neg **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

Good analytic about China threat

REASON FOR DECISION

Ultimatley I decide that the chance of the aff solving for some of the impacts that have been taken out is low, I wouldn't have voted on the DA if it was in the 2NR because they dropped Kissinger, but there wasn't enough case answers in the 2AC or 1AR to vote aff

Mimi Sargent-Leventhal (*18)
Round 1 9:00am Room 200
Aff: 3 Berning - Tooper
Neg: 10 Yuan - Lichtmacher
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Mimi Sargent-Leventhal

Judge's School Affiliation: hired / Sonoma Academy

AFF		NEG	
7:28 Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	10
6:30 Aff Speaker #1	Chris Berning pts 25	Neg Speaker #1	Paul Lichtmacher pts 29
Aff Speaker #2	Nicole Tooper pts 26	Neg Speaker #2	Devin Yuan pts 28

4.05

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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Both: extremely kind & courteous. Nice job! In particular the 1N.

Aff 1: Make sure to time your 1AC ahead of time so you can get through all the cards.
Work on giving roadmaps!
Consider what your strongest arguments are vs. each of their positions in the 1AR

Aff 2: Talk w/ your coach about emailing cards + what exactly needs to be sent!
Make sure you're only answering the arguments they went for in the 2AR!

Neg 1: Good case analytics in the 1NC
Good job w/synthesis of your arguments!
Try to take arguments that your partner didn't (split the block) to cover more arguments
Good job reminding your partner to extend an impact in the 2NR!

Neg 2: Start each 2NC position with a brief "overview" or explanation of the position and its impact calculus (for the DA)
I know it can be frustrating when the other team has [illegible] problems, but try to be more zen about it.
Great job analyzing case - i.e. both teams solve
Work on thinking through the DA story before the 2NC.

TEAM CODE #: 10 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
CP solves the whole case with a human rights net benefit. 2AR did not articulate a solvency deficit or real impact to "animosity." So human rights outweigh.



A	N
4:25	6:06
	3:35
	0:00

Mia Gil-Epner (*18)
Round 1 9:00am Room 203
Aff: 10 Wu - Tokarzewski
Neg: 3 hash - Jammula
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Mia Gil Epner

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 10		Team Code #: 3	
Aff Speaker #1 Tokarzewski	pts 28.5	Neg Speaker #1 Hash	pts 27
Aff Speaker #2 Wu	pts 28	Neg Speaker #2 Jammula	pts 27.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Email w. questions: Miagilepner@gmail.com

Aff 1: Don't mark so many cards in 1AC
I don't agree that the 2NC args were new, but if they were it's ok, it's a constructive

Aff 2: make sure to save enough time for the DA in the 2AC, although it ended up fine in this debate
The arg isn't dropped if not in the 2NC, could be in the 1NR
Don't interrupt the 1NR

Neg 1: stay confident! You're making good args but seem unsure of yourself
extend the disad so you have offense in the debate

Neg 2: You don't need to tell them the exact cards you'll read in the roadmap
you had a minute left in the 2NC, could have read the Taiwan cards

TEAM CODE #: 10 **on the** aff **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
Neg was good on case defense but didn't have a disad, risk the case solves → Aff

Rose Macias

~~Hendri Tjandra~~ (*9)
Round 1 9:00am Room 209
Aff: 7 Dupee - Wogan
Neg: 3 Nurko - Gupta
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Rose Macias

Judge's School Affiliation: Logan

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 7		Team Code #: ~~Gupta~~ 3	
Aff Speaker #1 Wogan	pts 28	Neg Speaker #1 Gupta	pts 27
Aff Speaker #2 Dupree	pts 26	Neg Speaker #2 Nurko	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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1:

- Very poised.
- Raise voice volume slightly
- Remained poised during cross fire
- Defended position well

Aff 2:

- Good voice volume
- Appeared slightly nervous. Papers kept moving/shaking. Use of clipboard would hide this.
- try to say "um" less often
- spoke past allotted time just over 2 min.
- organized information

Neg 1:

- Organized argument.
- Speaking too quickly caused "tongue tied" incidents from time to time.
- Ran overtime just under 2 min.

Neg 2:

- Very poised
- Great voice volume
- Spoke past allotted time by 3 minutes

TEAM CODE #: 7 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Both teams had organized & substantiated arguments. They were both respectful in addressing each other. Although the Neg team gave a slightly better delivery, the Aff team stayed within the parameters better.

Johanna Ilfeld (*3)
Round 1 9:00am Room 205
Aff: 10 Schelstrate - Win
Neg: 19 Marzo - Stolp
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Jo Ilfeld

Judge's School Affiliation: College Prep

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 10		Team Code #: 19	
Aff Speaker #1 Schelstrate	pts 29	Neg Speaker #1 ~~Schelst~~ Stolp	pts 28
Aff Speaker #2 Win	pts 28	Neg Speaker #2 Marzo	pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: Watch the "likes" in x examination
Very smooth initial delivery
Nice rebuttal in talking on NEG points

Aff 2: A bit halting in speech
You seemed to get flustered and lose track of your argument

Neg 1: Questions didn't seem well thought-out in 1st x-examination
Good x-examination questions
Occasional stopping & confusion during 1st negative construction
Overall good diction & command of material

Neg 2: You seemed glued to your notes and not very familiar with them
Hard to understand your argument
Some of your rebuttal argument seems to duplicate the 1st neg rebuttal

TEAM CODE #: 10 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Aff presented more coherent and able-to-be followed arguments and addressed NEG's points in rebuttal. NEG had some good points but was harder to follow both in organization & delivery

Tag team

Carl Siva (*9)
Round 1 9:00am Room 201
Aff: 3 Dileep - Ilfeld
Neg: 10 Jerrar - Rosenfeld
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Carl Siva

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	Dale RJ 10
Aff Speaker #1	Ilfeld pts 25	Neg Speaker #1	~~Rosenfeld~~ Jerrar pts 27
Aff Speaker #2	Dileep pts 26	Neg Speaker #2	Rosenfeld pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Ilfeld

Aff 1: Needs eye contact, clear speaking improvement, slow speech down, Very factual, Good detail, Not good counter point arguments, passive

Aff 2: Good pace, nervous, Great summary of issues. Emphasized points concisely & simply. Articulate impact on not responding to counter human rights issues/part

Counter Rosen

Neg 1: Good cross examination, Aff could not counter on military action

(Jerrar) Speech too fast, no eye contact, Nice detail & persistence, Focus human rights ~~vs pain~~,

Neg 2: Improve conciseness, read through section, no eye contact, fragmented points, Good impact assessment, war not inevitable

Counter Jaber

Agreed w/ Aff ~~care~~ condition

Good references to historical events. Focus too much on one dimension

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Howard Murayama (*9)
Round 1 9:00am Room 212
Aff: 3 Paoletti - Zhang
Neg: 18 Crean - Needleman
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Howard Murayama

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 18	
Aff Speaker #1 Zhang	pts 28	Neg Speaker #1 Crean	pts 28
Aff Speaker #2 Paoletti	pts 27	Neg Speaker #2 Needleman	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: Very clear presentation ~~of~~ in opening arguments. Engagement very good and contentions ~~strong~~.
1AR strong on addressing coop, weaker on dangers of space debris - should address Appeasement Disadv.

Aff 2: Good follow-up to Aff 1 positions. However, arguments addressing Neg 1 on topicality and Appeasement Disadv. weren't have been more effective.
~~2AR emphasis on importance of human~~

Neg 1: Topicality, Appeasement Disadv and Counterplan creative and effective. Stumbled a bit on current US-China coop being limited to small venture
2NR emphasis on importance of human rights wraps up Neg's argument.

Neg 2: very good response to why coop is current working without debris issue. Arguments for ~~econ~~ economic interdependence-preventing war and strength of US commerical sector persuasive.
1NR statement on human rights too general and conclusions too optimistic.

2AR was ~~very~~ good and a nice rebuttal approach.

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Aff's reasons for removing the Wolf Amendment countered nicely by Neg on appeasement and human rights. Aff did not provide compelling rebuttal to these two points. However, as 2AR summarized, ~~which~~ while these are laudable, subject was on cooperation.

Lucas Tung

~~Ben Unanaowo (*9)~~
Round 1 9:00am Room 139
Aff: 3 Gupta - Kumar
Neg: 14 Kelly - Mart
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Lucas Tung

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 14	
Aff Speaker #1 Gupta	pts 27	Neg Speaker #1 Kelly	pts 28
Aff Speaker #2 Kumar	pts 29	Neg Speaker #2 Mart	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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: Don't assume the judge knows the resolution. Didn't hear any framework, or plan text.
- speaks very monotone and quietly.
- no eye contact
- responds by restating evidence. Think & analyze

Aff 2: Great delivery
- should roadmap speech before jumping into it.
- sign post responses. Needs more eye contact
- asks a lot of leading questions.

Neg 1: Good voice projection and articulation.
- doesn't provide any framework or eye contact
- needs to convey with fiery passion
- point out where opponents didn't ~~agree~~ respond

Neg 2:
- decent articulation and pacing. Monotone delivery and not much eye contact
- Don't ~~really~~ have lots articulation.
- never heard the resolution of ~~framework~~ time round or f/w.

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Rebuttals for both side could use some improvement. Aff mostly restated evidence as a responses. Neg didn't link their responses well enough. Neg at least provided impact calculus in the 2NR, which really helped. Aff had a lot of good rebuttals, but came a little late to be effective.

Rodney Gothelf (*18)
Round 1 9:00am Room 144
Aff: 7 Aguda - Prather
Neg: 3 Goldstone - Patel
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: RODNEY GOTHELF

Judge's School Affiliation: SONOMA ACADEMY

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #:	7	Team Code #:	3
Aff Speaker #1	PRATHER pts 27	Neg Speaker #1	PATEL pts 27
Aff Speaker #2	AGUDA pts 27	Neg Speaker #2	GOLDSTONE pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: GENERALLY ORGANIZED + USED EVIDENCE → GOT BETTER AS TIME WENT ON → SPOKE FAST BUT ENUNCIATED / ARTICULATE

Aff 2: GOOD POINTS MADE TO RE-AFFIRM AFF 1 → USED EVIDENCE BUT SOMETIMES COULD BE MORE CLEAR BUT ORGANIZED W/ PARTNER

Neg 1: REASONABLE ARGUMENT BUT SPOKE PAST AFF ARGUMENT POINTS OFTEN. NEED MORE DIRECT/FOCUSED ARGUMENTS → SOMETIMES TOO BROAD → BUT SPOKE CLEARLY AND MADE GOOD POINTS

Neg 2: ALSO MADE GOOD POINTS → AGAIN, SOMEWHAT BROAD RESPONSE TO POINTS OF AFF - OVERALL GOOD

TEAM CODE #: 7 **on the** Aff **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

BOTH SIDES DID REALLY WELL → VERY DIFFICULT DECISION → AFF MADE SLIGHTLY CLEARER ARGUMENTS W/R/T CLIMATE CHANGE WHICH BECAME A FOCUS FOR BOTH SIDES, FOR EXAMPLE. AGAIN, BOTH SIDES REALLY GOOD.

Becky Choi (*10)
Round 1 9:00am Room 142
Aff: 18 Synek - Elder
Neg: 3 Hoge - Tandon
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Becky Choi

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell High School

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 18		Team Code #: 3	
Aff Speaker #1 Elder	pts 28	Neg Speaker #1 Hoge	pts 27.5
Aff Speaker #2 Synek	pts 27	Neg Speaker #2 Tandon	pts 28.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: · During CX, use author & date to address which card.
· Good using all rebuttal time and answering link by link!
· Ext. cards & warrants.

Aff 2: · good cites in CX!
· say "and" / "next" to clarify next argument.
· Don't reread cards!

Neg 1: · say "and"/"next" to clarify the next argument.
· use cites to address CX q's as well.
· Don't read off cards when asked to clarify, explain in own words.
· Give reading
- use up rebuttal time! Extend cards/read new cards to back up. Good explain on turns case !!

Neg 2: · use cites in speech & CX.
· Good analytics!
- Use up all rebuttal time
- ~~good~~

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** Neg **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Aff dropped Appeasement DA, Aff needs to do more work on why US & China coop is good & answering uniqueness arguments. Neg had a lot of warrants and analytics and UQ args and turns case arg.

Patrick Hoge (*3)
Round 1 9:00am Room 214
Aff: 19 Curr - Nielsen
Neg: 7 Diaw - Reichel
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Patrick Hoge

Judge's School Affiliation: College Preparatory School

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #:	19	Team Code #:	7
Aff Speaker #1	Nielsen pts 28	Neg Speaker #1	Diaw pts ___
Aff Speaker #2	___ pts ___	Neg Speaker #2	Reichel pts 24

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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: Ms. Nielsen gave a focused argument backed with evidence that was carefully enumerated. Better enunciation and modulation of sentences would help clarity. Also, it would be good to look at the audience periodically. Ms. Nielsen also answered the cross exam questions with focus and brevity.

Neg 1: Ms. Diaw asked clear cross exam questions.

Neg 2: Ms. Reichel's speech was not responding to the affirmative at all, and her team subsequently forfeited. She also read in a monotone mumble. Her argument seemed unfocused and wandering.

TEAM CODE #: 19 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

DOUBLE WIN