PARLI Debate

Dara, Ramesh (*11)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 220
Gov: 14 Woo - Melman
Opp: 5 Hinchcliff - McKinney
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: RAMESH DARA
Judge's School Affiliation: TENNESSE HIGH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>Team Code #:</th>
<th>Opp</th>
<th>Team Code #:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #1</td>
<td>Melman</td>
<td>pts 27</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #2</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>pts 28</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

**Prop 1:**
- Very nice speech with good points.

**Opp 1:**
- A very good speech.
- A lot of repetition in rebuttal.

**Prop 2:**
- Relax - great, friendly takes nervousness out to start off.
- Awesome rebuttal.

**Opp 2:**
- Very good speech.

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the **Opp** wins this debate.

(REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop did not start with a good plan but did an awesome rebuttal.)
Prop

1. Better representation.
2. By contribution be
   public — no democracy
3. —

Opp

1. Political freedom.
2. Widening RIGHT to vote.
   Require quotas.
   Fair to me.
3. Political education.
   — Awesome time?
   Celebrity vs. politician.
4. Good Leadership endorsement
   (external force).
   There's RIGHT with FREEDOM
   Popular vs. Experienced
   — RAIO decisions
   Chir's not to vote.

Which

1. Status quo.
   Quality of life no better when dead.
Dara, Ramesh (*11)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 220
Gov: 26 Goody - Sherman
Opp: 27 Cohen - Lemenager
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: RAMESH DARA
Judge's School Affiliation: ITHAVINGTON HIGH

Prop
Team Code #: 26
Prop Speaker #1: Goody pts 29
Prop Speaker #2: Sherman pts 27

Opp
Team Code #: 27
Opp Speaker #1: Cohen pts 29
Opp Speaker #2: Lemenager 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:
PROACTIVELY CONCEIVED ALL THE PROPOSITION -- Good Job.

Prop 2:
YOU ARE A GOOD SPEAKER -- BUT CONTINUOUSLY PROMPTING PUT YOU OFF THE TRACK.

Opp 1:
AWESOME SPEAKER -- RIGHT SPEED, CLARITY OF THOUGHT WELL PRESENTED -- AWESOME JOB.

Opp 2:
DONE WELL -- MAKE A POINT AND GO FOR SCENARIOS/EXAMPLES.

TEAM CODE #: 26 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
A very close call. First round goes to Opp.
Rebuttal went to Prop.
An awesome debate overall.
**PRO**

The US should ban the death penalty.

1. **DEATH PENALTY → REHABILITATION**
   - 1/10 found INNOCENT.
   - No turning back.
   - EXPENSIVE.
   - HIGHEST CRIME WITH DEATH PENALTY.
   - EXECUTION EXPENSIVE THAN LIFE IN PRISON.
   - $2000 MORE.
   - RACIAL DISCRIMINATION.

2. **KILLING IS OK → MESSAGE**
   - RACISM ONLY FOR DEATH.
   - CHANCE TO REHABILITATION LEADS TO LESS DEATHS.
   - OVERALL DEATHS WILL BE LESS.
   - MORE ECONOMIC - SAVES MORE TIME.

3. **CAPTURED" # DOES NOT KILL**
   - 17 PEOPLE MORE + 1 MORE SLAVE.
   - MONEY ON EXECUTION = "REHABILITATION."

**OPP.**

4. **INNOCENTS ARE ANYWAY KILLED BY MURDERERS.**
   - EXPENSIVE? BUILD INFRASTRUCTURE.
   - INSANE CRIME REHABILITATION?
   - RACIAL IS NOT SPECIFIC.
   - LET STATES DECIDE.

5. **ESCAPES FROM PRISON =) DEATHS.**
   - OUR MONEY TO PROTECT CRIMINALS THAT KILLS CHILDREN.

PREVENT 17 FUTURE DEATHS.
REHABILITATION CAN BE EXPENSIVE.
VALUE OBEVJU US NET BENEFITS.
Fulop, Anna (*24)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 228
Gov: 20 Le - Rather
Opp: 7 Kaura - Gajula
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge’s Name: Anna Fulop
Judge’s School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley High School

PARLI Debate

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: Le: 28
When you maintain eye contact and don’t lock down onto your paper too much, you are a very effective speaker. Well-delivered counter arguments.

Prop 2: Rather: 29
I was impressed with how much confidence and pace you spoke with. You are an effective debater. Keep it up!

Opp 1: Kaura: 25
To be a more effective speaker, practice delivering your points with more confidence. If you want to issue the definition of a word or you have a different definition, justify why you are right. This will strengthen your case.

Opp 2: Gajula: 18
Even though Prop was wrong, you should not interrupt or speak out of turn. I take into consideration Prop was wrong, however, it is important to defend the position.

TEAM CODE #: 20 on the prop wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
Pro had better delivery and argued points case more effectively by retuting well.
**Fulop, Anna (*24)**

**Round 1B 9:00am Room 228**

**Gov:** Wei - Zheng

**Opp:** Rettenmaier - Pineda

**Parliamentary Debate/Novice**

---

**PROP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Code #: 23</th>
<th>Prop Speaker #1: Wei</th>
<th>Prop Speaker #2: Zheng</th>
<th>Team Code #: 14</th>
<th>Opp Speaker #1: Rettenmaier</th>
<th>Opp Speaker #2: Pineda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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: Wei**
  - Your points were effectively supporting your resolution. Your voice is clear and your confidence when you speak adds to your persuasion. Try to bring up your points early in your turn to speak. I like that you used relevant supporting evidence.
- **Opp 1: Rettenmaier**
  - In order to strengthen your case, improve your argumentation by making sure you refute all of your opponent's contentions. Your confidence and eye contact aid your delivery.
- **Prop 2: Zheng**
  - Consider speaking with more confidence (for example, maintain more eye contact with the judge) in order to strengthen your cases.
- **Opp 2: Pineda**
  - You're an effective speaker because you maintain clear eye contact. Try using more supportive evidence to strengthen your contentions.

---

**TEAM CODE #: 23** on the **Prop** wins this debate.

**REASON FOR DECISION:**

& Overall, better supporting evidence for contentions.
Young, Wendy (*27)  
Round 1A 9:00am Room 210  
Gov: 23 Habib - Keshav  
Opp: 11 Chippa - Cherukuri  
Parliamentary Debate/Novice  

**PARLI Debate**  
Judge’s Name: Wendy Young  
Judge’s School Affiliation: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>OPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Code #: 23</td>
<td>Team Code #: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #1: Keshav pts 26</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #1: Srenath Chippa pts 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #2: Habib pts 29</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #2: Cherukuri pts 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:**
Maeda opened the debate with good contentions of voting reflecting the will of the citizens. He secured voting would reflect the will of 500 people. Good arguments but lead from Keshav lacked emotion.

**Opp 1:**
Chippa has a strong vocabulary and will do well in debate 2! More experience, good argument and caught what aff dropped quickly.

**Prop 2:**
Aidom was on top of the debate. He clearly knew debate to the letter of the law.

**Opp 2:**
Viliani will get stronger with more debate experience. He seems like a think intellectual to work well with his partner.

TEAM CODE #: 11 on the **Prop** wins this debate.

**Reason for Decision:**
While I felt the aff team had a good argument they never identified how they were going to get the message to lower income communities to vote on how they were going to get them to the polls to place their ballot. This would have won the ->
honest for them! Nog argued using first amendment of speech vs no speech was pretty solid. Though to refute and she didn't really try to amend the 1st amendment to include citizens must vote to enjoy the freedoms offered by the U.S.
Young, Wendy (*27)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 210
Gov: 14 Luk - Tserennamid
Opp: 20 Alam - Nguyen
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge’s Name: Wendy Young
Judge’s School Affiliation: London 27

PROP
Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Luk pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Tserennamid pts 27

OPP
Team Code #:
Opp Speaker #1 Alam pts 28
Opp Speaker #2 Nguyen 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: I really like the way she spoke. She used very clear and concise language to present arguments. Very good job!
Opp 1: Alam - great speaker and used his time wisely. When he had completed his case, he was still left with time to clarify.

Prop 2: Magi brought more life evidence to the team. I think she scored points lost when side showed up.
Opp 2: Nguyen is strong - factual and supported his points. Cases were clearly supported. Arguments were against the propositions.

TEAM CODE #: 20 on the Prop wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
Neg arguments were reasonable enough to create enough doubt in the judge's decision. Off continued on their line of reasoning but did not refute them as well as they could have.
US Should Require Citizens to Vote in Elections

**PROP**

**Team Code**: 20

**Prop Speaker #1**: Valle pts 27

**Prop Speaker #2**: Pollard pts 37

**Opp**

**Team Code**: 14

**Opp Speaker #1**: Lee pts 28

**Opp Speaker #2**: Fairchild pts 27

---

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

**Prop 1**: Fines, Canada: Education

1. Democratic Issues
2. Know Needs
3. No Ignoring

**Prop 2**: Recaptured points and counterpoints. Relyed on memes heavily

**Opp 1**: 1. Education - Don't Care

Big False Points
Countered Democratic Point
Vote - No Benefit, Harm from PAC's Issue
Good Use of Time
Strong Summation

**Opp 2**: Brief and Clear Counter to Democratic Argument for Freedom and Education

---

**TEAM CODE**: 14

**OPP wins this debate**

**REASON FOR DECISION**: The opp countered the 2 AFF points and landed a strong point about harm from Super PAC's that went unaddressed.
Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and suggestions for improvement to each debater. 

Prop 2: 

Summary: 

1. Analysis: How reasonably and effectively do the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered? 
2. Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently do the debaters support arguments with evidence—whether it be facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge? 
3. Argumentation: How directly and effectively do the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side? 
4. Points of Information: How relevant and appropriate do the debaters provide questions and answers? 

Judging Criteria: 

• Analysis: How reasonably and effectively do the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered? 
• Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently do the debaters support arguments with evidence—whether it be facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge? 
• Argumentation: How directly and effectively do the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side? 
• Points of Information: How relevant and appropriate do the debaters provide questions and answers? 

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

Prop Speaker #1: 

28.0 pts 

Prop Speaker #2: 

26.25 = Fair 

Opp Speaker #1: 

28.0 pts 

Opp Speaker #2: 

24.20 = Poor

REASONS FOR DECISION:

The Prop provided a clean map with cogent points and the ability to connect. The Opp, however, lacked organization and coherent points. The Prop presented a more coherent argument and maintained a stronger point. The Opp was weaker in analysis and had less relevant evidence. The Prop also provided more effective points of information. 

TEAM CODE #:

5

OPP

Opp wins this debate.
PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: SANKARAN
Judge's School Affiliation: DUHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>OPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Code #: 20</td>
<td>Team Code #: 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #1: JEREZ pts 26</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #1: SCOTT pts 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #2: MORAN pts 27</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #2: AMBROSE pts 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: Make more eye contact. Use your clock wisely and don't leave time unspent. Time and cost factors were used very effectively in your arguments.
Prop 2: Your points about "not yet 18" so they don't know how long it takes to vote don't hold water. That speaker 1's claim about lack of agents of enforcement as a dropped point.

TEAM CODE #: 24 on the OPP wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:

Neil's arguments were more forceful and largely went unrefuted. The use of "agents of enforcement" bringing up time and cost arguing that forcing people to vote leads to careless voting were all effective. I encourage PROP to consider focusing on a couple of points of argument, making forceful arguments, using the clock to dive deep and reinforcing them at each opportunity. Show more conviction.
PARLI Debate

Sankaram, Nandakumar (*7)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 204
Gov: 11 Arshad - Sankar
Opp: 14 Bystrom - Gast
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: SANKARAN
Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

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

TEAM CODE #: 14

PROP 1

Prop Speaker #1 SANKAR pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 ARSHAD pts 27

OPP 1

Opp Speaker #1 GAST pts 28
Opp Speaker #2 BYSTROM pts 28

TEAM CODE #: 14

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

Prop 1: Very methodical in laying down your points - you could have dived deeper into some of your points to support your emotional arguments! For instance, you mentioned 88% of criminologists claiming it is not a deterrent. But no further reinforcement.

Opp 1: Very articulate. Showed a lot of conviction. Effective in poking holes though opponent’s arguments. Your claim that it hurts economy and have not a net benefit largely went uncontested substantively.

Prop 2: Tighten your focus on a couple of points. You also focused more on an emotional strategy of argumentation which turned out harder to defend with your opponents.

Opp 2: Well supported your partner’s points and strongly refuted your opponent’s points without sounding disagreeable.

TEAM CODE #: 14 on the OPP wins this debate.

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Enjoyed the debate, particularly the courtesy and camaraderie among the debaters. Opp's arguments held sway and were effective overall. They reinforced partner's positions better overall.
PARLI Debate

Whitmore, Gerald (*4)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 221
Gov: 14 Holwitz - Kay
Opp: 26 Clark - Flanagan
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Team Code #: 14
Prop Speaker #1 Holwitz pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Kay pts 25

Team Code #: 26
Opp Speaker #1 Flanagan pts 27
Opp Speaker #2 Clark pts 26

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

Judging Criteria

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

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


Opp 1: Improve definition of contention. When eye contact was established strong presentation of ideas. Took time to manage anxiety. Good ideas to take this time.

Prop 2: Well organized. Managed anxiety well. Solid definition of contentions work on eye contact.

Opp 2: Take time to manage anxiety. He got rattled and wasn't able to stay on track. I could see behind good ideas to present but could not due to his anxiety.

TEAM CODE #: 14 on the Prop wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop won due to their well organized presentation and summary of contentions and excellent rebuttals. They also used a POI in a clever manner.
**PARLI Debate**

**Whitmore, Gerald (*)4**  
Round 1B 9:00am Room 221  
Gov: 14 Lawrence - Privalov  
Opp: 20 Byrne - Pareja  
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Code #</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>OPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop Speaker #1</th>
<th>Lawrence</th>
<th>pts 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opp Speaker #1</td>
<td>Byrne</td>
<td>pts 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop Speaker #2</th>
<th>Privalov</th>
<th>pts 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opp Speaker #2</td>
<td>Pareja</td>
<td>pts 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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 relevant and effective were the questions and the answers.
- **Courtesy**: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges.

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

**Prop 1**: Very well defined and stated contentions. When eye contact was made the judge was more engaged. Try not to look out of the window to manage anxiety.

**Opp 1**: Incredible use of examples to create a narrative to define and demonstrate contentions/refuted contentions well. Very well managed anxiety. Outstanding effort.

**Prop 2**: Good use of PCI. Improper organization: Started and stopped direction of presentation. Loosed disorganized with 100% He & Color.

**Opp 2**: Refuted contentions of Affirmation well. Try to improve eye contact & management of anxiety.

**TEAM CODE #: 20 on the (Prop or Opp)** wins this debate.

**REASON FOR DECISION:**

Opp won this debate due to well defined and stated contentions. They were also able to be more organized & refuted Aff contentions successfully.
**PARLI Debate**

Firsov, Oleksandr (*5)  
Round 1A  9:00am  Room 222  
Gov: 14 Chao - Wang  
Opp: 25 Lacombe - Appel  
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>OPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Code #: 14</td>
<td>Team Code #: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #1: Wang pts: 26</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #1: Victoria Lacombe pts: 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #2: Chao pts: 26</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #2: Appel pts: 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

**Prop 1:**  
- Good POI outlining: impact on the future, any voice still carries value.
- Could use more attention for technicality. Suggestion of own POI to Opp.

**Opp 1:**  
- POI tone decent and interesting, great technicality.
- Attention to Opp. Timing and direct eye contact as wr/ judge as the team.

**Prop 2:**  
- Good reasoning on change the value to policy round. Respect would be nice to play more of Opp's POI, there was plenty of space.

**Opp 2:**  
- Great presentation skills, response on opposite POIs and elaboration of own.

**TEAM CODE #: 25** on the **OPP** wins this debate.

**REASON FOR DECISION:**
- Points and presentation, technicality where on OPP side.
Firsov, Oleksandr (*5)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 222
Gov: 14 Chan - Foley
Opp: 14 Chan - Foley
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: OLEKSANDR FIRSOV
Judge's School Affiliation: CAMPO

... 7 Bardalai - Rangwala

Team Code #: 7  Team Code #: 14
Prop Speaker #1 Bardalai pts 30 Opp Speaker #1 Chan pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Rangwala pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 Foley pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Great emotional and in same time rational speech, good attention to points
Opp 1: Strong argumentation, interaction on audience ref. to po. Memorable the "motivational factors" as result of bar.

Prop 2:
Opp 2:

TEAM CODE #: 7 on the prop wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both teams been strong and it is a close match. Bardalai last speech won as emotional, well planned and laid out conclusion.
Brogan, John (*2)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 206
Gov: 14 Situ - Zhang
Opp: 20 Afzal - Kelly
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: John Brogan
Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROJ 14
Team Code #: 
Prop Speaker #1 Zhang pts 25
Opp Speaker #1 Kelly pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Situ pts 25
Opp Speaker #2 Afzal 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:
Eye contact needs improvement
Appears nervous
Better read own written notes

Opp 1:
Started with definition
Lots of some loss of impact
Good eye contact, good presentation skill, did not read notes (good)

Prop 2:
Good presentation skills
Obama can be a Debbie that took me off the point, nipped

Opp 2:
Made good point on vote for candidate vs. laws
Good response on Trump

TEAM CODE #: 20

on the (Prop or Opp) wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
Team 20 made better, more direct responses to opponent's position.
Brogan, John (*2)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 206
Gov: 26 Sheridan - Sappington
Opp: 23 Deng - Luo
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: John Brogan
Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PRO

Team Code #: 26
Prop Speaker #1 Sheridan pts 24
Opp Speaker #1 Luo pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Sappington pts 26
Opp Speaker #2 Deng 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:
Should the police have an overview of all crimes when it comes to art theft?
Organize thoughts better. Did not respond to Opp's position (distinction as to mass murderers)

Opp 1:
Good direct responses, good point by point. Clearly understands points.

Opp 2:
Good introduction, said that he was going to do but then did not repeat his side's position and rationale

TEAM CODE #: 23 on the Prop or Opp wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
Team 23 better organized their arguments and presented them more coherently. Team 26 did not attack Team 23's distinction on mass murderers.
Sutton, Emma (*12)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 205
Gov: 2 Archibald - Hohmeyer
Opp: 4 Thomas - Ralston
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge’s Name: 
Judge’s School Affiliation: 

---

Team Code #: PROP
Team Code #: OPP

Prop Speaker #1: Ellen Archibald pts 26
Opp Speaker #1: Nadia Ralston pts 29
Prop Speaker #2: Ina Hohmeyer pts 25
Opp Speaker #2: Rustin Thomas 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: Your speaking style needs to be more organized. Label your contentions. Definitions? Judging criteria? Don't give them so much time with questions!
Prop 2: Good job sticking it out against a well-organized attack. Refuted most arguments. Dropped their constitutional argument—don't drop!!

Opp 2: Very well-organized speech! Followed up on all arguments.

TEAM CODE #: O'Dowd on the 
(PROP or OPP) wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp presented a well-organized case & effectively carried their arguments. (I didn't buy the top call argument—they did have a case, just a somewhat disorganized one.)
PARLI Debate

Sutton, Emma (*12)  
Round 1B  9:00am Room 205  
Gov: 14 Kerr Stein - Lee  
Opp: 2 Hemerling - Barnett  
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name:  Emma Sutton  
Judge's School Affiliation: John Scott HS

Team Code #:  Lowell  
Team Code #:  Bentley

Prop Speaker #1  Kerr Stein pts 29  
Opp Speaker #1  Alexander Hemerling pts 28

Prop Speaker #2  Lee  
Opp Speaker #2  Will Barnett pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect  29 = Outstanding  28 = Very Good

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

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Great speaking style!  Nice, well organized & easy to follow. Excellent final summary of voting issues etc.

Opp 1: Very nice speech. Great speaking style! But needs more rebuttal of their arguments. Left lots for your partner. OK, but you had more time. You could have attacked their points.

Prop 2: Excellent rebuttal & clash. Work on sounding more confident - you left great points. Avoid saying, "I don't understand your argument."

Opp 2: Great opening, good job refuting their points. Work on organizing & labeling more

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Excellent round! Opp. did a nice job with a tough topic (had not to sound like jerks on this topic). Unfortunately, Opp. was unable to overcome arguments on injustice. Flow goes Prop. I vote Prop.
Tunnell, Nanny (*'17)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 227
Gov: 18 Raven * Fischer
Opp: 20 Mart * Andola
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell
Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS

Team Code #: Prop 18
Team Code #: Opp 20

Prop Speaker #1 Fischer pts 25
Opp Speaker #1 Andola pts 26

Prop Speaker #2 Raven pts 28
Opp 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: 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:
• + Courtesy (good intro)
• - Smooth delivery needed
• - Need to show more confidence
• + Good evidence
• - Delivery needs to stop playing with children's Tales

Prop 2:
• + Delivery is very natural
• + Good organization
• + Evidence provided better depth
• + Argumentation (Andola) 20

Opp 1:
• - Evidence
• - Delingy (case less "like")
• - Lack of enthusiasm
• - Abrupt ending

Opp 2:
• + Delivery (good eye contact)
• + Politeness
• + Argumentation (good effort at restating)

TEAM CODE #: Prop 20

The Opp wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:

- Better overall delivery of points
- Confidence level was high
- Good organization
Tunnell, Nanny (*17)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 227
Gov: 1 Ochoa - Chand
Opp: 23 Eizner - He
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell
Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS

Team Code #: 1
Team Code #: 23

Prop Speaker #1: Ochoa pts
Opp Speaker #1: Eizer pts

Prop Speaker #2: Chand pts
Opp Speaker #2: He pts

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
+ Courtesy (shuts hands/good)
+ Evidence (good buildup/history)
+ POI - Analysis - good prompts given
+ Delivery - good entice/natural

Prop 2:
- Delivery (need better age antennas
+ Argumentation (good points, esp. wot analysis)

Opp 1:
+ Evidence (good facts, memorized)
+ Delights (story, voice but could slow down a little)
+ Argumentation (good passion about)
- Delivery (need better organization)

Opp 2:
- POI - good clarifications
- Argumentation (good points, esp. wot analysis)
+ Delivery (good pacing, good pace)
+ Argumentation (clear connections)

TEAM CODE #: 1 (Chand) on the Prop wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Better evidence and organization
- Better delivery
PARLI Debate

Roberson, Sam (*20)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 203
Gov: 23 Ho - Prashanth
Opp: 14 Kwong - Tan
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge’s Name: Sam Roberson
Judge’s School Affiliation: PHTS

PROP

Team Code #: 23
Prop Speaker #1: Prashanth pts 26
Prop Speaker #2: Ho pts 27

Opp

Team Code #: 14
Opp Speaker #1: Kwong pts 27
Opp Speaker #2: Tan pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:

Good Job! Make sure you think before speaking. Make your points. Keep your cool. Do not allow your emotions to get the better of you. Use clear and concise language. Make sure you are saying things you want your opponent to hear. Keep your points. Stay on topic. Conform to the rules. You can speak for 3 minutes. Don’t break both rules and don’t break any rules. Do not break any rules.

Team Code #: 14

Opp 1:

In what you are saying, speak clearly and contact with the judge. Make sure you are being articulate. Take good notes. Keep your language professional. Keep your points. Keep your cool. Do not allow your emotions to get the better of you. Do not break any rules. Make sure you are saying things you want your opponent to hear. Keep your points. Stay on topic. Conform to the rules. You can speak for 3 minutes. Don’t break both rules and don’t break any rules. Do not break any rules.

Opp 2:

Make sure you are saying things you want your opponent to hear. Keep your points. Stay on topic. Conform to the rules. You can speak for 3 minutes. Don’t break both rules and don’t break any rules. Do not break any rules.

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop

Drop 1st contention until the very end and claimed that Opp had not use it until the end. But it was their first contention. Also miss interpreted/proposed 2nd contention as well.
Roberson, Sam (*20)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 203
Gov: 23 Samra - Yim
Opp: 2 Greenwall - DuPuy
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge’s Name: Sam Roberson
Judge’s School Affiliation: Puisse

Team Code #:
PROP 23
Opp 2

Prop Speaker #1: Samra pts 27
Prop Speaker #2: Yim pts 27
Opp Speaker #1: Greenwall pts 28
Opp 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  24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good job try not to just read from your paper but keep some eye contact and make sure to use all your time to convey points
Prop 2: Good job try to articulate a little more clearly and use all your time

Opp 1: Very good eye contact tone and dainty but try to relax so you can articulate more effectively and try not to use too many flow’s
Opp 2: Great use of time!

TEAM CODE #: 2 on the OPP wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
Multiple dropped points from the prop I.E. mental illness, 1 year rule
Kapoor, Ram (*'16)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 207
Gov: 7 Mohiuddin - Sharma
Opp: 23 Zhai - Khan
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge’s Name: RAM KAPOOR
Judge’s School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

PROP
Team Code #: 7
Prop Speaker #1 Mohiuddin pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Swaroop pts 28

OPP
Team Code #: 23
Opp Speaker #1 Zhai pts 27
Opp Speaker #2 Khan 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: LINKED THE ARGUMENTS WELL
Opp 1: CLEAR ARGUMENTS

Prop 2: GOOD REFUTATION
Opp 2: VERY GOOD DELIVERY NICE USE OF EMOTION

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
CLARITY OF ARGUMENT AND BETTER REFUTATION.
PARLI Debate

Kapoor, Ram (*'16)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 207
Gov: 14 Lyons - Wyszynski
Opp: 3 Berck - Adams
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Ram Kapoor
Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>Team Code #:</th>
<th>Opp</th>
<th>Team Code #:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #1</td>
<td>Wyszynski pts 29</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #1</td>
<td>Adams pts 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #2</td>
<td>Lyons pts 29</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #2</td>
<td>Berck pts 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: **Excellent**, Impassioned Delivery
Opp 1: Good Delivery, Lack of Content

Prop 2: Good Reputation
Opp 2: Somewhat Meaningless Arguments

TEAM CODE #: 14 on the **Prop** wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
Better prepared and stronger reputations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Code #</th>
<th>Prop Speaker #1</th>
<th>Opp Speaker #1</th>
<th>Prop Speaker #2</th>
<th>Opp Speaker #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>TARLETON pts 27</td>
<td>L (0) pts 29</td>
<td>CARAMUCCI pts 26</td>
<td>WANG pts 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:**

- TARLETON - WEAK REASON ARGUMENT
- NO REAL POINTS OR FACTS
- STRUGGLING - KIND AND COURTEOUS

**Opp 1:**

- LIN
- VERY STRONG - GOOD DELIVERY
- NICE ENERGY - GOOD FACTS
- WELL DONE

**Prop 2:**

- CARAMUCCI - TIMID - LONG PAUSES
- STRUGGLE FOR POINTS
- NO ARGUMENT AT ALL
- NEED BETTER RESEARCH

**Opp 2:**

- WANG
- VERY STRONG AND CONFIDENT
- GREAT CLEAR FACTS AND FIGURES
- GOOD DEFENSE

**REASON FOR DECISION:**

THE OPP CLEARLY WERE MORE PREPARED - STRONG ATTACK AND GOOD DEFENSE

The OPP wins this debate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Code #</th>
<th>Prop Speaker #1</th>
<th>Opp Speaker #1</th>
<th>Team Code #</th>
<th>Opp Speaker #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>Nash</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Thrasher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #2</td>
<td>Zhu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prop Speaker #2</td>
<td>Thrasher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: Wang**
- Courteous - Strong Speaker  
- Kind and good facts - very confident - Good Alt Plan  
- Great Attack

**Prop 2: Zhu**
- Great strong voice - Good Facts - Compelling - Weakened over time - Stuttered - Struggled to get words out

**Opp 1: Nash**
- A bit timid - became more confident over time - Needs to slow down and breathe - Some good points - Weak Argument overall

**Opp 2: Thrasher**
- Great Personality - Courteous - Strong - Good Hand Gestures, Confident
- Good Arguments - Good Attack

TEAM CODE #: 18 on the **Opp** wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very close - One strong team member on each side
PARLI Debate

Judge’s Name: Jeff Eng
Judge’s School Affiliation: Lowell High

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
+ good projection and delivery of points
- can slow down to emphasize points more
- movement distracting—should try to move with purpose

Opp 1:
+ great presence & delivery
+ good strong finish on points
+ good structure on points

Prop 2:
- can have better body positions and focus on audience when speaking
- can't speak fast enough

Opp 2:
+ excellent speed
+ good structure to follow for judge

TEAM CODE #: 23 on the Prop wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
Strong points were made on the benefits of the resolution (Involving the whole population for better policies). Opp could have explore more about the “requirement to vote”. There are very few requirements in the U.S.
PARLI Debate

Eng, Jeff (*14)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 202
Gov: 20 Ahmadi - Phan
Opp: 22 Burrous - Blackenburg
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge’s Name: Jeff Eng
Judge’s School Affiliation: Lawell High

Team Code #: 

Prop Speaker #1 Ahmadi pts 26
Opp Speaker #1 Burrous pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Phan pts 25
Opp Speaker #2 Blackenburg pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
+ nice calm demeanor
- could expand on arguments more

Prop 2:
+ like the research & explanations
- keep practicing on delivery, work on removing “Um”

Opp 1:
+ excellent confidentdelivery
+ nice scenario setting & vision
- linkages from argument 4 and the point you are making can be stronger.

Opp 2:
+ Good voice
- movement was distracting so try to keep feet calm
You may feel that you were stammering a little, but you made strong points at the end (Reform court system)

TEAM CODE #: (Prop or Opp)

OPP wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp made stronger case/argument for keeping the death penalty. Prop could have investigated more about the suffering on inmates with existing drug cocktails.
Li, Caroline (*23)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 201
Gov: 2 Lanzone - Hubinger
Opp: 4 O'Rafferty - Figueroa
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>OPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Code #:</td>
<td>Team Code #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #1</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanzone pts 26</td>
<td>O'Rafferty pts 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #2</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubinger pts 29</td>
<td>Figueroa pts 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:
- effective delivery
- eye contact
- supported arguments with evidence

Opp 1:
- effective delivery
- eye contact

Prop 2:
- good job in refuting the % of people who voted in USA
- convincing arguments with reference to opponents!

Opp 2:
- good job in refuting the % of people who voted in USA

TEAM CODE #: 4 Prop wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Both teams are strong in debate, demonstrating great presentation skills.
- As a team, we were able to deliver stronger arguments against the aff. team with more solid evidence & references to facts.
Li, Caroline (*23)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 201
Gov: 22 Rice - Griggy
Opp: 14 Stroumza - Chen
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Caroline Li
Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley

Team Code #: 22
Proper Speaker #1: Griggy pts 26
Prop Speaker #2: Rice pts 27

Team Code #: 14
Opp Speaker #1: Chen pts 28
Opp Speaker #2: Stroumza pts 28

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
• Like your "eye for eye" statement
• Proper voice projection

Opp 1:
• gave logical arguments
• good analysis of the points
• fluency, convincing arguments
• know your materials

Prop 2:
• organized presentation

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

• Stronger arguments
• Logical and persuading points delivered
• Good speech delivery, materials well that were delivered.
PARLI Debate

Condello, Dave (*1)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 200
Gov: 14 Fong - Geller
Opp: 27 Campanella - Petruska
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge’s Name: David Condello
Judge’s School Affiliation: Analy

Prop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Code</th>
<th>Prop Speaker</th>
<th>Opp Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fong pts 26</td>
<td>Campanella pts 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Geller pts 26</td>
<td>Petruska pts 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair
- 24-20 = Poor
- <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1:
- Good Job at Reforming Argument
- Tongue Down/Reduce Hand Gestures
- Eye Contact
- Slow Down a Bit to Add Clarity
- Addressed Prop Points Well
- Showed Passion but Not Too Much

Opp 1:
- Good Tong/Vol
- Eye Contact Due to Checking Notes
- Addressed Prop Issues Well
- Strong Return to Opp Points

Prop 2:
- Slightly Shaky Start
- Eye Contact
- Notes seemed to distract

Opp 2:
- Addressed Opp Points Well
- In Order
- Back on Track - Twice

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

Reason for Decision:

**Opp Team was smoother & did a better job of laying out and then supporting their points. Both teams show promise & will improve.**
Parliamentary Debate

Condello, Dave (*1)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 200
Gov: 2 Colbert - Clark
Opp: 14 Krishnaswamy - Goldstein
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: DAVID CONDELLA
Judge's School Affiliation: ANALY

Team Code #: 2

Prop Speaker #1: Colbert pts 28
Prop Speaker #2: Clark pts 77

Opp Speaker #1: Goldstein pts 27
Opp Speaker #2: Krishnaswamy 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: + Nice Start + Establishing Prop: Debate
+ Body Language + Tone
- Eyeb Contact
+ Stated Points in clear manner
+ Addressed off points

Opp 1: + Confidence to address prop points in the order of his choosing
- Eyeb Contact
- Too brief & too opening statement
+ Restated off points well

Prop 2: - chewing gum?
+ Good Eyeb Contact
+ Orderly refutation of opp
+ Good ref to prop points
- Very Brief (3 min)

Opp 2: + Great tone + volume
- Transition on points could be smoother
+ Eyeb Contact
- Very Brief (3 min)

Team Code #: 2 on the Prop wins this debate.

Reason for Decision:

Evenly matched teams. Prop picced and supported stronger arguments. Disc opp team made some strong points but didn’t pursue them.
PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: BO KOVITZ
Judge's School Affiliation: BERKELEY HS

Team Code #: 12
Prop Speaker #1: MURDOCK pts 26
Prop Speaker #2: SANTANA pts 24

Team Code #: 14
Opp Speaker #1: KIM pts 25
Opp Speaker #2: DUAN pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Excellent speaking style, just be a little more confident. You did a good job in your first speech, drawing out impacts, and your rebuttal speech was also very effective. Try to port on substantiating your points/ideas with EVIDENCE.

Opp 1: Pretty good. Need to work on speed/presentation. Contentions need to be worded better. Your third contention made no sense when you explained it. Also... warrants for your claims? You can fill the 3 questions by using examples/EVIDENCE—which would make you more persuasive.

Prop 2: Very short rebuttal. Would have liked to have seen you attack each of their contentions, or reinforce your own points.

Opp 2: Did a very good job with refutations—you did the best out of everyone. You, along with everyone, need to do a better job going down their CASE and attacking each point, or reinforcing each of your contentions. Your analogy was very effective.

TEAM CODE #: 14

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP did a better job with refutations and balancing their speeches. But both sides need to work on strengthening your cases with EVIDENCE/EXAMPLES, better organizing speeches, working on fluency while speaking, and sharpening analytical skills.
**Res: The US Should Ban The Death Penalty**

**Parli Debate**

**Prop**

- Be nice in final talk to judge, not at OPP.

**Team Code:** 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop Speaker #1</th>
<th>Ayalon</th>
<th>Prop Speaker #2</th>
<th>Wu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pts</td>
<td></td>
<td>pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opp Speaker #1</th>
<th>Harris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pts</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opp Speaker #2</th>
<th>Marr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pts</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
- **Courtesies:** 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: Should spend final speech on impacts/weighing rounds.
- Opp 1: Lots of contentions but not a lot of depth, just a lot of misstatements. You didn’t really get into the meat of the arguments (evidence and impacts), it was hard for me to believe your case. This would still move the discussion and make your case hard to attack. Reputation was OK, but could be stronger. You could have addressed them with better points.
- Prop 2: Thank you for using examples! Prop 1 pointed out that you guys made the states’ rights arguments in response to the Supreme Court precedents on capital punishment systemically addressed. OPP needs to focus on studies of PDK. Also no response to wrongful imprisonment.
- Opp 2: Thank you for using examples! Prop 1 pointed out that you guys made the states’ rights arguments in response to the Supreme Court precedents. OPP needs to focus on studies of PDK. Also no response to wrongful imprisonment.

**Team Code:** 5

Prop wins this debate.

**Reason for Decision:**

- Voted Aff because they overall did a better job explaining their case, attacking the opposing case, and defending their points.
PARLI Debate

Herman, Roy (*13)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 208
Gov: 20 Fong - Ligutan
Opp: 1 Schoten - Condello
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Roy Herman
Judge's School Affiliation: Livermore

PROPOSAL

Team Code #:

Prop Speaker #1 Fong pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Ligutan pts 26

O P P

Team Code #:

Opp Speaker #1 Schoten pts 27
Opp Speaker #2 Condello 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 or 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:
Signposting was a good organizational tool from the Neg.

Opp 1:

Prop 2:
All should cite references and use more hard data

Opp 2:

TEAM CODE #: (on the Neg wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
Stronger argument by Neg. Haf dropped the "no vote shows dissident", which is not true but unchallenged, Neg pushed impoverishing America and more education effectively.
Herman, Roy (*13)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 208
Gov: 22 Sundararaman - Elmhirst
Opp: 23 Cheng - Wei
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Roy Herman
Judge's School Affiliation: Livermore

Team Code #: 22

Prop Speaker #1: Elmhirst pts 28
Opp Speaker #1: Cheng pts 27
Prop Speaker #2: Sundararaman pts 27
Opp Speaker #2: Wei pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: Good sign for your first speech! Use all your time.

Prop 2: Very nice job! Beware of pounding podium. Parents love enthusiasm but it can get distracting.
Opp 2: Great job overall! Needed better examples on D.P. Requiring all crime!

TEAM CODE #: 22

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop made a good run at "DEATH IS JUST NATURAL," AFF's counter with CHANDI, LIFE IS MORE VALUABLE THAN MONEY. D.P. is not a solution to over-population was stronger. Saying "KILLING INNOCENT IS TWISTED" was great.

 Winning this debate.

(Prop or Opp)
**PARLI Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARLI Debate</th>
<th>Judge's Name: Baetkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge's School Affiliation: SMHS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Baetkey, Kerri (*22)**

Round 1A 9:00am Room 224
Gov: 7 Maitra - Aggarwal
Opp: 2 Fickinger - Williams
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>OPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Code #:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #1</td>
<td>Maitra pts 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #2</td>
<td>Aggarwal pts 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opp Speaker #1</td>
<td>Fickinger pts 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opp Speaker #2</td>
<td>Williams pts 27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

**Prop 1:**
- You have a quick pace in your speaking, very articulate and knowledgeable. Great vocabulary. Organizes your final speech well.

**Opp 1:**
- Great reasons, very thoughtful and accurate. You were very clear and poised. You were also organized. I liked when you said it was an issue of solvency! Your first speech ended with "so, ya, thank you." You can end stronger than that as you had many good points.

**Prop 2:**
- Very organized. Loved how you stated the agenda/layout! Loved the vote from home! Great vocabulary and knowledge

**Opp 2:**
- You were very articulate and stated many good points. I liked when you said there was no plan to "inform the uninformed." You were very organized and clear. You fuss with your shirt a bit which is distracting. Go for it!

**TEAM CODE #: 7 on the PROP wins this debate. You have good points - so go for it!**

**REASON FOR DECISION:**

They really articulated the policy debate & how it needs to flow and supported their ideas well. The final speech nailed it! It was organized & addressed all points very well. It came down to the end as both were very strong! It was neck & neck!!
PARLI Debate

Baetkey, Kerri (*22)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 224
Gov: 2 Galvan-Carty - Lisy
Opp: 25 Owen - Coscarelli
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Baetkey
Judge's School Affiliation: SMHS

Prop 2: 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 qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: You have great motivation and command up there! You had many solid arguments. Very articulate! You handled the poor POIs with grace and stayed on track. I loved your moral argument: “With current resources—” Treacherous, how do you decide?

Prop 2: You have a great way of painting a picture and using questions to express your points. Dig deeper to explore topics and use all of your time. Feel free to restate previous arguments to support the team.

Opp 1: You were poised, organized, and prepared. Your layout was clear and you specifically tackled their points. I liked when you said that the jury had already decided and that you had strong closings. The fiscal element was strong but at first a bit hard to follow—it got stronger later.

Opp 2: You did a good job backing all arguments and restating claims. Very organized. I did wish your team stated where you got those costs— that would enhance the argument. As you get more comfortable, hold eye contact longer—look up.

TEAM CODE #: 25 on the (Prop or Opp) wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
They really adequately addressed each point and their fiscal point was not refuted. I also thought their use of the Supreme Court + 8th amendment was strong. Good use of poor POIs! Both teams were strong and it was close!! Great work!!