PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Linda McCabe
Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor High School

Team Code #: 11
Prop
Prop Speaker #1: Chippa pts 25
Prop Speaker #2: Cherukuri pts 25

Team Code #: 25
Opp
Opp Speaker #1: Hinchcliff pts 26
Opp Speaker #2: McKinney pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: a policy imposed, defining the weighing mechanism, but there was no explanation for why the USF6 needed GPA regulations. Watch language such as "other things such that". Mention of toys/videogames but not fleshing it out as a reason to include. We have in first speech had time to do so. Please bring up your arguments in the kitchen better speaking.
Prop 2: You are a bit soft spoken. Try to project a little more. It will come with time. Good refutations of Neg's contentions.

Opp 1: Your 2 disads are really contentious. The slippery slope argument is a bit hyperbolic for me. Listing ads will not lead to political unrest. Agree. Nice use of some evidence by ABC news. I think this was the only fact citation in the debate. Good closing statement using vote criteria—although as if Opp used theirs better public health of children would "outweigh" advertising jobs.
Opp 2: Halting speaking style that will improve with practice. Watch hand movements throughout. A bit distracting. Good to note toys/videogame argument not expanded by aff. Weak argument about junk food considered by other in not dialectic. Anecdotal evidence that isn't convincing.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp had a stronger grasp of how cases are to be structured, even though I disagreed with their hyperbolic statements.
McCabe, Linda (*27)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 227
Gov: 14 Duan - Kim
Opp: 20 Le - Rather
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge’s Name: Linda McCabe
Judge’s School Affiliation: Windsor High School

Team Code #: 14
Prop Speaker #1: Duan Dephny pts 26
Prop Speaker #2: Kim Jie pts 25
Opp Team Code #: 20
Opp Speaker #1: Rather pts 27
Opp Speaker #2: Le 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: You did a nice set up for the debate
Staking your plan, landing mechanism and timing in 1st speech set your arguments in favor of nuclear and anticipated opponent arguments. Your 2nd speech included new arguments, response to opponent’s counter plan, you weren’t bold, but you should have been.
Prop 2: You did not refute any of opp’s contentions as you should have. Your speech was unorganized. Hard to follow.
Your halting speaking style will improve w/ practice.

Opp 1: [Proper Oppt]
1070 is not “substantial.” Good use of counterplan and mention if cool is so bad, why not take it from there? Also good re timing of 5 years to 1/10 zero power by 2030, broadening speech asking enforcement. You are a good debater, good practice you’ll fill uptime, could have mentioned Chernobyl in your nuclear power is dangerous.
Opp 2: Good burden press on Aff and mentioning topicality, v debating spirit of resolution, great ethos & logos.

TEAM CODE #: 20
Team wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
Aff did not fulfill their burden, neg called them on it.
Judge's Name: Roy Herman
Judge's School Affiliation: Livermore

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 Speaker!
- Excellent opening and definitions.
- Threat: Children - good point

**Opp 1:**
- Seemed like brilliant thinking that was not disciplined. Be wary of citing personal experience.

**Prop 2:**
- Good job supporting FCL points and
  - Human example

**Opp 2:**
- Asking for proof is good.
  - Having your own is better.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

**Better organized argumentation, pushed points of obesity and "social damage" while falling to freedom of speech.**
PARLI Debate

Prop 2: Excellent opening but not as great on the close but enough to win. Don't show at the end.
Prop 2: Use your time wisely, you can restate points in another way or as a reminder.

Opp 1: Good opening but lost steam in the final speech. Good idea to switch to "cost benefit" to "greatest impact" but they had impact as well.
Opp 2: Liked that you brought up Chernobyl, should have emphasized that and other disasters to show their safety data.

TEAM CODE #: 23 on the 22 wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
- More organized, stronger data points and wrote better questions on acceptable level of safety.
Brown, Peter (*27)  
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 220  
Gov: Thomas - Ralston  
Opp: 2 Greenwall - DuPuy  
Parliamentary Debate/Novice  

Judge's Name: Peter Brown  
Judge's School Affiliation: Under  

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: + speaks clear  
- too fast  
+ took P.O.I's  
+ couldn't do P.O.I. in first or last minute of speech.  

Opp 1: + strong voice  
- broken speech  

Prop 2: + good job taking P.O.I's and not getting off track  
+ good rebuttals  

Opp 2: good voice  
+ speaks clear  
+ good rebuttals  

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

REASON FOR DECISION:  
The Prop related all points of the Opp.  
The Opp dropped contentions.
# PARLI Debate

**Judge's Name:** Peter Brown  
**Judge's School Affiliation:** Winner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Code #</th>
<th>Prop Speaker #1</th>
<th>Prop Speaker #2</th>
<th>Opp Team Code #</th>
<th>Opp Speaker #1</th>
<th>Opp Speaker #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wu</td>
<td>Wu</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Byrne</td>
<td>Byrne</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:**  
- Speaks clear  
- Good use of time  
- + Polite and calm  

**Opp 1:**  
- Strong voice  
- + Listed speaker  

**Prop 2:**  
- Very calm and collected speaker  
- Good use of time  

**Opp 2:**  
- + Energetic speaker  
- + Used complete time slot perfectly

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

**REASON FOR DECISION:**

Both sides engaged constructively. Prop made a strong opening and follow-up but ran out of time. Opp didn’t really negate the left-in-time but came up with a good speech plan for that. I vote for the Prop.
Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

**Judging Criteria**

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

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

**Prop 1**: + Good eye contact

- Good pace in delivery
- Courteous
- Contention relating to advertising

**Opp 1**: + Good pace in delivery

- Courteous
- Contention relating to advertising

**Prop 2**: + Identified gaps in opposition arguments

- Good pace—easy to follow
- Courteous

**Opp 2**: + Good pace in delivery

- Outlines plan
- During prop’s rebuttal brings attn to PAULI rules\n
**TEAM CODE #**: III on the **Prop** wins this debate.

**REASON FOR DECISION**: The props presented sound analysis and their analysis of the topic was clear and persuasive.
PARLI Debate

Judge’s Name: Stacy Clark
Judge’s School Affiliation: Tyrone Academy

Team Code #: Prop 2 Opp 14

Prop Speaker #1: Hubinger pts 25 Opp Speaker #1: Situ pts 25
Prop Speaker #2: Lanzone pts 25 Opp Speaker #2: Zhang pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop 1: + Articulate + Persuasive examples + Analysis
Long day yes, but think about what is professional throughout debate. - Eye contact
Being courteous, professional. Think about being courteous throughout debate. - Effort to convey passionately.
Prop 2: + Articulate - Grace under fire
Long day yes, but think about being courteous. x Professional throughout debate. - Review public rules.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The prop presented a persuasive analysis.
Zaheer, Affan (*8)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 228
Gov: 26 Clark - Flanagan
Opp: 23 Roth - Yue
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Affan Zaheer
Judge's School Affiliation: Dublin 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:**
- Great delivery & poise
- Good counter arguments
- Main logic was weak, suggest to build stronger on the resolution a you can do better

**Prop 2:**
- Focus on getting smooth delivery & connectivity in your flow, work harder at you do better

Opp 1:
- Great opening, strong arguments & points. Very nicely stated.
- Nice closing - overall good job

Opp 2:
- Please slow down as you speak. You will be more impactful with slower & controlled delivery.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Opposition arguments were better. Prop team did not have a strong point defending the resolution.
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 closing arguments, highlighting risks, a offering an alternate solution of less risk at same costs.
- Nice closing.

**Opp 1:**
- Good starting arguments. Should emphasize more on cost vs output compared to alternate source or energy.

**Prop 2:**
- Good examples, arguments close debate. Once side came out more compelling with zero risk.

**Opp 2:**
- Good examples. Nice team work supporting each other's arguments.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Opp arguments were compelling opposing the resolution of providing a low risk alternate solution.
PARLI Debate

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

Prop Speaker #1: Colbert pts 27
Prop Speaker #2: Clark pts 26
Opp Speaker #1: Gajula pts 26
Opp Speaker #2: Kaura 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: I really nice, polite group of boys all around!!
Opp 1: I liked when you brought up freedom of speech & government legitimacy. You also brought up that ads are changing. You were calm & clear - work on your fluency & eye contact. Your closing could be stronger.

Prop 2: I liked how you laid out & stated your organization. You were clear & direct. You gave some good ideas.
Opp 2: I liked when you said it could lead to good ideas too! You also gave facts about the economy by stating Toys R Us and video game sales. That tipped to the win!

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
The Opp offered the only factual back up to their point by stating real figures ($) in their argument. The teams were close but the facts tipped to the win. Support claims with fact reference!
Baetkey, Kerri (*22)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 225
Gov: 14 Krishnaswamy - Goldstein
Opp: 24 Scott - Ambrose
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

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

Team Code #: 14
Prop Speaker #1 Goldstein pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Krisnahswamy pts 28

Team Code #: 24
Opp Speaker #1 Scott pts 27
Opp Speaker #2 Ambrose 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: You were calm, precise and matter of fact. Your natural cadence is very trustworthy and effective. You layed it out very clearly and handled the interruptions really well!

Opp 1: You were organized and assertive. You had a nice flow and strong arguments. I liked your examples regarding health environment. You asked good questions as part of your speech.

Prop 2: You were dynamic, clear, and powerful in tone. You gave a solid presentation with facts. Hold strong through the closing.

Opp 2: Ex. "Why do we need more $ for this?" You had good points. I liked when you referenced the trash island (but it didn't relate) and then you brought up Crohna which was a great example.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Goldstein layed it all out so clearly + then Krishnaswamy was emphatic, clear and added the info on fatalities related to 61 vs. uranium. They were so organized & precise.
PARLI Debate

Nash, Jennifer (*18)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 223
Gov: 25 Owen - Coscarelli
Opp: 23 Wei - Zheng
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge’s Name: Jennifer Nash
Judge’s School Affiliation: Montgomery High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Code #</th>
<th>PROP 25</th>
<th>OPP 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #1</td>
<td>26 Points</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #2</td>
<td>27 Points</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 relevant and effectively 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**: Good examples. Cited specific examples, work on using filter words less. Need to acknowledge opposing team’s strong pro-rebuttal.

**Opp 1**: Speaking style. Work on using less “filter” words. Addressed POI from opponent well. Good summary after slight stumble.

**Prop 2**: Good job supporting partner’s arguments. Good ending sentence, summation of points could be smoother.

**Opp 2**: Addressed POI from opponent well. Used good.

TEAM CODE #: 25

REASON FOR DECISION: Prop team used evidence better, analysis and argumentation was more clear. Prop team needs to acknowledge opposing team on POI. Good style, for both teams, there is room for improvement. Both teams very courteous.

Prop wins this debate.
**PARLI Debate**

**Nash, Jennifer (*'18)**
Round 4B  3:45pm  Room 223  
Gov: 4 O'Rafferty - Figueroa  
Opp: 14 Kwong - Tan  
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Code #</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>OPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #1</td>
<td>O' Rafferty pts 28</td>
<td>Kwong pts 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #2</td>
<td>Figueroa pts 27</td>
<td>Tan 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:** Good evidence, cited specific sources for evidence. Work on filler using filler words less.

**Prop 2:** Good job of re-stating of contention points.

**Opp 1:** Good job of supporting opponent by summarizing contentions. Several arguments were presented as questions vs. statements.

**Opp 2:** Good job of directly refuting opponent's first contention, but could have used more evidence in other points. Need more eye contact.

**TEAM CODE #:** 4 on the **Prop** wins this debate.

**REASON FOR DECISION:** Overall presentation, analysis was better. **Opp #2** nice style, **Prop #2** good style.
Prop 1: Thought the speech was too long. Would have given more specifics and time to adjust. Need to live eye contact with judge. Should have given a clear plan and outline for all speeches to that.

Prop 2: Don't see how your notes. Good points, but speech has too short. Should have included specific examples of bad, dangerous ads.

Opp 1: Good eye contact. Confident speaking voice. Good coverage of all points. However, were a bit short.

Opp 2: Excellent speech. Beautiful speaking voice. Very well organized and thorough. Good points that it's hard to define a 'bad ad' or an ad targeting adults. Children are second generational.

TEAM CODE #: 22 on the Opp wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp won by pointing out that it's difficult to decide whether an ad is good or bad (e.g., ads for toys) and that watching ads could improve kids' decision-making skills.
**PARLI Debate**

**Judge's Name:** Jim Sutton

**Judge's School Affiliation:** Lowell

---

**Team Code #:** 23

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

**Opp Speaker #1:** Cohen pts 26

**Prop Speaker #2:** Zhu pts 24

**Opp Speaker #2:** Lemenager pts 25

---

**Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:**

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

---

**Judging Criteria**

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

---

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

**Prop 1:** Too many NB or NO. Look very nervous. Don't have very good delivery. Very hard to understand your arguments.

**Opp 1:** Speaking style a bit melodramatic and hesitant. Need to speak faster. Very good focus on topic. Issues are well addressed.

**Prop 2:** You were clearly nervous, but you shouldn't have been. You had good responses and arguments. You left your sides attacks.

**Opp 2:** Good focus, but need to stay with a good focus of opponents arguments. Your number about cost of nuclear power was a bit "rare.

---

**REASON FOR DECISION:** Prop had good voter issue, but Opp regarded issue and your arguments. 

**TEAM CODE #:** 23 on the **Prop** wins this debate.
Fernando, Kurukulusooriya (*4)

Round 4A 3:45pm Room 201
Gov: 14 Luk - Tserennamid
Opp: 20 Fong - Ligutan
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Kurukulusooriya Fernando
Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

Team Code #: 14
Prop Speaker #1 Luk pts 29
Opp Speaker #1 Fong pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Tserennamid pts 27
Opp Speaker #2 Ligutan 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: very good speaker. I suggest better eye contact while delivering the speech.
Opp 1: good eye contact. I would like if you could speak clearly when you are giving the speech.

Prop 2: good eye contact pleasant
Opp 2: good introduction on negating the point good eye contact.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Team 14 delivered a better argument on their topic. They are better organized. They effectively analyzed their topic well.
### PARLI Debate

**Judge's Name:** Fernando, Kurukulusooriya

**Judge's School Affiliation:** Bishop O'Dowd

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>Team Code</th>
<th>Prop Speaker</th>
<th>Opponent</th>
<th>Opp Speaker</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bystrom</td>
<td>Chaudhri</td>
<td>Chaudhri</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gast</td>
<td>Zaheer</td>
<td>Zaheer</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPPONENT</th>
<th>Team Code</th>
<th>Prop Speaker</th>
<th>Opponent</th>
<th>Opp Speaker</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPPO NENT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bystrom</td>
<td>Chaudhri</td>
<td>Chaudhri</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPPONENT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gast</td>
<td>Zaheer</td>
<td>Zaheer</td>
<td>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:**
- Very good speaker
- Good eye contact
- Very pleasant

**Opp 1:**
- Gave lot of facts regarding the topic
- Good eye contact
- Very pleasant

**Prop 2:**
- Good eye contact

**Opp 2:**
- Very good speaker
- Delivers facts fluently

---

**TEAM CODE #:** 8 **on the** [OPP or PROP] **wins this debate.**

**REASON FOR DECISION:** Team 8 clearly won the debate through both teams were very good. Team 8 delivered more facts they are organized.
DeWitt, Jane (*14)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 205
Gov: 23 Ho - Prashanth
Opp: 12 Murdock - Santana
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Jane DeWitt
Judge's School Affiliation: 

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**: strong speaker - organized, good pacing + articulate. Case is good if not completely proven. Did give some examples, stats, etc. But, not very strong but convincing enough arguments.

**Opp 1**: good job rebutting Prop's contentions, ok, not the best for own side. Good pacing. Evidence for contentions not completely strong.

**Prop 2**: A bit disorganized - did not rebut contentions directly, got a bit side tracked - Freedom of Speech became issue to advertise to children, speech with emotion and deliver ideas was good way.

**Opp 2**: A bit disorganized, no presentation of arguments but made good points.

TEAM CODE #: OPP on the 12 wins this debate. Due to less advertising and a bit of a stretch, just less marketing space.

REASON FOR DECISION:
Overall made a stronger + more concrete case and had better refutation to Prop's contentions.
DeWitt, Jane (*14)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 205
Gov: 2 Archibald - Hohmeyer
Opp: 27 Campanella - Petruska
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Jane DeWitt
Judge's School Affiliation: ______________________

PROP

Team Code #: 2

Opp Speaker #1 Campanella pts 26
Opp Speaker #2 Petruska pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Campanella pts 26
Oppl Speaker #1 Petruska pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

Prop Speaker #1 Archibald: pts 26
Opp Speaker #1 Campanella: pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Hohmeyer: pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Petruska: pts 26

TEAM CODE #: OPP wins this debate.

Reason for Decision: PROP had an idea that would make salty + health concerns obsolete, but provided no evidence that we will have the technology to build a nuclear power plant on another planet. OPP pointed out weaknesses in their props case and built their strong case for themselves.

(Prop or Opp) - If you were PROP, you wouldn't want to lose to that argument.

TEAM CODE #: Prop on the 27 wins this debate. Favorable debate of the day!

Thumbs up!
Fogarty, Matthew (*16)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 204
Gov: 22 Sundararaman - Elmhirst
Opp: 14 Fong - Geller
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Team Code #: 22
Prop Speaker #1 Elmhirst pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Sundararaman 27

Team Code #: 14
Opp Speaker #1 Geller pts 27
Opp Speaker #2 Fong 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 voice, very clear
• Take more time to build case
(Part speaker was only 2.50min)

Opp 1: Good structure
Needs more passion + presence

Prop 2:
• Good structure
Push harder on their point
(be more aggressive)

Opp 2: Good voice
Nice story about woman with hole

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Freedom of speech + impracticality of change not addressed.
Fogarty, Matthew (*16)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 204
Gov: 23 Deng - Luo
Opp: 22 Baxter - Nam
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>OPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #1</td>
<td>LOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #2</td>
<td>DENG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-25</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-20</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: LOU**
  - Good passion, knowledge of rules, long term vs short term point was good.
  - Needs more evidence

- **Prop 2: DENG**
  - Good structure, avoid the phrase "and stuff like that..."

- **Opp 1**
  - Good use of evidence
  - Good voice & poise

- **Opp 2**
  - Good structure
  - Good delivery

TEAM CODE #: 22 on the OPP wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop had good points, but OPP won because of evidence.
The USFG should substantially increase regulation on advertising directed to/ward children.

**PARLI Debate**

**Judge’s Name:** Eileen Burrous

**Judge’s School Affiliation:** San Marin High

---

**Prop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Code #:</th>
<th>Lee</th>
<th>Opp</th>
<th>Sankar</th>
<th>Opp</th>
<th>Arshad</th>
<th>Opp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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:**
- Prop 1: Good points, good supportive information, clear speaking.
- Prop 2: Good points, good supportive evidence, strong arguments, logical development

**Opp:**
- Opp 1: Polite, should listen to opponent better, argument a bit weak - clean speaking, good eye contact
- Opp 2: Argument lacks evidence, clean strong delivery, offer more concrete evidence/facts

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

**REASON FOR DECISION:** Good examples were offered for the benefits of regulation of advertising reg. Points were relevant.
The USFPC should substantially increase support for nuclear energy

**Prop:**
- Lawrence: Prop speaker
- Privalov: Prop speaker #2

**Opp:**
- Eizner: Opp speaker #1
- He: Opp speaker #2

---

**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

---

**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**

---

**TEAM CODE #: 14**

**On the APP wins this debate.**

**REASON FOR DECISION:**
PARLI Debate

Condello, Dave (*1)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 226
Gov: 23 Zhai - Khan
Opp: 22 Burrous - Blackenburg
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: DAVID CONDELLO
Judge's School Affiliation: ANAL

PROP 23
Team Code #:

Opp 22
Team Code #:

Prop Speaker #1 Zhai pts 27
Opp Speaker #1 Burrous pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Khan pts 27
Opp Speaker #2 Blackenburg pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

PROP

Prop 1: + GREAT POSTURE + POISE
- EYE CONTACT

Prop 2: + PASSIONATE! Good Tone.
+ GOOD ORGANIZATION TO RESPOND TO OPP'S POINTS
- LESS LOOKING AT NOTES, LOOK UP MORE.
- SHORT - (4 min)

TEAM CODE #: ______________

Opp

Opp 1: + EYES CONTACT

- A BIT TOO MUCH MOVEMENT
+ ADDRESSED + REFUTED PROP POINTS SYSTEMATICALLY & WELL
+ SUMMATION COVERED ALL POINTS WELL
- CITED NO ACTUAL FACTS TO SUPPORT POINTS

Opp 2: + NICE JOB OF SUPPORTING PROP CASE 1ST, THEN REATING OPP CASE.
- SLIGHTLY RATTLED, THEN PULLED IT TOGETHER. WILL IMPROVE!
+ EYES CONTACT

TEAM CODE #: ______________

(Prop or Opp)

Prop wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams made some good points and some weak points. Both arguments could use more factual support. This Prop team presented the stronger argument.
PARLI Debate

Condello, Dave (*1)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 226
Gov: 14 Woo - Melman
Opp: 22 Harris - Marr
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge’s Name: 
Judge’s School Affiliation: ANA LY

Team Code #: 14

Team Code #: 22

Prop Speaker #1 - Melman pts 27
Opp Speaker #1 - Harris pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 - Woo pts 27
Opp Speaker #2 - Marr 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:

+ CLEAR STATEMENT OF CONTENTIONS
Prop 1: - EYES CONTACT
- VERY SHORT (3 min) SPEECH
+ CLEAR STRONG VOICE
+ NICE REFUTING OF FUKUSHIMA

+ STRONG START, GOOD TONE
Prop 2: + REFUTED OPP RES
- CASUAL TONE
- EYES CONTACT VS NOTES
- SHORT (3 min)

+ DEFINED TERMS SINCE PROP DID NOT + CITED FACTS FOR ENERGY COST
Opp 1: + ADDRESSED PROP POINTS NOW
- EYES CONTACT VS READING NOTES
- BRIEF (4 min) - 1ST SPEECH
+ GOOD RECAP & SUMMATION OF ARGUMENTS - 2ND SPEECH

+ REFUTED PROP CONTENTIONS
Opp 2: + CITED ALT ENERGY OPTIONS
+ CITED JAPANESE MIGHT DO
- EYES CONTACT VS NOTES
- SHORT (3.75 min)

TEAM CODE #: 22
(Prop or Opp) wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp used facts + alt. energy options to refute Prop arguments. Both teams did very well for novices + will do much better w/practice.
Sawhney, Sakina (*7)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 202
Gov: 20 Afzal - Kelly
Opp: 14 Holwitz - Kay
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: Sakina Sawhney
Judge's School Affiliation: AY #5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>OPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Code #:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #1</td>
<td>Kelly pts 28</td>
<td>Holwitz pts 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Speaker #2</td>
<td>Afzal pts 27</td>
<td>Kay pts 18</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

The U.S. Fed Govt should substantially increase regulations of ads targeting children.

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

Prop 1: Kelly - Speech was good, contentions can be more organized and easy to flow.
- Provide stats
- View not targeting children as opposed
- Can loss interpretation of facts and on that note.

Prop 2: Good speech, eye contact
- Like google
- Can organize a bit since the actual topic was not clearly addressed, ads "targeting children"

Opp 1: Holwitz - Some people cannot afford $8/mo.
- Bias: cannot be able to pick up bias.
- Contention: -refined -do not understand own content
- Freedom of press
- Provide stats - Ads targeting children are not set of vaccines.

Opp 2: Good delivery and analysis
- Good examples of parental control. Need stats (examples when you say daylight TV).
- Organize your thoughts in conjunction with your examples. You had some good points.

TEAM CODE #: 20 on the AFF wins this debate. (Low point win).

REASON FOR DECISION: Analysis and evidence was more weighted on AFF's side.
AFF provided statistics showing ads which can be harmful for kids. Although Opp had many points that they could have expanded on, no evidence was provided for the costs etc.
12 or younger. What is regular??

made public or promote.

1. biased opinion ->
   promote a product.
   example - cigarette cartoon.
   less hurtful, etc.

2. parents are not able to control
   90% of children's shows - PG/B + R-Rated??
   Youtube ads -> we reprogrammec.
   prefrontal cortex.

1. bias :(
Sawhney, Sakina (*7)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 202
Gov: 1 Schloten - Condello
Opp: 2 Fickinger - Williams
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

**PARLI Debate**

**Judge’s Name:** Sakina Sawhney  
**Judge’s School Affiliation:** AYHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>TEAM CODE #</th>
<th>OPP</th>
<th>TEAM CODE #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schloten</td>
<td>pts 29</td>
<td>Fickinger</td>
<td>pts 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condello</td>
<td>pts 29</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>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:**
- Good voice projection the voice will become stronger and more reliable in context.
- Cost of wind turbine cost is high.
- Safety - dams can be dangerous.
- Can be locally maintained.

**Opp:**
- Not substantially
- Very costly to build
- Have your thoughts organized since you have some great points.
- Nuclear energy plants are unsafe and AF's contentions addressed. Provide stats and evidence

**Team Code #:** 1 on the **AFF** wins this debate.

**Reason for Decision:**
Although neither side provided any substantial evidence, AFF side was better at analyzing the topic, and they delivered their thoughts and points in better common knowledge facts.
PARLI Debate

Prop 1: Prop Speaker was very nervous during first round but recovered well. On second, clearly articulated plan and contentions.

Opp 1: Effectively went through Prop contentions and provided refutations.

Prop 2: Reinforced original contentions well.

Opp 2: Good roadmap, and good organization related to undercutting contentions.

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

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Code #</th>
<th>Prop Speaker #1</th>
<th>Prop Speaker #2</th>
<th>OPP</th>
<th>Opp Speaker #1</th>
<th>Opp Speaker #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raven</td>
<td>Ahmadi</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Phan</td>
<td>Phan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pts 26.0</td>
<td>pts 21.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>pts 26.0</td>
<td>pts 26.5</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**: Prop Speaker #1 was nervous but still presented clear contentions.

**Opp 1**: Good classification of definitions. Good focus on alternative energies.

**Prop 2**: Prop Speaker #2 was well spoken and focused on supporting contentions laid out by Prop #1.

**Opp 2**: Clear restatement of issues with understanding of primary points.

**TEAM CODE #**: 18 on the **Prop** wins this debate.

**REASON FOR DECISION:**
Whitmore, Robin (*14)
Round 4A  3:45pm  Room 207
Gov: 20 Alam - Nguyen
Opp: 18 Nash - Thrasher
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge’s Name: Robin Whitmore
Judge’s School Affiliation: 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>OPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Code #:</td>
<td>Team Code #: 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alam pts 27</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #1 Nash pts 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen pts 27</td>
<td>Opp Speaker #2 Thrasher 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**: Good set of evidence. Would have liked to hear better explanation of funding aside.

**Opp 1**: Great set of contentions and you argued well for them. Good use of POI.

**Prop 2**: Great refutation. Stating not all ads are on TV! Be careful of using "like" and playing with sleeves.

**Opp 2**: Great speaking ability and persuasiveness. Fantastic refutations of contentions.

TEAM CODE #: 18 on the OPP wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:

The opposition clearly stated their contentions and clearly refuted the proponents.
Whitmore, Robin (*14)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 207
Gov: 23 Samra - Yim
Opp: 26 Sheridan - Sappington
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Team Code #: 23

PROP

Prop Speaker #1 Samra pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Yim pts 28

Opp Team Code #: 26

OPP

Opp Speaker #1 Sheridan pts 27
Opp Speaker #2 Sappington 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 clear points of contention!
Try to not read word for word.

Opp 1:
Great enthusiasm, but you need to maybe giggle less. Also would be good to refute each of your opponents contentions.

Prop 2:
Good defense when Yim stated that waste was only a part of the issue, the pros outweigh cons. Energy.

Opp 2:
Good research & evidence & great rebuttal, especially about the renewability of nuclear energy.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Better job of coming up with contentions and refuting the other side's contentions much more polished.
Jacobs, Joel (*3)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 224
Gov: Ochoa - Chand
Opp: 26 Goody - Sherman
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Jacobs
Judge's School Affiliation: BarK

Team Code #: 26

Prop Speaker #1 Ochoa pts 24
Prop Speaker #2 Chand pts 24
Opp Speaker #1 Goody pts 27
Opp Speaker #2 Sherman pts 25

Prop #1: This is a policy res, not value. Consider using evidence. Very passionate, clear speaking style. Day 2 and strong: Don't tear off paper up while still speaking. Hope excitement was new in rebuttal.
Prop #2: Don't need to read the res. Focus on attacking the counterplan, not restating arguments the opp agreed with.

You don't need to "extend all the points my partner made." If a couple are particularly important, then talk about them.

Opp #1: Explain why it matters that it's a policy round, e.g. that there should be a plan (which prop doesn't give) and opp can run a counterplan. U are right about drawback of plan, but that's not your case; make the case in the context of attacking prop case. Be reluctant to use Nazi analogies. Work on eye contact. Counterplan should have agent of action, timeline, details, etc. Harms of adgs not so important given counterplan. Focus on why bun is better than res. Need to respond to economy disadvantage raised by prop.

Prop: talk to your coach about how to handle a counterplan.

TEAM CODE #: 26 on the Opp wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp counterplan captured all net benefits of plan and went further.
Jacobs, Joel (*3)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 224
Gov: 2 Galvan-Carty - Lisy
Opp: 20 Valle - Pollard
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

PARLI Debate

Judge’s Name: Jacobs
Judge’s School Affiliation: BerkJ

Team Code #: PROP 2
Team Code #: OPP 20

Prop Speaker #1 Lisy pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Valle pts 26
Opp Speaker #1 Valle pts 25
Opp Speaker #2 Pollard 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: 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: Say “US federal govt. not USFor. at least the first time.
Need more conclusions.
Need evidence

Opp 1: Avoid pronouns - “It is not a crisis right now.”
The debt? Energy.
Need evidence re alternative energy options.
Need why US debt matters if both sides are spending money on energy.

Prop 2: A POC is not an extended dialog.

Opp 2: Need to support all that nuke energy pollutes.
Conclusion should be as forceful as rest of speech.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Gov argues effectively that nuclear is more efficient and productive than alternatives. Both are non-polluting.
Regulations on advertisements targeting children

Keshav, Sineesh (*'23)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 208
Gov: 14 Kerr-Stein - Lee
Opp: 11 Wang - Lin
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge's Name: SINEESH KESHA
Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Academy

Team Code #: 14
Prop Speaker #1: Kerr-Stein pts 29
Prop Speaker #2: Lee pts 26
Opp Team Code #: 11
Opp Speaker #1: Lin pts 28
Opp Speaker #2: Wang 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: Kerr-Stein
  +: good delivery
  +: handled POI in 1st minute well
  -: FFC?
  -: some points well made, others not well
Prop 2: Lee
  -: not organized
  -: 300mm refute not clear
  -: USFC as enforcers did not address POI adequately
  +: confident delivery

Opp 1: Lin
  +: Good POI
  +: Topicality point
  +: Great point on educational websites
  -: Good examples
  -: Delivery could be smoother
Opp 2: Wang
  +: Good delivery
  -: Argumentation did not address POI adequately
  +: Good point on funding

TEAM CODE #: 11 on the Opp wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Better arguments
- Topicality not refuted well
Keshav, Sineesh (*23)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 208
Gov: 14 Rettenmaier - Pineda
Opp: 20 Jerez - Moran
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Judge’s Name: Sineesh Keshav
Judge’s School Affiliation: San Ramon Academy

Team Code #: 14
Prop Speaker #1: Pineda pts 25
Prop Speaker #2: Rettenmaier pts 27

Team Code #: 20
Opp Speaker #1: Jerez pts 26
Opp Speaker #2: Moran pts 26

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

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

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

Prop 1: Pineda
+ : delivery was good
+ : good final argument
- : too much reliance on notes
- : brief

Opp 1: Jerez
+ : good arguments
- : Rebuttal was a repeat
- : eye contact
+ : good rebuttal

Prop 2: Rettenmaier
+ : good rebuttal
+ : good delivery
- : brief

Opp 2: Moran
- : Rebuttal to tracking not convincing
+ : Good rebuttal on jobs
+ : Confident delivery

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
> Better argumentation
> Better delivery
> More direct addressing of points
Lacombe, Victor (*25)
Judge's Name: LACOMBE
Judge's School Affiliation: 25

PARLI Debate

Round 4A 3:45pm Room 221
Gov: 14 Chao - Wang
Opp: 2 Hemerling - Barnett
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

USFQ Advertisements Targeting Children

Team Code #: 14 Prop

Opp Team Code #: 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:**
- More money = better
- Benefit to adults
- Health of children

**Opp 1:**
- Free fromSpeech
- More human
- Some companies with (203)
- Confused speaker, clear presentation of argument, but must argue to benefit of government best of individuals

**Prop 2:**
- Adults, large money
- Problem's resolution
- Help Adair's
to hunt Tapps'

**Opp 2:**
- Have to employ
- Freedom of speech
- Well known
- More exist

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

REASON FOR DECISION: OPP brought forth more stronger points of their own in this "plan" type debate.
PARLI Debate

Lacombe, Victor (*25)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 221
Gov: 14 Chan - Foley
Opp: 7 Maitra - Aggarwai
Parliamentary Debate/Novice

Team Code #: 14
Prop Speaker #1 Chan pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Foley pts 28
Opp Speaker #1 Aggarwai pts 28
Opp Speaker #2 Maitra pts 27.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-25</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-20</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

Plan 1: Recycled uranium adversaries
- Plan 1: Uranium Reliability, 24s
  1. Uranium Reliability
  2. Rear & wind
  3. Not sure if start
  4. Saves lives forever

Prop 2: Roadmap, great speech, really nice
- Prop 2: Good speech, nice

Opp 1: Arms control
- Opp 1: Unsafe, people swarming
  1. UNSAFE, people swarming
  2. Wind & solar were offered them Nike
  3. ARMS CONTROL
  4. Rubs off credit

Opp 2: Good counter, great speech, polite
- Opp 2: Roadmap, nice handling of facts

TEAM CODE #: 14

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

REASON FOR DECISION: ATF's plan was well defended. Opp counter was nice but had no counter other than slight gain and did not have enough neg impact to offset their (+5) points.