

Novice Policy - Round 2

Double Check Sheet

✓ 3, Rancho Bernardo	7LA El Camino HS	Kurtis LaMore Ulysses Aquilar	29.0 ✓ 28.0 ✓	5DL Classical Acader	Cameron Done Charlie Larkin	28.0 ✓ 28.0 ✓	NEG	Room 201
✓ Academy, 3 Canyon C	12CZ Rancho Bernard	Serena Chi ✓ Leah Zabezhins	27.0 ✓ 28.0 ✓	13HB San Dieguito Ac	Charlotte Hou Sean Belin	27.0 ✓ 27.0 ✓	AFF	Room 202
✓ 3, SDA Judge	7SK El Camino HS	Emma Stoerme ✓ Juni Kim	28.0 ✓ 28.0 ✓	10KH Mission Vista HS	Matthew Gabrie Logan Harteloo	27.0 ✓ 27.0 ✓	AFF	Room 204
✓ 18, MVHS	8IF Grossmont HS	Joseph W. Bod John Flaherty	27.0 ✓ 27.0 ✓	12HL Rancho Bernard	Brady Housley Maxwell Lashke	27.0 ✓ 28.0 ✓	NEG	Room 301
✓ 2, El Camino	12HH Rancho Bernard	Andrew Han Samuel Hwang	28.0 ✓ 29.0 ✓	1EK Bonita Vista HS	Rachel Elliott Nawal Keddo	28.0 ✓ 29.0 ✓	AFF	Room 303

NCX

Novice Policy				SDA Judge 3 (*13)			
Round 2				Room 204		Tue 10/04/16 10:00AM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd Emma Stoermer		3	28	1st 2nd Matthew Gabriel Kilpatrick		3	27
1st 2nd Juni Kim		4	28	1st 2nd Logan Harteloo		4	26
7 El Camino High School				10 Mission Vista High School			
The winner of this debate was							
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature CBAD			
Is this a low point win? _____				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aft.

Stoermer: good smile - shows confidence
 confident good pacing and varying emphasis - slow down - when too fast can't follow argument and facts/evidence run together.
 good eye contact
 need to use questions (cross) to point out error in opponents argument
 need to take a few steps further.
 - effective addressing of Neg pts.

Kim: ^{Cross} good pt on leader pronunciation
 need to follow up more than just restating what opponent said, used to pt out flaws - good questions
 - no need to reintrod. self
 - clearly restated arguments & illustrated flaws (ie off topic) in opponent.
 (perhaps too short)
 - need to explain clearly how ↓ transaction costs helps decrease our debt.
 lower trans. costs = ↑ trust? needs more explanation
 calm, clear speaking

Harteloo: ^{8 min const} explaining "Belt" unclear
 develop more how evidence makes point & clarity - seemed off topic.
 i.e. Belt sep. ch/state/correctly pronounced L.S. name
 State Religion Affairs -
 explain how pressure on china would mitigate Korea's threat.
 unclear on cross
 cross questions need clarity.

Kilpatrick: untucked shirt, distracting.
 good use of evidence - lead point.
 😊 speaking w/ conviction
 use pauses to emph. pts - pts tend to run into each other & become muddled.
 convinced that you care
 need to explain the meaning of the quote about N. Korea.
 good pt on how aft didn't pt out how the success in Euro was implemented

NCX

Novice Policy			El Camino 2 (*7)		
Round 2			Room 303		Tue 10/04/16 10:00AM
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative
1st 2nd Andrew Han		3	28	1st 2nd Rachel Elliott	
1st 2nd Samuel Hwang 12 Rancho Bernardo High School		1	29	1st 2nd Nawal Keddo 1 Bonita Vista High School	
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				MVHS / PARENT / DEPUTY SHERIFF School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

all students did well.

RBHS -

- Andrew - dressed well was very polite, used his computer. Non Verbal ~~was~~ was good especially when he smiled during his rebuttal.
- Samuel - dressed well. Very smart, polite and he also used his computer. Non verbal was good w/ his hand and expressions. Negative remarks - he needs to slow down. He was well prepared, used his time well.
- Nawal. - She spoke very clear and her non-verbal was great. She did not use a computer and stayed focus on judge. Only downfall is that she was short on her time.
- Rachel - spoke clear, Non Verbal was not so good. ~~eye~~ eye contact was good. Rachel was very polite content was good she stumbled a few times.

NCX

Novice Policy				3 Canyon Crest Academy (*2)			
Round 2				Room 202		Tue 10/04/16 10:00AM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd	Serena Chi		27	1st 2nd	Charlotte Hou		27
1st 2nd	Leah Zabezhinsky 12 Rancho Bernardo High School		28	1st 2nd	Sean Belin 13 San Dieguito Academy		27
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature cca / parent School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- ① Great job - nearly a tie but terrific last rebuttal by aff. won it for affirmative
- ② Negative - you have what seems like stronger call, but diversions to trade and over-emphasis on Taiwan weakened argument.
- ③ Protectionism - important concept in US-China relations. Would read up on.
- ④ Nervous ties/habits - natural to be nervous as novice. ~~At~~ Would ~~to~~ try to avoid saying "like" a lot (Charlotte) and avoid other ties (cracking knuckles). This is not easy but comes with practice.
- ⑤ Sources were often cited that I was not familiar with. This may be a convention in this type of debate. This judge, however, would have appreciated a quick line about the sources → their job/expertise/etc. Also, might want to avoid some vjargon as in 1st cross-X, like like "tag" debate
- ⑥ Leah - great wrap-up at end.

NCX

Novice Policy				Rancho Bernardo 3 (*12)			
Round 2				Room 201		Tue 10/04/16 10:00AM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd	Kurtis LaMore	—	29	1st 2nd	Cameron Donez	—	28
1st 2nd	Ulysses Aquilar 7 El Camino High School	—	28	1st 2nd	Charlie Larkin 5 Classical Academy High School	—	28
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)				RBHS School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? ☒							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Strong debate on a complex topic. I thought the negative team won based on their arguments about the economic impacts to the US based on lower tariffs. Their rebuttals were clear, logical and convincing.



Ulysses: confident, loud speaker. Could improve clarity of his reasoning; some sentences seemed disjointed. He went too quickly to the "tariff solution" without fully clarifying the current issues and challenges. Quick thinking on his feet during cross examination. Energetic closing statements, though a bit too scattered, which lost some persuasion.

Charlie: cross examination started with short questions. Perhaps an introductory few sentences would have set the stage better. Only arguments about protecting US economy with tariffs
 - [rebuttal] Good understanding of the tariff impacts. Clearly explained his reasoning and how lower tariffs would hurt the US. "Apple example" was good. Clear speaker, poised, organized.

Cameron: Good impression, well spoken. Just slightly nervous, though I'm sure will change quickly (fidgets with jacket button). Supporting evidence about North Korea and threats of war didn't seem to challenge the US-China issue. very strong

Kurtis: ~~1st half was a bit quiet, at first he did seem to actually support Ulysses during prep times.~~ Strong rebuttals

NCX

Novice Policy		MVHS 18 (*10)			
Round 2		Room 301		Tue 10/04/16 10:00AM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative
1st 2nd Joseph W. Bodden III		—	27	1st 2nd Brady Housley	
			27		
1st 2nd John Flaherty		—	27	1st 2nd Maxwell Lashkari	
8 Grossmont High School				12 Rancho Bernardo High School	
The winner of this debate was					
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____				 School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Right off the bat, the Aff got off to a shaky start. Joseph started right in providing reasons, but as a judge, I was caught off guard. He did not state the resolution, give any definitions or propose a plan of any kind.

This weakened the aff side tremendously as there was no way to frame the statements (especially for Aff 1).
 Aff → *Clarify your understanding of an economic subsidy vs subsistence farming*
 Brady was able to course-correct during his time by providing the clarification the aff neglected. Brady & Max provided an alternate plan (and did the best they could to "guess" at the Aff's plan). Neg needed to back off using China's reputation as a defense. Cite some evidence or a more prepared team will call you on this.

Specific issues relating to present debaters:
 Joseph & Josh — overall preparation should be increased. They each used less than half of the 8 minutes allotted.

Brady — He's a passionate speaker, but stumbles w/ pronunciation and fidgets while partner is speaking.
 Max — Nice job! Keep practicing!!

*Both should practice multi-syllabic words aloud ahead of time to smooth out presentation. Be prepared!

100-100000

NCX

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000