

Novice Policy - Round 4

Double Check Sheet

Academy, 3 Canyon C	7SK	El Camino HS	Emma Stoerme Juni Kim	29.0 29.0	5DL	Classical Acade	Cameron Done Charlie Larkin	27.0 26.0	AFF	Room 201	✓
1, grossmont	10KH	Mission Vista HS	Matthew Gabrie Logan Harteloo	28.0 27.0	13HB	San Dieguito Ac	Charlotte Hou Sean Belin	27.0 26.0	AFF	Room 202	✓
3, SDA Judge	8IF	Grossmont HS	Joseph W. Bod John Flaherty	26.0 26.0	12HH	Rancho Bernard	Andrew Han Samuel Hwang	28.0 29.0	NEG	Room 204	✓
1, Classical	12HL	Rancho Bernard	Brady Housley Maxwell Lashke	29.0 25.0	7LA	El Camino HS	Kurtis LaMore Ulysses Aquilai	26.0 28.0	AFF	Room 301	✓
	1EK	Bonita Vista HS	Rachel Elliott Nawal Keddo	26.0 28.0	12CZ	Rancho Bernard	Serena Chi Leah Zabezhi	27.0 28.0	NEG	Room 303	✓

Novice Policy		SDA Judge 3 (*13)					
Round 4		Room 204		Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM			
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd	Joseph W. Bodden III	—	26	1st 2nd	Andrew Han	—	28
1st 2nd	John Flaherty 8 Grossmont High School	—	26	1st 2nd	Samuel Hwang 12 Rancho Bernardo High School	—	29
The winner of this debate was				Judge's Signature			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				Mission Vista HS School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? —							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Overall, a better use of time would have solidified & reinforced arguments. Only Samuel used the bulk of his time while the other 3 yielded too much time.

The Aff side never really got their argument going. If they had used all of their allocated time, even if restating items differently, it could have been more impactful.

Joseph - used 2 minutes of his 8 to start out leaving 6 minutes on the table. Good voice.

Samuel - used all his time. Clear, strong voice.

Confident. Structured well. My only critique is: STOP the Pen Clicking while others are speaking!


John - used 4 mins of his 8 minutes.
Clear, strong voice. Good eye contact.

Andrew - 4 mins, 45 seconds used out of 8 mins.
Clear voice, lost train of thought several times.

Both sides could have done much better on their respective cross-exams.

For rebuttals, their wasn't really defined items from Aff to rebuttal. Aff should have more clearly defined their terms and action items.

Lastly, Neg interjected on minor contention items (thinking the judge (me) may not be aware). They should have discussed beforehand and not during rebuttals.

Novice Policy		Classical 1 (*5)			
Round 4		Room 301		Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM	
Speaker (circle) 1st 2nd Brady Housley	Affirmative	Rank (1-4) 1	Points (25-30) 29	Speaker (circle) 1st 2nd Kurtis LaMore	Negative
1st 2nd Maxwell Lashkari 12 Rancho Bernardo High School		4	25	1st 2nd Ulysses Aquilar 7 El Camino High School	
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Mission Vista School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Max AFF open - was not clearly stated what exactly the policy was - being proposed. It came across as weak. There is no example of specific technology to be shared.

AFF using each section to thank judge came across as insincere and off-putting. once it good - did not offend just be aware

AFF used debate tactics to absorb Neg policy into their own policy.

Neg - well spoken and clear as well as strong use of cross examination.

Both arguments were very weak and lack an understanding of current events. Participants should better research the issue and understand how their policy is relevant.

Brady is a much stronger speaker.

Restating of policy a good tactic.

- AFF tactic usurped Neg's plan and thereby automatically winning the round.
- Neg's job is to state why Aff plan is not a good one not pose another policy.

Novice Policy				grossmont 1 (*8)			
Round 4				Room 202		Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd	Matthew Gabriel Kilpatrick	_____	<u>28</u>	1st 2nd	Charlotte Hou	_____	<u>27</u>
1st 2nd	Logan Harteloo 10 Mission Vista High School	_____	<u>27</u>	1st 2nd	Sean Belin 13 San Dieguito Academy	_____	<u>26</u>
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:


You did it! It gets better and easier!
 Good 1st debates.
 Aff had more logical arguments summarized better and
 spent more time refuting Neg more.
 Neg needs to discuss more of Aff's point did not talk much about
 2nd + 3rd contention if at all except lumped in trade.

Logan Good show evidence when asked. Strong logical Case. Clearly stated Contentions Good use of evidence Could use more passion in questions and speeches.	Matthew Really Good cross questions. (exam pointed effective!) well done. Summarizing restate resolution done well. Counter lines vs. jobs argument spoke about it. Still lacks more depth analysis	Sean Awkward-reading Computer. Put information in own words more. Summarize more Address more of Aff's points Both only 2 min speeches Could summarize more and in depth. Good w/ I + w/ II points Give more organization to speeches.	Charlie Confusion plan or no plan. Ask more specific questions Good passion Good rate of speaking.
---	---	--	---

Novice Policy		3 Canyon Crest Academy (*2)			
Round 4		Room 201		Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative
1st 2nd	Emma Stoermer	2	28.5	1st 2nd	Cameron Donez
1st 2nd	Juni Kim 7 El Camino High School	1	29	1st 2nd	Charlie Larkin 5 Classical Academy High School
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				 School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. Affirmative side took good amount of time preparing the evidences ahead to support their arguments, well organized, great speech!
2. Negative side was trying to state the arguments without substantial evidence.
3. Negative side should also improve their speech skill to state every sentence logically with eye contact.

Novice Policy				Judge			
Round 4				Room 303		Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd Rachel Elliott		4	26	1st 2nd Serena Chi		3	27
1st 2nd Nawal Keddo		1	28	1st 2nd Leah Zabezhinsky		2	28
1 Bonita Vista High School				12 Rancho Bernardo High School			
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							
Comments & Reason for Decision:				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both the affirmative and negative positions were very persuasive. While I felt that the affirmative provided more details related to their plan, I feel that the citations were less reliable. The negative team provided specific citations from reliable government sources. The affirmative team did a good job challenging the negative argument; however the negative position made a strong refutation as to the net benefit of their plan vs. the affirmative. In addition, the negative argument had specific evidence that China would be willing to work unilateral toward their position whereas the negative assumes that due to bad press and PRC the PRC would feel pressured into negotiations. Both sides presented their arguments well and in the end the negative simply demonstrated that their plan had the best Net-Benefit.

