


Varsity Policy Debate - Round 2

Double Check Sheet

✓ Vista, 1 Bonita	5B Classical Acader	Alex Tseng Christian Wort	26.0 ✓ 29.0 ✓	10A Mission Vista HS	Alexander Bodc Anamaria Carlc	28.0 ✓ 30.0 ✓	NEG	Room 304
✓ 4, Rancho Bernardo	5C Classical Acader	John Melton Jake Melton	28.0 ✓ 28.0 ✓	2B Canyon Crest Ac	Vainavi Viswan Mitali Juneja	27.0 ✓ 27.0 ✓	AFF	Room 305
✓ 2, Classical	3A Carlsbad HS	Yousuf Hashmi Zahra Alawi	27.0 ✓ 27.0 ✓	2A Canyon Crest Ac	Rithvik Rao Nathan Thoms	29.0 ✓ 28.0 ✓	NEG	Room 306
✓ Cbad, 3	1A Bonita Vista HS	Danielle Bloom Joseph Casey	28.0 ✓ 27.0 ✓	5A Classical Acader	Chris Tai Crystal Sung	27.0 ✓ 27.0 ✓	AFF	Room 307
ok	BYE	BYE		3B Carlsbad HS	Caroline Allen Corin Magee			Room 308

VCX

Varsity Policy Debate			1 Bonita Vista (*1)		
Round 2			Room 304		Tue 10/04/16 10:00AM
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative
1st 2nd	Alex Tseng	1	26	1st 2nd	Alexander Bodo Schnellinger
1st 2nd	Christian Worthen 5 Classical Academy High School	2	29	1st 2nd	Anamaria Carlotta Del-Zio 10 Mission Vista High School
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				BVHS / Parent / Marine Engineer School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams argument were very similar.
 However the negative presented a better argument.
 What decided the debate was the aff team
 stating that treaties that the US was involved
 with the UN did not count do to the
 argument that the treaties were not solely
 between the US and China.

Christian Worthen - Great clean speaker.
 a little stiff with the body language.

Alex Tseng - First speech was full of confusing statements
 repeated phrases, used filler words (aah, um, and)
 twice paused in speech for 45 seconds to look at
 computer.

Anamaria Del-Zio - Great speaker. Very professional
 and well spoken. Well practiced with her material.

JCA

Alexander Schnellighen - Very passionate speaker
Well spoken. and very well versed with his material.
Tends to use filler words a little too frequently.

Varsity Policy Debate				Rancho Bernardo 4 (*12)			
Round 2				Room 305		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 John Melton	blond	1	28	1st 2nd Vainavi Viswanath		3	27
1st 2nd Jake Melton		2	28	1st 2nd Mitali Juneja		4	27
5 Classical Academy High School				2 Canyon Crest Academy			
The winner of this debate was				Jane Crowe Judge's Signature RBHS School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win?							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

There was a discussion about tag team process
but they all agreed.

JL: Good pace of speaking
Be careful of fidgeting at beginning.

I'm convinced global warming + overfishing
are reasons to engage.
convincing about combining tracks

Vianavi:

read from computer, should look
at judge, hard to follow, reading
way too fast
much better speaking in Rebuttal.
good points about how status quo
already includes engagement so
why should we increase it?

Mitali -

You know your points, but
calm down. You are talking
so fast and animated that it
is distracting.

Your strongest points are the
quotes from the Japanese officials.
Showing dissatisfaction.
Better job during Rebuttal.

John: Ask a clear question.
Good cutting her off when she kept
talking during 1st cross ex.
Define tracks at beginning would
be super helpful.
You are talking SO FAST when reading
cards
Calmer and clearer in Rebuttal.

Did anyone define terms?

all unprepared with sharing docs, cards, papers?

Lots of time in between makes you all seem unorganized.


• Listening to this, I have no idea what track 1 and 2 are. Define? Someone has to define this as you go through.

• what are picks? Should you be debating who had more time/infinite time/picks?

• ~~Someone should~~

VCX

Rhesa LACanienta

Varsity Policy Debate				Classical 2 (*5)			
Round 2				Room 306		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	Yousuf Hashmi	3	27	1st 2nd	Rithvik Rao	1	29
1st 2nd	Zahra Alawi 3 Carlsbad High School	4	27	1st 2nd	Nathan Thomsen 2 Canyon Crest Academy	2	28
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Rancho Bernardo HS School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? _____							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg had better vocal communication skills. They enunciated more, used hand gestures, used volume variation for emphasis & exuded confidence. At the beginning of the speech, one partner was noticeably nervous & lacked flow, but gained confidence later. This team told more of a story to the audience especially when talking about people's lives to evoke emotion. With that said, neg lacked manners and professionalism during questioning. The statements, "Have fun," and "nope," are not acceptable and made me cringe as a judge, because of the lack of respect for the other team. Overall, great confidence and good job at making your arguments clear.

Aff: At the beginning of the debate, one partner was speaking incredibly fast, so fast it was difficult to understand the arguments. If I cannot determine what you're saying, I cannot vote for you. Enunciation was very much needed at times. The word "like" was used as a filler word. The team also had difficulty answering questions during the first cross examination. Also, one team member asked multiple times for clarification. This showed me that the team could not follow what was being said. The casual choice of shoes was distracting and credibility was lost because it did not go w/ the professional outfit. With that said, this team made a great point when talking about the significance of 4,000 lives lost in 11 years. You responded to the opposing team with, "How many lives need to be lost to be deemed significant?" and "4,000 lost lives in America would seem more critical." This change in perspective was eye opening and greatly appreciated, as I agreed with ~~his~~ these statements. It connected the issue directly to the audience to provoke emotion and urgency.

VCX

Varsity Policy Debate			3 Cbad (*3)		
Round 2			Room 307		Tue 10/04/16 10:00AM ✓
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative
1st 2nd	Danielle Bloom	1	28	1st 2nd	Chris Tai
1st 2nd	Joseph Casey 1 Bonita Vista High School	4	27	1st 2nd	Crystal Sung 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? <u>N</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

ORGANIZATION FOR ARGUMENT FOR AFF WAS A
LITTLE MORE CONCISE AND UNDERSTANDABLE.

CONTENT - EACH GAVE GOOD EXAMPLES FOR THEIR ARGUMENT
AND SUPPORTED THEM WELL.

AFF DID A LITTLE BETTER JOB OF ~~PO~~ FILLING
HOLES IN NEG ON CROSS EXAMINATION.

AFF ULTIMATELY PRESENTED THEIR SIDE
OF THE ARGUMENT IN A MORE CONFIDENT
AND BELIEVABLE MANNER. BOTH SIDES WERE
WELL PREPARED.

~~ONE PPT~~

~~ORGANIZATION~~ ~~Content~~ ~~Style~~

~~PD 2~~ ~~not on the time~~

~~O - abstracting~~

~~C - good, understandable~~

~~S - made better piece~~

~~CT: Should have US corporate info~~

~~China's space program~~

~~PD 1 2~~

~~Chen J. Tai. NFG~~ ~~0-9~~ ~~C-9~~ ~~S-8~~

~~O - very well organized and put together when understandable~~

~~C - India's angle is a good argument~~

~~PD 2: argument for China using this to start the war~~

~~S - Unintelligible for the rest of the world?~~

~~most part, when you start~~

~~down maybe your job were very well made~~

~~Cont. PPT, Counter-Terrorism 2000~~ ~~Coat~~ ~~Sec DM~~ ~~Cont~~

~~Crystal Song ④~~

~~O - 0-10~~ ~~C-9~~ ~~S-9~~

~~How does this~~

~~have economic impact on~~

~~C - World of Americans~~ ~~well put. How does~~

~~Aff solve for this?~~

~~posed better in David's argument~~

~~S - Very understandable and well paced~~

~~AFF~~

~~Style - Joseph Carey~~

~~Content - others~~

~~he captured thought~~

~~specific observations~~

~~NSA NSA~~

~~Style~~

~~David Bloom~~ ~~0-10-09~~ ~~S-9~~

~~O - Very well organized and put together argument~~

~~C - good research, clear argument~~

~~For his presence China has in the world and how that impacts US~~

~~S - Very well paced and very understandable~~

~~understandable~~

~~abstract job of policy like in~~

~~1 - comparison with int'l security~~

~~2 - China's central utility space~~

~~3 - Empirically derived~~

~~PD 1~~

~~1 DB~~

~~2 CS~~

~~3 CT~~

~~4 JC~~

~~PD 2~~

~~SC~~ ~~CT~~ ~~CS~~ ~~0-9~~ ~~S-9~~