

Varsity Policy Debate - Round 4

Double Check Sheet

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

Varsity Policy Debate				El Camino 4			
Round 4				Room 305		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	Alexander Bodo Schnellinger	—	<u>29</u>	1st 2nd	Rithvik Rao	—	<u>30</u>
1st 2nd	Anamaria Carlotta Del-Zio 10 Mission Vista High School	—	<u>30</u>	1st 2nd	Nathan Thomsen / 2 Canyon Crest Academy	—	<u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				CARLSBAD HIGH Speech pathologist School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD
 Aff's case is plain, but well-defended. They successfully addressed ^{ideas} NEG
 Neg falsely restates Aff's plan as a mandate that eliminates
 other energy and doesn't convince the judge RE: topicality.

Aff 'Ana: Clear voice, super-articulate and committed to point
 of view. Good rebuttal of "too late to solve for climate
 change" by pointing out limited fossil fuels. In general,
 Persuasive and responsive.

2 Alex: Good point RE: some climate change effects
 we can't recover from (e.g., extreme weather events)
 Strong speaking skills and organized presentation
 of ideas and especially refutations.

NEG
 Nathan: You focus on the impossibility of increasing
 something that "doesn't exist" - while it seems that
 Aff is increasing by adding a type of investment treaty
 Fair to dispute their "common knowledge" evidence. You
 seem distracted during Aff's speeches.

2 Rithvik: Not reversing climate change info doesn't convince
 Good use of very recent cards. Outstanding skills. The
 comments RE: adaptations were interesting but non-
 specific. STRUCTURAL INEFFICIENCY argument very
 intriguing - short term vs. long term

VCX

Varsity Policy Debate		2 Poway (**11) MV			
Round 4		Room 306		Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative
1st 2nd Yousuf Hashmi			<u>29</u>	1st 2nd John Melton	
			<u>28</u>		
1st 2nd Zahra Alawi			<u>28</u>	1st 2nd Jake Melton	
3 Carlsbad High School				5 Classical Academy High School	
The winner of this debate was					
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative				 Judge's Signature	
(Circle Winner)				 School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD - Unable to discern NEG constructive speech preventing follow on debate related material from supporting/refuting.

Zahra → (Pos) clear statements of objectives, excellent volume, strong sequencing of thoughts and creating easy to comprehend ideas and notions.

(Rec) slow down! Construct started way too fast... improved as debate went on.

John → (Pos) Willing to take a risk and devised a strategy so as to be impacting & memorable. ALWAYS seek those opportunities. Very articulate and convincing when debating.

(Rec) This time the risk didn't work. I don't believe intent was to insult, but message seemed somewhat inferred towards Judge.

Yousuf → (Pos) Clear presentation, confident, well balanced material memorized/written/free spoken. Step by step flow of reason that was easy to follow, strong clarification skills

(REC) Refrain from engaging in personal defenses or defending you as an individual over your argument.

Notes:

- I would advise all debaters to avoid future personal attacks or arguments, detracts from all parties debate.

(over)

Take → (Pos) Exceptional presence, powerful in advocating for ideas and opinions. Well placed gestures and movement. Good variation from speech to conversation & back.

(Rec) I would have liked to see you put effort into topic ("Resolved") issue rather than a strict demonstration of debate fundamentals and rules.

Paola Burns

VCX

SDIVSL 1B

Varsity Policy Debate				Judge			
Round 4				Room 307		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	Chris Tai	—	28	1st 2nd	Vainavi Viswanath	—	28
1st 2nd	Crystal Sung 5 Classical Academy High School	—	28	1st 2nd	Mitali Juneja 2 Canyon Crest Academy	—	28
The winner of this debate was				<u>Paola Burns</u> Judge's Signature <u>Carlsbad High School</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? —							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Affirmative plan adhered to the topic.

The Affirmative team proved there is a justification to have a plan by providing specific examples and evidence of human rights problems in China.

The Affirmative plan showed that U.S engagement with China has not caused problems with Japan. Japan supports human rights diplomacy. The Affirmative plan eliminates the problem better than the present system.

The Affirmative plan advantages outweigh the ~~disadvantages~~ disadvantages presented by the Negative team.

VCX

Varsity Policy Debate				1 Poway (*11)			
Round 4				Room 304		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	Danielle Bloom	1	30	1st 2nd	Caroline Allen	3	29
1st 2nd	Joseph Casey 1 Bonita Vista High School	4	29	1st 2nd	Corin Magee 3 Carlsbad High School	2	29
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				MVHS School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? _____							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

When I shared that I was a new judge (inexperienced) - I felt that the affirmative team took this into consideration - specifically Bloom. Bloom was confident, clear - persuasive even when the Negative countered.

Casey was well prepared - lots of information, however could work on tone - was a little dry.

The negative team tackled a couple of topics but arguments felt repetitive; however, Magee & Allen brought up many good unrelated points. Magee mumbled a little in the beginning but found a strong voice that almost swayed me. One argument by Allen ~~was~~ almost convinced me - ~~appealing~~ ^{supporting} ~~towards~~ human rights is definitely a plus, but I felt the affirmative was more prepared and presented a stronger case.

