

Navice Pauli Rd. IV

Extras

B

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	OliChi DP	POINTS	RANKS
2	Julia Park	26	2
1	Gaurisha Dewan	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga KS	POINTS	RANKS
2	Kunal Kanekar	28	2
1	Mihir Samdarshi	28	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Saratoga KS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Sunder Velamuri

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The NEG team was very effective at refuting the arguments of the AFF team. The NEG team cited relevant data and sources to justify their claims. The AFF team surprisingly cited that prosecution as carried out by private parties and not govt. agencies. The AFF team made some good arguments but some experience will make them a winning team in the future.

A

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Saratoga AX	POINTS	RANKS
2	David Akeley	16	4
1	Kelly Xiao	17	3

NEGATIVE

POS	OliChi WH	POINTS	RANKS
1	Andre Wang	18	2
2	Eric Han	19	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from OliChi WH
AFF OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Saratoga 1; weak, unconvincing. Doesn't help support decision.
 OliChi 1; One side argument. Use statistics.
 Saratoga 2; Assertive however avoids the neg's argument. Fails to support claims and jumps around.
 OliChi 2; Took a while to build momentum. Breaks down and loses focus at certain points.
 Both teams fail to acknowledge parts of the topic. It is whether or not it affects or should be implemented in CA. CA only.

Both teams epitomize novice,

OliChi: wraps up points quickly and concisely. Closing is fine, both teams must have stronger arguments and confidence. They both have pacing issues. They ramble.

Saratoga: Overstated. Adds new information and unrelated remarks in concluding statement.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	BisOD CM	POINTS	RANKS
1	Shawn Cunningham	28	1
2	Hailey McKenna	25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	DiaVal JY	POINTS	RANKS
1	Paul Jeon	27	2
2	Brandon Ye	26	3

The better debating was done by the NEG from DiaVal JY
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- BisOD 1: Rambling, speaking well, Skews statistics and examples. ~~Can argue~~ argues well however ~~the~~ should better back himself up. Needs substance. Needs a better understanding of the Death Sentence. Picks himself up in the end.
- DiaVal 1: Aggressive. Used statistics and does reference the prompt. Examples have some substance. Could get a better background on the Death Penalty in California.
- BisOD 2: One sided. Uses generalizations. No not valid because the DP is via the states, not on the federal level. Does bring up the alternative. References prompt. Passive Aggressive. Not true; there are mandates. Argument and presentation is good. Needs a better analysis and background on the topic.
- DiaVal 2: Attacks the affirmative. Does not understand difference between DP and Life in Prison. Could be more aggressive and confident. Still passive despite attacking the pro. Does bring up countermeasures possibilities and show a knowledge of the "legal" system.

DiaVal: State Legislature > Federal
 BisOD: Federal > State

Both teams could be clearer on their stance. Would be stronger if they had a better background on the topic. They both do reference CA. Neither acknowledge the due process nor any outside interest groups or organizations for the pro or cons.

DiaVal wins only because arguments are overall more complete. Victory by small margin.

BisOD lost only because they did not provide enough analysis and substance on California legislature. Defeat by small margin.

A

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Wash SV	POINTS	RANKS
3	Rahual Sheth	22	3
1	Anirudh Veeraragavan	27	1

NEGATIVE

POS	OliChi LW	POINTS	RANKS
4	Richard Liu	20	4
2	Brendan Wu	24	2

The better debating was done by the AFF from WASH SV
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Affirmative
- Definitions - pros
 - How well it be framed - lack of strong arg.
 - Prop of statistic off topic
 - Good benefits/Adv
 - GDP
 - economy
 - Debt
 - Keep jobs in col.
 - Good sources
 - Good data
-
- did not show how good teacher hire cut be impl.
 - rebuttal on diversity - is ok
 - WP org unmarks
 - rambling
 - repetitive
- As ringy benefits - Opposition does not bring a counter plan

- Negative
- PSU -> better job did not get shown!
 - Why lower salary? did not show link!
 - Repeat, not unique 5 adv.
-
- lack of evidence that quality helps
 - did not give any sources
 - rebuttal did not present hole in the argument.
-
- ✓ statistic on private school is not rebutted
 - ✓ evidence to link quality of teachers decrease dropout!
 - ✗ small school size > better education
 - spending in other places - did not show the linkage to a better choice

→ SUMMARY

A

4

Aggarwal, Bereni

KAKALI BHATTACHARJEE

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	TEAM	POINTS	RANKS
	Everg DB		
	Anh Diep	29	1
	Priya Bhattacharjee	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	TEAM	POINTS	RANKS
	JamLog CW		
	Zachary Chee	25	4
	Brian Wang	26	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from Everg DB.

AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Bhattacharjee

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Topic: CA Should implement a tax on plastic bag.

AFF: Well framed contentions with eloquent speech. Very fluent and gracefully handled questions from the opponent team. On another note, should provide more statistical data & empirical data to prove your point of advantage. Both speakers have proven that intention of being in the debate team.

Neg: Proper eye contact necessary, should sit ~~lower~~ more/proper examples to prove specific contentions. Feet little unprepared. Need to speak more fluently and coherently. Sometimes words were gobbled up and not heard. Few examples provided were not logical and consistent with the topic.

B

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	SumPrep DG	POINTS	RANKS
	Sean Decker	26	1
	Elsa Gernand	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	NotDam AC	POINTS	RANKS
	Kimia Ashktorab	26	2
	Melissa Cuevas	26	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from SumPrep DG.

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Bhattacharjee

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Topic: CA should implement a tax on plastic bag.

Aff: Need to express yourself readily, clearly, and effectively. Did not provide a value criterion. Contentions were good but not firm enough. Need to work on eye contact and speak articulately. Provide empirical data to support contentions.

Neg: Need to understand why you stand against the statement, provide proper reasons. Although you all spoke clearly and with proper expressions, your contentions weren't enough to support the negative arguments.

B

4

Delinda Dore
 Milrea, Ileen

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	NotDam LW	POINTS	RANKS
1	Caroline Liongasari	24	3
3	Elizabeth Wu	25	1

NEGATIVE

POS	OliChi AB	POINTS	RANKS
4	Vikshar Athreya	23	34
2	Prachit Bhike	24	2

The better debating was done by the AFF from Not Dam LW
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Delinda Dore

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

CA should repeal the death penalty.

Aff:

define value debate
 define death penalty - putting to death
 death row

refute cont 1) State doesn't have right to kill own citizens - hypocritical killing
 killers. 8th amm - protection against cruel and unusual puni
 (People can learn from crimes, but not if they are killed)

refute opp's cont cont 2) Cost - saving 500,000 per case
 use money for moral things healthcare education (all cost associated w/case)

cont 3) wrongful convictions irreversible death is permanent.

~~refute opp's #86 cases and innocent people not proving~~

NEG

refute - criminals deserve death penalty
 lethal injection is painless (not cruel or unusual)

cost - of incarceration is very expensive. money should be spent on innocent civilians
 86 wrongful convictions not 130

Room: Mission E
 Start: 8:00 am
 Novice Parliamentary

4

Mitrea, Heen

Delinda Dane

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	BisO'D PD	POINTS	RANKS
3	Kendall Post	26	1
1	Bryce Dewitt	25	3

NEGATIVE

POS	NotDam YN	POINTS	RANKS
2	Czarina Yip	23	4
4	Divya Nikkanti	25	2

The better debating was done by the AFF from Bis'O'DPD
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Delinda Dane

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

CA should implement a tax on plastic bags.

No definitions -

Volume in landfill -
 \$ to get rid of bags
 Animals eat plastic
 Harm to environment - ocean, other waterways

GOV
AFF

Acton - CA state gov or SF
 plan 5¢ tax across the state - all plastic bags
 earn 9 mil per ~~year~~ ^{mo} year
 Help cut use in half
 implement ~~annoy~~ by 2013

plan

Creates revenue for CA 108 ^{mil} per yr
 Improve environment

Neg

reputations - tax on bags → ethanol tax
 plastic bag use went up 10%
 tax ineffective

3

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS	RANKS
	Leland WP		
	David Webb	29	1
	Grace Phan	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS	RANKS
	OliChi CD		
	Ishika Chawla	27	3
	Neha Dubey	25	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Leland
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: TKat

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: TOPIC: CA should Repeat the death penalty
 The AFF side won because they put forward better points and defended them well while raising good Refutation.
 Critique: Neg missed some refutation in pointing out that Solitary Confinement was cruel & unusual speech could be improved.
 Important to stay calm.

A

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	POINTS	RANKS
Leland KK		
Sohil Kshirsagar	28	2
Matthew Kang	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	POINTS	RANKS
JamLog KC		
Hamza Khawaja	25	4
Sahil Chawla	29	1

The better debating was done by the AFF from Leland KK
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

TOPIC: CA should levy a tax on beverages with sugar added during manufacture

The AFF side won because the NEG was not convincing in refuting the claims by AFF.

NEG had a good strategy of moving subsidies from Sugar to Organic but they did not back it up with stats.

NEG missed opportunity to ~~show~~ talk about Narmy Govt.: Govt should not tell people what to buy and what not.

AFF made the point this was about soda and not all food which was NEG was doing.

AFF did contradict itself but so did NEG

In the end AFF had overall better speeches and won narrowly on points.

Critique: ~~to~~ Do better research. Several missed opportunities to bring counter points & refute.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

CLASH

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

Vocals strong & clear - both teams

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Saratoga CP	POINTS	RANKS
2	Sabrina Chen	28	2
1	Sonal Pai	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	BisOD SJ	POINTS	RANKS
1	Ryan Seideman	27	4
2	Anna Johnson	28	3

CA should implement a tax on plastic bags
The better debating was done by the Opp from Bishop O'Dowd

AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: YES

Sabrina good passion

Signed: Down H. Clark

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: Opp narrowly wins close round on flow

Both teams agree round is a policy resolution.

Opp criticized Gov. for "not having a plan & harms"
- Gov used Parli style IAC structure, TP structure not required, Opp ultimately drove a voter off this which could be tagged "vagueness" (Sol/-)

Opp launched CP - ban vs. tax. Opp claimed to address harms & exceed benefits (health, environ).

Gov drove govt. revenue as RTP

Gov attacked CP's relation to resolution but Opp's non-topical CP is valid theory & is not discarded solely on this basis

Opp claimed to uphold Gov's criteria

2 voters for OPP in rebuttals
① Gov tacked on 10¢/bag in rebuttals, thereby confirming Opp's vagueness
② Gov pushed ban w/ MX/China policy i.e. pilot programs

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

CLASH

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Prospect SS	POINTS	RANKS
1	Smith Austin	23	4
2	Smith Akshay	24	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg AG	POINTS	RANKS
2	Basil Abushama	25	1
1	Nihal Gowda	24	3

CA should repeal the death penalty.

The better debating was done by the Opp from Evergreen

AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: n/a

Signed: Dorr H. Clark

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Gov claimed savings, barbarism, & innocents. Opp ran a CP to address innocents (could have been tagged as a minor repair) asserted deference (Japan), and defended constitutionality via pragmatism. Opp also ran ADSQ for victims rights & closure grounded in statistics.

Both rebuttals ran short, especially IAR. IA & IN can benefit by using voters speech structure & making sure to drive all active flow elements in rebuttals

Opp wins close round

Room: Oconnor 204
Start: 8:00 am
Novice Parliamentary

A.

4

~~Marsh, Gary~~

VELAMURI, SUNDER

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

CA should implement a tax on plastic bags

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	SumPrep IG	POINTS	RANKS
	Liam Isaacs	28	1
	Nathaniel Griffin	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg LL	POINTS	RANKS
	Minh Le	27	3
	Nieman Liu	25	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from SumPrep IG
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Sunder Velamuri

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The affirmative team won as they did a better job of articulating the net benefits of their proposition. The AFF team was clear on the plan, the cost of the plan, the owner of the plan and also cited the cost/benefits of the plan. The NEG team was clever on the counterplan. However they did not provide any details of their plan: cost & net benefits. The AFF team did a good job pointing out the deficiencies of the NEG team's arguments and won the debate.