

Judge name: Shabnam Basha
Judge number: _____

Room number: 162

AFF team name and school:

1. Veronica Knowlden - Millenium charter.
2. Nicole ~~Engen~~ Engen - Millenium charter.

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

1. Veronica Knowlden - 29
2. Nicole Engen - 28

Neg team name and school:

1. Annika Freeling - Berkeley High
2. Ava Remler - Berkeley High

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

1. Annika Freeling - 27
2. Ava Remler - 27

Comments:

<u>Aff. Speaker 1 :-</u> Good presentation and organisation of content. Confident speaker.	<u>Neg. Speaker 1</u> Good presentation although could work little more on the presentation. - confident speaker.
<u>Aff. Speaker 2 :-</u> Good presentation and organisation of content. Confident speaker.	<u>Neg. Speaker 2 :-</u> Good presentation and organisation of content.

Winner: Aff. team.

Shabnam

Reason why:
They were more persuasive

Judge name: Karitha Kondapalli
Judge number: _____

Room number: 213

Aff team name and school:
Washington

Neg team name and school:
Millenium Highschool

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Sama Setty 26

Grace Bhatia (28)

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Shruti Vemula 23

Ashley Deep 25

Comments:

Aff: Sama Setty and Shruti Vemula made very good points and arguments. Sama's first and final conclusions were impressive. However they could have used the second round for rebuttal to Neg case. Also Shruti's ^{voice} weaving off. ~~per~~ Though her points are really ~~quite~~ good, she can improve on modality.

Neg: Grace Bhatia and Ashley were good in their contentions and also in their rebuttals. Their evidence and analogies were impressive. Keep it up!!

Winner: Negcase.

Reason why:

Negcase Made good ~~points~~, Contentions, and rebuttals with Evidence & analogies.

Page number: 20/11/20

Room number: 217

AFF team name and school:
Foxcroft PS

Neg team name and school:
Mountain House ~~PS~~

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Jayasree Peri 29

Nidhi Shettigar 28

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Chinmaya Matyela 28

Kadva Mishra 28

Comments:

1A) Excellent speaking style! Contentions were a bit messy. Great job handling their counterplan. It it was a tough one.	1N) I love counterplans! That was the only way to handle a tricky resolution.
2A) Could have argued topicality (Per. specific CT) or abusing counterplan (it left little to debate). Very poised, good job handling a challenge.	2N) You got flustered, but had a great comeback. When you put down your notes & just spoke, everything flowed. Very powerful!

winner: AA / Foxcroft PS

reason why:

→

Great debate!

Counter plan was a bit abusive, ~~the~~ only
real issue to debate was who is the
best / most appropriate actor. AHA
managed to fight their way back
& convince me that a pilot program
in CA is logical and appropriate.

THANKS FOR A FUN
ROUND!

Judge name: Varsha Mishra
Judge number: _____

Room number: 202

AFF team name and school:
Millenium Shika Acolatse
Evie Snarr

Neg team name and school:
Bentley School
Clara Schwartz
Sophie Foster

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Shika Acolatse 28.1

Evie Snarr 28.1

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

28.4 Clara Schwartz

28.5 Sophie Foster

Comments:

Winner: Neg
Bentley School
Clara Schwartz
Sophie Foster

Reason why:
This team took an approach that identified the problem, but at a Federal level. They were very clear!

Judge name: Elizabeth Clausen
Judge number: _____

Room number: 201

AFF team name and school:

Esoredo + Melmuu

Willa Gibson + Emma Ramirez

Speaker #1 (25-30)
name & points

1 ~~Willa~~ Willa 27

2 ~~Emma~~ Emma 26

Neg team name and school:

Los Altos

Angelina Luo + Nanya Singhai

Speaker #2 (25-30)
name & points

1 Angelina 27

2 Nanya 28

↳ both need to watch your "um's".

Comments:

Questions	Aff	Neg	Questions
	SP1-1- Increase availability of access to save - require all 1st responders to have it by relocation of tax \$ - easy to save lives - safe and quick - prevents further drug use in the future - save life from opioid use. Ended at a good summary. 3 points Huffington Post source	encourages opioid overdose - heroin - creates a safety net - Prince - also creates normacy in addiction may become dependent - said "um" in every sentence but I could tell you were passionate stated the same point over and over of the first 4 min. All of this was covered by your opponents not create this argument. Voice modulation - don't yell! Friend and family save the ones that give you drug not first responders.	
	Addiction blinds you - First responders have an obligation to save lives - should be over the counter - sentence fluency need work - awkward pauses - needed partners help - 27000 ppl have been saved - shouldn't take away.	what's the point of giving it to 1st responders if friends + family have it? or relocating tax \$ that could be going elsewhere - drug is too powerful for untrained people. Addicts use it as a safety net - excellent flow and speech - way to tie it together! Turned other teams argument against them.	
	Net benefits - what is best for the users - quickest way to save lives, kills 100's of 1000's of ppl every year - 1st responders can help (trained) - help to prevent future drug use.	Find a way to prevent drug addiction, don't use the people's tax money - Governor resource - money is being wasted, increases the likelihood of a relapse "Prince" - it's being used as a safety net by addicts too often - good ending with the video game bit.	

winner: Neg

reason why:
Better argument and
speakers though need to
watch the "um's"

my number: 2096402187

Room number:
A152

AFF team name and school:
hernandez
harrington

Speaker #1
name & points (20-30)

hernandez (SP 29)
~~valentine~~ (SP 28)

Neg team name and school:
valentine

Nathan
Berkeley ~~valentine~~
Speaker #2
name & points (20-30)

harrington (SP 26)
~~valentine~~
nathan (SP 30)

Comments:

<u>A</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Both</u>
Speaker #1: good job refuting	* suicide was a good point!! S+2: GREAT JOB on your refuting and rebuilding your case	* what is Naloxone? * Wm * organization * perfect world * status quo? * opioid crisis? * impact? links? * CA not USA research! research! research

winner:
Negation

reason why:

Judge name: Bharathi Ramchandraseo Room number: 161
Judge number: Karla Buenaventura

~~NEG~~
~~AFF~~ team name and school:
AFF
Foxcroft

~~NEG~~
~~NEG~~ team name and school:
Neg
Crystal Springs Uplands

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

1. Esha Padbhawia 28.5

2. Winnie Dong 27

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

1. Kyra Reepke 26

2. Phoebe Wong 25

Comments:

AFF 1st: - great 2nd speech - fluency/articulation needs to be improved in 1st speech 2nd: - you talk alot about why naloxone good but justify ↑ - weigh impacts more Neg 1st: - no links - prove how addiction will be ↓ w/ therapy - work on fluency 2nd: - be more confident - justify why long term better than short don't speak to each other during speech Winner: AFF	Round: • both teams talk about naloxone in general but do not specifically talk about whether or not it should be increased enough, more emphasis on this - (AFF should've extended increase in IAR more) • Neg needs more links, needs to prove uniqueness of CP • Overall round came down to solvency + who accessed it • more analysis needed for both teams
--	---

Reason why:
AFF ~~are~~ are to prove CP + overall refuted extended better

IAC

def: naloxone
used to stop
opoid ab
plan: ~~WFA~~ CA
gov \$10 mil subsidize
into naloxone
RF: ASAP

W: net-benefits
S: 2016 647.
Americans died
of OD
- naloxone
successful in
stopping 93%
of time
- restored to
normal respiration
only 1-3 hours
after OD

- \$150 / dose
• subsidize
solves
A: lives
• stops overdose
• too high, inaccessible
\$150 → \$4,000
• BP jacks prices
• no reason to be
high
↳ impact minimized
• subsidies solve
↳ more access = more
lives

RU

INC

counterpoint: mandatory
initial therapy
6x therapy session
per year
17% ↑ in rg tax
prevents opioid overdose,
gives one step (p.nachol)

DA: bad consequence
- 107 died w/ year
• saves lives in short
term
- first responder
get addiction?
• does not solve addiction
• not increasing ↑,
V consequences

DA: protection better
than reaction
• more trauma = opoid
• everyone goes to therapy
allows to cope
- prevents isolation
CP: not stopping
naloxone
How does therapy
solve?
→ not stopping
naloxone, constant
• long-term prevention
short term reaction

IAR

AFF
a: goes unregulated
• costs go under
insure
- Health insurance
can cover
• talking about
accessibility
↳ low-income
can't afford
• aff saves lives
↳ affects minorities

Neg

DA:

• 107 people die
later
• would have
died in the
first place w/o
naloxone
• doesn't solve
the root problem
- short-term
people die
DA 2: problem
- naloxone is present
• naloxone good
both agree

CP: not competitive
if it can occur from
Vote a RF at some time
↳ would die w/o
OD

INR

AFF

A: lives

• insurance used
to cover high
costs
• not how
insurance
works
↳ if not succeed
has to have
been present
to save lives
• naloxone not
available

Neg

DA:

not long term
solution

• wouldn't have
survived

• not trying
to get rid of
naloxone
availability
not increase

• already
successful

↳ solve for
long term
more important

• no perm:
- AFF submit
neg

• too much
strain in
econ

• only important
neg

2NR

impact calc

• AFF

- will save lives in
short term

• ↑ addiction

• destabilize
economy

• long-term >
short-term

• focus on
investment from
future

ZAR

• CP non-competitive
aff can perm
- no analysis on
uniqueness

• only talk w/
cost -
- gov doesn't
pay for
therapy

• solving both

• put (minutes)
get impacted

• not solely on
neg

Judge name: Robin Bartelman
Judge number: _____

Room number
203

Increase Narcan Dist to 1st Providers

AFF team name and school:

Jordan Keys - Millenium H.S.

Manal Sidd - Millenium H.S.

Neg team name and school:

Sydney Taylor Berkeley

Gurkiran Bains M.H.H.S.

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Jordan - 29.50

Manal 30
59.50

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Sydney 30.00

Gurkiran 29.00
59.00

Comments:

AFF - clearly stated the naloxene works & is cheap.

NEG - increased access to antidote will result in continued use instead of seeking treatment

AFF - Increases access to treatment to all levels of society

NEG - \$ for naloxene should be spent on treatment and access to

AFF - No financial impact increased access, even regardless

Winner: AFF

Reason why:

Neg arguments were weak and didn't have citations to back claim that ODs always OD again

AFF

Drug is cheap \$1.84

184,000 dead of O.D.

Drugs saves lives and
cost

Epidemic has ballooned
some states monitor drug abuse
All walks of life af

NEGation

- Narcan has been around 40 years but deaths increased
- Users will increase since ODs are fixable
- Will reduce seeking treatment for addiction
- Narcan also subject to OD.
- "better humans"?
- opponents have failed to address contentions
- easy access to Narcan

increased addiction
not ad

Judge name: Rubena Rashid
Judge number: 4086770782

Room number: 212

AFF team name and school:

Jindal & Giri

WASHINGTON HIGH

Neg team name and school:

YI & MORENO

MHHS & MILLENNIUM

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

JINDAL (AFF) (28)

YI (NEG) (28.5)

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

GIRI (AFF) (28)

MORENO (NEG) (27)

Comments:

Jindal - You started off with a clear plan, direct contentions & strong arguments. You were confident & refuted the NEG contentions.
Giri - You maintained the strength of your arguments & built upon the arguments stated by your partner.
Yi - You had a strong statement to start with but you were not strong in rebuttal. You are confident & tried to maintain the arguments.
Moreno - You could have strengthened your arguments & given more legitimate reasoning.

Winner: AFF

Reason why:

AFF started off with a good plan, & listed their contentions & maintained it throughout. NEG team couldn't rebut all the AFF contentions. AFF held through their arguments all the way.

Judge name: Ana Castelli
Judge number: _____

Room number
~~213~~ 215

AFF team name and school:

Buhach
L M

Neg team name and school
Mountain House

H K

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Lolanne 29

Marr 29

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Hag 27

KanaKi 27

Comments:

Buhach Team:

- very confident on arguments debating
- strong and clear evidences
- They used the time with great informations and clear reason for my decision.

Judge name: Vijaya San kara
Judge number: _____

Room number: 218

Aff team name and school:

Washington SS

Fremont

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Serena Zhang (Neg) - 28

Anika Shah (Affirm) - 28

Neg team name and school

Foxcroft HZ

San Jose

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

28 - Stella He (Neg)

25 Gopika Sridhar (Aff)

Comments:

1. Need to improve contentional effort from Aff team side.
2. ~~well~~ Researched well from Neg. team.
3. Neg. team showed more contentions.
4. Questions raised from each team are not answered well by other team. (Not properly answered to each other).

Winner: Neg. team

Reason why:
More, effective contentions
from Neg. team

Judge name: Andrea Hurlley
Judge number: _____

Room number: _____

Washington
AFF team name and school:

Sophia Lvo 28

Isabella Morales

Calif. State Gov should increase availability of Naloxone to 1st responders to combat opioid abuse

Neg team name and school

Eugenia
~~Eugenia~~

Amanda Hao

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Sophia Lvo 27.4

Eugenia XV 28.6
~~Isabella~~

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Isabella Morales
Eugenia XV 27.4

Amanda Hao 27.6

Comments:

Sophia - Good "sticking with it" The point about other companies making Naloxone was a negative because the company that makes it now has a patent. & Maybe build more how first responders having it prevents deaths -

Good engagement w/ issue.

~~Sophia~~ Eugenia - Great argument re: monopolies - good organization and flow. Slow down just a touch. Good say strong voice! waste of time though to call opponents doing a "terrible job" - ~~lost~~ ~~say why~~ arguing their points

Isabella - Good engagement w/ issue; ~~element~~ Sometimes I got lost ~~on~~ when you were speaking.

Amanda - Good focus - slow down a bit. & I got lost a few times as to what points ~~you~~ you were addressing

Judge name: Vemula, Ranja a
Judge number: _____

Room number: 160

AFF team name and school:

Devin Lanzone - Bentley School

Madeleine Wilson - Bentley School

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Devin Lanzone - 28

Madeleine Wilson - 28

Samen Rida Shaikh

Neg team name and school
Mountain House - Samen Rida Shaikh

Mountain House - Donia Ghaith

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Samen Rida Shaikh - 28

Madeleine Wilson - 28.5

29.5

Donia Ghaith - 29.5

Comments:

AFF Team couldn't be able to
contradict the ~~po~~ strong points of opponent
team

NEG team was able to get very good
points to support the overall debate
statement.

Winner:

Mountain House

Reason why:

Better at getting
strong points

Judge name: Paladagula, Bharathi
Judge number: _____

Room number: 153

Aff team name and school:

Maria Keira - John Swift

Sanjana Makkala - Washington

Neg team name and school:

Passa Pungchai - Mountain House

Arshita Senthipathi

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

28

27

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

30

29

Comments:

- The neg. team are clear, confident, & well-educated about the topic. they had strong arguments & lots of statistics.
- The aff. team had nice explanations & clear notes, but ~~to~~ didn't have strong arguments.
- Both sides had a nice presentation with confidence.

winner:

Neg.

reason why:

- Strong arguments
- lots of information & statistics