

# Double Check Sheet -- Round 5 -- Div 1 Parliamentary

Biggerst	Pai-Duro	Anant Pai Carolann Duro	25.0 26.0	0 0	Corral-Duke	Emilee Corral Ashley Duke	22.0 22.0	0 0	AFF -- Pai-Duro
Bush Emi	Su-Rivas	Tatiana Su Cesar Rivas	26.0 24.0	0 0	Hunt-Schaaf	Katie Hunt Katie Schaaf	26.0 25.0	0 0	NEG -- Hunt-Schaaf
Colby Aa	Mathur-Saric	Devanshi Mathur Ivana Saric	26.0 25.0	0 0	Yun-Tan	Justin Yun Tori Tan	24.0 25.0	0 0	AFF -- Mathur-Saric
Daniels	Ganime-Richards	Farid Ganime Brooklyn Richards	27.0 28.0	0 0	Serrano-Ottoson	Anthony Serrano Tyler Ottoson	27.0 28.0	0 0	NEG -- Serrano-Ottoson
Hunt Wen	Khandakar-Azam	Alvi Khandakar Humza Azam	27.0 27.0	0 0	Ramirez-Murillo	Rebecca Ramirez Kristian Murillo	25.0 25.0	0 0	AFF -- Khandakar-Azam
Itkis Mi	Aurajo-Cappelli	Camila Aurajo Kathy Cappelli	25.0 27.0	0 0	Reddy-Han	Dwarak Reddy Alex Han	25.0 26.0	0 0	AFF -- Aurajo-Cappelli
Lala San	Mathieson-Nguyen	Hannah Mathieson Annie Nguyen	26.0 27.0	0 0	Sanchez-Massini	Juan Sanchez Adam Massini	27.0 27.0	0 0	AFF -- Mathieson-Nguyen
Mansour	Allen-Gutierrez	Allen Allen Mirella Gutierrez	27.0 27.0	0 0	Harcarik-Johnson	Austin Harcarik Erica Johnson	27.0 28.0	0 0	NEG -- Harcarik-Johnson
Mathur Y	Clement-Patel	Joshua Clement Akshar Patel	26.0 27.0	0 0	Zhang-Pantoja	Alex Zhang Elijah Pantoja	28.0 28.0	0 0	NEG -- Zhang-Pantoja
Mlynarsk	Rush-Mills-Strickl	Lance Rush-Mills Glenn Strickland	25.0 25.0	0 0	Lopez-Greene	Andrew Lopez Gavin Greene	25.0 25.0	0 0	AFF -- Rush-Mills-Strickl
Ottoson	Xie-Chitre	Brian Xie Amberish Chitre	29.0 29.0	0 0	Huerta-Zarglis	Gabriela Huerta Sara Zarglis	26.0 26.0	0 0	AFF -- Xie-Chitre
Pickett	Ramsey-Murillo	Ta'Myra Ramsey Vanessa Murillo	25.0 22.0	0 0	Seymore-Halverson	Ariana Seymore Kristina Halverson	26.0 28.0	0 0	NEG -- Seymore-Halverson
Pielstic	Pascua-Sirski	Jilly Pascua William Sirski	28.0 29.0	0 0	Webb-Strong	Cody Webb William Strong	27.0 26.0	0 0	AFF -- Pascua-Sirski
Sapio Ka	Sanchez-Bergh	Jesse Sanchez Michael Bergh	27.0 26.0	0 0	Guerrieri-Long	Francesco Guerrieri Reggy Long	29.0 28.0	0 0	NEG -- Guerrieri-Long
Sims Jen	Jekki-Marshall	Diana Jekki Sydney Marshall	25.0 25.0	0 0	Cortina-Itkis	Luis Cortina Sasha Itkis	25.0 25.0	0 0	AFF -- Jekki-Marshall
Wolf Aus	Shahatit-Winston	Amir Shahatit Faith Winston	26.0 25.0	0 0	Schiffiris-Weigand	Sam Schiffiris Madisson Weigand	28.0 28.0	0 0	NEG -- Schiffiris-Weigand

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

### AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Rush-Mills-Strickland	POINTS Max = 30	
	Lance Rush-Mills	25	
	Glenn Strickland	25	

### NEGATIVE

POS	Lopez-Greene	POINTS Max = 30	
	Andrew Lopez	25	
	Gavin Greene	25	

The better debating was done by the AFF from Rush-Mills  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Marlena Mlynarska

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This was a messy round, and took me a lot of deliberation. The AFF's arguments were not articulated and presented with the best analysis but negative shared inaccurate analysis, that was pointed out as false by the aff. After comparing all three points and the flow, Aff was able to create the most logical scenario despite it being somewhat "magical and unrealistic".

AFF: please reconsider an economic motion, until you are better prepared to offer analysis. I appreciate your ability to recognize neg's mistakes. Both sides had faulty arguments that were not linked & impacted out.

Take burden off citizen  
 Aff: you failed to knowledg the impacts of 1/2 of government funding on people.

Neg: 1920's way not caused by too much money going around.

you both did not have enough depthful analysis

~~idea~~ Be more careful with your claims ask why... and who is this impacting

Neg: you failed to tell me why small classes are better :-)

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Pai-Duro	POINTS Max = 30
	Anant Pai	25
P.M.	Carolann Duro	26

## NEGATIVE

POS	Corral-Duke	POINTS Max = 30
L.O.	Emilee Corral	22
	Ashley Duke	22

The better debating was done by the

Aff from Pai-Duro  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: No

Signed: [Signature]

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

You all show good promise keep with it!!

Aff "Plan" was not a plan → 2 sentences.  
 Needs Admin, Mandates, Financing, Enforcement etc  
 Good solution of Aust + Great Britain + Develop more  
 Good use of "Impacts"  
 Your "Contentions" were advantages → good # of them  
 Tell judge to "Carry across" drops by the opp

Neg - Use your time (4:02 left for L.O.) + (4:01 left for M.O.)  
 → Give more examples etc.

Attack their lack of plan specs -

⊗ Counter Define their "small fine" if the public doesn't vote  
 → remind judge this was a prima facie burden  
 and counter Def "\$1.00" → that takes out  
 All of their advantages of "Forced voting" plan

RFD: opp had good logic that "forced" = bad outcomes  
 BUT P.M. who reminded fine and you get out of D.A.'s = AFF/Gov Win

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA  
February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Team Name	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Ganime-Richards		
2	Farid Ganime	27	
	Brooklyn Richards	28	

## NEGATIVE

POS	Team Name	POINTS Max = 30	
2	Serrano-Ottoson		
1	Anthony Serrano	27	
	Tyler Ottoson	28	

The better debating was done by the NEG from SERRANO-OTTOSON  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Mike Daniels

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF fell just short in proving that CALIFORNIA WAS OBLIGATED IN ALLOWING GAY MARRIAGE. Neg team did better job in defining the "Pursuit of happiness" definition. Neg team mention of CA voters saying no to gay marriage strengthened their position in the Debate. Prop team Rebuttals came just short on challenging the neg team. A very close debate.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POS	Team Name	POINTS Max = 30	
	<b>Mathieson-Nguyen</b>		
2	Hannah Mathieson		26
1	Annie Nguyen		27

**NEGATIVE**

POS	Team Name	POINTS Max = 30	
	<b>Sanchez-Massini</b>		
2	Juan Sanchez		27
1	Adam Massini		27

The better debating was done by the APP from \_\_\_\_\_  
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:**

The APP team defined their weighing mechanisms for the proposal as "who proves what stabilizes the economy most" wins and the app team did a slightly better job defending and persuading the weighing factor. Also, the Neg team had 1 point against 5 raised by the App. There were however specific instances where the App team could have done better points...

- 1) Lowering wages - App team did not counteract with the fact that lowering wages will also reduce the ability of people to spend money
- 2) Ask for examples where neoclassical theory has recently been employed

Overall, a great, and a very close debate.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Xie-Chitre	POINTS Max = 30	
2	Brian Xie	29	
1	Amberish Chitre	29	

## NEGATIVE

POS	Huerta-Zarglis	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Gabriela Huerta	26	
2	Sara Zarglis	26	

The better debating was done by the

AFF  
AFF or NEG

from

Xie-Chitre  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: "This house would roll with"

**AFF 1** Gun Control legislation

- 1) Mental health / background
- 2) Assault ban
- 3) mentally ill barred

(2150 STATES

- 1) Consistency in US Fed law gun crime over state lines?
- 2) Making it difficult to buy guns will make people less motivated?

**AFF 2**

- 1) Consistency - state lines = availability
- 2) Not all weapons banned - just assault rifles
- 3) The Black Market exists regardless
- 4) Fake Id ≠ background check

**NEG 1**

- 1) Assault weapon ban wasn't effective
- 2) Bill Clinton?

Economic impact of gun sales?  
Cost of enforcement  
2nd Amendment  
National Security?

There are ways around buying guns legally? Papers forged, Past bans haven't worked.

**NEG 2**

- 1) ~~Assault~~ Bans don't work
- 2) mental illness not clearly defined
- 3) States rights trump fed ~~rights~~
- 4) Background checks easily faked? (drugs are banned & still available)

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

### AFFIRMATIVE

POS	NAME	POINTS Max = 30	
2	Khandakar-Azam		
1	Alvi Khandakar	27	
	Humza Azam	27	

### NEGATIVE

POS	NAME	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Ramirez-Murillo		
2	Rebecca Ramirez	25	
	Kristian Murillo	25	

The better debating was done by the AFF from KHANDAKAR/AZAM  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: W Hunt

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- AFF/PROPOSITION PRESENTED A CASE: THAT THE EUROPEAN UNION SHOULD KEEP GREECE IN THE UNION; THEY GAVE 3 CONTENTIONS TO SUPPORT THEIR CASE
- NEG/OPPPOSITION STATED THEY COULD NOT DEBATE THE TOPIC BECAUSE IT WAS NOT COMMON KNOWLEDGE; THEY ASKED AFF/PROPOSITION TO DEFINE NEG/OPPPOSITION'S CASE; "MAKING GREECE LEAVE WOULD BE BETTER THAN KEEPING THEM IN."
- NEG/OPPPOSITION DID NOT OFFER A CASE, NOR DID THEY OFFER ANY INFORMATION TO REFUTE AFF/PROPOSITION'S CASE. THEREFORE, AFF/PROPOSITION WON THE DEBATE.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

### AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Team Name	POINTS Max = 30	
	Ramsey-Murillo		
	Ta'Myra Ramsey	25	
	Vanessa Murillo	22	*

### NEGATIVE

POS	Team Name	POINTS Max = 30	
	Seymore-Halverson		
	Ariana Seymore	26	
	Kristina Halverson	28	

The better debating was done by the Neg from Chico Hills  
AFF & NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: [Signature]

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*Neg contested each contention and successfully argued their points. Aff struggled to support their points*

*\* speaker was not confident of argument, needs to use less ums, ~~and~~ slow down ~~and~~ to put her thoughts ~~together~~ together better.*

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA  
February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Shahatit-Winston	POINTS Max = 30	
	Amir Shahatit	26	
	Faith Winston	25	

## NEGATIVE

POS	Schiffriis-Weigand	POINTS Max = 30	
	Sam Schiffriis	28	
	Madisson Weigand	28	

The better debating was done by the NEG from Schiffriis-Weigand  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Wolf Austin

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Amir 11  
Faith 111

Sam 1  
Madisson 1

NEG solidly refuted AFF contentions with adequate evidence  
AFF provided poor examples and contradicted themselves

weighing: Utilitarianism  
too specific/odd examples  
contradiction

US progressing green policy

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA  
February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Aurajo-Cappelli	POINTS Max = 30	
	Camila Aurajo	25	
	Kathy Cappelli	27	

## NEGATIVE

POS	Reddy-Han	POINTS Max = 30	
	Dwarak Reddy	25	
	Alex Han	26	

The better debating was done by the AFF from Aurajo-Cappelli  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: M. Itkis

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good debates. Topic "Sport funding" vs "education funding" is well selected by AFF team. Alex and Dwarak had a number of good points (about positive effect on health), but they could find some stronger arguments to support their NEG position. Camila and Kathy provided strong defence of their position.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

### AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Sanchez-Bergh	POINTS Max = 30	
	Jesse Sanchez	27	
	Michael Bergh	20	

### NEGATIVE

POS	Guerrieri-Long	POINTS Max = 30	
	Francesco Guerrieri	29	
	Reggy Long	28	

The better debating was done by the NEG from Guerrieri-Long  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Karen Sapio

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good debate -  
AFF defined topic in a creative way & made a good case.

NEG - refutation was very compelling and extremely logical and well organized and clear.

I gave the win to NEG on the clarity & superior organization of both <sup>their</sup> contentions & their refutations.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Su-Rivas	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Tatiana Su	26	
2	Cesar Rivas	29	

## NEGATIVE

POS	Hunt-Schaaf	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Katie Hunt	26	
2	Katie Schaaf	25	

The better debating was done by the NEG from Hunt-Schaaf  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Emily Ford

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neither case was good but I chose Neg because they address all of Aff's points and proved their own case while Aff did not effectively uphold their own case ~~and not effectively~~ or have an effective response to Neg's rebuttals.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	POINTS Max = 30	
Mathur-Saric		
Devanshi Mathur	26	
Ivana Saric	25	

## NEGATIVE

POS	POINTS Max = 30	
Yun-Tan		
Justin Yun	24	
Tori Tan	25	

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

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

Signed: Colby Aaron

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

For many intents and purposes, this round was two ships passing in the night. The decision ended up coming down to A) which side's impacts were more believable and B) which side provided the most clash in the round. Though they had time fulfillment issues, the affirmative ended up stronger in both cases. They set up a plan, discussed the feasibility of its implementation, and listed a few positive impacts from it. The negative team attempted to define 'illegal immigrants' as 'drug dealers', a definitional challenge that was unwarranted, incorrect, and not even observed by themselves. As the drug dealer point was ultimately one of their only areas of clash, and was fairly easily refuted with the point that it is already illegal in status quo, they ended up being shut out of the round.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Clement-Patel	POINTS Max = 30	
	Joshua Clement	26	3
	Akshar Patel	27	2

## NEGATIVE

POS	Zhang-Pantoja	POINTS Max = 30	
	Alex Zhang	28	1
	Elijah Pantoja	28	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from ~~Aff~~ Zhang - Pantoja  
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:

- Aff clearly defined the topic - US will help Syria
- Aff ~~was unable to~~ put forward arguments to defend their definition - why & how
- NEG provided good counter arguments to each of Aff arguments
- Aff ~~made certain~~ gave certain examples (e.g. US needs to improve relations with Turkey / make Turkey an ally) that were blown apart by NEG
- Aff made arguments but was not able to effectively defend them
- NEG came up with argument that was more convincing than Aff (decrease violence vs arm rebels).

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE


POS	NAME	POINTS Max = 30	
	Allen-Gutierrez		
	Allen Allen	27	27
	Mirella Gutierrez	27	<del>27</del>

## NEGATIVE

POS	NAME	POINTS Max = 30	
	Harcarik-Johnson		
	Austin Harcarik	27	27
	Erica Johnson	28	

The better debating was done by the Negative from Harcarik-Johnson  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*They did a great job.*

*But Mirella Gutierrez was aggressive.*

*The weighing mechanism should be carried through the entire debate if it is going to be used.*

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

### AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Team Name	POINTS Max = 30	
2	Pascua-Sirski	28	
1	Jilly Pascua William Sirski	29	

### NEGATIVE

POS	Team Name	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Webb-Strong	27	
2	Gody Webb William Strong	26	

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

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

Signed: 

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Sirski: Great sign-posting. Thank you! Well-articulated & justified arguments.

Pascua: Clear communication, but just a restate with little development beyond Sirski's initial comments.

Webb: Good job refuting w/o knowledge or nature of resolution. You are prepared. ~~to~~ <sup>you</sup> ~~not~~ introduce a counter-plan, please state it as such.

Strong: Lots of throat-clearing. Good clarification of Webb's points, but I wonder if it was also an attempt to reframe your initial contentions. I feel like the argument was shifted slightly mid-round.

The N Korea issue is difficult to debate. I felt both sides were prepared to discuss the issue, but on balance, the AFF presented a more developed and supported case.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

### AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Jekki-Marshall	POINTS Max = 30	
	Diana Jekki	25	
	Sydney Marshall	25	

### NEGATIVE

POS	Cortina-Itkis	POINTS Max = 30	
	Luis Cortina	25	
	Sasha Itkis	25	

The better debating was done by the AFF from Jekki-Marshall  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: J. M. Sims

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF - very well planned out. Perhaps pre-planned? They pulled in personal experiences to illustrate position but also had cited resources to support, too. \*The ladies were a little disrespectful however and should refrain from rolling their eyes or waving their arms to get the floor when their opponent is in the middle of a thought. Ms. Marshall should have allowed the point of information.

Neg. They both started so strong but didn't have enough material to fill their allotted time. They seemed to have been nervous and didn't react well to the points of information interruptions.