

62

Kiam Yeow - Kudos Leadershi

Open LD Round 4- 3:45pm

Room: La Reina 106

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45 pm

Ballot Due: 4:30 Pm

Affirmative: Nova 42 Academy HX

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning JM

Name

Points
(100-70)

Henry Xu

95

Name

Points
(100-70)

James Miller

90

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

Wayne H. Barber
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

LA Reina HS
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging! You make this tournament possible!!

(Wayne H. Barber)

Henry Xu = Won the debate

- Clearly stated his case.

- Pointed out flaws in James' logic

JAMES Miller - Very promising debator

- Should use current data to support
a case.

- Misinterpreted Henry's case.

58 Kelly Barber - La Reina

Open LD Round 4- 3:45pm

Room: La Reina 102

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45 pm

Ballot Due: 4:30 Pm

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership TH

Negative: Nova 42 Academy SZ

Name	Points (100-70)	Name	Points (100-70)
Ted Hong	2 85	Sabrina Zhang	1 90

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

Kelly Barber

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging! You make this tournament possible!!

Aff

- outline ~~per~~ what your contentions subpts are so its ~~easier~~ easier to flow
- @ the end of your 1AR Speech tie in your ~~value~~ value + value criterion
- give a roadmap ~~for~~ for your speeches
- ~~bring in new evidence into the last speech~~
- get evidence that combats ~~against~~ against drug courts

Neg

- I really like the drug courts ~~argument~~ argument but define what drug courts are and how important they are ~~how they~~
- Use an example of a country where drug courts are really effective
- extend more on Contention 2 and give more examples
- ~~1~~

64 Daniel Kyle - Nova 42

Open LD Round 4- 3:45pm

Room: La Reina 104

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45 pm

Ballot Due: 4:30 Pm

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership US

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning TS

Name

Points
(100-70)

Name

Points
(100-70)

1 Uma Shakla

80

Tarun Subramanian

2

79

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging! You make this tournament possible!!

Comments:

Uma: To help your star look ~~up~~ up and exaggerate your
mouth. Read the case more, ~~etc~~Tarun: Breathe and slow down. That is not a
slow down speak clearer. Your 2nd and 3rd contention made
no senseRFD Both of you don't talk ~~the~~ during opponents
speech
RFD Given in round 4

48 Emma Martin - La Reina

Open LD Round 3- 1:45pm

Room: La Reina 1042019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament**Round Start: 1:45 pm****Ballot Due: 2:30 pm****Affirmative:** Academy of Higher Learning NH**Negative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership
USNamePoints
(100-70)NamePoints
(100-70)AFF

Nelson Hu

97NEG

Uma Shakla

87**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.**Low Point Win? NO

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging!

Neg doesn't access any of their impact throughout the round - but they directly link to all args that center. AFF CI + CII provide solvency that go unconsidered throughout the round. AFF also takes the FW down proving consequentialism within the crime. just. system machine is not upheld when the system is flawed.

59

Sophie Zhang - Kudos Leadershi

Open LD Round 4- 3:45pm

Room: La Reina 109

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45 pm

Ballot Due: 4:30 Pm

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning DC

Negative: Nova 42 Academy AK

Name	Points (100-70)	Name	Points (100-70)
<u>1</u> Daniel Choi	<u>2</u> <u>88</u>	<u>2</u> Andrew Kim	<u>1</u> <u>92</u>

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

Sophie Zhang
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging! You make this tournament possible!!

Daniel Choi: Good speech with clear statement on the supporting evidences and analysis. Was able to make good arguments and ~~clarification~~ clarifications on defending the case. More confident presentation will be helpful, very good potential!

Andrew Kim: Great speech with thorough researched supporting evidences and strong arguments. Also, Critical thinking & analytical ability & skills to make the point and hold the ground!

60 **Helena Mao - Nova 42**

Open LD Round 4- 3:45pm

Room: La Reina 1082019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament**Round Start: 3:45 pm****Ballot Due: 4:30 Pm****Affirmative:** Academy of Higher Learning SJ**Negative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership
CFNamePoints
(100-70)NamePoints
(100-70)


____ Soren Jensen

198

____ Christina Feng

292**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.**

Low Point Win? ____



JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

NOVA 42

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging! You make this tournament possible!!

- Clear statement of value, contention, evidence and statistics.
- You picked apart two main evidences from your opponent - # of people and lower-income people using off-labeled drugs.
- It's apparent that you know your evidence well.

- You did not state a value at the beginning, which made it hard to understand and put your contentions in context.
- You had good cross examinations and re-stated your case well - but stating that the opponents definition (the part about not including distribution) limits your ability to argue neg, came across as you really don't have a strong stand.

61

Sanjana Vintha _ - La Reina

Open LD Round 4- 3:45pm

Room: La Reina 107

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45 pm

Ballot Due: 4:30 Pm

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership JL

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning NH

Name

Points
(100-70)

Name

Points
(100-70)

Jeffrey Liu

1 - 90

Nelson Hu

2 - 88

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging! You make this tournament possible!!

Jeffrey:

- very strong value that had a good knowledge on
- used more scenarios/ "for instance"
- had clear, concise roadmap
- upheld points through the whole case

Nelson:

- upheld points very well
- ↳ was able to support value and value criterion
- used cards to very good advantage

63

Tarani Udayakumar - La Reina

Open LD Round 4- 3:45pm

Room: La Reina 105

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45 pm

Ballot Due: 4:30 Pm

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership LW

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning TH

Name

Points
(100-70)

Name

Points
(100-70)

Luke Wu

1

89
~~88~~

Timothy Ha

2

87
~~85~~Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

Tarani Udayakumar

La Reina

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging! You make this tournament possible!!

Both Aff and Neg looked at each other instead of judge.
 Aff kept cutting off the Neg. I ~~can't~~ didn't understand
 Neg's contention 1 & link. ~~Aff didn't use all of cross examination~~
 Neg didn't use all of cross examination.

65 Evelyn Barber - La Reina

Open LD Round 4- 3:45pm

Room: La Reina 103

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45 pm

Ballot Due: 4:30 Pm

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning PP

Negative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
FZ

Name

Points
(100-70)

Name

Points
(100-70)

Aff

Phillip Park

9

87 Neg

Franklin Zhu

2

86

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.Low Point Win? yesEvelyn Barber
JUDGE'S SIGNATURELa Reina High School
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging! You make this tournament possible!!

Aff 3:28

- In your 1AR, I like how you said you could adapt the portugual approach to the public health approach. You covered the opponents' case nicely.
- In your aff (2AR) rebuttal, I would make sure to summarize the round with the ~~end~~ voting issues of this round.

Neg 2:54

- make sure you go over all of his points when you're answering his contentions in the neg rebuttal construction.
- I liked your solvency for your case, and the extention of your impacts and value/value criterion.

I voted neg because I felt the neg did a better job at extending the value and value criterions in the debate. The neg also did a good job at explaining why you need to uphold consequentialism because it included the affs value.