

40 Emma Martin - La Reina

Open Public Forum Round 2- 11:00am

FLIGHT: A

Room: La Reina 1052019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament**Round Start: 11:00 am****Ballot Due: 12:45 pm****Flip For Sides:** Wilshire Academy DHBA**Flip for Sides:** Kudos College of Youth
Leadership SGSJ

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
-----	------	----------	-----------------

1NR	Darren Hwang	2	90
-----	--------------	---	----

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
-----	------	----------	-----------------

1NR	Susie Gu	4	85
-----	----------	---	----

1NR	Brandon An	1	90
-----	------------	---	----

1NR	Stephanie Jing	3	89
-----	----------------	---	----

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

[Signature]
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

LA REINA
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging!

aff wins filtering impact - goes ^{unrefuted} ~~unrefuted~~ and
it's the only solvency ^{arg} ~~arg~~ in the whole round -
not a run of of clash, aff wins on cost-ben analysis

34 **Natalie Yates - AofHL**

Open Public Forum Round 2- 11:00am

FLIGHT: B

Room: La Reina 1022019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament**Round Start: 11:00 am****Ballot Due: 12:45 pm****Flip For Sides:** Kudos College of Youth
Leadership DZDW**Flip for Sides:** Nova 42 Academy AWDL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
1st	Daniel Zheng	94	2

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
2nd	Andy Wu	3	93
3rd	Andrew Wang	4	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!

This was a close round. You both had good points. Neg, you need to understand Rent Control better. There is an initial cap but then a slow increase depending on location. Los Angeles is 3% that would be pretty good. Argue negs point about profit, I like your stand on filter terms but you should also discuss that run down houses can cost more in the long run per cost afford. Aff, your case was based a lot on filter terms and that you argued that market ~~reduces~~ rent works. The Neg provided evidence that the solve for it as well but better and more ethical.

36 **Natalie Yates - AofHL**Open Public Forum Round 2- 11:00am
FLIGHT: A**Room: La Reina 102**2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Deabte Only
Tournament**Round Start: 11:00 am****Ballot Due: 12:45 pm****Flip For Sides:** Kudos College of Youth
Leadership KGCS**Flip for Sides:** La Reina Middle School RGSF

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
<u>Aff</u> ³⁵⁴	Katelyn Gan	<u>31</u>	<u>92</u>
<u>Aff</u>	Cloris Shi	<u>32</u>	<u>91</u>

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
<u>Neg</u> ¹⁵⁴	Regan Gama	<u>4</u>	<u>85</u>
<u>Neg</u>	Sarah Fireman	<u>3</u>	<u>87</u>

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.Low Point Win? yes

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging!

Great debate ladies. I think there were words both sides didn't quite understand. It seemed you were arguing points that the other wasn't saying. Aff you do not seem to understand what subsidize housing is. So your rebuttals didn't make a lot of sense. You said neg dropped your point but I felt they answered it. You argued well you care but you didn't rebuttal or answer Jeremiah. Neg you also made good points but should have expanded and used the words diplomatically. I felt you solved for housing and in an ethical manner better. Your response to their filter point was solid.

39

Sophie Zhang - Kudos Leadershi

Open Public Forum Round 2- 11:00am
FLIGHT: B

Room: La Reina 109

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Deabte Only
Tournament

Round Start: 11:00 am

Ballot Due: 12:45 pm

Flip For Sides: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership CLTL

Flip for Sides: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership AJSC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
1	Clinton Lau	2	95
2	Tony Lu	3	95

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
1	Annie Jiang	1	96
2	Seth Chang	4	90

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!

Annie Jiang: Great speech with clear statements
on evidences and arguments. Impressive
tactical skills with great potential and talent.

Seth Chang: good speech with clear statements, good
analytical skills with potential to improve.

Clinton Lau: Fluent speech with good speed and
clarification. Good supporting evidences
and arguments to hold the ground.

Tony Lu: Great speech with good arguments, ~~and~~
good analytical skills to utilize
the evidences to win this round.

38

Sophie Zhang - Kudos Leadershi

Open Public Forum Round 2- 11:00am

FLIGHT: A

Room: La Reina 109

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 11:00 am

Ballot Due: 12:45 pm

Flip For Sides: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership EJSSFlip for Sides: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership ELEP

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
<u>2</u>	Ellie Jiang	<u>1</u>	<u>98</u>
<u>1</u>	Sunny Sun	<u>2</u>	<u>97</u>

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
<u>2</u>	Ethan Liu	<u>4</u>	<u>90</u>
<u>1</u>	Ethan Peng	<u>3</u>	<u>94</u>

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!

~~E. Peng: Good speech~~, good speech skills and clear statements as well as confidence. Great analytical skills with ~~great~~ promising potential.

~~Ethan Liu~~: Was able to speak well, made clear statements on the evidences. Potential and room for further improvement.

~~Sunny Sun~~: Great speaker with impressive speech skills and confidence. Made sound arguments to hold the ground.

Ellie Jiang: Great speech skills and confidence. thorough research & solid evidence to win this round.

35 Evelyn Barber - La ReinaOpen Public Forum Round 2- 11:00am
FLIGHT: A**Room: La Reina 106**2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament**Round Start: 11:00 am****Ballot Due: 12:45 pm****Flip For Sides:** Kudos College of Youth
Leadership IGZX *Aff***Flip for Sides:** Wilshire CSCS *neg*

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
<i>Aff</i> #1	Isabel Gan	3 2 3	87

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
#1	Clara Son	1 2	95

#2	Zhian Xu	2 3 4	90
----	----------	-----------------------------	----

#1	Clara Son (2)	1 2	95
----	---------------	---------------------------	---------------

(no partner)

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.Low Point Win? *no**Evelyn-Mawuan Barber**La Reina High School*

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging! 1.21*aff notes**Isabel + Zhian*

You both are very strong speakers and your answers were very coordinated. The rebuttal speech was incredible, and your explanations were very clear.

- Be more assertive in cross x! Make sure to ask questions that break down the opponents case.

- I would strengthen your impacts so they extend in your case. Make sure to try and outweigh their impacts.

(*20million)

neg notes

- your cross x was very good! you had a lot of questions that were related to their case and broke down the case.

- I liked how you outweighed the Aff's value to yours. You're a very strong speaker!

- In ~~our~~ cross x, I wouldn't spend too much time on one point of their ~~round~~ rebuttal speech.

- The voting issues at the end of your end speech was very well organized with the 3 key pillars.

more notes

Aff

In your last speech, I would focus more on impacts and how your impacts outweigh. Your relation $\neq$ causation argument was awesome!

33 Evelyn Barber - La Reina

Open Public Forum Round 2- 11:00am

FLIGHT: B

Room: La Reina 106

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 11:00 am

Ballot Due: 12:45 pm

Flip For Sides: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership AZJM

Flip for Sides: Nova 42 Academy ZHAW Aff

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
#1	Alen Zhang left	3 4 2 3	87	#2	Zaire Hampton	1 3	95
#2	Jevon Mao	4 3 2 3	87.86	#1	Daniel Lin	2 3	90

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

Thank you for Judging!

Aff

Neg

Your rebuttal was very good and the turn of the Negs red line was very well thought at. How the second speaker clarifies the arguments on the Aff side was incredible.

For the first cross-x, your questions were very good and I like how you seemed to trap them on the NY evidence.

I would strengthen your questions during cross-x and break down their case a little more.

- For your New York evidence, I would have evidence on how the study was conducted.

- For your speeches, I would lengthen them because you can fit in a lot more evidence and counterarguments in the short amount of time.

Decision

I voted for the aff because the amount of evidence to counteract the negs case was too strong to ignore. The neg did a good job on responding to the aff case, but didn't cover enough to make the arguments extend. As the neg, I would make sure

to outweigh your arguments, because if you do, it's stronger. The aff did a really good job on impacting and applying their evidence to counter the negs case. The aff's rebutals were stronger and created more evidence that worked in their favor.

37

Taylor Yazel
~~Evan Feldman~~ - Kudos
 Leadershi

Open Public Forum Round 2- 11:00am
 FLIGHT: A

Room: La Reina 108

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Deabte Only
 Tournament

Round Start: 11:00 am

Ballot Due: 12:45 pm

Flip For Sides: Kudos College of Youth
 Leadership AYHZ

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
Neg 2	Ava Ye	2	88
Neg 1	Helaine Zhao	3	86

Flip for Sides: Kudos College of Youth
 Leadership DWML

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (100-70)
Aff 2	Danielle Workman	1	90
Aff 1	Michael Lee	4	84

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!

Helaine - man this status quo argument got confusing.
 good use of summary, you got through everything
 with plenty of time.

Michael - stand tall, be confident! You know these
 answers.
 Don't smush your face at your judge
 needs a little work, but that was the best summary
 I've seen you give.

Ava - good attacks, I see your framing in
 CX - watch your attitude though. Cutting them off
 from answering could be problematic.

Danielle - Good job attacking ~~your~~ ^{Neg 1} and
 furthering your case. That property tax ^{revenue} argument
 was great.
 -Be more assertive in CX, you got this!

"Did you read the Public Forum Rulebook?"

RUDE

1:17 prep left

More on Back →

Both

We spent too much time arguing why NEG has to support a plan. I know very little outside of the constructives on what you guys are trying to do. A lot of "This will happen" but not enough hard numbers or evidence. It makes it difficult to advocate for change if I don't know exactly what's going to happen or its direct results. AFF could win this if they were more assertive in Summary and CX's.