

FINAL – ROOM 150 – FINISH BY 4:30 !!!!!!! Rank next to the names, 1-8 (no ties at 8, leave 9s blank)

Adrian Baek

2 ~~1~~ **Christina Xu**

8 **Kaylee Wong**

7 **Cassie Kao**

4 **Silvia Gibilaro**

3 **Ingrid Luo**

Justin Lim

Justin Hong

6 **Kalen Han**

1 ~~1~~ **Luna McNeff**
Yee

5 **Zoe Kazan**

Cailyn Wang

Anne Chen

4 **Kerry Zhang**

	Spicks	Qs		
A.B.	NEG		-6	1
G.X.	AFF		-3	1
K.W.	AFF		-3	1
C.K.	AFF		-5	1
S.G.	NEG		-6	(3)
I.L.	NEG		-4	3
J.L.	AFF		-2	2

	Spicks	Qs		
J.H.	AFF		-3	1
K.H.	AFF		-6	2
L.Y.	AFF		-3	3
Z.H.	AFF		-2	1
C.W.	NEG			1
A.C.	NEG		-1	1
K.Z.	AFF		-6	2

Adrian Baek

2. Christina Xu

3. Kaylee Wong

5. Cassie Kao

Silvia Gibilaro

4. Ingrid Luo

Justin Lim

Justin Hong

1. Kalen Han

1. Luna McNeff
Yee

8. Zoe Kazan

6. Cailyn Wang

Anne Chen

Kerry Zhang

- Han: very good volume; social skills is needed
AFF;
2. Gibilaro: good conduct; preschool is useless
Neg; → shorten questions!
3. Zhang: Try not to walk around as much;
Aff; benefit our economy in the long run
Should not deny "low income children"
Kids will be better in the future
4. Luo: Neg; preschools are teaching the wrong thing;
overcrowdedness; preschools in the U.S. teach
how to really not playful ~~ness~~ness; really good at answering questions
5. Kazan: Aff; voice should be ~~louder~~ ^{louder}; free preschool will help kids in lower income;
prevents dropouts; people will get better jobs
6. Chen: Raise volume; can be more confident in capturing the room; neg
7. Hong: Analogy about the factory was awkward; good volume; really fills up the room; aff
8. Baek: Good volume; neg; financial consequences; preschool is not effective enough; good job
waiting to ask questions and then doing speech. Gough & overtime messed up. (angry)
9. Lim: AFF; preschool is the foundation of a really good person
10. Wang: Preschool is completely useless; expectations are unreasonable for kids who lack the
motor skills;
Harming kids instead of helping
11. Yee: Aff; equal opportunity for the next generation in America; children need to learn social skills
12. XU: Aff; preschool gives a good headstart on social and academic skills; those who went
to preschool test better; family in low income households would benefit
13. Wong: Aff; good volume; best investment the U.S. ~~can~~ can make; fewer criminal and dropout
rates; preschool is a better investment
4. KAO: Aff; good volume; good job rebutting arguments;

Adrian Baek

2 **Christina Xu**

3 **Kaylee Wong**

7 **Cassie Kao**

6 **Silvia Gibilaro**

4 **Ingrid Luo**

Justin Lim

Justin Hong

Kalen Han

1 **Luna McNeff**

Yee

5 **Zoe Kazan**

Cailyn Wang

Anne Chen

8 **Kerry Zhang**

Han: "

not responsible for
funding? it is his
burden

3:07

Zhang "

- reads off paper
- robotic
- swaying; goes on to talk about rest but doesn't defend it?
- dropped arg

2:35

Kazan "

- lack of sources(?)
- the jobs point doesn't seem direct to the bill
- rhetorical questions in cross ex? "

Hong "

- choppy analysis for refutation
- easy to understand but I don't hear anything on feasibility; just state's benefits, which every speaker has done

Lim "

- repetitive values
- uh...

2:54

Yee "

- finally! state values of education!
- well-delivered
- reads off script
- sources on point
- political practicality
- good feasibility though could've been better
- good refutation in cross-x to Baek
- source diversity

2:21

G.B. "

- isolated examples
- arg from authority
- claims there is research but doesn't cite it
- doesn't answer hows

2:55

Luo "

- good counter
- reading off paper
- doesn't allow to digest any info
- consistent

2:27

Chen "

- demand on teacher
- unique arg.
- good sources
- not hearing analysis directed to the bill
- info is good but there's no link
- arg from authority

Baek "

- pre-school cost \$12B is funded
- uses one state from 1988 to state a problem
- there are important issues
- dropped; is dodging the resolution completely

2:27

Wang "

- kids can still be kicked out
- it's useless cause ppl can get kicked out by that logic, a lot of things are useless

2:58

Xu "

- generalized analysis but adequate
- good presentation
- good refutation
- economics is eth.

2:54

Wong "

- good projection but repeated info
- reliant on a few sources
- same speech as Xu in content...

2:54

Kao "

- keeps waiting
- claims her evidence is best but it was already used
- 3rd & 4th time Georgetown was used

~~101~~ **Fidencio Jimenez - ELAC**

Open LD R4 - 3:00 FLIGHT: A

Room: E3 255

2018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: Also ASAP

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership HL

Negative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
FZ

Name	Points (30-1)	Name	Points (30-1)
✓ Ivan Leong	1 28.3	Franklin Zhu	2 26.9

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- stand up when speaking and CV

- trigger warnings must be before speech

Stumbling over words while speaking - 1. makes you slower
2. I can't understand

slow down on tag lines - I can't tell between tags/cards

voted Aff - Neg had no offense as to why Aff was bad
idea, CP/Case is only defensive.

Also given strong answers to the CP.

I think that there is a risk of Aff solvency => Aff

102 **Michael Yee - Emerson**

Open LD R4 - 3:00 FLIGHT: A

Room: E3 325

2018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: Also ASAP


Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership TH

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning TS

Name	Points (30-1)	Name	Points (30-1)
Ted Hong	1 28	Tarun Subramanian	2 27

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

Low Point Win? _____


JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

ELAC
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AFF:

Democracy and Transparency

Solid opening - delivery could be more pronounced - vary tone/volume more to add emphasis and reduce monotony. Good backing up your backing privacy definition. Good points and good sticking with them. Response to ableism ~~the~~ argument could have been a bit stronger. Also good defending the Freedom of Information Act. In most cases, I recommend against spreading. However, I would suggest working on your pacing a bit - some ~~then~~ extended pauses.

NEG:

4th Amendment and Right to Privacy

Solid argument - it seems much more impactful than when you had Aff. in the last round. Delivery - I would ~~and~~ suggest valuing fluency ~~and~~ over speed - you lose a little bit when trying to rush. Much better contentions, although the extent of the right of candidates' privacy to the general public could've been stronger - I feel like the AFF's privacy criteria did a better job of setting their parameters.

103

~~Eddie Diaz - ELAC~~

Open LD R4 - 3:00 FLIGHT: A

Room: E3 511

Triston Rendon

2018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: Also ASAP

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership LJ

Negative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
ML

Name

Points
(30-1)

Name

Points
(30-1)

Lily Johnson

1

27

Maxwell Lee

2


28

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

Low Point Win? ☒

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION



ELAC

AFF: Democracy, Maximizing Net Well Being

Truth Decay - good point. - distrust in news media - links to resolution (?)
Public holding govt. Accountable - good. Slight fluency problems, but worked
through well. Good pointing out case connecting to resolution. Interesting point
regarding candidacy. Less trust = less accountability → little hard to follow
but otherwise good responses to rebuttals. NEG did a better job of
reaching during cross x, rebuttals, etc. but AFF stuck with the key
points and convincing ~~was~~ we on their side.

NEG: ~~starting~~ Used a lot of rebuttal time on one point before getting to
your own main point. Good critique of one of AFF's contentions, however the
time could have been better spent. Great energy and delivery

Democracy and Consequentialism

Case argument was good, but I had ~~trouble~~ trouble connecting it
to the ~~NEG~~ regarding the resolution. Very good speaking however it sometimes
seemed like your points were supporting the AFF's side. ^(or contradicting yourself) Came together
a bit more towards the end, but the case ~~was~~ was a bit hard to
follow towards your implications.