

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Desmond Viegas

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: A 220

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Justine

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amanda Sultan

Alexa Richstone

Score
74
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Rouyn Noranda

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tony Wu
~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

Hugo Hu
~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

147
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

153
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good response to POI re: sequels
 - did not lay out burdens
 - good point in Summary speech re: any new movie can incorporate new values/themes (not just a rebut)
- Second Proposition
- point of copyright was weak
 - good line ~ "Classics will always remain classics"
 - refutation could have been stronger

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- good refutation of 1st PROP point
- effective summary speech

Second Opposition

- effective refutation of Prop's 4 points
- good point re: females / minorities / LGBTQ

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jonah Rosen

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4 Room: M339

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ville Marie

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Fatima Anees

Huda Abdelkherim

Score
73
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Valennes

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sahasro Bhowmik

Lucas Turry

Score
75
100

Score
77
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

147

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

152

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- keep model as general as possible
- Took too small of a burden
- good sign posting and tone
- Always try to fill time
- tell me about the purpose of old times and why that's wired on your side
- give examples!

Second Proposition

- Point - Time split was off, more time to construction
- Point should come one up earlier
- good POI responses
- When you talk about blackface ~~deb~~
- ~~restate~~ give examples
- good organization

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good organization
- Refutation was excellent and very methodical
- Remember to talk about impacts
- the POI that was given can be perceived as offensive, try to be careful of that

Second Opposition

- Good calling them out on model
- Loved the examples
- Remember to tell me how ~~more~~ more women in ghostbusters actually affects real people

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CHLOE SHAHNIAN

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: M341

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Mont Laurier

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ashton McNamara

Danica Scully

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Gaspé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Puneet Chhina

Anisha Biswas

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

157
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Would have been beneficial to look at the comparative in light of a regrets motion → what have these 'reboots' looked like?
- Talk about why this is an exclusive mechanism through which to learn about the past

Second Proposition

- Focus on refuting the most important opp. material → ex. the point on representation instead of the model issue

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Make sure that you impact your analysis - What are some tangible impacts of more diverse casting in movies?
- Focus on the most important themes in your summary, you want to favor your case

Second Opposition

- Make sure your reconstruction is not just repetition of constructive

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Marnell Wether

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: 243

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte-Croix

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Cameron O'Hare

Claudia Leroux

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Granby

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Mendall Barnes

Lily Rich

Score
72
100

Score
74
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
152
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
146
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Don't take on too much burden in your model
 Good division of your points
 Don't forget to tell me why any of your points actually matter
 Good poi's given
 Don't introduce new points if 30s only remain

Second Proposition

Take the other side on the best versions of their arguments to boost the quality of your refutation
 - examples will help to get your points across

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Don't forget to give evidence to justify all your claims
 - Good poi response
 - your first speech needs themes or questions to characterize the debate
 - Try to think of more points to avoid repetition

Second Opposition

Good poi responses
 Don't forget to be explicit about why your points are relevant to the motion and debate
 Don't need to rebuild points your partner repeated many many times unless they were knocked down.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: H. GUTHRIE

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 207

PROPOSITION

Team Name: LACHUTE

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

DANAE PEPELASSIS

AVA OLIN

Score
81
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BEDFORD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

HELEN PAN

EMILY LI

Score
83
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

159
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Strong delivery.

Second Proposition

Add more new argumentation to the P1's case.

*Clash with MO's strongest arguments:
Why do we reboot Shakespeare?*

Strong, vigorous, spirited delivery.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

*Raise POIs earlier.
Some vigorous rebuttal clash.
Several good lines of argument.*

Second Opposition

*Vigorous delivery -
Some good clash -*

There might be more new argumentation to add to

MO's case - strong support though

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Keith Moussa

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: A207

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Lachute

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Danae Peplarsis

Ava Olin

Score
81
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Bedford

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Helen Fan

Emily Li

Score
83
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

159

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

162

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Ideas clear right away
- Very good impact
- watch the likes!!
- Road mapping & signposting = unclear
- Time could've been filled better

Boil Down: - Themes unclear and turn into refutation
- Could have been good themes if they were labeled as such

Second Proposition

- Great roadmap
- Good impact in constructive
- Time
- Rebuttals absent / unclear

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Very good organization
- A lot of reading
- Relevant examples
- ~~Major points~~ flashed out points for
- Time not filled completely
- Could use better intro

Boil Down: - Clear roadmap
- Jobs at contradictions in Prop's case
- Starts themes over halfway through

Second Opposition

- Slow up
- Good at pointing out flaws of Prop.
- Organization could use work

→ Missed out on analyzing good themes!

Not enough POIs

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: D. HASTINGS

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 207

PROPOSITION

Team Name: LACHUTE

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

DANAE PEPLASS / AYA OLIN

Score
81
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BEDFORD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Helen Park

Emily Li

Score
83
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

159
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

162
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- nice signposting
- motion well defined
- more concrete examples would have been great
- point about creativity / new ideas should have been mentioned earlier than bail down
- well organized approach to refutation
- your constructive should be your own point, rather than a restatement of partner's points

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- use better signposting - arguments were a little hard to follow in first point
- really great Shakespeare example
- refutation well laid down was thorough

Second Opposition

- persuasive tone
- have your own constructive; your partner already discussed "artistry" and "enjoyment"

* More P.O.T.s needed all around

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christine Lang

No. of Judges: 2 Round: 4 Room: M340

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Drummondville

Team Name: Sainte-Adèle

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Eric Li Jonathan Chu

Dylan Lee Daniel Bergerin

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

<u>154</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>155</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- great speech organization; it's very clear and easy to follow
- speaking style is very clear
- excellent vocabulary
- try to incorporate more examples to support your contentions

Second Proposition

- be careful not to repeat too much of your partner's content
- liked your speech's organization and clarity
- you need varied examples

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- be careful of your body language; it can send the wrong message
- watch your rate of speed; it can make your content difficult to understand
- great use of varied examples

Second Opposition

- be careful that you don't come across as overly casual
- be sure to explain your examples as though your spectators know nothing about the topic
- good job with POIs; you think well on your feet

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Abigail Trevino

No. of Judges: 2

Round: M340 Room: 4

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quinnondville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Eric Li

Jonathan Chu

Score
87
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte-Adèle

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rylan Lee

Daniel Bergevin

Score
82
100

Score
77
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

161
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Great roadmapping, framing, and points. Excellent reply speech.

Second Proposition

Excellent rebuttal + rebuilding

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Great job taking gov's arguments at their best! Stellar reply speech.

Second Opposition

More examples + analysis would improve the strength of your arguments.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Matthew Schmeiser

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 4

Room: M328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saint-Espice

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Home

Sasha Klagen

Score
81 81
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Acton Vale

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Patrick Sheld

Anna Beaudry

Score
83
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

163
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Proposition had decent arguments that Opposition had good arguments (in an
Opposition had good arguments (in an
Prop didn't sufficiently respond to.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Opposition successfully engaged with. (be it bizarre framing sense) that

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nicholas Viegas

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saint-Sulpice

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Homa

Sasha Klien

Score
78 78
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Acton Vale

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Patrick Shield

Anna Beaudry

Score
81 81
100

Score
79 79
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

158 158
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

160 160
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

This was a very good round. down to numerous assumptions present within proposition's case.

- good model, rebuttal speech (refutation)
- relevant first point
- 2nd pt. contradictory

Second Proposition

- Really good clarifications
- good weighing & refutation
- ~~assumptions~~ made some assumptions

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Ultimately, the decision came down to numerous assumptions made & contradictions in case.

nice refutation, good rhetoric

strange way to frame round

nice points, exps, logics

Second Opposition

- Good delivery & refutation
- Nice clarification
- Spend more time on constructive point

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Glenda Stoneman

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 4 Room: 246

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: St. Remi

Team Name: Gatineau

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Laurin

Jacob Surry

Sean Oh

Simran Vig

Score
79
100

Score
76
100

Score
81
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

155

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

159

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Very organized. Clear, articulate speaking style. Clear structure to arguments that sign-posted well.

You listened well and summarized effectively in your final speech. It was good to bring the idea of creativity up again at the end.

Second Proposition

You have a lot of good ideas and a broad scope of knowledge that allowed you to add good facts and evidence to support your ideas.

↳ At times this made you speak really fast. Consider saying more in less words. (Succinct)

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Your ideas were well thought through. There is clear structure to your speech. Strong analysis of the topics you discussed.

Strong point by point refutation + good POIs.

• Good identification of themes of the debate in your rebuttal speech.

Second Opposition

Good listening skills to clearly provide refutation.

You declined a lot of POIs but answered the one you took very well.

Your speech was well structured and you added good detail and elaboration.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Liz Stratton

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M246

PROPOSITION

Team Name: St. Rémi

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Laurin

Jacob Surry

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Gatineau~~ Gatineau

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sean
~~oh~~

Simran Vig

Score
79
100

Score
75
100

Score
81
100

Score
77 77
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

154
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- engaging & dynamic speaker
- very clear structure & well organized
- strong analysis in argument #1 & 2 - but seemed to overlap
- 3rd argument could use more explicit analysis to link the backlash against Ghostbusters to ~~old~~ original fanbase

Second Proposition

- very good articulation of "expanding the universe of old movies" w/ sequels
- ~~some important points of refutation~~
- strong points of refutation to counter some opp. claims - be sure to focus on bigger issues
- organize refutation clearly
- slower speaking would enhance presentation

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- strong, thorough, & distinct refutation
- excellent POI engagement - perhaps follow up on the significance of 1st POI (ex. asking for ~~the~~ criteria to regret or not)
- important & well developed 1st argument - 2nd argument seemed very close to 1st
- strategic reply speech

Second Opposition

- excellent introduction & framing
- some effective points of refutation, but could prioritize the importance of each point (ex. spend more time refuting key ideas vs. small Prop points)
- 3rd argument was repetitive of partner's arguments
- try to refute/respond to Prop. case at it's best, not solely it's weakest

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michelle Murphy

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 4 Room: 246

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: St. Remi

Team Name: Gatineau

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Laurin

Jacob Surry

Sean Oh

Simran Vig

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

<u>161</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>158</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

clear, articulate presence
well organized and elaborated
on analysis
excellent examples
good confidence - nicely done

Second Proposition

Your movement / stepping back and forth was distracting
be careful not to be repetitive
try not to rush
Some nice clear articulation of the argument and background knowledge.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

good presentation skills
nice confidence
sometimes one point was confused with another
not always a clear argument

Second Opposition

clear and generally articulate
beautiful introduction
explain your example more precisely - eg Les Miserable

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Elspeth Easto

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 220

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte Justine

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amanda S

Alexa R

Score
70 73
100

Score
75 74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~St. Justine~~ Rouyn Norridg

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tony Wu
~~Max A.~~

Hugo Hu
~~Adam~~

Score
70 76
100

Score
70 77
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

<u>147</u>
200

147

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>153</u>
200

153

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Be aware of your burdens
- you have a good flow that would be complemented by more depth

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Be careful of offering unrelated points.

Don't both stand

Second Proposition

expand examples / case line.

Second Opposition

good points expansion needed

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex Karamba's

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 9

Room: A220

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte Justine

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Amanda S

Alexa R

Score
73 73
100

Score
79 79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~_____~~ Royal Noranda

First Speaker: _____

Second Speaker: _____

~~_____~~ Rory W

~~_____~~ Hugo H

Score
75
100

Score
76
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
197 197
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
151
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

ten me why

Second Proposition

Need better point

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Slow down

Second Opposition

Plan poi so
you don't
set up at
the same
time

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Gabriel

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 336

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Cowansville

Team Name: Quebec

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Maya Mior

Natalie Viegas

Vivek Sapru

Jessica Yu

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
<u>158</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>165</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kathryn Bjornson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M 336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Cowansville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Maya Mior

Natalie Viagas

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Divek Sapra

Jessica Yu

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

158
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

162
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Good intro, good roadmapping but also roadmap partner's points at beginning. Good closing.

Second Proposition

Good organization & roadmapping. Nice rebuilding. Your regret that the classics won't be watched was well expressed, but you could have appealed more to the artistic merit of the classic + the change that a reboot could tarnish the franchise.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Good point about new diversity. Very good refutation. You correctly refuted the plagiarism point. Appreciated you explaining why this low-impact ~~point~~ ^{message} is actually important.

Second Opposition

Your assessment of their framing was correct - as well as your point that reboots will create new interest in the classics.

1115 STUART TUNNEL

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex, Sebastian, Francesca

No. of Judges: 3

Round: Sat-2 Room: A306

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Hudson

Team Name: Rigard

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Penelope Chalakis Montserrat Alvarez

Michael Chen Jasma Zhou

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

Score
81
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
152
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
163
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Gov case seemed to focus more on problems w/ older stories than problem w/ remains.

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Opp line about ~~is~~ using old properties to challenge problems in old versions was strong.

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Sebastian Lopez

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: A306

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Hudson

First Speaker:

Penelope Cholakis

Second Speaker:

Montseñor Alvarez

Score
75
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rigaud

First Speaker:

Michael Chen

Second Speaker:

Jasna Zhou

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

148
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

153
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Need to link the examples more into the arguments instead of asserting they're true.

Second Proposition

- Repeated a bit of the case with little new argumentation

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Needed to develop the stance of opposition more, came out more in second speech.

Second Opposition

- Asserted a lot of examples were true.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Francesca Fagnoli

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1306 Room: 5

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Hudson

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Penelope Cholakis Montserrat Alvarez

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rigaud

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Chen Jasmine Zhou

Score
80
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

152

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

162

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

~~First Proposition~~

- Careful to differentiate your points
- Use examples to support arguments, not as arguments
- Upon with constructive so you can use it to refute

~~Second Proposition~~

Judge's Comments:

~~First Opposition~~

- Try to bring in new analysis to refute instead of just repeating point.
- Careful when bringing up examples that they are true and make sense
- Make sure your strongest points come out early

~~Second Opposition~~

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: PATRICIA DONNELLY

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M 333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Chicoutimi

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Logan

Jesse Heiv

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Roberval

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Yusef Elmagay

Ashley Liu

Score
82
100

Score
84
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

161
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

166
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

*Too much dependence on Shostakovich throughout prop case.
Assertions not proven in many cases*

Second Proposition

*Need to prove contention that reports are necessarily failures!
EVERYONE WANTS TO MAKE MONEY!*

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

*good challenge to the burden presented by proposition
good rebuttal + build down*

Second Opposition

*You caught prop's contradiction.
Good Refutation.
Connection of older & younger generation interesting
new idea:*

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Massimo D. Lullo

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 4 Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Chicautimi

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Logan

Jesse Liu

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Reberval

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Yussef Elmoraghy / Ashley Lin

Score
81 <u>81</u>
100

Score
83 <u>83</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
<u>159</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>164</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Mechanize More = D Past movies Not for profit etc
- Flesh out arguments more

Second Proposition

- Comparative Analysis is necessary
↳ Diff Actors = Diff stances
- Incorporate more Actors

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Focus more on Content less on style
- Good summary speech
↳ Read map more
- Flesh out arguments

Second Opposition

- Good Refutation
↳ Refute All contentions though
- Very Good speech
↳ Polish is ~~not~~ necessary tho

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jarren Feter

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Chicoutimi

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Alex Logan

Jesse Lin

Score
80 83
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Roberval

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Yusef Elmaraghy

Ashley Liu

Score
81
100

Score
84
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
163
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
165
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Championnat National De Débats

Nom du juge: CHRISTIANS

No. des Juges: 3

Ronde: 4

Salle: A209

AFFIRMATIF

Nom d'équipe: Beaucerville

Premier débateur:

Second débateur:

Lachlan van Egmond

Pahul Singh

Score
76
100

Score
69
100

NEGATIF

Nom d'équipe: Louiseville

Premier débateur:

Second débateur:

Arian O'Brien

Margaret Gouldig

Score
80 79
100

Score
81
100

En évaluant le pointage à accorder, gardez en tête: le contenu, le style, la stratégie et les points d'information

L'équipe Total
145
200

L'équipe gagnante est
(Veuillez encercler):

L'équipe Total
160
200

AFFIRMATIF / NEGATIF

Commentaires des juges:
Premier débateur:

set up ok but narrowly of definition of house this debate was less than ideal

Second débateur:

needed clearer conception of culture & definition of points

Commentaires des juges:
Premier débateur:

refuted nostalgia point well but didn't refute opportunity cost

Second débateur:

core idea of rightly past wrongs was well introduced, could have been even stronger with additional explanation.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Miranda Collett

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: A209

PROPOSITION

Beauceville

Team Name: ~~Bea~~ Beauceville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lachlan van Egmond Pahul Singh

Score
72
100

Score
69
100

OPPOSITION

Louiseville

Team Name: ~~Bertherville~~

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Arian O'brian
~~Petra Plandon~~

Margaret Goulding
~~Hana Sereja~~

Score
70
100

Score
70 70
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

141
200

141

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

140
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Yasmine Abitama No. of Judges: 3 Round: 4 Room: A209

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Beauveville

Team Name: ~~Beauveville~~ Laisville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Luetham van Engelen

Pahul Singh

Argan O'Brian

Margaret Goulding

Petra Clark

Keenel Baker

Score
75
100

Score
72
100

Score
75
100

Score
76
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
147
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
151
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

better model
more impacting

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Edward Lai

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: M244

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Anne Kimpton~~ Val d'Or

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anne Kimpton

Lauren Chang

Score
<u>72</u>
100

Score
<u>71</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint-Jérôme

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Talia Trottenberg

Mia Su

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
<u>143</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>156</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- You spent a lot of time explaining that reboots change storylines, but could have elaborated more on why this is bad.
- You mentioned "disrespect", but did not give any strong examples, and did not prove that disrespect necessarily follows reboots.
- None of opposition's points were really refuted

Second Proposition

- No real refutation
- Too much repetition of partner's points.
- Logic of certain arguments hard to follow (i.e. how reboots sweep discrimination under the rug).

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Very strong first point about diversity.
- You could have elaborated more on why this diversity is important.
- Constructive portion had a lot of repetition, and could have used more structure.
- Good refutation
- Very good theme analysis in 2nd speech.

Second Opposition

- Good refutation
- Good job supporting your partner's points.
- You could have given more examples to back your arguments (i.e. by giving examples of racism in old movies).

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: JANIA LEB

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 4 Room: 4339

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ville Marie

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Fatima Anees Linda Abdelkarem

Score
72
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Vaffens

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Sahar Bhowmik Lucas Tarry

Score
75
100

Score
77
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
145
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Model was extremely unclear
- lacked analysis
- relevant and valid points were mentioned

Second Proposition

- Model was unclear
- irrelevant rant about sexual assault and cat calling (generally strayed off topic)
- Good point about lacking credibility, should have come up earlier, but well done in this speech

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- lacked clarity and as a result, some analysis
- Good ~~and~~ VALID model critique
- strongest point was refutation
- Good clash and engagement

Second Opposition

- Strong analysis
- unclear
- strayed off out of the round a little
- GREAT examples
- good refutation
- Good clash

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Maren Al Jendi

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M339

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ville Marie

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Fatima Annes

Huda Abdelkrim

Score
72
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Vareance

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sahasro Bhowari

Lucas Terry

Score
74
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

147

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

152

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Model should be in the spirit of the motion

Debate was mischaracterized

Buildup needs more solid themes

Second Proposition

Strong points however lack of structure

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Good structure

Good model attack

Points need to be better fleshed

Buildup needs more solid themes

Second Opposition

Great job with structure

consider better timing splits.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Akil Alleyne

No. of Judges: 2 Round: 4 Room: m342

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Pierreville

Team Name: Montreal

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Cydney Carothers Holly Jamieson

Thane Morgan William Ahem

Score
78
100

Score
76
100

Score
76
100

Score
76
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

154
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

152
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good point that rebooting old movies isn't necessary to bring about greater cultural diversity etc.
- Good summary - but a forceful response to the Opp's claim that you contradicted yourself would have made it even better.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Interesting point about greater cultural diversity
- Good rebuttal of contradiction in Prop's points about popularity & profit ability
- I would have liked to hear more discussion of why reboots are necessary for diversity; can't society achieve that by making all-new movies!

Second Proposition

- Good point re: importance of encouraging creativity & forward looking movie quality
- I'd have loved to see both teams have a bit more beer with their topics & delve more deeply into the quality of the movies. On a purely artistic

Second Opposition

level, ~~are~~ do reboots tend to be as good as the original? Were they worth paying more to see? Does the movie industry benefit from them at all? That discussion, with extensive use of examples, was missing from this debate.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nabeel Ahmed

No. of Judges: _____ Round: 34 Room: M342

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Pierreville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Cydney

Holly

Score
<u>74</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Montreal

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Thane

William

Score
<u>74</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
<u>150</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>149</u>
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- ↳ Avoiding repeating yourself to fill time... try to go into greater depth
- ↳ Impact your arguments more
- ↳ Do more weighing in reply instead of summarizing

Second Proposition

- ↳ Need more clash
- ↳ Role fulfillment
- ↳ Impact your arguments more

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- ↳ Try to approach the motion from more than one perspective
- ↳ Do more weighing in your reply as opposed to just summarizing

Second Opposition

- ↳ Need more clash
- ↳ Role fulfillment
- ↳ Mechanize your arguments more
- ↳ Avoid bringing up most of your case in 2nd opp speech

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jack Stewart

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 4 Room: M240

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sherbrooke

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Adrian's Morehouse Liam Leduc-Bayle

Score
75
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Beloeil

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Christina Liu Hana Araf-Taher

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
151
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
158 159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

careful with THR mytims:

- they may make less money, but they may be less good, but explain why these are bad things, or are worth regretting
- what does the world look like without these mins
- good whip - keeps; but careful not to introduce too much new material
- you narrowed the debate down a lot by tightening scope of what you were defended depending.
- avoid generalizations about broad groups of people.
- careful with time management.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- make sure your refutation addresses ~~and~~ of opponents ~~arguments~~ arguments
- ~~was~~ for put on economics, ~~flexures~~ why its way or valued
- try not to argue by example, back up points with analysis.

Second Opposition

- very good introduction
- good job pointing out limited scope of your examples
- your new point was largely similar to your opponents material.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lowden

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: M 329

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Faraham

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chan

Jack Barry

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Thetford Mines

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dishita Emaya Karamban

Rafay Ahmed

Score
76 <u>77</u>
100

Score
76 <u>77</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
<u>151</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>151</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

This debate had good qualities on both sides. The screen writer point was well done first prop speech was solid

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Opposition

Opp side to the debate in a different direction - would have liked some more clash on side opp to prop but it was great analysis.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Daniel Mendelson

No. of Judges: 3 Round: A Room: M237

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sorel

Team Name: Rowdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Fatima Elawad

Muhammad Mahmood

Rally Lin

Alastair Thorburn-Vitals

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
<u>152</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>166</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Keep asking why, don't state things, demonstrate how it will happen and why it is good.
- Good speaking style.
- Summary rebuttal was repetition of your points. Try to compare both sides.

Second Proposition

- Good constructive, could use more analysis.
- Good refutation, make it clear why your side is better and what the differences between the sides are (this goes for everyone).

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good constructive. → spend more time on second point.
- Excellent summary rebuttal
- Take more POI's (only took one)

Second Opposition

- strong refutation.
- keep asking why for constructive.
- Great examples.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michael Di Giorgio

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M237

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Socel

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Fahima Elwaal

Muhammad Mahmud

Score
75
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Baba Rowdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nally Lin

Alastair Ho

Score
83
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

153

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

166

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

You don't have to define every word in the motion. Would have benefited from an explanation of why creativity and fulfilment in representation was important. Good boil down, try to make your rebuttal implicit in your theme.

Second Proposition

Very strong rebuttal but your previous points came under heavy fire and required substantial rebuilding. Make sure that you devote adequate time to all 3 elements of your speech.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Very strong constructive. Points were well developed and impacted. Focus on doing a pre-rebuttal when you can anticipate the refutation. i.e about indie studios.

Second Opposition

Exceptional rebuttal and reconstruction! Took a bit of a ushy approach in giving 1 minute to your constructive, could have been further developed.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Isaac Cape

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M237

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sorel

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Fatima Elawad

Muhammad Mahmood

Score
75
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rawdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rally Lin

Alastair Thorburn-Uitols

Score
81
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

152
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Make sure to fill time
- Organization was slightly confusing
- Less ambiguity around idea of creativity
- Case could've been structured as why progressive norms shouldn't happen through an old movie lens
- Themes in whip

Second Proposition

- More refutation & clarification in rebuilding
- ~~Second~~ constructive point was good, needed a bit more to get to heart of round

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Refutation was strong
- Really good job fleshing out all the links in first point
- Work on time split to make second point sufficiently compelling.
- Whip was strong but not sure if representation should've been allotted less time than viewship

Second Opposition

- Really strong role fulfilment
- Very good & concise refutation
- Strong examples
- Good constructive point
- Try to add more with regards to rebuilding so that constructive case develops about more

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: DAN ELBLING

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: M242

PROPOSITION

Team Name: PORTNEUF

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

JAKE WALDNER

NORA McLENNAN

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: PORT CARTIER

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

BRETTY HELLWARD

VANDER BODDUP

Score
78
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

155
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

◦ You need to explain to me more specifically why reboots are bad for the industry, since having them doesn't mean that other new movies cannot be made.

Second Proposition

◦ The idea of "celebrating the original" without a reboot was an interesting idea, but you still have to convince me that this will be as effective

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

◦ Explaining that reboots don't "get rid of" originals is a great point. It really mitigates harms on your side.

Second Opposition

◦ Your "representation" point is interesting, but you have to convince me that studios want to create social change & not just make more money

◦ really thorough refutation

◦ Your point on "new audiences" was good new material, but you have to develop it further.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Zac Beadman

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 4 Room: M344

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Napierville

First Speaker: Max Mitchell
 Second Speaker: Aidan Egan

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Beethicoville

First Speaker: Petra Planden
 Second Speaker: Hanna Seirjo

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

Score
77
100

Score
74
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
149
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
151
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Tell me why the bad things are bad
 ↳ good points, need more maximization: why it's true
 Impact: why it's bad

Second Proposition

Good Analysis
 ↳ not super relevant to the round
 Bring back to motion

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good Analysis: a little everywhere
 ↳ more structure would help
 ↳ said good things
 ↳ best impacting in round
 LOR: Try to thematically summarize
 Good REF -> structure as willow

Second Opposition

Good line by line
 Refutation -> smart analysis
 Try to fill time!
 even if reactive

↓
 Spend more time on each refutation!

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Brian Casey

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M346

PROPOSITION

Team Name: GASPE RIMOUSKI

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chiang

Eduard Yano

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SAINT FÉLIX

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Angie LEI

Paul Zhang

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>85</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

<u>166</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>168</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Angie

The Opponent can avoid the point. Propositor was not required to argue "only old movies". It was arguing original new movies, not reboots. However Paul responded to that argument, pointing out that

Second Proposition

a) franchises were more useful ways of making a profit
b) reboots would lead to more quality of the original. Just debate.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Sunny

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M 346

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rimouski

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chiang

Edward Yong

Score
76
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Felicien

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Angie Lei

Paul Zhang

Score
78
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
156
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- More mechanisation
- unclear analysis
- good ideas
- great build-down

Second Proposition

- Good refutation
- solid construction
- ↳ beware of being repetitive of your 1st speakers constructive

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- good construction
- Make sure you refute everything!
- You left a large portion of the
your case unbutted

Second Opposition

- Really good speech
- be careful about repetition within your speech, good ideas though.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ryszard Riley Cohen

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M346

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rimouski

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chiang

Edward Yang

Score
82
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Felicien

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Angie Lei

Paul Zhang

Score
83
100

Score
84
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

164
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

167
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Great speech. I think your case could have been stronger if you brought up more constructive material.

Second Proposition

- Great speech. Maybe be more organized in rebuilding.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Great speech. maybe focus more on the quality of the movies.

Second Opposition

- Great speech. Good job refuting your case ~~to~~ to refute both of the govt's arguments.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Gabriel Trottenberg

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 343

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Mas Kinong

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Evan Lawrence Charlie Simms

Score
<u>79 79</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Chateau quay

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Emma-Jane Burns Kaari Urbanek

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
<u>157</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>167</u>
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Be careful making assumptions
i.e. everyone hates Superman now

Second Proposition

- Good argument, might have been a good idea to have had that in the first speech.
- Less time on point.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good arguments
- Some more competition...

Second Opposition

- Great weighing
-

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Max Schiller

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M343

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Mas Kinong'et

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Evan Lawrence Charlie Simms

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Chateaugay

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emma-Jane Burns Kaari Urbanck

Score
81
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

158
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

103
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Points were almost the same

~~Second Proposition~~

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Points were almost the same

~~Second Opposition~~

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Robinson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 343

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Maskinongé~~ Maskinongé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Evan Lawrence

Charlier Simps

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Châteauguay

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emma - Jane Burns

Kaari Upp Urbank

Score
84
100

Score
84
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

157
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

168
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good delivery - could vary tone more
- > good approach
- > two points were very close to each other
- > good examples
- > ~~scribble~~

Second Proposition

- good use of language - clever e.g. digging up a dead horse to
- great eye contact
- good argument -> try to have it less similar to partner's points.
- > try to find some completely new ones e.g. hurts new ideas in film
- > Black Panther was a good example
- > watch the time

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Great delivery
- Very good approach to opp case
 - > good examples
- > would have been better to point out what they have to prove

Second Opposition

- > great delivery
- > very good response to their attacks
- > good arguments but your side's arguments were very similar to each other - even better to have another very distinct argument or two. e.g. look at dif. groups or dif types of movies
- > good conclusion - be careful about the time.

OR why it is good for film industry

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Keenan MacNeal

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: M325

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Shawnigan

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Annabelle

Philippine

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Magog

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anais

Julia

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

154
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Victoria Kalisky

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 4 Room: A305

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Amos

Team Name: Saint Bruno

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Livia ~~Wang~~ ~~Wang~~ ~~Wang~~

Julia Wang

Andrew Shi

Daniel Lu

Score
74
100

Score
76
100

Score
82
100

Score
81 81
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
150
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
165 163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- great intro and style
- minority representation argument lacked analysis
- consumerism argument was very strong

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- minority representation argument is strong and clashes wonderfully with gov.
- However, your arguments would be much more persuasive if you slowed down and emphasized certain words.

Second Proposition

- respect for historical artifacts ~~is~~ is interesting, but why should we respect films that failed to capture diversity?
- great crazy rich asian example
- I like your speaking style! very eloquent

Second Opposition

- great POI, ~~took~~
- strong refutation of consumerism argument
- however, did not sufficiently address MC's argument about respect for history (i.e. holocaust)
- lacked constructive, but strong refutation

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lauren Kim

No. of Judges: Round: Room:

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Amos

Team Name: Saint Bruno

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Livia Ion

Julia Wang

Andrew Shi

Daniel Lu

Score
76
100

Score
78
100

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

154
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

162
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- narrow conception of movies
- good speakers
- interesting historical point but you need more analysis or broaden constructive
 - i.e. talk about creativity
- comparative debate not policy debate

Second Proposition

- good job @ clarifying gov. stance
- need to fill in gaps better
 - i.e. why hist. is important
- good closing remarks
- good use of examples strategically

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- STRONG constructive
- slow down, will help judges follow your analysis
- good understanding of round
- need to compare worlds
 - ↳ regret motion

Second Opposition

- good support for partner's constructive
- good → delt w/ even if w/ historical films
- NEED a clear constructive argument for ~~real~~ proper role fulfillment
- good style in contrast to partner

Championnat National De Débats

Nom du juge: ANDREW KAPLAN

No. des Juges: 3

Ronde: 84 Salle: A305

AFFIRMATIF

NEGATIF

Nom d'équipe: AMOS

Nom d'équipe: SAINT BRUNO

Premier débateur: Second débateur:

Premier débateur: Second débateur:

Livia Ion Julia Wang

Andrew Shi Daniel Lu

Score
75
100

Score
77
100

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

En évaluant le pointage à accorder, gardez en tête: le contenu, le style, la stratégie et les points d'information

L'équipe Total	152
	200

L'équipe gagnante est
(Veuillez encercler):

L'équipe Total	162
	200

AFFIRMATIF

NEGATIF

Commentaires des juges:
Premier débateur:

some good points but needed to flesh out and "regret" better as well as the idea of film as a historic lens.

Second débateur:

Good reclarification of side. Needed to expend ideas further.

Commentaires des juges:
Premier débateur:

Strong clash, very present in debate. Need to slow down because you're swallowing a lot of words and yelling.

Second débateur:

Good support of partner a clash but could have expended opp case further.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Julia Abundo
~~Carol Hyacinthe~~

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 4 Room: A 206

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Hyacinthe

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Yuran Wang Penelope Siozos

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
77 <u>77</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Base Comeau

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Thomas Beschell Simran Dharmi

Score
78 <u>78</u>
100

Score
<u>74</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
<u>153</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>152</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Impacting! Tell me why your point matters!
- Good definitions
- Great use of themes in whip speech

Second Proposition

- Great structure and hook
- Excellent POI responses
- Make sure you fully impact your points

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Great style, very interesting to listen to!
- Work on really impacting your points - it will help you fill your time
- Try organizing your whip speech into themes and questions to make it easier to follow

Second Opposition

- Make sure to always take side you at their best.
- Good rebuilding!
- You needed a little work on your mechanisms and impacts. Make sure to tell me why I should care about your points.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Allie McGowan

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: A205

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Les Coteaux

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Gregoria

Marya

Score
<u>74</u>
100

Score
<u>74</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Victoriaville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Will

Rohan

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

<u>148</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>153</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

AM

In general:
1. Consider alternatives
- what does the
2. Impact Ar
- make sure
- They can

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

impacts if no rebuts
more industry look like

impacts are realistic
valuable on a small scale
bc (connection between parents + kids)
but explain why

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CECELIA LOPEZ

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 4 Room: M336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: COWANSVILLE

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Maya Mizor Natalie Viccars

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QUEBEC

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Vivek Sarku Jessica Yu

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score
<u>159</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>166</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- GREAT SPEAKING STYLE
- BIG STATEMENT ABOUT PLAGIARISM → ACKNOWLEDGE LEGALITY

Second Proposition

- GOOD REFUTATION
- DONT AGREE TO POI'S

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- REALLY IMPRESSED
- GREAT SPEAKER, SUPER CLEAR AND EASY TO FOLLOW

Second Opposition

- VERY THOROUGH REFUTATION AND REBUILDING
- TAKE MORE POI'S

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Foster Salpeter

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: M326

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Lacolle

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zahra Slutchuk

Anna Koplovich

Score
76
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Trois Rivières

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ty Deutscher

Elliot Costa

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

151
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Careful with an overly complex model that makes the Prop. case much more difficult
"Regrets" ≠ "not allow the viewing of"
First point would have benefitted from a deeper discussion on why current movies are better, and why a reboot can't be altered to be more progressive
Good, confident speaking style!

Second Proposition

Refutation lacked some engagement with opp's points, and ~~sometimes~~ sometimes morphed into constructive
Careful with extension points in this style, I'd encourage at least 1 new constructive point as MC

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good introduction, specifically in dealing with an odd model
Some good refutation actually came out here, but you need to engage with PM's points specifically; this favors clash as opposed to railroading

Summary came at 5 mins, could have taken more time

Boil down should be based on themes rather than purely refutation

Second Opposition

Best refutation of the round, but needs to be taken further (especially point about old movies having good morals: try to think of differences and similarities to make important distinctions)

Careful with speaking too fast!

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nick Morrow

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 4 Room: 334

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Joliette

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Nazar Viznytsya

Kuan Zhang

Score
74
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Huntingdon

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Aliya Kubani

Rhea Gupta

Score
78
100

Score
75
100

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

150
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

153
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

→ Intro on back to future too long → to illustrate importance - into construction time

→ Careful of assertion, how does updating Manhattan for Spiderman throw dirt on it, need example here if it makes sense

→ ~~the~~ never explains harms that reboots have on other movies why are none being made

→ Good poi on movie
→ don't renege reboot in whip / they have zero time to respond

Second Proposition

→ don't rely on your model to refute all of opp
→ why can't historians still study old movies - when new ones exist? this was unclear - old is not wiped out

→ links need work - rest case on assumptions - ppl always like originals better (if so why do reboots re-actually make money?)

→ Creativity point is good ✓ however, OTHER MOVIES outside the original though... i.e. ppl can make new things ✓ continue

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

→ very on dash ^{retrained debate as old new in dash - don't do this to new team} ^{point shift burdens}
→ Refutation was solid - but don't stay a few responses if just one - did not touch lack of creativity point

→ Great explanation of how themes still exist ^{more would appeal}
~~more work~~ in modern times HOWEVER, need to say why its better w reboots than new movies

→ Amazing examples! ^{various superhero Spiderman}
→ be careful of not using constructive to refute first as it makes speech repetitive

Second Opposition

→ very on point poi's (4-45 - try consistency all time)
→ job to take down new point / poi case spent 2:00 ref / rebuild to respond to 10 mins of cons... not enough cons

→ shouldn't be 3/4 of speech
→ try new examples rather than repeating points

→ short term analysis is good
→ long-term - good explanation of what you mean but what is the benefit of that