

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Zac Bendra

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 5

Room: M326

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Portlough

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nora

Jack

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Napierville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Max

Aidan

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

Score
78
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
155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

1. Try to Mekhanize: tell me how staff will happre

Good Def

Try to fill time: you were doing great then stopped

Good PAR: great refutation

Good themes → keep up the good work

Second Proposition

GOOD POINTS → turned facts to your advantage

Good point → connect to round more

Good refutation: line by line

addresses their main args

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Weighing: good job

↳ very good part

LCR: good themes → 1st was not really a theme 2nd one was good!

Second Opposition

Improved a lot since last round!

Good analysis → try to connect to motion

↳ good point structure!

Very close ROUND 1

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lauren Kim

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Huntingdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rhea Gupta

Aliya Kabani

Score
83
100

Score
80 81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Trois Riviere

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ty Deutscher

Elliot Costa

Score
74
100

Score
75
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

149
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- ~~good use of examples~~ good conception of the round
- ~~an~~ good idea of this as a regrets motion but more explicit characterisation of two worlds would help strengthen your constructive ^{and comparative}
- use more than 2 themes in your buildown ^{or questions} (break down round even further)
- don't get caught up in definitions in buildown

Second Proposition

- decent refutation but be sure to take opp's case at their best to have strongest refutation
 - point out explicitly what opp failed to do and the material they failed to respond to → makes it easier for judges to follow what arguments fall out of the round
- more explicit weighing ~~in~~ in refutation
- point/constructive wasn't much different from PM material

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- more engagement (refutation) of PM constructive material
- if definition doesn't fit the case you predicted, it's a tough situation but try to adapt your case to what the debate is about
- get to the idea of weighing but need more explicit weighing to make refutation stronger
- good pacing and style

Second Opposition

- need more concrete examples of influencers doing good to support benefits weighing
- treat this as a regrets motion where you're comparing two worlds not an implementation resolution
- ~~an~~ avoid getting caught up in definitions
- speech would benefit from more signposting when moving between refutation and rebuilding (organization)

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nick

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: M328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Huntingdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rhea Gupta

Aliya Kadan

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Trois Rivière

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ty Deutscher

Elliot Cook

Score
74
100

Score
75
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

149
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good vs harm framing ✓
- Good PPT response
- too much time on ~~T+H~~ example
- good idea with influencers taking away from credible news → why does the news just focus on other things - why is it influence vs news - what about celebs
- frame whip as themes - work
- Good even if refutation ✓

Second Proposition

- Good responses to PPT's
- Talk about unique harms of influencers - link rather than just famous ppl
- (good) link work between youth harm and influencers
- When rebutting address opps refutation by and add analysis, do not just restate.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good framing of saying you allow the harms if benefits are better ✓
- how does lack of influencers = lack of internet (very unclear) - no links
- does not play ball with motion - talks about ppl with brand deals not comp-anies - clearly read motion
- conflate internet and influencers - how vs still interact → it was just re-linking points/refutes
- ← frame whip speech in themes for better role fulfillment

Second Opposition

- refutation on ads vs insula worked against you - as influencers - are not as regulated
- companies vs influencers (see above)
- need the link between influencers and profit - just assertion it equals profit.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Surry

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: M328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Huntingdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rhea Gupta

Aliya Kabani

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Trois Riviere

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ty Deutscher

Elliot Costa

Score
72
100

Score
73
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

145

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Model, was 1, OK, I think app misinterpreted it.
- explain why your points matter
↳ give me extreme examples
- really good buildup
- careful with examples

Second Proposition

- Deal with model challenges
ie "are computers internet influencers"
- Differentiate your constructive from your refutations.
- Really good even if

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Make sure you are debating the motion
- In refutation go point by point, you cant just outweigh their case
- Explain why your arguments are relevant in the round.

Second Opposition

- Make sure you rebuttal
- Constructive is dramatic, but you did a good job w/ analysis and impacts

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jack Stewart

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 5

Room: 1325

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte-Justine

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amanda Sultan

Alexa Richstone

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sorel

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Fatima Elmad

Muhammad Mahmood

Score
76
100

Score
74
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

150
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- make sure to tie points back to motion. why do your points mean you should regard influencers
- make sure not to just argue by citing examples supporting your point:
 - what factors lead to toxic culture.

Second Proposition

- try to more explicitly clarify when ~~you~~ you are rebutting vs. refuting.
- make sure to impart arguments explicitly.
- explain why influencers + viewers are the main actors.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- go deeper on refutation:
 - why does the fact that not all people have negative influencers take down point?
 - why weigh these against.
- difference between influencers and celebrities.

Second Opposition

- Even if influencers choose a life that harms them, does it make it a good thing.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Marnel Williger

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M 243

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rowyn - Nozarda

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tony

Fluys He

Score
76
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rowdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alastair Thorburn-Vitalis

Rally Lin

Score
743
100

Score
738
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

151

200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Make sure to clearly define your model and not add anything extra especially in your last speech.
Good model and outline

Second Proposition

- very good points, but make sure they are clearly defined. Don't let your refutation and points melt together.
- take the other side at their best when you refute.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Make sure that you don't allow your points to become too similar
- make sure to tell me why I should care about your points
- when you refute, make sure you address what prop is saying and give them the benefit of the doubt

Second Opposition

- you mentioned something about the idea of influence in general, and it would have been cool to hear more about why influence is good in general as a thing people do.
- you speak very well, just slow down a tad
- Don't let your points get jumbled

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Massimo Di Zullo No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: M243

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Roslyn Noranda

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tony Wu

Hugo Hu

Score
78
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rawdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alastair Thorpe-
vitals

Rally Lim

Score
74
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
152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

▷ Impact Arguments ⇒ why they matter + more mechanisms

Second Proposition

▷ Call out the fact that opp didn't debate within the model
▷ Attack opp's mech's & Impacting

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

▷ More Differentiated Arguments
▷ Engage w/ the other side
↳ Refute their best case scenario
Good Contrn Call out

Second Opposition

▷ Don't ~~recycle~~ recycle your point & refutation
▷ Have diff response
↳ Strive to have multiple responses per contention

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: PATRICIA DONNELLY

No. of Judges: ~~2~~ ³

Round: 5 Room: 14243

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rouyn Noranda

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Jony Wu

Hugo Hu

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rawdon

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

alastair Thorburn

Rally Ken

Score
75 <u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>73</u>
100

Score
<u>78</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

Please slow down!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

well presented - +
well supported with examples

Second Proposition

Try to vary your voice - it's hard to listen to a monotone.

Second Opposition

stand alone great speech, but not really on topic of the debate as set out by prop.

In general, opposition cannot overlook the definition presented by proposition. A much broader view of "influence/culture" was presented by prop than opp. without detailed definition.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Keith Moussa

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: M333

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Bruno

Team Name: Roberval

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Andrew Shi _____ David Lu _____

Ashley Lin _____ Yusef Elmaraghy _____

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

Score
78
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
158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- slow up → clauses stumbling
- Refutation?
- Roadmap too fast to take in
- Lack of clear impact
- Time management
- Goodbye contact

I can't follow properly

- Good signposting
- Points are similar

Boil Down: - No themes - Fundamentally is not a boil down speech

- Just responses

Second Proposition

- Nice roadmap → Not followed however
- Refutation does not consistently engage Opp's points
- Organization needs much work
- Lot of repetition of partners points

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Great roadmap
- Refutation fails to directly link to roadmap
- Times
- Don't be so nervous!
- Not enough time for constructive (2 mins)
- ↳ Not fleshed out enough

Boil Down: - Good clear themes

- Too much time on 1st theme
- Lack of time management

Second Opposition

- Great public speaking skills
- ↳ Clear and loud
- Good roadmap
- Argue the best version of prop's points
- Good impact
- ↳ Explains why Opp's impact > Prop's impact

No POs given

Very few POIs on this side

• definition of influencer

• organic vs. paid / model Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Victoria Kalisky

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Bruno

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Shi

Daniel Lu

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Roberval

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ashley Liu

Yusef Elmaghy
~~Elmaghy~~

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

163

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Arguments

- a. deters critiquing + product quality leads to failure to represent product/brand
↳ trust/accountability mech.
- b. censorship of controversial media due to fear of retaliation / monetary penalty deters influencers from commenting on injustices
- deters brands marginalizes small brands
→ great point

Comments

- speak slower to provide better impact, but better
- provide examples to demonstrate impact
- elaborate second arguments further!

Second Proposition

Arguments/Refutation

- a. ~~at~~ influencers allow mediocre products to bypass quality filtering leading to inflated product reviews, i.e. firefly
- b. great refutation (i.e. firefly)
- c) except that it is arguable whether they are influencers?

Comments

- great use of firefly example!
- your construction was an extension of your partners first argument, although a deeper analysis

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Arguments/Refutation

- b. awareness of controversial topics not related to influencers → this is not true though, think a nice.
- brands are already large
- c. influencers represent marginal social causes i.e. like fashion theater (promotions) causes as a means of displaying personality and personal beliefs → interesting analysis!
- Rebuttal questions don't address product quality
- Style: Comments
- clear and delivery and great use of example

Second Opposition

- a. refutation as essential in combating false product reviews (i.e. James Charles)
↳ demonstrates that influencers are regarded as role models.
- very strong refutation
- I would have liked a discussion about the process of influencer growth, in particular the fundamental role of ORGANIC GROWTH
- organic vs. paid/influencer who are "real" backlist

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Keenan MacNest

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ~~St~~ Saint Bruno

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew

Daniel

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Roberval

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ashley

Yusef

Score
80
100

Score
83
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

163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Robinson

No. of Judges: 2 Round: 5 Room: A205

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Gatineau

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Sean Oh

Simran Vig

Score
80
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Felicien

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Angie Lei

Paul Zhang

Score
84
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score
160
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Good clear case
- Good delivery
- Well organized
- Good attempt to refocus debate in rebuttal
- watch the time in rebuttal.

Second Proposition

- Very good delivery
- Good ~~points~~ additional argument
 - ↳ need to use the 2 worlds approach more
 - ↳ need to avoid potential attack that the good influencers are on the internet
 - ↳ better to use non-internet based influencers
- ~~watch~~
 - ↳ should deal more effectively with the benefits they point out.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- ~~Good~~ Good intro - pointing out what you actually need to prove
- Great delivery
- Good arguments
- Spend more time on direct refutation
- Good use of examples
- good analysis
- excellent rebuttal - good focus on what the key issue is

Second Opposition

- good delivery
- very effective attacks and responses to their points
- good analysis

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jarren Fefes No. of Judges: 1 Round: 5 Room: M234?

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Thane Morgan~~ ^{Montreal} ~~William Ahern~~

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

Thane Morgan William Ahern

Score
74
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Boie Comeau

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

Thomas Beschell Simran Dhani

Score
74
100

Score
74
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
148
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Carissa Bakcaen

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 5

Room: M244

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Porter Cartier

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Xander Biddulph Briley Hilliard

Score
79
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Jérôme

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Talia Trotterberg Mia Su.

Score
79
100

Score
76
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

155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Prop

You created a hard burden to prove in your definition by saying that society would be fine if not better ~~with~~ without the influence of ^{for your 2nd argument.} ~~the internet~~ we better without the internet since you are against its evolution, how do we move backwards?

Second Proposition

- Medications need to be prescribed.
- Very effective argument on distraction from a real problem/issue in society
- Be sure to reiterate this in the final rebuild.
- Try to integrate POI's more effectively. Refer back to those statements as well.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- good POI on parents acting as a regulator of child activity
- Attempt to do more analysis of the major idea, less time giving examples.
- Do be sure to rebuild your partners point on oppression of opportunity to "speak" compared to celebrities. This was a key

Second Opposition

- Expand more on the oppression of freedom of speech. Also, try to refute the main argument as opposed to the example.
- Continue to work on summing up a little faster.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: JULIA LEB

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 5 Room: M24 2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: CASPÉ

OPPOSITION

Team Name: COWANSVILLE

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Po Neet Chhina

Anisha Dinesh

Maya Major

Natalie Veyal

Score
74
100

Score
79
100

Score
75
100

Score
74
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
149
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

→ lacked mechanisms in constructive analysis
→ relevant examples
→ end of build down was strong because it focused on the correct points of clash ~~and analysis~~

Second Proposition

→ best analysis came out of this speech
→ LACKED MECHANISMS IN CONSTRUCTIVE ANALYSIS
→ strong refutation (thorough & relevant)

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

→ strong refutation
→ didn't give any mechanisms in constructive analysis
→ impacted arguments well

Second Opposition

→ didn't give mechanisms in constructive analysis either
→ point about social movement had a lot of potential if it could have been fleshed out more
→ ~~the~~ refutation could have been less dismissive

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Gabriel

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 205

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Gatineau

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sean Oh

Simran Vig

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Felicien

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Angie Lei

Paul Zhang

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
82 <u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>162</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>163</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: Matthew James

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 5

Room: 1346

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Shawinigan

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anna-Sofie Kollmer

Philipine Delooy

Score
73
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Doliette

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kuan Zhong

Nazar Viznytsya

Score
69
100

Score
69
100

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

Team Score

146
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

138
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Proposition has a solid case but it suffers from having low stakes. Kids learning but beyond or a warped view of the value of hard work is not super compelling or unique to social media influencers. Discussion of why social media influencers uniquely detract from society would improve the quality of Prop's case.

~~Second Proposition~~

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Opposition's ideas are too much of a stretch for them to fully justify. They remove themselves from the round by straying too far from relevant topics with sufficient linking. Influencers → Free Speech → Soviet Russia is too much of a stretch.

~~Second Opposition~~

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christine Lang

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

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Lachute

Team Name: Saint Rémi

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Danae Pepekassis Ava Olin

Alex Laurin Jake Scurry

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

Score
81
100

Score
78
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

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good use of concrete examples
- great speaking style
- could use clearer sign posting to indicate contentions

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- great style + good vocabulary
- great organization
- good clash, but try not to rush it; perhaps move it to the beginning of your speech

Second Proposition

- be specific in your examples
- great volume + eye contact
- good clash with the opposition's case

Second Opposition

- careful when responding to POIs to not get too riled up
- great engagement with the other side

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Brian Casby

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 340

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Lachute

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Darius P

Ann Olin

Score
78
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: So Remi

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Kremen

Jake Serry

Score
82
100

Score
81
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
163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Gabriel Trottenberg

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3A0

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Lachute

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Danae Peplassys

Ava Olin

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: St. Rémi

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Laurian

Jake Surry

Score
79
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

158
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good analysis

Second Proposition

- Little more ref. needed.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Spend a little more time on refutation.

Second Opposition

- Careful with assumptions.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Daniel Mendelson.

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: A306

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Drummondville.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Eric Li

Jonathan Chu

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>79.</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rimouski.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chiang

Edward Yang

Score
80
100

Score
80
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

160
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- cleaner def. of celebrity might have helped round.
- Very good rebuttal.
- Explain more principle, ~~what~~ what is it? why is it true.
- Good POIs.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Very good summary rebuttal.
- Good refutation.

Great Speaking Style.

Second Proposition

- Good analysis & break down of points.
- constructive could have used more analysis.

Second Opposition

- Good constructive.
- Good ref.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: D. Smith

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: A306

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Drummondville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Eric Li

Jonathan Chu

Score
78
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rimouski

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chay

Edward Yang

Score
79
100

Score
79
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

- Strong introduction, presentation
- Great boil down
- Need to really show why this is an influencer debate & not just about general marketing.

Second Proposition

- Constructive quite similar to partner's
- Need to show the substantive harms that come directly out of internet influencers, but good points. Made re: celebs in general

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Constructive could be better analyzed
- Great job w/ clash
- Really strong boil down

Second Opposition

- Strong clash
- Great constructive pt., needed further analysis though.
- Strong Poi response

Quebec Student Debating Association

Judge's Name: CHRISTIANS

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M306

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Drummondville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Eric Li

Jonathan Chu

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rimouski

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chiang

Edward Yang

Score
81
100

Score
80
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

161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Weak definitions led to some confusion & ultimately, a redefinition in summation; it wasn't clear whether prop opposed social media or all materialism / Consumerism

Second Proposition

points needed to be distinguished and defined distinction between social and conventional influences.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

very good boil down, good refutation of points. additional explanation of benefits vs harms would have strengthened the argument.

Second Opposition

additional points to support passion argument would have strengthened this point.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Max Schiller

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: a220

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Amos

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Liva Ion

Julia Wang

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Vijet Sapru

Jessica Yu

Score
76
100

Score
78
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

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

POI Was too long and wordy
- flag constructive

Second Proposition

too dramatic...
flag constructive
- Don't go

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

POI Was too long and wordy
- NEED to read map!!
- Couldn't distinguish between constructive and refutation

Second Opposition

Not enough time for point
- wasn't too relevant

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: DONNA HASTINGS

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5 Room: A220

PROPOSITION

Team Name: AMOS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Livia Ion

JULIA WANG

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

VIVEK SARRU

Jessica Yu

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

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

Team Score
<u>156</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>153</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- great persuasive tone
- nice intro
- second constructive pt. too similar to 1st pt.
- love use of repetition & "we regret in bail down", very effective technique

Second Proposition

- great persuasive tone
- confusing intro
- stay connected to the motion

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- better signposting needed, difficult to find differences between refutation and constructive
- strong bail down, refutation strong

Second Opposition

- excellent tone, very passionate
- speech and refutation close to yellow

1:30

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex, Donna, Max, + Saade

No. of Judges: 3

Round: Saturday 3 Room: A220

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Amos

Team Name: Quebec

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Livia Ion

Julia Wang

Vivek Sappu

Jessica Yu

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

Score
78
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

155
200

3 PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Akil Alleyne

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5 Room: M 334

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Bedford

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emily Li

Helen Pan

Score
82
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rigaud

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jasma Zhou

Michael Chen

Score
83
100

Score
82
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: — Very good intro & road map

First Proposition

- It would've been better not to mention a model at all, since — as you said yourself — it's not needed.
- Good job taking POIs, esp. conceding some things while pushing back against the overall thrust of the points.
- Good job acknowledging that some influencers do promote body positivity, etc. while still arguing that the overall trends are negative.

Second Proposition

- Good use of real-world examples to back up & illustrate your points!
- Good responses to POIs
- Great job setting up the theme of the debate in your intro
- * BOTH PROP SPEAKERS: You focused a bit too much on the examples of sponsored influencers who review/promote commercial products. That left your case vulnerable to the Opp.'s rebuttal that

Judge's Comments: — Very good intro & theme!

First Opposition

- Good job taking & offering POIs
- Great articulation of your constructive arguments!
- I would have liked to hear greater development of your case/argument re: the social, political, & intellectual benefits of influencer culture. More discussion of how greater diversity of opinion & empowering ordinary people to communicate their ideas to the public are good for society would have made your case even stronger.
- Very good summary!

Second Opposition

- Good POIs
- Great intro, esp. when you said "Don't believe what you heard from side Proposition" & pointed out that influencers aren't just makeup promoters & the like!
- Be careful not to overstate your case — e.g. there are racist & anti-semitic influencers who actually have very large followings.
- Good point that companies will still advertise with or without influencer culture.
- Make sure to stay within the time limit

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Miranda Collett

No. of Judges: _____

Round: 5

Room: M334

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Bedford

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emily Li

Helen Pan

Score
78
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Rijnd~~ Rigoud

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jasna Zhou
~~ZAAA~~

Michael Chen
~~CHAA~~

Score
80
100

Score
83
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

163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good job!
 - as a side - make sure to clarify/define what ~~interest~~ internet influencers are (like are we only talking about beauty gurus or is this everyone online)
 - be careful with relying too much on examples & not enough on direct clash
- Second Proposition
- good job!
 - elaborate on why it matters that influencers are hurt
like give the judge a reason they ought to weigh this point heavily in the round
 - be careful with repeating the same clash - build new responses

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- good clash!
 - be careful with assuming that you have to be defending ads & why ~~that's~~ good ~~or~~ there
 - be careful with repeating clash points build new responses
- Second Opposition
- really good point!
 - good clash
 - elaborate on why this advocacy is most effective because it exists online like why can't advocates advocate on other mediums.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Francesca Fagnoli

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M334

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Bedford

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emily Li

Helen Pan

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ryland

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jasmin Zhou

Michael Chan

Score
80 <u>81</u>
100

Score
80 <u>80</u>
100

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

Team Score
158 <u>158</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
161 <u>161</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

~~First Proposition~~

- If you give a broad definition, engage with other interpretations
 - If you provide lots of example you need to explain them and why they support.
- Judges might not always be familiar
- ~~Second Proposition~~ Always prioritize analysis

Judge's Comments:

~~First Opposition~~

Careful not to include slight contradictions

~~Second Opposition~~

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Foster Salpeter

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: M334

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Varrens

Team Name: Hudson

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

Sahasro Bhowmik

~~Lucas~~ Lucas Tarry

Penelope Cholakis

Montserrat Alvarez

Score
73
100

Score
71
100

Score
82
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score
144
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
160
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

There is no need for a fancy or off the beaten track model: make sure you define your terms in a way that keeps the most Prop. arguments open
Careful with basing a bulk of constructive on one example (especially without explaining the example!)

Second Proposition

You control the floor when you are speaking: take POIs when it is best for you, and ask your opponent to sit down if they speak for too long.
In the MC speech, I recommend bringing in some new/original content.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good analysis in refutation & constructive material
You do a good job of asking yourself why something is the case, but you'd benefit from going further and emphasizing why something is most important.

Good POIs, careful not to be too combative
Identification of themes was solid, but you'd benefit from recalling more constructive material rather than just refutation.
Second Opposition careful with time management!

Your rebuilding and refutation was clear and coherent, but it's important in the MO speech to bring some new take that the LO hasn't brought to the table

The constructive material seemed like an extension of points already brought up: in some instances this is okay, but it should be presented as such.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jacqueline Belzberg

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: M344

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Varenes

Team Name: Hvelson

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sahasro Bhawmik

Lucas Tarry

Penelope Cholakis

Montserrat Alvarez

Score
72
100

Score
71
100

Score
82
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score

143

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

161

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Whenever you have a ~~regret~~ motion, try to paint the world that would exist w/o social media influencers.
Try to be more specific in your impacts instead of just mentioning vague 'harms'.
Be careful to not strawman in your summary speech

Second Proposition

Try to have more rebuttal about specific prop points instead of using general responses.
Keep exclusivity in mind when it comes into a topic about a specific and niche actor.
Make sure your points are also relevant to the topic

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Really strong speech overall!
Incredible job w/ rebuttal and your constructive was well done, and had strong impacts.
Try to tone down the sass during your speech at times but it didn't bother me too much :))

Second Opposition

Great job bringing back relevant material from your partner's points.
Fair rebuttal but try to do more, add new material and responses beyond your partner's points.
Great style and examples

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Louden No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: 344 19

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Varrennes

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Sahasro Bhownik / Lucas Tarry

Score
72
100

Score
72
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Hudson

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Penelope Holakis / Montserrat Alvarez

Score
82
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score
144
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

In this debate the speakers did a great job.

Side prop did not produce a strong case on their side. Lack of analysis. not sure the motion was clearly understood.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Opp case was excellent - well developed - analysis was well put together to form a convincing case.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kathryn Bjornson

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: 342

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Scint-Sulpice

Team Name: Thelford Mines

First Speaker: Matthew Homa Second Speaker: Sasha ^{Klein KB} ~~KB~~

First Speaker: Rafay Ahmed Second Speaker: Dishita ^{Emmy avar-ahmed}

Score
73
100

Score
74
100

Score
75
100

Score
73
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
148
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Roadmapping is key. Slowdown. You have a fluid style. Definitions didn't meet your later ~~on~~ distinction on who an influencer is.

Second Proposition

Good style. Confident speaker. More clash needed. Keep your conferring at the table very subtle.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Great @ constructive. Good examples. Good point on diversity. Work on confidence - you have good points.

Second Opposition

Work on confidence. It will come. Double standard point of corporations was good.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Desmond Viegas

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: M342

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Sulpice

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Moma

Sasha Klein

Score
74
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Thetford Mines

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rafay Ahmed

Dishita Emayamban

Score
75
100

Score
74
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
149
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- definition was not specific enough given later arguments
- spoke too fast, especially during summary speech
- good constructive points

Second Proposition

- good speaking style
- stated Perry is not an internet influencer
↳ this went contrary to his partner's definition
- spoke to his partner very loudly during the 1st OPP's summary speech → this was disruptive and distracting

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- good refutation (with specific examples)
- good constructive points

Second Opposition

- good point regarding ^{new} monetized
- speaking style was a bit fragmented

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex Koutroubis

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 342

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saint-Sulpice

First Speaker:

Matthew H

Second Speaker:

Sasha K
~~Matthew~~

Score
73
100

Score
79 74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: The Lord Mines

First Speaker:

Rafay A.

Second Speaker:

Dishita E

Score
75
100

Score
79 74
100

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

Team Score

197
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

199
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michael Di Giorgio

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: M237

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Adèle

Team Name: Maskanojé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dylan Lee

Daniel B

Evon L

Charlie S.

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

Score
76
100

Score
76
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

152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Gov won this round because the moral argument about the fairness of forgetting children of the culture. Ultimately, they proved why more influence would be worse.

Then the monetary benefits are models.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Julia Abundo

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 5

Room: M 336

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte Croix

Team Name: Les Coteaux

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Cameron O'Hare

Claudia Leroux

Gregona Girakes

Manya Syed

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

Score
78
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
157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Try to spend a little more time on modelling to ensure terms are as clear as possible
- Excellent organization
- Great POI responses
- Excellently organized reply speech

Second Proposition

- Be sure to leave yourself enough time to rebuild
- Great POI strategy
- Excellent hook

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Be careful that you remain passionate and confident and don't slip into hostility
- Loved the actor analysis!
- Great structure
- Make sure you fully explain your points and be careful you don't make assertions

Second Opposition

- Try to explain your refutation a little more - you have time!
- Great hook
- If you have extra time, try and impact your points more!

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Riley Cohen

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5 Room: M34

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Louisville

Team Name: Chateaugay

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Arjan O'Brien Margaret Gauding

^{Em} Jane Burns Karen Debanek

Score
75
100

Score
73
100

Score
79
100

Score
78
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

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Focus your argument about why the principle of making money as an influencer is regrettable

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Be careful about framing your arguments in the context of prop's definition

Second Proposition

- make sure not to take too many POIs

Second Opposition

- make sure not to get too caught up in examples

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Sebastian Lopez

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M341

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Louiseville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Arjan O'Brien

Margaret Gouding

Score
74
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Chateau Guay

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emma - Jane Bonn

Kaori Ubonak

Score
80
100

Score
81
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

161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- don't generalize one bad example without warning why it's the case

Second Proposition

- Make sure to refute

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- be careful not to oversimplify the opposing arguments into the worst case scenario

Second Opposition

- avoid personal examples

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Liz Stratton

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5 Room: M341

~~OPPOSITION~~ ~~PROPOSITION~~

~~OPPOSITION~~ PROPOSITION

Team Name: Chateau Guay
(winning team)

Team Name: Louisville

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Emma-Jane Burns kaari Urbanek

Arjan o'Brien Margaret Gould
-ing

Score
79
100

Score
77 78
100

Score
74
100

Score
72
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 146
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Arjan

- engaging, clear delivery & well organized arguments
- excellent use of ~~the~~ real world examples
- offering a benchmark for what makes something ~~be~~ regrettable would help the case rise above a few of the worst examples that exist outside social media too

Second Proposition

Margaret

- clear speaking & pace
- good instinct to try to distinguish activists & influencers - be sure to provide clear reasons why
- work on making your analysis more specific to "influencers"

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Emma-Jane

- excellent introduction & framing
- strong refutation to Prop's harms by pointing out that these are tied to broader culture, not solely influencers & ways to mitigate harms
- arguments should be tied more closely to influencers specifically vs. social media generally

Second Opposition

kaari

- excellent POI engagement
- intro. was confusing - average older teenager using social media isn't an "influencer"
- strong refutation
- argument was less relevant (influencers can be celebrities/elites as well, ~~etc~~ some public figures can ~~be~~ base their image on being "every day" person)
- EXPLICIT weighing

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Elspeth Easton

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 5 Room: 343

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Lacolle

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anna Fioplovich

Zahra Slutchuk

Score
76
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sherbrook

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Adriano Morehouse Liam Lecluc Boyle

Score
78
100

Score
79
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

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: Interesting interpretation of Regret.
First Proposition

1) How can you determine who has access?

Regrets influence needs to be expanded further.

- that's not really regret?

- you set a very difficult burden for yourself.

Second Proposition

1) you are a very fluent speaker.

2) you did a very systematic rebuttal of the points - giving more impacts could be helpful.

Judge's Comments: 1) good handling of status quo points.

1) you did not fully have an introduction and lack of signposting.

2) Think of the examples you are using do they contradict?

↳ positive example James Charles

3) Rebuttal was well structured and you are 90% there:

point → evidence → analyze

Second Opposition

Good Questioning.

- malleability of children was an interesting point.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nabeeh

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 5

Room: M 339

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Beloeil

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Christina

Hana

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Val d'Or

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lauren

Anne

Score
<u>78</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
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

157

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- ↳ Be more comparative
 - ↳ what is the alternative to influencers & why that is good or bad?
- ↳ needed a clearer conception of the round

Second Proposition

- ↳ Good mechanization, but arguments needed to be impacted
- ↳ Need more clash

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- ↳ Make your impacts more explicit & easier to identify
- ↳ Try to do more weighing in your reply speech

Second Opposition

- ↳ Go more into depth for your args, ref., rebuilding.
 - ↳ depth >
- ↳ Need more clash

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CECELIA Lopez

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: A207

PROPOSITION

Team Name: MAGOG

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ANATS LEWIS

JULIA REZMAK

Score
72
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Bedford~~ BEAUCEVILLE

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

LACHON VAN

EGMOND

PAUL SELIGH

Score
72
100

Score
71
100

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

Team Score

146
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

143
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- FOCUS LESS ON BRINGING UP THE SAME EXAMPLES
- DEVELOP ARGUMENTS MORE

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- GOOD REFUTATION
- ARGUMENTS HAD NO IMPACT, EXPLAIN WHY WE SHOULD CARE

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Isaac Cape

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: ~~4207~~
4207

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Magey

Team Name: Beauceville

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Anais Lewis

Julia Reimer

Lachlan von Egmond Rahul Singh

Score
72
100

Score
74
100

Score
71
100

Score
71
100

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

Team Score

146
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

142
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Avoid repetitive examples
- Choose better mechanism than brain development
- Solid constructive points
- more refutation in whip speech
- more true to motion
↑
inc

Second Proposition

- Solid role fulfillment & organization
- Good constructive point
- more meaningful impact than hurts lives of influencers

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Maybe econ wasn't the best direction
- Work on time split (started constructive at 4:43)
- less concession-type responses with pessimism/optimism approaches
- Work on clarifying structure for whip speech

Second Opposition

- Lots of responses
- less responses about why something is mitigatory or already exists & more on why something is worse or better on one side
- solid point construction

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alle McGowan

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: A207

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Magoy

First Speaker:

Anais

Second Speaker:

Julia

Score
72
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Beauceville

First Speaker:

Laeklan

Second Speaker:

Pahul

Score
71
100

Score
71
100

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

Team Score
146
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
142
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

1. More clear

2. Provide alternative world

3. Prove

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

definition of influencers

mutual exclusivity on either side

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nicholas Viegas

No. of Judges: 3

Round: ~~5~~ ⁵ Room: A305

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Farnham

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan C.

Jack B.

Score
<u>72</u>
100

Score
<u>70</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Grandby

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lily Rich

Kendall Barnes

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>74</u>
100

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

Team Score

142
<u>142</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>149</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Nice speaking style
- good engagement with POIs
- make use of more road-mapping
- Avoid assumptions & generalizations
(this culture is ALL bad)

Second Proposition

- Good point & organization
- Be sure to take opposing side at their best
- Avoid assumptions & generalizations

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Nice refutation & POIs
- Interesting points.
- Hammer home opposing sides generalizations
- Provide more analysis (ask WHY?)

Second Opposition

- On-point examples brought forward
- Nice clarifications
- Hammer-home opposing sides generalizations
- Try offering NEW refutation

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michelle Murphy

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: A305

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Farnham

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan

Jack

Score
<u>72</u>
100

Score
<u>72</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Grandby

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lily

Kendall

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>144</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>151</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Be careful not to be too general:
Clear precise well articulated ideas at times
nice style

Second Proposition

Good ideas ~ explain them in greater details
good handling of POI do all influencers create controversy
watch generalizations

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Nice work ~ some excellent examples -
Clear speaking style great pace - well done

Second Opposition

Beautiful style - nice and calm
clear and articulate
be careful not to be repetitive

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Edward Lai

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: A305

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Farnham

First Speaker:

Ethan C.

Second Speaker:

Jack B.

Score
<u>73</u>
100

Score
<u>73</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Grandby

First Speaker:

Lily Rich

Second Speaker:

Kendall

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>72</u>
100

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

Team Score
<u>146</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>147</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Decent opening.
- You spent your speech talking about the negatives of influencers but did not explain why these negatives outweigh the positives.

Second Proposition

- See point 2 for first proposition above.
- Careful of generalizing a large group of people (influencers).

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good job calling out Proposition's generalizations.
- Good job refuting Proposition's point about disclosure.
- You could have filled more of your time.

Second Opposition

- Refutation was okay, but could have used more structure.
- Repeated too much of partner's arguments.
- Good handling of POI's.
- ~~Be careful of~~ - Be careful of time management.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CHLOE SHAHINIAN

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 5

Room: M329

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ville Marie

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Fatima Anees

Huda Abdellkrim

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Berthierville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Petra Planden

Hana Seveda

Score
75
100

Score
74
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

149
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Could have expanded the scope of the debating part advertising
- Make sure to impact for each actor group and emphasize role model position

Second Proposition

- Make sure to impact back to culture as a whole and the actor groups Fatima succeeded

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Try to organize your summary according to broad themes in the debate
- Make sure to mechanize your arguments by asking "why is this true?"

Second Opposition

- Make sure your reconstruction is not just repetition of your constructive
- provide new refutation responses

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Yasmine Abi-Hanna

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 5

Room: M240

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Pierrville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Holly

Cydney

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Monte Laurier

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ashton McNamara

Danica

Score
72
100

Score
73
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

145

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Stronger impacts

Second Proposition

differentiate your constructive more

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

constructive needs to explain why we don't regret not enough to just say there's no reason not to do something, therefore we should do it

Second Opposition

spend more time analyzing constructive

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: _____

No. of Judges: _____

Round: _____

Room: _____

PROPOSITION

Team Name: St-Hyacinthe

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Yuran Wong

Penelope Siosoa

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Victoriaville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rohan Nair

Will Sheppard

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

Score
79
100

Score
82
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

161

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good road mapping
- Don't take on as high of a burden

Second Proposition

- good examples

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Great refutation + reply
speech organization

Second Opposition

Excellent handling of POIs,
Excellent refutation + analysis,
Would've benefited from more
constructive

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Maren Al Jord

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: A205

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Gatineau

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sean Oh

Simran Vig

Score
80
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Felicien

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Angie Lei

Paul Zhang

Score
83
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score

160

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

162

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Good case

Need more depth and impact
why should I care and why is selling Phony
Products is bad and different from any advertisement

Buildup is clear and the response is accurate

Second Proposition

If the "other influences" were not contingent
on internet the case would have been stronger.

Great point but low impact driven

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Impressive speech very little could be done to improve. maybe P.O.I. but overall great round

Second Opposition

CNDF needs a ~~second~~ point however great refutation and stance

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jonah Rosen

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: A206

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Acton Vale

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Patrick Shield

Anna Beaudry

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Chicoutimi

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Logan

Jesse Liu

Score
<u>78</u>
100

Score
<u>78</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>156</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: Glenda Stoneman

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: 206

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Acton Vale

Team Name: Chicoutimi

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Patrick Shield Anna Beaudy

Alex Logan

Jessie Liu

Score
78
100

Score
76
100

Score
79
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
157
200

PROPOSITION OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

→ clear, concise speaking style.
- Consider putting your notes on the desk
- You asked Pöls and engaged in the debate.
You listened to the debate and addressed issues raised in your Summary

Second Proposition

Consider putting your paper on the desk. Consider if what you say is the same as your Partner.
You speak with good tone and Pacing.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- You took the case at its best, which was fair and good debating
- Your speeches were well-constructed and clear to follow.
You listened well to the debates and provided an effective Summary Speech.

Second Opposition

Your arguments were well structured and clear.
Your pacing was excellent.
You addressed each issue concisely, listing your responses. Then speaking about them in your speech in good detail with strong examples

Championnat National De Débats

Nom du juge: ANDREW KAPLAN

No. des Juges: 3

Ronde: 5

Salle: A 206

AFFIRMATIF

NEGATIF

Nom d'équipe: Action Vale

Nom d'équipe: Chicoutimi

Premier débateur:

Second débateur:

Premier débateur:

Second débateur:

Patrick Shield Anna Beaudry

Alex Logan Jesse Lin

Score
82
100

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

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

L'équipe Total
159
200

L'équipe gagnante est
(Veuillez encercler):

L'équipe Total
151
200

AFFIRMATIF / NEGATIF

Commentaires des juges:
Premier débateur:

well defined case with notable
fundamental issue. [could be offering
more c[on]cl[us]h].

Second débateur:

Good support of partner, well
substantiated case. may have
over-extended def of media.

Commentaires des juges:
Premier débateur:

oral comments given..

Second débateur:

oral comments given..