

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Julia Abundo

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: M-336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sorel

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Muhammad Mahmood Fatima Elawad

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint-Hyacinthe

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Yuran Wang

Penelope Siozos

Score
77
100

Score
78
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
155
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Make sure that your model is clear and concise.
- Try to use themes or questions in your whip speech
- Good structure!

Second Proposition

- Good structure!
- Make sure to fully explain and impact
- Try to flesh out and develop your refutation more. If you're worried about time, you can try your constructive first.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Make sure your structure is as clear as possible so your judge can follow you
- Make sure you keep a close eye on your time splits
- Excellent use of POI responses to launch into further explanation

Second Opposition

- Excellent POIs & responses!
- Fantastic hook!
- Make sure you keep an eye on your time splits

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ↓
Alex David Riley

No. of Judges: 3

Round: S274 Room: M243

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rigard

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Michael Chen Jasma Zhou

Score
74
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Chicootini

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Alex Logan Jesse Liu

Score
80
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
158
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Lack of clarity in model was damaging.

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Focus on cameras was unnecessary, arg on privacy was well developed.

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Riley Cohen

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M243

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Bigaud

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Chen

Jasna Zhou

Score
74
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ch:costini

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Logan

Jesse Liu

~~Jesse Liu~~

Score
78
100

Score
78
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

156
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

modelling
some good
case you think out the
issues. Make the

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

They not to get caught up in
specifics like cameras

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Sunny

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M243

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rigard

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Chen

Jessica Zhou

Score
73
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Chicoutimi

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Lagon

Jesse Liu

Score
77
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

153

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Model needs to be much clearer, sort of messed the round
- good constructive
- Builddown was ok

Second Proposition

- more refutation
- clear up model issues
- point was very similar

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- don't put too much emphasis on content
- say "even if"

Second Opposition

- very repetitive

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kathryn Bjanson

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: M340

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte Adèle

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dylan Lee

Daniel Bergerin

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Victoriaville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rohan Nair

Will Sheknek

Score
77
100

Score
76
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

153
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

This motion needs to be modeled in a way that would somehow work w/ Canadian values. Setting up gov't surveillance in the model would be a 180 for Canada. More info needed on the "new branch" mentioned. Distinguish your model from your constructive. Roadmap your partner's points. Need for nice society well made.

Second Proposition

You make some uninteresting points about bullying. On your side, I kept thinking - what will the gov't do w/ all the ppl who will become unemployable under this model? Won't it lead to more welfare + unemployment?

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

points about personal freedom well-made. Great point about effect on gay+transgender ppl. Titled point about organic vs. inorganic change.

Second Opposition

Rightly pointed out contradiction in their case. - be sure to have clear constructive.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: BRIAN CASBY

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M240

PROPOSITION

Team Name: SAM BRUND

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ANDREW SHI

DANTE LU

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ANDS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

LIVIA LOU

JULIA WANG

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

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

Team Score

162

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

159

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Ultimately I accept that a social credit is a positive influence that outweighs the privacy risks.

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Mazen Al Jendi

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M 240

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Bruno

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Shi

Daniel Le

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Amos

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Livia ION

Julia Wang

Score
78
100

Score
79
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

157

200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Slow down and calm down

Great points and passion

Clarify the thesis of the build down

Second Proposition

A bit more organization and time splits would have been helpful

More fleshing needed for a promising point

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

More impact explain what is the privacy cost

More impact overall and deeper refutation

Know what burdens should be borne by prop.

Do not use personal examples
Second Opposition

A second point is necessary

Refutation was great

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Zac Beaman

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M240

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Orano

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew

Daniel

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: AMOS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Livia

Julia

Score
78
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

158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Slow Down a little
Meh Def => explained it well, and opened it up was needed, but was a little mitigators

great 1st point: well Mechanized and Impact

Second Proposition

good structure and analysis
Little bit irrelevant

Refutation: good engagement, took them as they
Best

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Great speaking style
Try to get into the meat of the argument

Second Opposition

Great analysis - a little late

Try to bring up args earlier

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nicholas Viegas

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: ~~MAAR~~ ^{mz42}

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Roberval

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ashley Liu

Yusef Elmaraghy

Score
77 77
100

Score
74 74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Félicien

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Angie Lei

Paul Zhang

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score

156 156
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

162
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Could have provided more details in model (# of pts. gained/lost)
- Good recognition of neg. trends in SA
- Point: Changing behavior
 - ↳ aren't you already deterred from committing crimes under SA?
- Needs to offer more POIs

Second Proposition

- nice clarification about China
- interesting refutation: "not mutually exclusive"
- Good constructive point (rewards for doing good)
 - ↳ try to differentiate from partner's point
 - ↓ provide other refutation

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Nice Intro
- Super-detailed & unique constructive points
- 1st opp needs to do refutation
- really-good comparative analysis

Second Opposition

- nice refutation & rebuilding
- good clarifications
- avoid assumptions

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michelle Murphy

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M242

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ~~ASH~~ Roberval

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ashley Liu

Yusef E.

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: St. Felicien

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Angie Lei

Paul Zhang

Score
80 84
100

Score
83
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

167
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Clear and precise presentation
Careful not to argue the opposition points
Great speaker work on
Stronger refutation of arguments

Second Proposition

Very well spoken - clear and animated - well done.
General points ~ give further deeper thought to examples.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Strong presence ~ great clear speaking voice
Strong and clear - excellent arguments and analysis
Clear understanding of the issues
easy to listen to and very well argued

Second Opposition

Wonderful personality in your presentation style
Watch your speed though sometimes very fast.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Matthew Elmeser

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M242

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rebervel

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ashley Liu

Yusef Elmarghy

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Felician

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Angie Lei

Paul Zheng

Score
85 85
100

Score
84 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
169
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Prop has a strong case but fails to illustrate the actual mechanism by which the score would affect changes in behavior. Also prop relied too much on the ~~int~~ mts slide, should have modeled a proper points system.
Opp does a fantastic job of illustrating the harms and Prop fails to sufficiently defend against or demonstrate why the concerns are unfounded.

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

illustrating the harms and Prop fails to sufficiently defend against or demonstrate why the concerns are unfounded.

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Allie McGowan

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: A209

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Lachote

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Danae

Olin

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Gaspe

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Purvet

Anisha

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

Score
77
100

Score
78
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

155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

1. Go deeper into impacts of system beyond incentives to do good

2. Frame debate from beginning. Why do we need this?

Second Proposition

1. More engagement with ppl's best parts (SES Segmentation)

2. Weigh 3rd argument against rest of debate

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

1. More engagement with prop

2. Impact arguments re why is it bad to judge ppl by a #

Second Opposition

1. Weigh SES segmentation against increased social good

2. expand on SES part (best argument)

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Daniel Mendelson.

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: AZC9.

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Lachute.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Danae Papelassis

Ava Olin.

Score
80
100

Score
79.
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Gaspé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Puneet Chhina

Anisha Biswas.

Score
79.
100

Score
81
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

160.

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good points.
- Good analysis
- Good breakdown.

Second Proposition

- Good refutation.
- Good analysis.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good points.
- Good analysis.
- Good boil down.
- Maybe slow down, speaking very quickly.
- You are all asking right questions and providing thorough answers.

Second Opposition

- Good points
- Good analysis.

- Need to refute their best case.
- If it does encourage to do good why do the intentions matter so much? we could have gone further.

- Needed better refutation to their social point, why should everyone be treated equally?
You are all asking right questions and providing thorough answers.
- Maybe explaining & fleshing out model could have helped.

Keep it up!

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Sebastian Lopez

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: A209

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Lachôte

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Danae Peperossis

Ava Olin

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Gaspé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Puneet Chhina

Anisha Biswa,

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

- Modeling had the right idea, but needed to be more clear, go into detail about what this looks like

Second Proposition

- be careful not to make generalizations, especially when it comes to questions about equality

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- There was very little direct refutation of the prop points

Second Opposition

- The structure could have been a little more clear.

Championnat National De Débats

English

Nom du juge: Carissa Balcaen

No. des Juges: 1

Ronde: 6

Salle: A205

AFFIRMATIF

NEGATIF

Nom d'équipe: ~~Anne Kimpton~~ Val d'or

Nom d'équipe: Sainte Sulpice

Premier débateur:

Second débateur:

Premier débateur:

Second débateur:

Anne Kimpton

Lauren Chang

Matthew Homa

Sasha Klein

Score
72
100

Score
72
100

Score
86
100

Score
85
100

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

L'équipe Total	<u>154</u>
	200

L'équipe gagnante est
(Veuillez encercler):

L'équipe Total	<u>171</u>
	200

AFFIRMATIF / NEGATIF

Commentaires des juges: ~~add~~

Premier débateur:

- good job of pointing out the limit of hate speech.
- you mentioned making the country better, but you need to explain why we need to be better ✓✓
- that both the "fine" aspect of the model in the opening (sooner)
- Expand on importance on social issues more.
- You made assumptions about people's capabilities for the point attainment.
- ~~expand on relevance~~ ↑ Good level of confidence
↓ I really enjoyed both your speaking styles

Second débateur:

- When asked about the +ve point lack of opportunity, you needed to explain that, in your model, this would be accounted for.
- You did provide a nice analogy to a classroom environment and how other people benefit from the +ve's of others, but what is the reward in your model?
- Why do we need more tourism?

Commentaires des juges:

Premier débateur:

Practical-manipulation

- Misuse of power ✓
- limit discourse ✓

Final Rebuttal

- needed to reiterate that in their model, there is no mechanism or positive reinforcement for having +ve points

Second débateur:

- Clear clarification given on who can see the scores.
- Nice analogy that even though marijuana was illegal, people still used the drug.
- I would not have discussed political parties as an example.
- Nice clarification on how often if you are "still a person", in society's eyes, they will only see the score -

great response to P&I
of limit of free speech
- value point was muddy until you discussed an fair opportunity to gain + points.
↳ expand on this more

- Try to add pauses between your ideas.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nick Morrow

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: M244

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saint-Jerome

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Talia Trottenberg

Mia Su

Score
<u>78</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Pierreville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Cyndey Caruthers

Holly Jameson

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>156</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>153</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- offer more pols
very clear stance framing - ✓ goal

- Model: be clear on what happens with points if bad or good - very unclear - is it symbolic just get jobs?

- Good example of current merit systems like in (clues down)
- link work is good -> showing why without incentives ppl don't help community mechanism of job benefits like mand-t hours in high school was solid

Second Proposition

-> offer more pols
-> if you have a model challenge -> ADDRESS IT
- not strategic to say "we already do this"
because your side changes status quo - also not strategic to say points are so easy to give
-> internal conflict
-> new point on jobs how helps employees
employers = good actor analysis - but weigh the importance of this - better economy? more businesses. idk what it is, unclear
-> refutation is flippancy

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

-> good mention of alternate ways to do the same
-> be more clear on dehumanization, what is imperf. that is not in and of itself a harm - need to impact how affects lives of people.

-> Good model challenges -> points out hole, China has facial recognition

-> on the right track with government failure (i.e. race, but would have liked more). Gov is bias LS should have examples like fare bias/gil ratio
-> no new point -> i.e. "ppl dislike gov" in the whip

Second Opposition

-> offer more pols
constructive
LS Motion = unfair as not a new point - partner had same point - must add a NEW POINT
-> took one example too seriously - blow Jorntion was example of volunteering. take this into account! not just nit picking
LS could have added more analysis on bias point and why that is MOST important

strengthen outside

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lauren Kim

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: A305

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Grandby

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lily Rich

Kendall Barnes

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Portneuf

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jake Waldner

Nora McLennan

Score
78
100

Score
77
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

- decent model ~~but~~ that wasn't too contentious
 - but are certain acts worth more points than others?
 - could have clarified some clash based on misunderstanding
- need more mechanization (why you achieve systems that lead to proposed impacts)
- need clearer comparative (why your world is better than SQ)

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- good constructive, well explained and nuanced
 - could've benefited from concrete examples to further characterization of world
- link refutation back to motion
- left some ~~points~~ info hanging (but picked up by partner)

BOILDOWN - FOR LD

- good breakdown of different scenarios + very organized
- use themes to summarize round rather than big info dump
- good effort to weigh / - point out exactly what opp failed to do

some mixed up →

BOILDOWN - FOR PM

- good reminder of constructive that got lost in the round
- interesting idea about precedent → came out to late in round and needed more analysis

Second Proposition

- needed to show me how tracking would specifically minimize crime (walk me through the why)
- ~~linking~~ make sure to establish logical links between context and impacts
- good style, good presentation
- good example but in future, generally avoid personal examples

Second Opposition

- opp dump
 - brought up a lot of new ideas very last minute
 - overall opp would've benefited from a better case split
- needed more mech
- constructive was implicit refutation
 - as 2nd speaker just make it refutation to avoid opp dump

RFD: opp had better/more profound analysis though keep in mind this was a very tight round so contributions to both for handling this motion well and respectfully

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: D. AASINUS

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 6 Room: M344

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Jolie He

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

NAZAR Vigneysoya KUMON Zhang

Score
70
100

Score
71
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Beloel

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

CHRISTINA Lin HANNA Aref Jahan

Score
81
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score
141
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
160
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- You need to define the motion much more clearly
- identify your constructive points for the judge (roadmap/signpost)
- Good persuasive tone
- to bail down resist few - till

Second Proposition

- offer some signposting
- don't speak in sweeping generalizations
- stick to the motion and use concrete examples

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- great tone
- helpful signposting
- excellent use of POIS
- arguments are clear and well substantiated
- strong ball down

Second Opposition

- excellent point by point refutation
- don't prioritize rebuild own constructive; luckily you did not run out of time
- good response to POIS

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Gabriel Tottenborg

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: 339

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Trois Riviere

Team Name: Montreal

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Elliot Costa

Ty Deutscher

Thane Morgan

William Aherm

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>76</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>157</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Try adding more mechanisms, how the system reduces stereotypes.

Second Proposition

- Careful taking a small burden - monitoring police officers is very similar to the status quo.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Try to address the other side directly - don't just say that this won't be an issue anyways.
- Good point on privacy, but I needed more mechanisms to buy it.

Second Opposition

- Be careful with the difference between a criminal record and the potential social credit system.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jack Stewart

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: A306

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Hudson

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Penelope Cholakis

Montserrat Alvarez

Score
83
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte-justine

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amanda Sultan

Alexa Richstone

Score
78
100

Score
77
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
155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Elspeth Estee

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: 207

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Shawinign

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Annabelle Kollmar Philippine Debbay

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Maskinonge

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Evan laurence Charlie Simms

Score
79
100

Score
80
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
159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
 First Proposition
 ◦ aware of status was an interesting point
 ◦ If your implementing a system how are you doing so.
 ↳ Be carefule of identifying a domino effect when they lead to the same result.
 ◦ Addiction question was slightly probimasic

Judge's Comments:
 First Opposition
 Subjectivity was a very strong point, it could use an example to follow the quality.
 How can gov's decide?
 Your even if point was very well structured.
 Careful of semantics.

NO one needs to say sorry

Second Proposition

- Are there laws against it though.
 ↳ are their harms of this?
- Your speech had a very good flow.
- More explanation of your neutrality point.

Second Opposition

- Interesting well delivered questions!
- Your actor analysis was well handled
- I appreciated you looking at the comparities

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex Koutroubis

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: m325

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Baie Compu

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Thomas B.

Simran D.

OPPOSITION

Team Name: La Colle

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anna K.

Zahra S.

Score
74
100

Score
74
100

Score
74
100

Score
73
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

147

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

need to ask why



Second Proposition

Give me more in hand input

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Take Poi

Second Opposition

Give one of your points to LO so that she can fill time

RdG don't tell me that their side is good I can give you the win if you tell me that the only problem is pretty every time else is fine

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Foster Salpeter

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: M246

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Acton Vale

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Patrick Shield

Anna Beaudry

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Drummondville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Eric Li

Jonathan Chu

Score
85
100

Score
82
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

167

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Model could have been a tad clearer on this resolution

Constructive was good, but first point (people not what they seem) got

lost through the round

This was the opportunity to accept harms! ie sure it is questionable to track people, but they are inherently evil

Summary came at 5 mins., could have taken more time for constructive

Second Proposition

Very good speaking style/eye contact
Refutation was quite good, but did not always engage with strongest material

There was some good new analysis in constructive material that unfortunately did not get developed enough

(ie cyberbullying, hard to punish acts)

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Very good strategic refutation, specifically in your analysis of the status quo, and of marginal impact

Very solid constructive that prop. had lots of trouble taking down even with good refutation.

Minorities point very clever

Good use of POIs
Good thematic boil down

Second Opposition

I liked the talk about problems with the model, but this should have come out in the LO.

You did - just enough refutation work on the "cremes that go unpunished point"; but I would have liked more specific engagement with ^{their} examples.

Very good - job at keeping LO constructive relevant, but would have liked more work on 'some smaller but important arguments

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Edward Lai

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: M237

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte Croix

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Cameron O'Hare

Claudia Leroux

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>72</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Varenes

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sahasro Bhowmik

Lucas Tarry

Score
<u>72</u>
100

Score
<u>72</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>144</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Very strong opening
- Good POI
- Good boil-down
- Called out Opp. for not sticking to resolution.

Second Proposition

- Decent constructive
- Good POI
- No clear refutation

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Focused too much on logistical details instead of concept meant to be debated.
- POI's were weak.

Second Opposition

- Refutation not very effective
- Focused too much on logistical details as well.
- A bit too much repetition during constructive.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Isaac Cape

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: U346

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Chateaugay

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kaari Urbarek

Emma-Jane Burn

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rouyn Noranda

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tony Wu

Hugo Hu

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>81</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

164

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Clarification for model
- Better mechanism for deterrence
- Good organization for whip

Second Proposition

- more organization, but like we lost a lot of that case
- more unique rebuttals to make your additons to the round clear

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Sometimes it is good to just POI the clarification rather than use it as an attack at top of speech
- Good constructive
- more diverse points
- Clearer refutation structure for whip

Second Opposition

- Good clarification of partner's case
- Strong refutation
- Avoid hyperbole

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jarren Fefer

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6 / Room: M316

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Chateauguy

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kaasi Urbanek

Emma Jane Boris

Score
79
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rouyn Noranda

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tony Wu

Hugo ~~Wu~~ Hu

Score
82
100

Score
82
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
164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Strong argument
- Need better model

Second Proposition

- Good intro
- need more structure

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good comparative
- Need other arguments to diversify case.

Second Opposition

- Good clarification of Tony's argument.
- Need a different argument

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ANDREW KAPLAN

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M346

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Chateau Guay

Team Name: Rouyn Noranda

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Keari Urbanek Emma-Jane Burns

Tony Wu

Hugo Hu

Score
79
100

Score
76
100

Score
84
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

164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

confident, clear speaker.
could have spent more time clarifying the model, opened gov up for attack.

Second Proposition

some good clash & speaker style.
How does organ donation help your score when most organs are donated once you're dead?
watch you assumptions about what wealthy families are donating

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

very strong clash, strong case construction.
effective identification of key contentions for side.

Second Opposition

some good clash points but it's okay to concede some ideas but show how they are well dealt with (status quo, eg) no drunk teachers, no drunk doctors.
well organized & systematic attack.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Massimo De Lullo

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: ~~1329~~ M329

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Post Carter

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Xander Biddulph Breley Hillard

Score
72
100

Score
72
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Huntingdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aliya Kabani Rhea Gupta

Score
70
100

Score
71
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
141
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Donating to Charity

• Job Opportunity contention =
Not at All sufficient to justify a gov't policy like this.

• Need More Medimization

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

• Need 2 contentions

• ~~More refutation~~

• More refutation

• You Needed much more content

Second Proposition

Impact arguments and engage more w/ app

Second Opposition

• Impact arguments

• Refute w/ diverse views

DO NOT repeat 7th speaker

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Keith Moussa

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M329

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Fort Carter

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Xander Biddulph Briley Hillyard

Score
71
100

Score
72
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Huntingdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aliya Kaban Rhea Gupta

Score
71
100

Score
70
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

141
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good roadmap
- Good impact
- Examples & analysis - need more
- Only one constructive point

Boil down: - Better themes than opp.

- Good summary of own side
- Does not really address opp's still standing arguments

Second Proposition

- Need a roadmap
- Good constructive with not enough analysis (why are these social points more of an incentive than the legal system?)
- Relate refutation to specific points made on Prop.

No POIs given

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good roadmap
- Effective at poking holes in Prop's case is OK
- Excellent public speaking skills
- ~~Very good impact for road~~
- Watch out for the "likes"!

Constructive: 1st point = rushed, 2nd point = much better

Boil down: - Effective review of own side's case

Second Opposition

- Great roadmap
- Very good public speaking skills
- Good arguments on principles and practicals, though it was unclear on the occasion of 15 min
- ~~Excellent analysis~~
- No original constructive material (if there was, it was very unclear)

Time not fully filled

need more rebuttal suggestions

Leave yourself more time for construct

Time not fully filled -> OK

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Yasmine (Chair)

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 6 Room: M329

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Portcartier

Team Name: Huntington

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Vander

Briley

Aliya

Rhea

Score
71
100

Score
72
100

Score
70
100

Score
71
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
141
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

model

Second Proposition

impact + analyze more

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

impact arguments

Second Opposition

different
constructive

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Desmond Viegas

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Bedford~~ Bedford Helen Pan

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emily Li

Helen Pan

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Anais Lewis Magog Julian Raman

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anais Lewis

Julia Reimer

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

- 2 well thought out "pillars"
- In summary, good tackling of side opp's comment on fake news

Second Proposition

- could have spent more time with refutation
- good Pnt asked

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- good point re: fake news
- refutation only begun @ 5:10
- effective summary speech

Second Opposition

- good answer of Pnt
- not much point development

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Max Schiller

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6 Room: 1328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Bedford

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emily Li

Mehar Pan

Score
76
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Magg

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ariais Lewis

Julia Koiner

Score
72
100

Score
71
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
143
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Need more points

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- more refutation,
- needs more rebuttals

Second Proposition

Just reiterate your points
- more refutation

Second Opposition

- need to explain your points better

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: JULIA LEB

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BEDFORD

First Speaker:

GIMMY LI

Second Speaker:

HELEN PAN

Score
77
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: MAGOG

First Speaker:

ANITA'S
LEWIS

Second Speaker:

JULIA
REIMER

Score
72
100

Score
72
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

144
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

→ Good constructive, though it
was only 2 points (not 3)
→ Good ball down nice
engagement

Second Proposition

→ No new constructive but said
there would be
→ Lacked clash and analysis

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

→ Not enough refutation
→ needed more mechanisms
→ needed more analysis and impact
→ Touched on very valid and
intelligent ideas

Second Opposition

→ Many assertions in this speech
→ Lacked clarity

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Victoria Kalisky
~~Mont Laurier~~

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 6 Room: M342

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Mont Laurier

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Ashton McNamara Danica Scully

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Farnham

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Ethan Chan Jack Barry

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>79</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>161</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

how does the electoral process prevent abuses in monitoring?
 • modeling was not concise, don't need a fully fleshed model but a general framework limited to case stance, principles (safety)
 • Citizen incentives incentive for long term benefits
 ↳ you spent over half of your speech on definition. specifically, until 4:43.
 • speech lacked in structure and signposting.

Judge's Comments:
Second Proposition

why would volunteer work decrease loans? at that point you might as well get a job....

Judge's Comments:
Refutation

lacked explanation of how dictatorship could not occur from extreme monitoring.
~~maybe this should~~
 didn't provide analysis of how this system replaced criminal systems

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

1984 example!
 good P.O.I response
 • great public speaking style, a little speedy but very clear.
 • also good roadmapping
Dictatorship, like China by allowing government monitoring → creates informant culture. reduces freedom of speech if penalized for dissenting views
Quantifying people → interesting. i wish you elaborated on dangers.

Judge's Comments:
Second Opposition

→ amazing points, I wish you elaborated more
~~disadvantages marginalized~~ classes/ groups
 ↳ good that you address role of criminal justice system

Refutation/Rebuilding
 good

started constructive arg. too late.
 Discrimination: explain why this is bad?
 slippery slope hypothesis

maybe this should have been framed around

could minimize a "purge"

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CECELIA LOPEZ

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 6 Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: RIMOUSKI

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

ETHAN CHIANG EDWARD YOUNG

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: VILLE MARIE

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

FATIMA ANEES HUDA ABDELKEREM

Score
79
100

Score
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
156
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- GOOD JOB @ BOLTING INTO
THEME PRIVACY VS
 SAFETY

Second Proposition

- BE NICER W/ THE POL'S!


Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- ~~BE~~ • GOOD SPEAKING STYLE
- EXPLAIN MORE THE IMPACT OF POINTS

Second Opposition

- POWERFUL SPEAKER

ALSO



Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Akil Alleyne

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rimouski

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chiang

Edward Yang

Score
77
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ville Marie

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Fatima Anees

Huda Abdelkerim

Score
79
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

158

200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: Splendid intro, theme, First Proposition & road map!

- I'm not sure that making a universal basic income (UBI) part of your model was a good idea. That's a whole other debate unto itself, & I don't think it's a necessary feature of a social credit system.

- Instead of proposing a UBI, it would have been a better idea to outline how social credit could be implemented in Canada in a way that's consistent with civil liberties, esp. privacy.

- Good summary/rebuttal speech

Second Proposition - Good intro & road map

- Good job - responding to the POI about privacy by arguing for some reasonable restrictions for safety's sake!

- Good argument that good behavior for mercenary motives is better than no good behaviour at all!

Judge's Comments: - Good intro & theme

First Opposition:

- When ~~ask~~ offering POIs, it's better to make them clearly argumentative rather than open-ended requests for more details from the other team. It risks giving your opponents an opportunity to elaborate on their case - to their benefit.

- Good job using examples of alternative systems (e.g. Finland) & articulating your constructive arguments.

- Good job - arguing the right to privacy; exploring the potential for govt. abuse of social credit information would have helped.

Second Opposition

- Interesting point about the plight of homeless people & their mental health problems...

- Be careful ~~to~~ to address the speaker, not your opponent directly.

- Good point that Canada shouldn't take its social-policy cues from China - BUT make sure to get your facts straight. China has never been a democracy; it went from being a dictatorship under Mao to authoritarian since the 1970s.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nabeel

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rimouski

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan

Edward

Score
79 79
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ville-Marie

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Fatima

Huda

Score
79
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

158

200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

↳ UBI model was unnecessary and made your burden to high

↳ Needed more framing to come out earlier

Second Proposition

↳ Good stance

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

↳ More clash

Second Opposition

↳ China point needed impacts

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michael Di Giorgio

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M337

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Vivek Sapru

Jessica Yu

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Score
<u>82</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Louisville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Arian O'Brien

Margaret Goulding

Score
<u>87</u>
100

Score
<u>78</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>157</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: Jonah Rosen

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M334

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Vivek Supra

Jessica Yu

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Lowville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Argan O'Brien

Margaret Seidling

Score
78
100

Score
79
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

157
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: 3

Round: 6

Room: 334

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec

Team Name: Louisville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Vivek Gupta

Jessica Yu

Arian O'Brien

Margaret Goulding

Score
84
100

Score
83
100

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score

167
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Great delivery
- Good arguments
 - Even better if you ^{use even more} ~~use~~ ^{more} ~~examples~~ ^{examples}
 - Racial Bias argument not that convincing
 - Politics example was better
- Strong conclusion
- Good rebuttal — it would be even better to emphasize the themes to an even greater extent.

Second Proposition

- good attacks
- great delivery
- excellent ~~extra~~ point about trust
- strong conclusion

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Great delivery
 - Good refutation
 - Good points but need to explain them more fully
 - e.g. against our values
 - had the right idea but needed to be explained more clearly.
 - your points should have been more organized
 - ↳ good ideas
 - leave time for a conclusion
- Good rebuttal? even better if it was more organized*
- Great delivery in rebuttal*

Second Opposition

- Good point about intrinsic and extrinsic, but you need to deal with the impact
- Great delivery
- ~~good~~ ^{some} Good arguments — ~~explain~~ ^{→ e.g. stress} explain them more fully
- have a conclusion ^{→ discrimination can work if you connect it to a social slightly but need to do more to make this connection} or religious or some other bias. You did that
- good point about teenagers — point out that they didn't put an age limit on it — could have done even more with that

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Abigail Trevino

No. of Judges: _____ Round: _____ Room: M326

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ramdon

Team Name: Thetford Mines

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rally Lin

Alastair Therbit

Rafay Ahmed

Dishita Emayalath
ban

Score
83
100

Vitals

Score
74
100

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score

162
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Excellent analysis, good rebuttal, be more careful with modelling

Second Proposition

Try not to take on such a high burden as ending inequality

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Try to dash more with other team's material

Second Opposition

Good points, but try to have your first speaker introduce them earlier

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christine Long

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M326

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rawdon

Team Name: Thetford Mines

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rally Lin

Alastair T-V

Rafay Ahmed

Dishita F.

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<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>164</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>152</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- exceptional style + analysis of the issue
- excellent organization of your speech
- excellent diction
- please stick with debate;
- You are awesome

- liked your speech organization
- liked the morality of government argument; you could have done so much more with it
- great job responding to POIs

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

- great natural style
- great point by point clash
- good job overall

- you seemed very flustered + nervous; take a breath + compose yourself
- you need a much stronger clash to end, by this point
- seemed to wait too late to truly refute the points put forth by the other side

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CHLOE SHAHNIAN

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: M343

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Napierville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Max Mitchell

Aidan Eisan

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Cowansville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Maya Mior

Natalie Vicqas

Score
82
100

Score
80
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

162

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Might have been good to see more analysis between the status quo and the proposed system within the model
- Make sure that your mechanism is not too reliant on examples

Second Proposition

- Needed more of a mechanism for why this would lead to a dynamic of friendly competition instead of discrimination

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Would have been good to discuss increased class disparity earlier on in the round
- Talk about what types of people in the govt. would be deciding
 - ↳ would the group be diverse ~~and~~ representative?

Second Opposition

- Make sure that your reconstruction accounts for reputation from the 2nd Govt. speaker
- Would have liked to have seen more analysis of incentive structures which push individuals to perpetrate crimes under status quo

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Marnel Wiltzer

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 6 Room: 220

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sherbooke

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

adriano moukhoue Siom Leduc Bayle

Score
76
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Les Coteaux

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Gregoria Ginabes Marya Dyed

Score
73
100

Score
73 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
148
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Great pol response
clear roadmap
made use a little lacking
make sure your points are distinct
make sure you don't add more info
in your boil down

Second Proposition

a little more context / points would have been great

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

make sure that you explain why your points are valid, and back them up with evidence

Second Opposition

you don't need to repeat the motion in the 4th speech
very good points but since they were so important, they should have been in the first speech

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Miranda Collett

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: A206

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Beauceville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lachlon van Edmond Pahul Singh

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Berthierville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Petra Planden

Hana Jereda

Score
70 70 70
100

Score
68 68
100

Score
69 69
100

Score
68 68 68
100

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

Team Score

138 138
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

137 137
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: PATRICIA DONOVELLY

No. of Judges: _____ Round: 6 Room: M341

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Grafineau

Team Name: St Keri ~~Jake Surry~~

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Sean Ooh

Simran Vig

Alex Lawrin

Jake Surry

Score
78
100

Score
79
100

Score
79
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
160
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Gap in the implementation.

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

The opposition was able to show the difficulty of implementing the system proposed by govt & also of suggestion of the surveillance state that might result.

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Glenda Stoneman

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 341

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Gatineau

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sean Ooh

Simran Vig

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: St. Peni

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Laurin

Jake Surry

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

You speak clearly and organize your thoughts well. You add detail and elaboration to expand and explain your ideas.

Second Proposition

You spoke well - nicely structured and well-laid out. Your pacing is good and you included good examples and analysis. I would have liked more point by point refutation as it was hard to follow.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

You thought clearly about the issues and showed good insights. Your speech delivery was passionate and convincing. Great POI on the morality of the system.

Second Opposition

You start strong, but then progressively get faster and faster. Consider saying less, but communicating more - think about how your points fit into your structure. -> adding more verbiage detracts from the points you are making.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex Benzri

No. of Judges: _____

Round: 6

Room: M341

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Edsall~~ Gatineau

First Speaker: ~~Alex~~
~~Gatineau~~
Sean

Second Speaker:
~~Simon~~
Simon

Score
78
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: St. Remi

First Speaker: Alex

Second Speaker:
Jake

Score
80
100

Score
81
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
161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good dev of burden
- Pillars
- Incentive to do good
- Speech has good flow.
- Refuse to accept POI
- 2. Transparent system and more qualified
- Second Proposition
- Pillar
 - Socio-economic benefit
- Refuses POIs
- Great development of pillar
- Requires more refutation
- Strong speaker

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- ~~Good development of burden~~
- pillar
 - Introducing new argument in clash (rebuttal speech)
- 1. Dehumanization
- 2. Practicality
 - How will it be implemented
- Needs to more systematically clash
- Strong rebuttal speech
- Second Opposition
- Good speaker
- Systematic refutation
- Natural progression of pillar

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Francesca Fagnoli

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M326

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rawdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rally Jiv

Alastair Vitals

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Thetford mines

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rafay Ahmed

Dishita Emayana
ramban

Score
78
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score

162
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

~~First Proposition~~

Model was a bit too broad and became a problem later on.

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:

~~First Opposition~~

- Make sure to debate what the other team actually said.

- If you say something falls on your side make sure to explain why.

Second Opposition

- Strongest point out a bit too late.