

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: J.J. Gerstein

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1 Room: Geo.

PROPOSITION

Team Name: DM Saskatchewan

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Leora Diakou

Jillian McLeod

Score
78 78
100

Score
76 76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia FJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anya Friesen

Alex Jackson

Score
81
100

Score
77
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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

comfortable speaker
Spoke a bit too fast
Organized

Second Proposition

Good flow
Change tone ~~more~~ ^{more} often
Good info.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

good speaker
sign post a bit more clearly
relatable

Second Opposition

Good speaking style
A bit confused at some points,
be confident in your points
Nice refutation point

Opp. remember POIs!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Katie Rochford

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: G70

PROPOSITION

Team Name: DM Saskatchewan

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Leora Diakuw Jillian McLeod

Score
76
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia EJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anya Frusen Alex Jackson

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

152
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

156
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- one point → try to have min. of 2
- needs analysis of argument
- 2nd speech more conviction. well structured
- Try to fill your time
- good style

Second Proposition

- one point
- Try to fill time
- needs more analysis. WHY does it matter, HOW will it happen etc.
- more refutation
- good pace

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- one point
- ↳ needs analysis
- lots of internal refutation
- good refutation, could have more

Second Opposition

- one point → needs more time
- take time w/ POIs
- watch use of time

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ariel Melanckoff

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1 Room: Geo

PROPOSITION

Team Name: DM Saskatchewan

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Leora Diakw

Jillian McLeod

Score
78
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia FJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anya Friesen

Alex Jackson

Score
80
100

Score
77
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

153
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Good intro, good info + style
- ~~Good~~ Good final rebuttal
- Little analysis into why those are the criteria for heroes

Second Proposition

- Need more analysis into why being a hero makes others better
- Good info, but ~~work~~ work on clash

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Good caseline
- Good use of humor
- needs more rebuttation
- slightly repetitive towards the end of your speech

Second Opposition

- relax!
- Good rebuttation
- needed more substance in constructive

(Remember to give POT's

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ABHINAV GUPTA

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: GEO

PROPOSITION

Team Name: DM SASKATCHEWAN

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Leora Dinkus

Jillisa Meleco

Score
<u>70</u>
100

Score
<u>69</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NOVA SCOTIA FJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anga Friesen

Alex Jackson

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
74 <u>74</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
<u>139</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>154</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Careful on your POI's; they tend to focus on wording and not content (Semantics)
ie: "Terry Fox: Dead so not a hero?"
=> you didn't catch his argument
- Strong tone, but be careful about sounding too aggressive.

Second Proposition

- You needed more constructive arguments
- Organization could have benefited from letting Dany Meleco's traits outline the argument (rather than fitting Meleco into your framework)

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Your arguments were excellent; you caught all the holes in Govt's arguments
- Work on finding some more constructive points (though I'm aware some constructive points overlapped with rebuttal)

Second Opposition

- You needed more arguments
- Note: the arguments you had were excellent; work on the delivery/public speaking
ie: your point casing ^{practice} standing vs. GOV'T's POI; you had that one!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: M. Literovich

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1 Room: GEO

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Leora Diskun

Jillian McLeod

Score
75
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia FT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anya Friesen

Alex Jackson

Score
79
100

Score
75
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

148

200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

154

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Rhetoric was hyperbolic at times
- Need more explanation of why your criteria are correct.
- Who doesn't qualify?
- Less Jack Layton, wasn't adding value.

Second Proposition

- Incomplete rebuild
- Why are your criteria still right?
- Why, specifically, are theirs wrong?

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Needs more material
- Good point about national recognition
 - Are there cases where this wouldn't apply?
 - Historically discriminated groups?
- No POIs offered

Second Opposition

- Work on stronger answers to POIs
- Work on eye contact
- I liked your point, but it needed further expansion.
- No POIs offered

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Emanuel Siman

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: MS-3

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta PK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Navin Kanjarsan Noah Panno

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>81</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec 65

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julian Guidote Adrian Gair

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
<u>164</u>
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>155</u>
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good style/confidence
- could have set up framework better
- Strong rebuttals, good use of historical examples (8 ppl at cholera tummy welly Malm)

Second Proposition

- Good elaboration of economic points
- good rebuttal, use of steam engine example

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Set up framework well
- well-organized arguments
- Main rebuttal that events would have transpired with or without D'Arcy Mcgee was weak.
- Did not back up statements with enough facts.

Second Opposition

- slightly disorganized
- could have been better at refuting opposing arguments
- Good example of Lester B. Pearson
- went over time

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Debi Ogunrinde

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: M3

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta PK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Navin Kariyawason

Noah Pinno

Score
83 83
100

Score
83 83
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec - GB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julian Guiclotte

Adrian Goin

Score
77.5
100

Score
75
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

116 116
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

152 152
200

Decision
Prop had the best reputation and their case was better structured and supported.

PROP: good use of POIs & examples & analogies

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

great speaking style, but try to read a bit less

great structure, but try to be a bit more specific

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

OPP - good points, just need a bit more substance and reputation

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

try to have a bit more structure and more specific examples.

you spoke well, but lacked enough rebuttal and substance.

make sure to respond to all ~~prop~~ prop arguments.

- wonderful reply, but make sure not to miss any main points (Lester B Pearson)

Second Proposition

great speaking, try to read a bit less. your logic and examples were very good.

- best rebuttal in the round!

Great round everyone

Second Opposition

give POIs!

try to bring in greater reputation in more ways. more reasons for something to be wrong than just one!

good point! it was made well, but try to use a bit more argumentation than narration though!

All of you be more specific in your examples and justify the premise behind your arguments (e.g. why do intentions matter, not just what they are!)

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: MARK LAZAR

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: MS3

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ALBERTA PK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

NARIN KARIYANASAM

NOAH POND

Score
83
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec BG

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

JULIAN BULDORE

Noah Goin

Score
78
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
163
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
156
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Good Presence and Control of Information -
Good POI answers
Too Repetitive of conclusions in first presentation

Second Proposition

DMegee would have been a hero to the Brits by denouncing Finians -
Good Refutation of Opposition and Presentation of 3rd Pillar

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Liked Premise "average" politician
Good Presentation
But weakness on presenting the alternative "hero of the time"
Never backed up why he was "average" - someone else must have been initiated -

Second Opposition

Good response to POI's -
watch time - no need to repeat points made -
need to respond with current info -
Good Presence on stage

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Tarung Marathe

No. of Judges: 5 Round: 1 Room: MS-3

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta - PK

Team Name: Quebec - GG

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Navin Kariyawasam Noah Pinno

Julian Guidote Adrian Goin

Score
79
100

Score
76
100

Score
78
100

Score
74
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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

- Need a tighter definition of a "hero". Make it clear.
 - Analyze how a particular quality fulfills the criteria for heroism
 - Excellent rebuttal speech.
- Try reading from notes less.

Second Proposition

- Don't make assertions without backing them up with analysis
"I don't think he was average"
↳ why not?
- Excellent point about economics, but why would this be heroic?

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good handling of POI's
- You need more case analysis. Keep telling me why something is important.
- Need more detailed refutation

Second Opposition

- Deeper analysis required about how he fought primarily for the Irish.
- You need to deal with POI's and government arguments in more detail.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: José Judel

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 01

Room: MSJ

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta PK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Navin Karyawasan

Noah Pinn

Score
83
100

Score
83
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec GG

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julien Guibete

Adrien Goin

Score
77
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

166
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
~~First Proposition~~

The criteria by which to judge a hero could have been clearer. Seemed to be about "values". Why is "Economy" relevant?

Judge's Comments:
~~First Opposition~~

"Average Politician" argument would have been stronger with reference to other politicians from the same time period.
I thought the construction material in the second speech was more compelling.

~~Second Proposition~~

~~Second Opposition~~

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Mwanzo Tshimbalanga No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: Lucas Seminar

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba GO

Team Name: Quebec DU

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Mariam Guindi Oreose Okunnu

Karl Valentini Nikolas De Stefano

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
152
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Both you and your partner should think about going into deeper, more qualitative analysis. Devotion and equality are great, but we need to know why they are important and why that makes a hero. Good job, though. You started a great case! 🙌

Second Proposition

You have a great style. Have a bit more confidence in yourself and you'll see your speeches will be easier to deliver.

Try doing some more thematic rebuttal instead of just giving out facts.

Great Speech! 🙌

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

I really liked your comparison to JFK and how assassination skews our view of his actions. I would try to be a little clearer, though, so the opposition can understand and rebut your great points!

Second Opposition

Your division of ~~time~~ argumentation and refutation really enabled you to work your constructive back into your refutation. I would try and work on get a little bit deeper into your point.

Great Job!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Theo McLaughlin

No. of Judges: 3

Round: i

Room: Lu:rs Seminar

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba JD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Mariam Guindi

Orofe Okunnu

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Karl Valerini

Nikolas di Stefano
~~Nikolas di Stefano~~

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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

You have a good grasp of setting up an argument, and a confident style. However, I didn't find your immigration point held up over the round; especially, you were justly forced to back off of the 4.5 million claim. You had some good responses to opp points in your rebuttal, especially on the ideal picture of a hero, but ultimately I did not have a strong sense of McBee's contributions.

Second Proposition

You are a strong, confident speaker. You had some decent responses to opp points, especially on raising minority rights, which ought to have been more central. I found your reconstruction repetitive, though, and the assassination point odd.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

* You had a very good rebuttal speech, effectively grappling with Gov's assassination & minorities arguments. I thought your rebuttal on immigration was comprehensive. Your own independent points could have used considerably more, though. You spent a little too much time on JFK, not enough on McBee.

Second Opposition

Basically opposite strengths & weaknesses to your partner, very good constructive matter esp. on McBee's early life, but rebuttal was a bit thin. Good job on the assassination point. Work on time management. 4 min on constructive was too much.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kelsey Keddy

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Lucas Seminar

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba GO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Mariam Guindi

Oreofe Okunna

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Karl Valentini

Nikolas De Stefano

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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

More analysis is required to support your point. You had really nice style but you needed more coherent ideas. Devotion and intention is really hard to measure and the opp did a good job at refuting your claims. Keep going, you're going to be great!!

Second Proposition

You need to consider the debate on an international level. Consider why we do to some extent need to consider what happened in the past. (w JFK). I liked your point on music but you needed to prove why it is important! Great style!!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Your closing speech really tied the round together. You were able to effectively make connections and relate to your partner. Your JFK example was very relevant. Consider whether or not you need to be famous to be a hero. Good job!!

Second Opposition

Great link with the role of politicians. I think its important to consider values from today and the past and you did this effectively. Make eye contact with the judges but other than that, fantastic!!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ryan Rogers

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: History

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Québec HS

Team Name: Saskatchewan SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Logan Stack

Isaac Harris

Loyla Mawmin

Ahmereeh Salim

Score
<u>176</u>
100

Score
<u>174</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

<u>150</u>
150
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>156</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Comments were given extensively in the round.

Prop had a low burden approach and told us about a lot of Darcy McGee's accomplishments but arguments lacked substance and could have differentiated Darcy McGee over other fathers of confederation.

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Opp, despite some issues and flaws, better fulfilled their burden.

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Marianne Amar

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: History

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Logan Stack

Isaac Harris

Score
73
100

Score
70
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Layla Maunin

Ahmereen Salim

Score
74
100

Score
75
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
143
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
149
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

too much history
not ~~enough~~ enough analysis

too much questions!

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

given in round

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Celina

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: History

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QC HS

Team Name: SKSM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Logan Stack

Isaac Harris

Layla Mounir

Ahmerreen Salim

Score
76
100

Score
75
100

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

good time.

Team Score
151
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
155
200

5:55

good road map

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

6:15

Judge's Comments: First Proposition

definition hero = contribution to Canada

- ① Who is D'Arcy McGee
 - ↳ description → superficial
 - ↳ very undeveloped.
 - ↳ constructive effort
 - ↳ pioneered a campaign for unity... other feathers of Confederation. (Not well developed)
- ② Confederation
 - ↳ Terry Fox, Flansburg
 - ↳ go more in to detail when defining a "hero"
- ③ fits with other heroes

Needs depth that we do need research
 LOOKS at this paper too much
 ↳ not confident & shaky
 ↳ not a lot of eye contact
 you should NOT be reading at this level

Judge's Comments: First Opposition

Nice opening!
 ↳ good road mapping

- ① Problems of classifying someone as a hero
 - ↳ divides the ppl... isolates one man & not the ppl
 - ↳ unknown ppl are better for representing the ppl / goal!
- ② Controversy
 - ↳ good he has done varies
 - ↳ good ex of Louis Riel

look at your audience to give you confidence

Judge's Comments: Second Proposition

me and my partner are good

- ① Economic expansion
 - ↳ colonial railway (unity, jobs, Canada)
 - ↳ 5000 fast... did not expand!
 - ↳ needs depth
- ② Cultural expansion
 - ↳ journalism
 - ↳ representing us (Canada)
 - ↳ potato famine
 - ↳ Irish ppl to go to Canada

do not touch the table when attempting to appear

Judge's Comments: Second Opposition

- Nice opening → I like the quotations
- ① worthiness
 - ↳ not distinct
 - ↳ he left when the going got tough.
 - ↳ he acted like a opportunist which was his job... GOOD... Good man but not heroic.
 - ↳ famous ≠ heroic... GOOD!
 - ↳ death purely circumstantial!
 - ↳ left... just like we don't really know when we die.

STOP READING PLEASE!

you speak way too fast

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Don Tomtnaf

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: MS-4

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia JM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Harper Metler
~~Speaker~~

Ivy Journey

Score
80 80
100

Score
83 83
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: FD British Columbia

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kian Draper

Kadre Freeman

Score
78 78
100

Score
84 84
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
<u>163</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>162</u>
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good argument (didn't develop o give me further!) concrete examples of courage o link it back to Canada

- Give me an example of someone who ppl. don't know yet is a hero.

→ Great T. fix example! → Good PMR

- Good arguments
- 1) Invasion → show how he saved Can lives!

2) Solid second argument

- By making him a hero... what will that do? show me give examples

→ Good rebuttal

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Be more structured in rebuttal but solid refutation

- Good response to POI

- Good arguments 1) Irish hero
- ↳ show me how he put Irish needs ahead of can

- Good Rebuttal Sum.
- o last contention on confed was a bit o other than that good! weak

Second Opposition

- Good POIs, Good intro, Solid rebuttal

- Solid 1st argument ~~and~~ and 2nd argument

- minor detail: tell me explicitly what the harms of making him a hero? You did

- Arguments could've been more relevant. to summarize

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Julie Hootan

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M34

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia JM

First Speaker:

Harper Metler

Second Speaker:

Ivy Junney

Score
79
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia FD

First Speaker:

Kian Drapel

Second Speaker:

Kadri Freeman

Score
78
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
161
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
160
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Followed key structures required
Put forward 2 arguments - hero, role model
I felt rambled on 1st point. Could be
more concise in speech. The role model
point was a good one but again, wandered

Okay on POI
Good in summation, Tied up arguments
(Appeared a little nervous. Take deep breaths
to focus again.

Second Proposition

Met key structures

arguments - Finian invasion
Fathers of Confederation - v.g
2nd point, well-addressed
Confidence was better as went along

Good job on 'reputation' re: waffling
Did not address Irish question as well.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Met key structures required
Reputed well
Made arguments well & two good arguments
Handled POI well.
L Irish
L waffle.

Undermined speech by use of notes.

Very good summary & rebuttal

Second Opposition

Met key structures

Reputed well tho' strength of this presentation
was in presentation of arguments (hero finite space)
I liked use of quotations to support presentation
(hero finite space)
(hero finite space)

Slowdown a bit but good expression.
Use of notes undermined that Kadri was well-
prepared.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Elizabeth Winans No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: M4

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia JM

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Harper Met

Ivy J

Score
79
100

Score
80 82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia ED

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Kian Draper

Kadie Reeman

Score
78
100

Score
80 82
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

161

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

160

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

overall BFD
 ↳ sufficient refutation for main opp. points (selfishness, minority representation, changing minds)
 w/ good development of points, esp. in second speech (role model, father of confederation)

→ great summary

Second Proposition

- excellent speech - picked up confidence as it went on

→ great refutation

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- strong speech
- good organization

Bfd

↳ odd argument focus, not quite enough analysis

↳ didn't provide enough of a link to why selfishness to defend minority rights was a problem

Second Opposition

- strong speech
- good organization

↳ would have liked more emphasis on hegemonic norms point

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Tristano Tenaglia

No. of Judges: 5 Round: 1 Room: Bed

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta EE

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Azan Esmail Sanir Esmail

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: AS Manitoba

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Nicholas Aguiar Roshan Sadhak

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
154
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

While the intonation was very good, it is also very important to be well prepared. Should study more detailed facts about the topic, in order to directly address points made by opposition.

POI was taken well, but when responding should be more confident in information answered and on how you answer.

Second Proposition

The points made by opposition should have been better addressed.

For Both: Do not feel intimidated by POIs and use more facts to back up your points and counter instead of just repeating yourself.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Very direct in how you addressed all your points and you made it very clear as to what the debate was about. Very good that you addressed your POIs directly and firmly.

However, you should try and have a more enthusiastic approach to your intonation and general speaking quality.

Second Opposition

Fantastic intonation!! and you really embedded your points into everyone listening. Your points were very clear and your POI answers were very well taken. (Wouldn't you agree!!) Try not to bring up so many points during second opp. speech however so that prop. can later counter.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: EDWARD BECHARD-TORRES

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: Red Room

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ALBERTA EE

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

AZAN Esmail

Samir Esmail

Score
81
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: MANITOBA AS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nicholas Aguiar

Roshan Sadhak

Score
82
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
162
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
165
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Strong presentation, compelling evidence. Good job!

In first speech, you could have made processing your quantity of research easier by more clearly distinguishing arguments.

Also, with your research, you could have narrowed ~~the~~ the number of arguments & delve into history more

Second Proposition

Strong presentation & compelling evidence as well. See your partner's comments.

Other comments given orally.

Reason for decision: opp's characterization of Mcbee as rabid, bi-polar, opportunist was most compelling & historically grounded & most strongly urged us to find he's not a hero.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good job! Compelling case, good research.

- For arguments, would have delved more into history - ~~why~~^{why} why wasn't he invited to 3rd conference?
- And for "hero" classification - be sure to tie your research-based observations "was not respected at the time" to why that might impair his "hero" status - the link is not literally intuitive.

Second Opposition

Comments given orally.

Very effective speech - the characterization of Mcbee in your speech won the round.

Next time, for researched case, group into more thematically so it is easier to present.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Clarissa Brisseau

No. of Judges: 5 Round: 1 Room: Red Room

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta EE

Team Name: Manitoba AS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Azan Esmail

Samir Esmail

Nicholas Aguiar

Rashan Sadhalk

Score
80
100

Score
82
100

Score
81
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
162
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good justification of what a hero is, but it only really returned at the end of your summary.
- Your summary was good at dealing with new ideas from 2nd opp.
- Needed to delve into why his contributions and visions made him a hero.

Second Proposition

- Good references to other heroes.
- Explain why even though he betrayed the Irish that he was just following what he believed in.
- Stress more about why even a reformed person can be a hero.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Very good job laying out opp case.
- Nice calm style.
- Maybe try to tie up the entire debate after 6 mins of your partner's rebuttle.

Second Opposition

- Good analysis of all of his traits.
- More of your constructive / reasoning should have come up in your partner's speech

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Zachary Baker

No. of Judges: 5 Round: 1 Room: Red Room

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta EE

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Azan Esmail Senir Esmail

Score
81
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba AS

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Nicholas Aguar Roshan Sidhak

Score
81
100

Score
83 83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
162
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Most Comments given in room

- good opening
- strong layout
- good reasons for why a too busy to analyse effects more.
- spoke very well.

Second Proposition

- good layout, try to point out when you are rebuilding
- go into more analysis of what his visas accomplished, don't just say why visas are good enough.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- very well structured, kept round organized
- good points
- spoke clearly
- for rebuttal, try to go more in depth of why it makes other sides points fail.

Second Opposition

- ~~very~~ great contrasted,
- very good ~~and~~ at being convincing
- well analyzed
- but too much constructed for this speech, some should have been put in your side's first speech, because not fair to expect Gov to rebut all this new stuff in their 1st speech.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Catherine Holloway

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: Red Room

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta EE

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Azan Esmail

Samir Esmail

Score
82
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba AS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nicholas Aguiar

Roshan Sadhak

Score
82
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
161
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
165
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Very strong delivery but at times looked like you were reading a canned speech.

The S/R speech is where the debating really started on this side
Good counter examples

Second Proposition

Speech was very prepared
I would have liked to see better engagement with the other team's points

Good delivery

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Very strong organization helped us keep track of historical detail

Good POIs

Second Opposition

These points were strongest and should have been brought up first

Charismatic style

your speech really carried a lot of the case's weight.

Well done all around!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Justin Kuzmicki

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: MS-ScLab.

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec City - KZ

Team Name: Ontario ZG

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ms. Athina Khalid

Ms. Maria Zimmerman

Ms. Catherine Zeng

Mr. Rainer K Gva

Score
74
100

Score
74
100

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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

Spoke well, refuted well, not enough facts in initial not as formal in style - could improve confidence.

Second Proposition

Spoke well, refuted well, not enough facts in initial. ~~also~~ somewhat formal in style - improve confidence during speech

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

very quick speaker, too much reading, good points though. did a good job of refuting clearly.

Second Opposition

Spoke well, improve eye contact, too much justification w/ out the floor. (mockish) tone down the arrogance! otherwise a quality speaker. and defended well.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jill Rollins

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: MS-Sc. Lab.

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QC - KZ

Team Name: Ontario ZG

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Athina Khalid

Maria Zimmerman

Catherine Zherg

Rannak Gera

Score
74
100

Score
71
100

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
145
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Care points well defined. Gd.
- You must make use of Points of Info. You did answer them well
- You could have challenged their examples of "real" heroes.

Second Proposition

Both of you were well prepared.
You will speak with more confidence with experience

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Well defined ~~arg.~~ & rebuttal. Clear evidence.
Style: speaking so quickly can detract fr. strength of content.

Second Opposition

- Both ^{of} your responses to Prop. bordered on the distracting for all.
- Clash on points evident. Some clever logic.
- Gd. teamwork
- Gd. delivery on the whole.

All in all, a well-prepared & clear debate, though the resolution re N. Bee as Canadian hero not really resolved.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Roger Smith

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: ~~MS~~ science lab

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QC - KZ

Team Name: Ontario Z6

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alicia Khalia

Maria Zimmerman

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Catherine Cheng

Raunak Bera

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

Score
78
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score	149
	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

- point about minority rights is very good
- careful of arguments like "he was a founding father"
→ explain what that means

- good refutation
- careful about assertions (like what his intent is)
- speak slower!

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

- good constructive material
- watch for assertions (he was trying to help people)

- nice refutation
- try to keep style calm

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: DAVID PRICE

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: French 2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC DS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amolak Singh Dhillon Safir Jazayeri

Score
75
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS DW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Marcus Willmott Elizabeth Duff

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
152
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Good confidence
Quite a bit of reading.
Good answer to first POI
Try for shorter POIs (when asking)

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

watch use of "like" - way too much
Good confidence & eye contact
Ran out of time - budget better
Very good 2nd speech

Second Proposition

Quite a bit of reading
Watch shifting of body
Great continuing!

Second Opposition

Machiavelli stuff was a bit convoluted
Good eye contact

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Louden

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Fr 2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC DJ

First Speaker:

Amolak Singh
Phillon

Second Speaker:

DEIL Jazayeri
Soufir

Score
<u>74</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS DW

First Speaker:

Marcus Nimott

Second Speaker:

Elizabeth Duff

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

<u>149</u>
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>156</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good historical research but try not to read and be more involved in class

Second Proposition

- good try.
- try not reading ^{so} much
- good luck

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- do your rebuttal last
- be careful with your debated persona.
- good final ~~of~~ min speech.

Second Opposition

- well done speech
- well developed

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Isabelle Fahmy

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: French 2

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC-DT

Team Name: NS-DW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amdak Singh Shillon

Safir Tazayer

Marcus Wilcott

Elyzaeth Duff

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

Score
78
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
149
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Your speech was very well organized. You clearly did a lot of research for this topic. However, you need to clash with the main philosophical points presented by opposition. Work on Rebuttal

Second Proposition

→ your speech was well organized with reference to some strong examples regarding political moves and accomplishments. Much more CLASH needed against opposition.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Your approach was a little too casual (not enough reference to key historical points about life of McGee). However, keep the major clash of philosophical points for the final speech. Very Strong Clash.

Second Opposition

Excellent organization of speech. More key evidence + examples needed to support your main arguments. Good philosophical points. Good Clash.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CAROLINE WAGNER

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: MS 2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario LK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ainur Kassim Laha

Javid Karim

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sam Skinner

Jamie Denham

Score
76
100

Score
75
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

153
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

151
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Better material
- Work on timing and length of speech.

Second Proposition

specific comments given orally

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- General lack of substantive material & validity of facts
- Very good speakers

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Wilson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M52

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ONTARIO CR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ALAN KAMM

DAVID KAMM

Score
76
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QUEBEC JS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

SAM SKINSEN

JAMIE BRIDGMAN

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

133
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

149
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- STRONG, SOLID CONTENT
- RUJHS) DELIVERY
- SLOW DOWN

Second Proposition

- GOOD CONTENT
- SPEAK MORE SLOWLY - PACE IT MORE

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- EXCELLENT SPEAKING STYLE
- READING TO FAR WITH DOCUMENTS - FEEL THE DOCUMENTS DON'T MESS UP COME TO CONSIDER TO ESCAPE CRIMINAL / TORTURE
- GOOD (NARRATIVE) DELIVERY NOW UP

Second Opposition

- GOOD DELIVERY

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ryan Pistorius

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: MS-2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario LK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alnur Kessim Lakha

Javid Karim

Score
78
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sam Skinner

Jamie Denham

Score
81
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
152
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Strong speaking style
- Appeared very confident
- Don't ask "Right?" after each point; the whole idea is that you are right
- Don't put your hand in your pocket for the entire speech

Second Proposition

- Watch swaying
- Watch your time
- Good eye contact

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Very clear speaking style
- Confident and calm speaking
- Watch swaying / movement
- Can be distracting
- Much stronger when you deal with POI then end there, instead of saying you'll address it later
- Excellent final refutation; especially discussion of true heroes

Second Opposition

- Don't talk to the other team; you won't convince them, or, at least, they won't admit it. Address the audience and judges.
- Clear speaking style

Proposition: Don't talk to each other during one of your speeches; quite distracting to your partner and audience

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alexandra Mazzella

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: MS-1

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta-GK

Team Name: Nova Scotia RF

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Swish Goswami Ashish KC

Rory Flynn Mattea Roach

Score
79
100

Score
76
100

Score
82
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
155
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
160
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Roadmapping is clear
- Make sure to really define points.
- Arguments need to be brought back to definition.
- Do not introduce new material in last speech.

Second Proposition

- Good intro and eye contact.
- P.O.s too long.
- Try not to read your speech.
- Have Refutation a little longer

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good points
- well spoken.
- Try to have more refutation at the end.
- Good presence.

Second Opposition

- Good points
- P.O.s good - try to take 2 and give 2
- Make sure to refute
- Good speaking skills.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nico Vit

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: MS-1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta - GK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Swish Goswami

Ashish KC

Score
83
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia RF

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rory Flynn

Mattea Roach

Score
83 84
100

Score
79 79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
161
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
165
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Good Delivery P.O.I well handled
 Good signposting
 Failed to outline McCrees role in conference (lack evidence)
 well prepared

- put words in opponents mouth
- Harp on os point good
- "Can't a man change" prove that he changed!
- good starts → made some ambiguous statements

Second Proposition

- Good Signposting
- weak ~~signposting~~ evidence
- keep saying, he was integral to that, not convinced.
- watch your time
- POI, not question

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Signposting - other points well delivered
 strong first point well prepared

good summary, good keep building up your points.
 very strong re-labelling points

Second Opposition

- Signposting!
- POI well handled
- strong refutation
- good job pointing out points that gov didn't rebutt

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: A. Martin

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M51

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta GK

Team Name: Nova Scotia RIF

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

David Goswami Ashish KC

Rory Flynn Mattia Poach

Score
84
100

Score
72
100

Score
87
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
156
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
169
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

excellent poise & style.
well organized.
Need to relate hero characteristics to arguments.
V. good final sum up.
added new info in F. Rebut - Trudeau

Second Proposition

Too closely tied to notes.
Took too many P.O.I's.
Historical facts - reaching.
Very good voice.
Timing!!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Excellent reputation.
well organized.
Excellent sum up
V. good P.O.I's.
Talking during speeches is distracting
"lay with people" - not tied.

Second Opposition

Try not to say "like"
V. good argument - good vs. great.
Excellent reputation.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: BASLYK

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Speir's Seminar

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QUEBEL CS

Team Name: ONTARIO KT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Riley Cohen

Foster Sulprator

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alexander Kop

Ronno Tello

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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 -

- Identified by names with McNeil
- Good presentation but failed to make connections between by a head and achievements

Second Proposition

- Too general on scope -
- not clear about rev. edging and impact on Canada and now

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Speech was generally quite good
- Rebuttal at end could have been stronger

Second Opposition -

- excellent historical background of Fenians & McNeil's relations
- strong rebuttal & points made - & were easy to understand

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ahmad Nehme

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Speirs Seminar

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec CS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Riley Cohen

Foster Salpeter

Score
78
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario TIC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alexander Karp

Romeo Fello

Score
78
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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

- Good structure
- Your definition of ahem was a bit weak and opposition took advantage of that.
- Your points were interesting but instead of using examples as points use principles that you prove with examples.
- Good summary speech; you didn't successfully refute the Irish agenda successfully though.

Second Proposition

- Prove why a mosaic is better than a melting pot! Not just why he created one...
- Your rebuttal was okay; you needed to prove why his actions were more than the ones of a politician

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good counter-definition.
- Opened opp case in the right direction.
- Roadmap your points more clearly.
- Nice examples to support your points.
- Not enough rebuttal though, keep more time to clash with proposition.
- You addressed the right themes at the end.

Second Opposition

- Loved the Irish Agenda point.
- The analysis about his role as a politician in the first place was extremely relevant.
- Good rebuilding.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Caroline Mei

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Speirs Seminar

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec CS

Team Name: Ontario TK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Riley Cohen

Foster Salpeter

Alexander Kamp

Romeo Tello

Score
78
100

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

$\begin{matrix} 179 \\ + 78 \\ \hline 157 \end{matrix}$

Team Score

157
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

159
200

$\begin{matrix} 79 \\ + 80 \\ \hline 159 \end{matrix}$

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Overall, an excellent round. All debaters were very polished speakers with clear articulate style.
The round went to opposition in the end. Opp did a good job of asking "what is a hero" and provided principled examples and reasoning as to what a hero was.
Gov. did a good job of rebuttal, but it was not enough to win the round. Gov's constructive matter was solid, but we wanted to hear more explanation as to why (specifically) during McFiee's actions were heroic, and why they were important. Gov. could have also used more examples of people who may not be famous, but who are still considered heroes. (eg Norman Bethune?)

Second Proposition

All debaters had excellent role here well done.

Good luck w/ the rest of the tournament and in future!!! ☺

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Gov. did a good job of rebuttal, but it was not enough to win the round. Gov's constructive matter was solid, but we wanted to hear more explanation as to why (specifically) during McFiee's actions were heroic, and why they were important. Gov. could have also used more examples of people who may not be famous, but who are still considered heroes. (eg Norman Bethune?)

Second Opposition

fulfillment, and summary speeches

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Melissa Cape

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: bio lab

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba HR

Team Name: Saskatchewan OH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Yael Ripstein

Sophie Hershfeld

Slade Hall

Dominic ^{Ong}

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

Score
83
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
160
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
166
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Definition was ~~effective!~~ ^{effective!}
- Great points, ^{needs} more evidence
- Sign Post a bit more!

Second Proposition

- Dealt with POI's very well!
- Great POI's
- Good refutation
- Sign Post a bit more!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Great POI's!
- Sign post a bit more.
- Set up the opp case very well.

Second Opposition

- Great POI's!
- Slow down and sign post a bit more.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Josh Dannenbaum

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: ~~101~~ ^{bio}
lab

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba HR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

~~Yael Ripstein~~ Yael Ripstein

Sophie Hershfield

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan OH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Slade Hall

Dominic ONG

Score
83
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
160
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
166
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- good POI management
- definition ^{good, but} → define hero
- good volume + tempo
- need to sharpen points, your side had 6 points, could have been three

* need to signpost
* put papers down

- didn't fully address 3 questions brought up
- well done recognizing a traitor can be a hero

Second Proposition

- good rebuttal, should mention that adversity (the drinking) doesn't stop you from being a hero
- well spoken and had conviction
- good reconstruction

* signpost
* paper down

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- signpost could be better
- flip flop construction + rebuttal. If you constructed first, you could have used your points to help you argue the prop's case.
- very well done though, brought up the burden of proof on the gov. and point of horses forge themselves, don't lead gov's help amazing

* slow down

- amazing questions

Second Opposition

- good POI's, but don't take POI in mid-sentence
- slow ~~down~~ down
- good signposting
- great response to "small heroes" POI
- once again, legacy → no help from gov good point
- a little repetitive
- brought it down to the crux of the debate.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jon Hoyt-Hallett

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Biolab

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba HR

Team Name: Saskatchewan OH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Yael Ripstein

Sophie Hershfield

Slade Hall

Dominic Ong

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

Score
83
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

160
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

168
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Great definition to frame debate
- Strong style/engaging delivery
- watch paper → distracting
- Would benefit from a more cohesive case

Second Proposition

- Great POI's
- Strong logic - but more evidence to support pillars.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Great style/delivery
- Strong clashes & POI
↳ deciding factor of the debate
- Great job of identifying flaws

Second Opposition

- Great POI's - deciding factor
- Speech was slightly repetitive
- Slow down.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: PETER SZILAGYI

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: MATH 3

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ON-YZ

Team Name: AB-FM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

LOGAN YE

DAVID ZHAO

BRYAN MA

JEREMY FAN

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

<u>161</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

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Megan Gagliano

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: Math 3

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ON - YZ

Team Name: AB - FM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Logan Ye²

David Zhao¹

Bryan Ma³

Jeremy Fan⁴

Score
81
100

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

163
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

159
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- great roadmapping
- the evidence provided was very compelling, however, it could have been made much stronger had there been more analysis.
- handled POI perfectly.

in your final point, you did this successfully.

- outlined burdens well.
- effectively rebutted opp. argument.

Second Proposition

- outlined opp burden well
- also, great roadmapping
- the analysis provided was very compelling and successful in that it took facts and explained, in depth, how it defined him as a hero.
- good successful general clash
- ↳ more specific and P. by P. would have made it stronger.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- POIs were well conceived.
- argument about lack of perseverance was very strong but could have been made stronger had you made the link between why being a 'politician' did not make you a 'hero'.

- try to read less.
- good clash in final speech, ought to have been more of a 'crystallization' of the round.

Second Opposition

- made link between his failed political moves and his not being a hero.
- was the first of the round who made it clear that Magee ought not be credited as a 'hero'
- try to read less.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: AMIR KHOUZAM

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: MATH 3

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ONTARIO - 42

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

LOGAN YE

DAVID ZHAO

Score
76
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ALBERTA - FM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

BRYAN MA

JEREMY FAN

Score
78
100

Score
76
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

151
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

153
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good presence and presentation
- extensive historical analysis - takes away from your argument
- First 2 points were essentially the same.
- Good structure (roadmap - signpost)
- Second Proposition - very good last speech, ^{for first} 2:30 min, slow down.
- Slow down
- good point, good response to P.O.I. - Good rebuttal.
- Be careful: speech read ~~so~~ like a boil down, when it should read as a conclusion. Allow the definition of each burden to be explained near the end

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Excellent preamble
- Try not to read your speech: should look like a free flowing, organic speech
- For further reference: Canada is both a Monarchy and a Democracy.
- Structure speech more effectively
- Very good final speech
- Second Opposition
- Good Preamble
- Structure speech more effectively: not enough to just say "dash & conclusion". Outline your speech, in slightly more detailed terms.
- Excellent 2nd point.
- Try not to repeat yourself too much

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Deirdre Casey

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: Math 3

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ON-YZ

Team Name: ALBERTA-FM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Logan Ye

David Zhao

Bryan Ma

Jeremy Fan

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
161
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

→ liked your reply + criteria based refutation

→ Make explicit whether you are ~~not~~ refuting their criteria or making counter criteria

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: JONATHAN CRAIG

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: MATH 3

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ON-77

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

LOGAN YE

DAVID ZHAO

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: FM-AB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

BRYAN MA

JEREMY FAN

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
<u>158</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>156</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

First speech seemed rushed, but the measure + calm in 2nd speech saved the day. Excerpts were well elaborated, though sacrifice + link to political party change flandered a bit - again, this was clarified in final speech.

Second Proposition

Clear definition of burden on opposition around "substantial net good" was positive; idea of linking sacrifice to assassination got a bit muddled + I find the Bill Gates comparison a bit odd. Seemed rushed; use of "like" + "right" distracting in speaking style.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Quote was a great way to start. Tone + speaking presence was great. Some problems with specificity of evidence - generally a "presentist" argument - judging the past on today's criteria rather than on the circumstances of the time - relationship to constituents, monetary/democracy division oversimplified things.

Second Opposition

Good rebuttal of assassination - sacrifice link to opp argument. Use of evidence from earlier period in Michee's life (Boston Pilot) was odd as was immigration / GDP argument. The timing seemed well-planned as Catholic school stuff was really anchored in.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Karen Butt

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: French 1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia JH

First Speaker:

Kevin Jacobs

Second Speaker:

Tia Huttemann

Score
76
100

Score
78 79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba KB

First Speaker:

Peirce Dickson

Second Speaker:

Peter Koczanski

Score
80
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
155
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
162
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Definition needs to focus more on what makes a hero in his context and his time period instead of reading a dictionary definition. I liked how your speech was well organized. ~~the~~ The stuff you said in PMR was good refutation, but it had to come up earlier. And don't just say what your points were, try to summarize, fill the 3 minutes.

Second Proposition

"Terrorism" is an over-exaggeration, also why is someone considered a hero for opposing terrorism? Responded well to POIs, first point was well-presented and convincing. The point about the plan is irrelevant, because you're trying to convince us that he's a hero, not what to do about him. IF we accept he's a hero.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good analysis about what is a hero. Explained really well how he was doing things for personal gain. Explaining why that's bad deepens your analysis. In the future, try not to make the summary a reiteration, but tell us why your material is more convincing than the other side.

Second Opposition

Good examples, showed you were prepared.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex Amour

No. of Judges: 3

Round: F1

Room: F-1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC ~~SH~~ JH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kevin J.

Tia H

Score
76
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: MB KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Pravie D

Peter K

Score
80
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: VINAY DESAI

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: F-1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia - JH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kevin Jacobs

Tia Huttemann

Score
76
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba - KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Pierce Dickson

Peter Koczanski

Score
80
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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

- Use your definition to guide the debate
↳ ie: he wasn't a hero in the traditional hero, but in ~~the~~ the context, he was
- Try not to use prepared notes

~~Try~~
Summary

- Don't nit-pick little things, attack holistically

Second Proposition

- Good speaking, engaged and ~~offered~~ offered/took good POI's.
- "Our plan" → never at the end

~~Use~~

- Use your rebuttal to rebuild your partners argument, don't nit-pick ~~the~~ what they said.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good speech, spoke well & gave good POI's, good clash

- Try not to state things, make sure you always bring back what you said to explain why this is in support of your side

(ie: Ordinary actions → because he didn't have an impact makes him not a hero because ...)

Second Opposition

- Engaged well in the debate
- Don't be implicit in your arguments
→ Relate ~~back~~ the facts to why he's a hero.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Cameron

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Speirs 1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan HC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Hannah Costa

Caleb Haight

Score
78 80
100

Score
71 70
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario SS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emil Stanca

Zaid Salatheen

Score
78 78
100

Score
67 67
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

150
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

145
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- + handled POI's effectively and tactfully
- + brought her main points full circle from beginning to end of her speeches, lending an organized and coherent feel to the presentation.

Second Proposition

- did not capitalize on ~~one~~ conveniently-timed and easy-to-refute POI's from his opponents.
- weak logic for his main argument: the need for a hero doesn't qualify D.M. as one.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- + good framing of their case: D.M.'s accomplishments were commendable just not heroic.
- + well-structured, well-timed speech.

Second Opposition

- Although he presented well, he could have spoken a little more firmly.
- far too many frivolous POI's, and too early in the debate.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Aislin Flynn

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Spiers 1

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sask HC

Team Name: Ontario SS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Hannah Costa

Caleb Haight

Emil Stanca

Zaid Salakeen

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

Score
74
100

Score
77
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

157
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

151
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good language
- Reading a prepared speech (reply was much more compelling, stylewise)
- Less reading, 'point the sword' language
- Response to 1st POI weak → recovered for 2nd

Second Proposition

- POI acceptance not an issue for me
- Good rebuttation
- Constructive was weak
- Compelling style

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good idea, not developed enough, redundant
- Uncomfortable answering POIs
- Delivered one good POI

Second Opposition

- Your POIs were fine — not an issue
- Lots of content
- Good style

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Veeru

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Sp. 201

PROPOSITION

Team Name: SKNC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kannah Costa

Colin

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ONSS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Guil Stenca

Zaid Soliman

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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

- Clear, concise, good criteria
- less rhetoric, more arguments quicker
- well researched

Second Proposition

- Good set of responses to main opp contention
- Do remember to touch everything
- Opp says
- Constructive argument was not timely important

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Greater diversity of arguments/ clarity would have helped
- lay out a criteria
- Get depth of examples

Second Opposition

- Good diversity in clarity
- More focus on clarity, not so much on that argument

→ ultimately, Opp never showed why it was important that there would be a war.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ANDREW KAPLAN

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: math 1

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: N.S. - MD

Team Name: B.C. SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Brie Oakeshires

Matt Machum

Holder Beggs

Samantha Storkey

Score
78
100

Score
78
100

Score
74
100

Score
75
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
156
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
149
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

6:06

definition fair.
well developed evidence.
consistent clash => effectively defended
mended a pos.
"unsung hero" well put.

Second Proposition

5:23

effective rebuttal of side opp.
effectively walked through & rebutted
opp case.
Boil things down at the
end of your speech. You had
extra time and yet you
chose to end ~~quickly~~
quickly.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

6:00

organic speaking style. could have
benefited from a more organized speech.
Speech mentioned notable information
about Percy but could have been
more pointed in the necessary character
questioning & challenge to the definition
to heroism.

Second Opposition

5:37

Strong speaking style.
lots of contradictions in points,
need to tighten up your language.
I enjoyed the concept of challenging
the term 'hero' but mentioning that
Ferry Fox was a different kind of
hero was problematic.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christina Orlando

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: M-1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NSMD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Brie Dukeshire

Matt Machum

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BCSB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Holden Beggs

Samantha Sterkey

Score
75
100

Score
76
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

155
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

151
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Very good road mapping
- Well spoken
- Well developed point.
- Good question to end your speech.
- ~~idea bit too~~
- ~~judging points at end~~
- good questions in your build down.
- very convincing speaker

Second Proposition

- good logical points
- good analysis of your points.
- good refutation.
- good job taking your time to answer POI
- be sure to spend enough time on your refutation.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good refutation
- Good clear speaker
- good points, but I would have liked more analysis.

- good point pointing out what prop didn't do & how your point still stood
- be sure to manage your time effectively in your last speech.

Second Opposition

- Good passion
- Careful, the debate wasn't about whether or not heroes should be honored.

Canadian National Debating Championships



Judge's Name: Jeremy Obrand

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: M1

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS MD

Team Name: BLSB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Brie Dukeshire

Matt Machym

Holden Beggs

Samantha Starkey

Score
78
100

Score
78 78
100

Score
76
100

Score
74 74
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

156
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

150
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

6:06

- Strong ~~intro~~ introduction
- Changed the mindset
- helped create Canada
 - National Unity
 - good response to POI
- Quiet when your discussing
- Strong examples
- good choice to take POI

Careful of using "like"

Second Proposition

5:23

- Careful of using "I think" or "withhold"
- Slow down
- Strong points
- overcoming adversity

assumptions
- take POI's

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

6:00

- Stand still
- > Strong rebuttal
- careful of assumptions
- > good response to POI
- good speech but had trouble following which argument you were on

Second Opposition

5:37

- interesting argument
- good rebuttal to deconstruct their case
- Don't walk around the POI

take your POI's

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Amanda Sino

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: math 1

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NSMP

Team Name: BCSB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Brie Dukeshire

Matt Machum

Holden Beggs

Samantha Starkey

Score
78
100

Score
78
100

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

156
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

150
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

pm speech could have been a bit more substantial in argument and not a 2 minute introduction.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

your boil down could have been more cohesive into major points and show how they fall on your side since your partner already rebutted.

Second Proposition

In General, this round could have used a lot more clash both sides made good attempts but didn't really get to the heart of the arguments. Be careful of contradictions in the definition of here on both sides. Good speaking overall.

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Marcovitch

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 1

Room: Math 1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NSMD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Brie Dukeshire

MATI Marcham

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BCSB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Holden Beggs

Samantha Starkey

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
155
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
150
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good speaker
- develop points more
 - more examples about what he did
- long intro

Second Proposition

- great refutation
- Again ~~we~~ put more examples in your points

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- good public speaker
- some of the points were not strong enough

Second Opposition

- Interesting point
- Watch out for contradictions