

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Caitlin Danielson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 3D.23

PROPOSITION

Team Name: B.C. FD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kian Draper Kadie Freeman

Score
80
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jillian McLeod Leora Diakon

Score
79
100

Score
80 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

162
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Great speaking style!
try to make sure you provide rights analysis if the resolution calls for it.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Great refutation, be more confident next time you're fantastic.

Second Proposition

Great constructive
Next time take a stronger stance ~~stance~~ instead of swallowing harms!

Second Opposition

Great speech!
Slow down a bit next time, you'll fill your time and be that much better.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Allison Rander

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: 4C-1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec GG

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julian Guidote

Adrian Goin

Score
78
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia DJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Safir Jazayeri

Amelate Singh Dhillon

Score
75
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score
152
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Model generally clear, could have been clearer by specifying that more students would be able to go to university (this was simply assumed).
"Motivation" argument might have been better fitted
"Access" - would have been clearer.
Make connections + ask why!

Second Proposition

Point was developed but was mostly repetition of 1st speaker's points, with some small / less relevant additions.
Benefits not proven.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

could have benefitted from taking clear stance - eg. "we support the status quo."
It costs too much is generally not a strong point but it went unrefuted.
Could have used more development/ connections on "moral issues/ entitlement" point.

Second Opposition

Had two significant arguments: 1. Problems start before university and 2. Parents who can afford it can pay.
Points generally well-developed, could have been carried further, w/ better refutation.

All speakers generally had good structure + confident speaking style.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ABRAHAM MOUSSAKO

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: 5B.13

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia FJ

Team Name: SASKATCHEWAN OH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anya Friesen

Alex Jackson

SLADE HALL

DOMINIC ONG

Score
79 79
100

Score
75
100

Score
79 79
100

Score
74
100

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

Team Score
150 150
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
153
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

SASKATCHEWAN OH

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Anya Friesen
GOOD FRAS & SPEAKER, COULD
HAVE BROADENED FROM "BOULMANN
IS GOOD", HOWEVER

Second Proposition

Alex Jackson
EXTENDED THE POINTS, SUFFICIENT
CLASH

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

SLADE HALL
GREAT SPEAKING, PROVENT POINT
GOOD POINTS OVERALL

Second Opposition

DOMINIC ONG
GOOD ARGUMENT ON OTHER
GOV'T PRIORITIES

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Sophia Nass

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: 705

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia DN

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Elizabeth

Marcus

Score
74 75
100

Score
76 75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba AS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nicholas

Score
74
100

Score
73
100

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

Team Score

151
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

147
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Proposition did a good job presenting basic arguments for why education is necessary, and but could have made more explicit links to rights and the government's role in protecting rights.
More analysis of benefits to society ~~would~~ could have been given.

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Opposition provided interesting arguments against the motion, but needed to clash more directly with the idea that education is a necessity, and thus must be provided.
More analysis needed on the societal ~~burden~~ burden.

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kaylann Knickle

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: 3B.4

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Prop~~ ON-4Z

Team Name: SK-HC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Logan Ye

David Zhao

Caleb Haight

Hannah Costa

Score
78
100

Score
78
100

Score
75
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

155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Strong opening → good case summary; excellent initial structure
- No personal examples, please.
- Overall: very on-the-ball speaker, pleasant to listen to.

Second Proposition

- Some very strong rebuttals, grounded in reality, esp. point on global economy!
- Need to take POIs
- Shake up your hand motions → repetitive and distracting.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Please be careful w/ POI. Make sure they are on point and requested appropriately.
- Keep refining your existing ability at structuring a case
- Keep summary argument a summary: don't get lost in the details
- Survival of debt crisis = excellent point

Second Opposition

- "How to fund" point was key to case, well expressed.
- Good style but ~~a bit more~~ up the ante when responding to an aggressive POI.
- Substantive points, substantive methodical ~~refutations~~ refutations

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: A. Martin

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: Oliver

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ont. T.K.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

G. Romeo Tello

A. Karp

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ont. Z.G.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

C. Phung

R. Herra

Score
78
100

Score
72
100

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

Team Score
149
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
150
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

arguments weak.
needed better framing
of resolution.
How would this work?

Try not to use "um" "uh"
sounds.

Second Proposition

need a stronger argument.
Timing!!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

I do not understand
definition of relationships -
confused with hierarchies.
reputation of / ^{at} / weak.

Try not to use "like"
Need to ask more P.O.I.'s

Second Opposition

Timing! - need to
make sure have
constructive on the floor.

Try not to say "right"

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Aung Mya Kyaw

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: 4A 1.0

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta GK

First Speaker:

Swish Goswami

Second Speaker:

Ashish KC

Score
85
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia JM

First Speaker:

Harper Melter

Second Speaker:

Ivy Journey

Score
77 77
100

Score
80 79
100

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

Team Score

167
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

157 157
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good quality arguments
 - Good rebuttal in summary speech, I like your point about dream to get into university = already hard work.
 - Need better time management. You spend too much time on 1st point, about 5 minutes.
 - Need to better time manage in summary speech too. Too much time on 1st theme.
- Second Proposition**

- Very good refutation of opp's material
- Good constructive point on long term benefits.
- You were short on time; your speech was about 4 mins.
- You need to rebuild your partner's points more

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Spent too much time on 1st point. Need to better time manage
 - Needed more refutation with prop's material
 - Expand more on the "teach value of money" point in your 1st speech
 - Need better structure in summary speech. Break it into themes or questions
- Second Opposition**

- Good refutation of prop's material
- Good point on knowing the value of money and hard work.
- You took too many POI's, take two maximum.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jon Hoyt-Hallett

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: 4E:1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba HR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Yael Ripstein

Sophie Hershfield

Score
83
100

Score
84
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec KZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Maria Zimmermann

Athina Khalid

Score
81
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score

167
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

163
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Strong case line / logic
- Good use of POI's → Engaged
- Great summary & analysis

Second Proposition

- Great delivery / style
- Strong POI's
- Great constructive case
↳ economy

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Well defined case based on sound logic → Money.
- No POI's offered → these are essential
↳ show engagement
- Good summary + sign post:-)
- Good Reply speech → Analysis

Second Opposition

- Great use of POI
- Strong refutation & Clash
↳ strong replies to POI's

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alexandra Mazzeola

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 3B-16

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario SS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zaid Salatheen

Emil Stanca

Score
78
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia JH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tia Huttenmann

Kevin Jacobs

Score
76
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score
159
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
155
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Good Roadmapping
& Points
Well Done with POIS - answering
and giving them to other team
Good Eye contact.
Watch out for answering
other questions & going into
detail with ideas.

Second Proposition

Well Done!
Try to organize your points
a little better
Great POIS
Good job clashing!

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Good voice & Eye contact.
Make sure to keep POIS short
Summary at the end is not
just rebuttal - make sure
to state your points

Good work!

Second Opposition

Good work! Well Done on POIS
POIS are too long.
Elaborate on points.

Good stuff!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Brian Casey

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 3.6.15

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Oni SS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zahid Salameh

Emil Stora

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BL JH.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tea Hoffmann

Kevin Jacobs

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>81</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>162</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>158</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

What does it mean to "have a wife?"
Your POI were nearly side issues.

Second Proposition

TEAR POI

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

long POI.
I thought your point "many is not a deterrent" contradicted Kevin's

Second Opposition

Emil pb - good question

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Denis Brault

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 3B.15

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario SS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zaid Salameh Enil Stanca

Score
76
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia IH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tia Hiettemann Kevin Jacobs

Score
74
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score

156
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Zaid

It was "Madame" speaker
Good summary

Your analogy with a "negative element (students)" is not necessarily a good way to go to reinforce your argument. Strong return to your definition.

Second Proposition

Eni

Well structured speech
Good balance in moving from POI's to answers
Good approach in rebuttal - you spoke to all your opponent's points

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Tia

Good speaking style
You presented your case well, but did not really address the issue of "equal chance" raised by your opponent. No need to repeat resolution in rebuttal.

Second Opposition

Kevin

You spoke with force
Some interesting points, but some hedging on the part of "requirements" and "ability"

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Mark Perlman

No. of Judges: 3

Round: ^{Jr.} 3

Room: 3D.2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba 60

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Mariam Guindi

Oreofe Okunnu

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec CS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Foster Salpeter

Riley Cohen

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

Everyone: More analysis
of what is right is,
why education is one
of those, not just
based on precedent

Second Proposition

Signpost more

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Tracey Lee

No. of Judges: 3

Junior Round: 3

Room: 3D.2

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba G.O.

Team Name: Quebec C.S.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Mariam Guindi Oreok Okunnu

Foster Salpeter Riley Cohen

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score
153
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

Clear structure but your case would have benefitted from a plan (outline) of how this policy would be put into effect - your arguments became more developed as your speech progressed.

- good refutation - you list some of the major lines of argumentation that the prop side was trying to run.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Second Prop

Some good ideas came out later in your speech as well but it's important to keep in mind (and reiterate) the main stance that your side is making (more rebuilding needed).

Good analysis of the issues in contention - don't forget to rebuild overall case (not just restate your partner's points - tell us how your overall case is stronger than the prop's).

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ahmad Mehmud

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 300

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba GO

Team Name: Quebec CS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Mariam Guindi Oreebe Okunnu

Foster Salpeter Riley Cohen

Score
74
100

Score
74
100

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score
148
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- You proposed education ^{is} ~~was~~ a good thing but not why it should be a right. Analyse that assumption more.
- Talk more about inequality and how this helps compensate them.

Second Proposition

- Again why is it a right?
- Refute point by point not just ideas here and there.
- Your point was the same as 1st prop.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Both your points were kind of the same.
- You had good ideas but didn't explore them that much. talk about why education provides individual advantages that the state shouldn't pay for.

Second Opposition

- Your point on lowering education quality was ok. it's an important issue. analyse it more.
- "we need people to do other jobs" is a separate point.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: TAYLOR STEELE

No. of Judges: 1

Round: Sat, R1 Room: 3F. 43

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia MD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Brie Dulleshire Matthew Machum

Score
82
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Isaac Harris Logan Stack

Score
76
100

Score
73
100

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

Team Score
160
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
149
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- ~~caselme earlier (start of speech)~~
- ~~move away from stats → link!~~

Generally good case !!

- ↳ Link why things are and why they ought to be that way.
- ↳ More thematic/organized reply speech.
- ↳ Shift from pro-poor to meritocracy.
- ↳ Always ask "why?" to your points, was usually fine though.

Second Proposition

→ "more honour students in India than students in Canada"

- crime (3rd argument) was unclear, show links, again.
- reputation was good

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- make clear distinction between s.g. and prop case

Mainly suffered from an unclear stance and more superficial points than prop.

- 2nd argument (investment) did not support your case, be careful.
- Lots of concessions which weakened your side.
- Link scholarships → ask why they lead to your outcomes.

Second Opposition

→ "Canada is the #1 most educated society" "we don't need more people to get education"

- Both arguments were cost. Cost doesn't work → If it's worth doing it's worth doing.
- Partner didn't rebut (haard-) so thank you for that !!

* Come see me if you have questions *

Canadian National Debating Championships

1st of the day!

Judge's Name: CAROLINE WAGNER

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3/1

Room: 3A.4

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta PK

Team Name: Ontario LK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Narin Karingawasam

Noah Pinno

Anur Kassim Lakha

Javid Karim

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

Score
79
100

Score
78
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

- Fundamental lack of analysis
- Plan became too important
- very nice speaking style for both

Second Proposition

More comments given orally.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Focused on sort of odd aspects but some more analysis
- Good speaking style: both of your timing improved since last time.

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Daniel Del Balso

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3 ^{1st today} Room: 3A.4

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: _____

Team Name: _____

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Navin Kangaswam

Nody Pinno

Ahmed Kariha

Javid Kari

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

Score
77
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
156
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Plan unwise to state
- Debate should have been on a model/plan.

Uncorelated statements, random examples!

Second Proposition

Finland example a poor choice, should have been on principles.

Both of you: ↑
Good speakers!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

based on principles not

First two points well argued on principle

Second Opposition

- Good ~~discussion~~
- Second argument basically an attack on the "plan".

Also: ↑
Good formality. v. well spoken!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Caroline Mei

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 3A4

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta PK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Navin Karjawasam Noah Pinno

Score
76
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario LK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alnur Kassim-Lakha Javed Karim

Score
78
100

Score
79
100

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

76
75

151

Team Score

151
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

157
200

78
79

157

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

The round went to opposition. We felt that proposition took a strange stance in the round and debate could have taken a more principled line. By that token, opp's stance on jobs was also unconventional, but was unrefuted by gov.

All speakers have clear style.
Good luck in future!



Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

We felt that proposition took a strange stance in the round and tried to implement a "plan", when the debate could have taken a more principled line. By that token, opp's stance on jobs was also unconventional, but was unrefuted by gov.

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Cynthia Siino

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: ~~3A9~~ 3A9

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS RF

Team Name: ~~SK SM~~ SK SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rory Flynn

Mattea Proach

Layla Maumin Ahmeren Salim

Score
82
100

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

Score
74
100

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

Team Score
161
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- be careful of assertions

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- better analysis in points.

Second Proposition

- better analysis in rebuttal!

Second Opposition

- be more organized.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Neena No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: 3A.9 (30)

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS AF

Team Name: SK: SM

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Rory Flynn _____ Mattia Rossan

Layla Mannin _____ Ahmereen Salim

Score
83
100

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score
162
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
154
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- ↳ Clear stance, well presented etc
- ↳ Strong important parts of argument easier
- ↳ Good rebuttal

Second Proposition

- ↳ Make sure to ~~clear~~ w/ everything before you!
- ↳ But stuff you did clear with and really well done

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- ↳ Good refutation
- ↳ ~~More~~ more varied constructive would have been good

Second Opposition

- ↳ Good support for your partner
- ↳ More distinct material would be useful

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Katharine Cukier

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 3A D.

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NS RE.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rory Flynn

Mattea Roach

Score
83
100

Score
80 79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SK = SM.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Layla Moumin

Ahmeren Salim

Score
79
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score

200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- more education. is good
- breaks cycle of poverty
- very good communication, clear and confident

POI ✓

Second Proposition

- good presentation
- confident enunciation
- need.

POI x

made good
POI

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- very good delivery
- deconstructed arguments
- not fair → rich - argument was captured
- misunderstood meritocracy is not proven by wealth

POI ✓

Second Opposition

- Confused arguments
- ① work force? high vs small
- ② rich have worked hard
- ③ very clear voice
- students now.
- rights they do have?
- ④ high schools??
- ⑤ needed new points

POI ✓

disincentivizing

helllo
reputation
fci

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Carol St-Gelais

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 3

Room: 3B.2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec 05

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sam Skinner

Jeanne Denham

Score
70 70
100

Score
75 75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba KO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Peter Koczanski

Peirce Dickson

Score
81
100

Score
83
100

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

Team Score
153
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
164
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Good summary speech, had probably most compelling material of round. Bring it out earlier. Be clearer on model initially, tell us what we are doing and how this is different.

Second Proposition

Be clearer when clarifying model, and do more refutation. Benefits to youth was well developed. education was right and something that should be accessed like public school.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Very clear systematic approach but counterclaims about taxation could have been more compelling. Poland was an interesting example, maybe not the best.

Second Opposition

Too many university degrees point was well done, could have been more developed on constructive side. Good pointing out assumptions made by proposition.

THBT students have the right to fully subsidized university education
Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Katrine Doganoglu

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 3B.2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sam Skinner

Jamie ~~D~~ Denham

Score
78.
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba KD.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Peter Koczanski

Pierre Dickson

Score
81
100

Score
83
100

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

Team Score

153
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- make score model is very clear → you said it will apply to some universities, but didn't explain which ones or why or how.
- your summary speech was stronger, and so had some great analysis that should have come out ~~earlier~~ earlier in the round.

Second Proposition

- when opp. has model issues, you need to clarify them right at the beginning of your speech → you did it right at the end + not very clearly
- you needed to clearly refute both of their points.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- nice organization + structure of both speeches!
- watch your time management → not enough time for your 2 constructive points esp. your 2nd one - so you ran although the points were good, they weren't analyzed in as much depth as they should've been.
- watch out for generalizations → in summary you said "Canadian public schools are crumbling"

Second Opposition

- well organized + structured speech
- nice ~~point~~ constructive point! I liked your idea about less people going into college + training programs → I would have liked to see a bit more development on this.

REF: ~~Prop~~ ^{Opp.} ultimately won b/c of issues with the model + lack of ~~of~~ effective refutation on prop. Also, analysis on opp. was a bit stronger!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christina Orlando No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: 3A6

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BCSB

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Samantha Sterkey Holden Beggs

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta EE

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Azan Esmal Samir Esmal

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score
162
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
150
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: First Proposition

- Good persuasive style
- You took the POI well
- Your first point needed more analysis
- Be sure to ask yourself why...
- Great speaker

Second Proposition

- Good refutation, very clearly explained
- good rebuilding of partner's points
 - be careful about rebashing your partner's points.
 - Your constructive points could have used more analysis.

Judge's Comments: First Opposition

- Be sure to explain your refutations more. You have to explain more when refuting
- Be careful not to contradict yourself
- Good passion
- finish your thoughts before taking POI's
- Be sure to sign post

Second Opposition

- Good clear speaking voice.
- carefully, you are opp. You can't create a different model.
 - try to explain your refutations more.
 - try to respond directly to POI's
 - You don't need to take every POI, it cuts into your speech.
 - good point about bearing responsibility.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Roger Smith

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 3A6

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC-SD

Team Name: Alberta EE

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Samantha Starkey Holden Beys

Azan Esmail Samir Esmail

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>75</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>150</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: HAMISH GUTHRIE

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 3A6

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BCSB

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

SAMANTHA STARKEY HOLDEN BEGGS

Score
85
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ALBERTA EE

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

AZAN ESMAIL SAMIR ESMAIL

Score
76
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score

167
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

152
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Vigorous, clear reasoning.
Excellent explanation of the model.
Several excellent POI's, consistent engagement in the round.
Excellent summation of the case.

Second Proposition

Excellent manner, reasoning.
V. good teamwork, structure, plan.
Avoid some slight sense of hesitation.
You deserve to sound and feel v. confident.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Take POI's when you are ready! - Don't let them interrupt your argument.
Cost is an issue, but not the best argument, because many good but necessary things cost a lot!
Consider other arguments more.

Second Opposition

V. Strong tone, manner, confidence.
V. good response to POI's, v. good opener to POI's.
Deeper analysis at both ends.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Allison Render

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: 4C1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec CS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Riley Cohen

Foster Salpeter

Score
76
100

Score
78.5
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan HC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Caleb Haight

Hannah Cester

Score
80
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score

151
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

162
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Presented clear model.
Had well-developed arguments + examples, but they were effectively rebuked by opp because they were based on assumptions about the existence of a military threat + the effectiveness of the ^{proposed} solution.

Second Proposition

Good point about social benefits to Canada.
Improved conditions point was confusing - Asserted we need to protect Canada without explaining why.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good rebuttal of gov's contentions, more nuanced analysis of the international relations aspects. Quality vs quantity point could have benefitted from more analysis.

Second Opposition

Good rebuttal.
Rights point needed more development but was relevant and persuasive.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Marie Ouellet

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 3A7

PROPOSITION

Team Name: FM - Alberta

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bryan Ma

Jeremy Ma

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Karl Valentini

Nikolas De Stefano

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>75</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>154</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good links between proposition + opposition. ✓
- prepped for arguments from opposition. ✓
- good questions.

Second Proposition

- develop arguments a little bit more.
- good refutations.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- brought in strong examples to the debate.
- 1st arguments ~~were~~ not as relevant to the debate.

Second Opposition

- arguments overlapped with 1st opp.
- strong speaking style.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: M. Litherich

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 3A7

PROPOSITION

Team Name: FM - Alberta

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bryan Ma

Jeremy Fan

Score
78
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kael Valentini

Nikolas De Stefano

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score

159

200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

150

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- What about student loans?
- What about trade schools?
- Economics point needed deeper understanding of economics.

Rebuttal:

- Good answer on quality
- Taxes argument less convincing

Second Proposition

- use "all" rather than "some"
- stop anticipating Opp arguments.
- third point was vague

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Wrong to change definition - it was debatable
- Argument by example on economy

Rebuttal:

- "prove through two examples" -> that's not the way to prove

Second Opposition

- "raising tax rates or cutting services" - debt??
- third point was irrelevant.
- fourth point was good.
- weak ending
- good use of credentialism

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Barley Kay

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 3A-7

PROPOSITION

Team Name: FM-Alberta

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bryan Ma

Jeremy Fan

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Karl Valentini

Nikolas De Stefano

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score

200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- speaks well
- made relevant points
- some holes in arguments but they weren't addressed by opposition.

Second Proposition

- valid point, rebuilt arguments of partner
- rebuttal needed more depth

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- points are less developed, addressed by proposition
- changed the model, wasn't necessary, created problems in the debate
- spoke very well

Second Opposition

- similar to partner
- answered points well