Both teams were very fluent in their debate and backed by data. The Pro team had the advantage of better points. It was a close round!
The Pro team had more data & were clearly had the winning argument.

The Con team should work on rebuttal a little more strongly.
beginning the week of 7-25, left us
with the care of [illegible].

[illegible] was such a

...
The Pro team of Jagdish and Griffin made a better case for the US to implement a universal basic income. They set out specific examples in their contentions that showed how a universal basic income would benefit citizens in the United States.

Both teams asked effective questions during the crossfire or final crossfire question and never period.

The Con team of Moreno and Venkatachalam had a good understanding of the debate topic. It was a very polite and respectful debate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 101</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 07:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Bauer (2)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Patel (4)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

Judge’s Signature
BONITA VISTA HIGH SCHOOL
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CHENG - GREAT SPEAKING / DEBATING SKILLS. I LIKE THE WAY YOU PRESENTED YOUR CASE CLEARLY.

BAUER - NICE UNDERSTANDABLE SPEAKING VOICE, A LITTLE MORE ORGANIZED WILL HELP YOU.

TRAN - SLOW DOWN, YOU TRY GETTING YOUR POINT OUT THERE AND TEND TO STUMBLE ON YOUR WORDS.

PATEL - DON'T LET YOUR OPPONENTS TAKE UP ENTIRE 3 MIN OF CROSSFIRE WITHOUT GETTING A QUESTION IN.
NPF
FLIP: 35 Huffman - Sankhla v. 28 Ramkumar - Mahey

Novice Public Forum
Round 3
Speaker Pro Points (20-30)
1st MAHEY (1) 29.28*
2nd RAMKUMAR (3) 25

Israel Jazo (*9)
Speaker Con Points (20-30)
1st HUFFMAN (2) 27
2nd SANKHLA (4) 26

The winner of this debate was

[Pro] Con
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Bonita Vista High School
School/Affiliation/Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

MAHEY - GREAT SPEAKING SKILLS, YOUR SUMM. COULD USE SOME IMPROVEMENT

HUFFMAN - I LIKE YOUR SPEAKING VOICE ALTHOUGH YOU READ RAPIDLY I COULD STILL FOLLOW YOU.

RAMKUMAR - SLOW DOWN AND CONCENTRATE ON YOUR DEBATE

SANKHLA - NICE JOB BRING UP NO SUPPORTING DATA ON THE RICH REINVESTING AND ABOUT THE $1.40 PER PERSON

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

1 Speaker 1..................4 min
2 Speaker 2..................4 min
3 Crossfire (1 & 2) *........3 min
4 Speaker 3..................4 min
5 Speaker 4..................4 min
6 Crossfire (3 & 4) *........3 min
7 Speaker 1 Summary......3 min
8 Speaker 2 Summary......3 min
9 Speaker 3 Final Focus...2 min
10 Speaker 4 Final Focus...2 min
11 3 minutes of Prep Time per side
12 * The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
## NPF

**FLIP: 38 Cehajic - Haveman v. 1 Vaidyanathan - Yuan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Nicholas Russell (*'50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 102</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 02/07/20 07:45PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Haveman</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Cehajic</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro [ ]

Con [ ]

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

Judge's Signature: **Russell**

School / Affiliation / Occupation: **Brophy College Prep**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg - I don't know why you ask me about delivery rates & choose to speak quickly anyhow. Better not to ask.

Aff - be more assertive in crossfire - line by line

Neg rebuttal - more line by line refutation

**RFP** I vote neg - preponderance of evidence that welfare works.

### Order/Time Limits of Speeches

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crossfire 1 & 2: 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire 3 & 4: 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 3 minutes of Prep Time per side

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*
The Neg implicitly concede all defense on their case. Aff wins "C3."
### NPF

**FLIP: 9 Mensinger - Webb v. 35 Kousoulas - Shaik**

#### Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 106</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 08:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Victoria Webb</td>
<td>Waina Shaik</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jack Mensinger</td>
<td>Pauline Kousoulas</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Pro**
- **Con**

(Circle Winner)

**Is this a low point win?** **No**

##### Judge's Signature

- **Hamilton**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Aff did weighing so Aff won.

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

| Speaker 1 | 4 min |
| Speaker 2 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1 & 2) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 | 4 min |
| Speaker 4 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3 & 4) | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary | 3 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary | 3 min |
| Grand Crossfire (all) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |

3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
NPF
FLIP: 28 Pajuyo - Gopalani v. 15 Alfaro - Suthar

Novice Public Forum

Round 3  Flight 2  Room 105  121  Fri 02/07/20 08:30PM

Speaker  Pro  Points (20-30)  Speaker  Con  Points (20-30)
1st  Pajuyo  26  1st  Suthan  28
2nd  Gopalani  29  2nd  Alfaro  27

The winner of this debate was

Pro

Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Slow down when reading citations/read them more clearly
- Don't contradict yourself

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 1 4 min
Speaker 2 4 min
Crossfire (1 & 2)* 3 min
Speaker 3 4 min
Speaker 4 4 min
Crossfire (3 & 4)* 3 min
Speaker 1 Summary 3 min
Speaker 2 Summary 3 min
Grand Crossfire (all) 3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus 2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus 2 min
3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
**NPF**

**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 105</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 07:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Michael Fang</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shrey Chaudhary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**Is this a low point win?**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Prep:**

"SPEAKS CLEARLY with good diction, nice presence and confident. Need more eye contact; try not to rely on lap top. Crossfire - speak up & speak out. (little more passion)"

Be more familiar with opposite framework for refutation purpose. Needed interaction during crossfire. Evidence based.

**Con:**

"Excellent eye contact used/relied on notes very little - great job! Very familiar with framework. Speaks clearly, good diction, confident. Need to be moved to varsity."

"Good eye contact did not solely rely on notes. Spoke to judge. Good diction & speaks clearly. Good speed. Outlined framework - familiar with material. Evidence based research."

**Speaker Notes:**

"Worked well as a team. We started this round very late by almost 3 hours. Student fried."

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Type</th>
<th>Time Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire (all)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 123</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 07:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jesus Higuera</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Tejas Subbaraman</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

The Con side had better detail and supporting detail.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Time Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire (all)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
### Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>&quot;Suits&quot;</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 102</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 08:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro / 2nd</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Burns</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Bora</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was [signature]

**Due tointernetuse in round 1 – Pro win**

Is this a low point win?

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

Thank you for your commitment to debate – & for your willingness to play by the rules with a winning spirit.

neg rebutted - you begin rebutting your self – use line-by-line reputation

Keep it civil in crossfire. That second crossfire gets too intense for my taste.

Thanks for the conversation about civility before the second cross. Schmidt - try to be more civil in cross. Your speaker points reflect your tenor.
#35 Flores vs Pham

**FLIP: 35 Flores - Pham v. 5 Sun - Wickett**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Leslie Edquist (*22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room 110</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 02/07/20 08:30PM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro** | **Con**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ______

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2)*: 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4)*: 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

---

#35 Flores vs Pham

no show
### Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 107</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 07:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Comments from Con were more convincing about how UBI did not work in 2 US states.

- Both teams had good speakers.

**Pro - Suggestion:** Add card how UBI would be easily to avail but current system has too many criteria.
NPF
FLIP: 35 Andrews - Saissan v. 28 Choppa - Singh

Novice Public Forum | Jen Groman (*41)
---|---
Round 3 | Flight 2 | Room 109 | Fri 02/07/20 08:30PM
Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30)
1st | Ayush Singh | 25 | 1st | Kiyan Saissan | 30
2nd | Gautam Choppa | 24 | 2nd | Daynan Andrews | 29

The winner of this debate was

Pro 0  Con 2
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ayush - you need to work on fluency when reading your case. Make sure you participate in C-X by asking questions, not just answering. You need to spend some time researching the topic and understand it.

Gautam - you need to answer questions as best you can in C-X. In your speeches, make sure you go down the flow and address all arguments. It's important to respond to all arguments as best you can.

Kiyan + Daynan - you guys are both excellent speakers, thorough debaters, great use of analysis and evidence, and clear understanding of the material. You are a power team and I know you will have great success in debate in the future.

I am voting for the neg because I think they clearly understood the topic best, supported their case + refuted the aff completely.
This was an excellent debate, you did a great job with complex information. Grace and Matthew in particular exhibited excellent cross-ex examination skills and a solid understanding of the material. Grace, excellent job questioning their biased source in e-x. Munia, don't let your opponent dominate you in e-x. Pipe in and ask questions. I am voting for the Con because I think they defended their case best and demonstrated the best use of evidence and overall persuaded me to their side.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 103</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 08:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Zhang</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kapadia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

Is this a low point win?  **No**

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Speaker 2</th>
<th>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)</th>
<th>Speaker 3</th>
<th>Speaker 4</th>
<th>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)</th>
<th>Speaker 1 Summary</th>
<th>Speaker 2 Summary</th>
<th>Grand Crossfire (all)</th>
<th>Speaker 3 Final Focus</th>
<th>Speaker 4 Final Focus</th>
<th>3 minutes of Prep Time per side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>3 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

Speaker 1 (Bisson) introduced the topic of the discussion and supported his argument with evidence. Speaker 2 (Zhang) made his point very well.

During crossfire, Speaker 3 (Piraino) did a great job and declined that a claim should not be targeted to a specific group. It's universal.

During summary, Speaker 2 (Zhang) substantiated the arguments with reliable evidence. Speaker 3 (Piraino) gave more evidence to prove their point.
**For Pro:**
Better if you explain how money received from UI will help to make citizens more competent for future jobs.

**For Neg:** Not convinced about Republican viewpoint.
**NPF**

**FLIP: 50 Chun - Kumar v. 39 Leger - Murthy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Nair Sreeprasad (*35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Flight 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Leger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Murthy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- Pro: 
- Con: 

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **NC**

Judge's Signature: **ACP Chandler**

School/Affiliation/Occupation:

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

Speaker 1 (Chun) did a good job on introducing the topic. Speaker 2 (Leger) was specific on her main arguments. During crossfire, Leger could prove her point over Chun. Speaker 3 (Kumar) was more assertive. Speaker 4 (Murthy) was a little vague. His contentions were not supported by evidence. Leger was able to convince the debate using concrete evidences. Supported by concrete evidence.

As a judge, I look for 

Revised: Concrete
and reliable evidence showed, for example, which are countries that a significant reduction in poverty levels after the implementation of UBI.