

Open Public Forum

Preliminary Round Results

Roxanne Salkeld 1A Analy HS Cami Hill	5B L 0* 0.0* Con 0*	5G L 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	5D L 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	0.0/0 0 - 3 0
Ariel Schloten 1B Analy HS Sarah Condello	5H L 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	5D L 0* 0.0* Con 0*	5B W 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Anthony Chand 1C Analy HS Ben Talcott	5F L 0* 0.0* Con 0*	5E L 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	5A L 0* 0.0* Con 0*	0.0/0 0 - 3 0
Megha Bhargava 5A Dougherty Valley HS Saishruti Adusumilli	BYE 0* 0.0* 0*	16A L 0* 0.0* Con 0*	1C W 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Srisai Nachuri 5B Dougherty Valley HS Aman Sakineni	1A W 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	9D L 0* 0.0* Con 0*	1B L 0* 0.0* Con 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Effie Jia 5C Dougherty Valley HS Samantha Maclwaine	9A W 0* 0.0* Con 0*	9E W 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	16A W 0* 0.0* Con 0*	0.0/0 3 - 0 0
Amisha Kambath 5D Dougherty Valley HS Sakura Rapolu	9B L 0* 0.0* Con 0*	1B W 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	1A W 0* 0.0* Con 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Saad Jamal 5E Dougherty Valley HS Dev Bali	9C L 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	1C W 0* 0.0* Con 0*	12A W 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Joon Ha Jang 5F Dougherty Valley HS Manav Shahi	1C W 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	9C L 0* 0.0* Con 0*	9B L 0* 0.0* Con 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Lekha Pillarisetti 5G Dougherty Valley HS Tanaya Bhakhat	9D L 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	1A W 0* 0.0* Con 0*	9A L 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Ergene Kim 5H Dougherty Valley HS Benjamin Roth	1B W 0* 0.0* Con 0*	9A L 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	9C L 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Bryan Yuan Wang 9A Miramonte HS Aaron Lundin Baum	5C L 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	5H W 0* 0.0* Con 0*	5G W 0* 0.0* Con 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Daniel Ginsburg 9B Miramonte HS Jonathan Hongde Zhou	5D W 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	11A L 0* 0.0* Con 0*	5F W 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Kelly Zheng 9C Miramonte HS Anna Miskelley	5E W 0* 0.0* Con 0*	5F W 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	5H W 0* 0.0* Con 0*	0.0/0 3 - 0 0
Elaine Lee 9D Miramonte HS Evan Steinberg	5G W 0* 0.0* Con 0*	5B W 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	11A W 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	0.0/0 3 - 0 0
Erica Stephen 9E Miramonte HS Julia Lin	16A L 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	5C L 0* 0.0* Con 0*	BYE 0* 0.0* 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Reece James 11A Piedmont HS Anna Fehr	12A W 0* 0.0* Con 0*	9B W 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	9D L 0* 0.0* Con 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0
Aly Walji 12A Quarry Lane Keya Vijapur	11A L 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	BYE 0* 0.0* 0*	5E L 0* 0.0* Con 0*	0.0/0 1 - 2 0
Diego Sanchez 16A St. Joseph Notre Dame Meredith McMurray	9E W 0* 0.0* Con 0*	5A W 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	5C L 0* 0.0* Pro 0*	0.0/0 2 - 1 0

Burnes, Mica

Noah, Mariah (*1)

Round 1 9:00am Annex5

Pro: 5 Jamal - Bali

Con: 9 Zheng - Miskelley

Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Mica Burnes

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PRO:
Team Code #: 5

CON:
Team Code #: 9

Pro Speaker #1 Jamal pts 28

Con Speaker #1 Zheng pts 20

Pro Speaker #2 Bali pts 28

Con Speaker #2 Miskelley pts 20

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

*-rolling eyes
-tone*

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: Good speaking - tone, volume, pace. Keep an eye on the clock - get all contentions in 1st speech if possible.

Con 1: Good organization and time management. Be careful with your speaking tone; be respectful.

Pro 2: Good job! Try to focus more on voter issues in the last speech.

Con 2: Good confidence. Be respectful of your opponent - especially during cross ex.

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the Con wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Con provided clear voter issues and proved more harm than good.

Ainsworth, Laura Ainsworth (*8)

Round 1 9:00am Village3
Pro: 5 Jang - Shahi
Con: 1 Chand - Talcott
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Laura Ainsworth

Judge's School Affiliation: Mania Camillo High School

PRO: 5
Team Code #: _____

CON: 1
Team Code #: _____

Excellent Speakers

Pro Speaker #1 Manav Shahi pts 29.5

Con Speaker #1 Talcott pts 26.5

Pro Speaker #2 Joan Ha Jang pts 30

Con Speaker #2 Chand pts 27

I expect this order (lops), because you are both

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1:

Excellent case, questions, speed, clarity

Very strong case, point for point rebuttal, crystallization and ability to organize the con

Pro 2:

Phenomenal analytical skills, ability to adapt, sound logic

I believe you can work on your own responses + non-unique, but I imagine you have these arguments available when needed.

Con 1:

Good expansion of examples

Great job focusing on the potential plants, providing real-world examples and putting multiple arguments out there

Good ability to ask questions!

TEAM CODE #: 5

on the PRO wins this debate. (PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

*On-Case Arguments
Strength of Pro Case*

Handwritten notes at the top left of the page.

I

2008
12

10/10/07
Lond

2.15
of part of

Handwritten notes on the right side of the page.

Handwritten notes in the bottom left section, including phrases like "Handwritten notes" and "Handwritten notes".

Handwritten notes in a circular shape.

Handwritten notes in the bottom middle section.

Handwritten notes in a circular shape on the right side.

Handwritten notes in a circular shape on the right side.

Handwritten notes in a circular shape.

Handwritten notes in a circular shape.

Handwritten notes at the bottom center of the page.

Sappington, John (*14)

Round 1 9:00am Annex3
Pro: 9 Stephen - Lin
Con: 16 Sanchez - McMurray
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: JOHN SAPPINGTON

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

PRO:
Team Code #: 9

CON:
Team Code #: 16

Pro Speaker #1 Lin pts 27

Con Speaker #1 McMurray pts 30

Pro Speaker #2 Stephen pts 29

Con Speaker #2 Sanchez pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1:

WRITING & Evidence well written - slow down and be present with your material verbally.

Pro 2:

WRITTEN material & evidence well structured - great delivery & relaxed confident presentation.

Con 1:

Well structured - really good delivery. Non-seemed very relaxed w/ process.

Con 2:

Relay - need more theatricality for a better sense of presentation. Well structured material.

TEAM CODE #: 16 on the CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very difficult decision, both team presented good evidence and substantial arguments. Con ~~earned~~ out a win based on confidence of ~~you~~ and eked out their presentation & ~~was~~ over... →

cohesive presentation of their
material. con did seem to
control the argument putting
PRO on to defensive early on.
Good work by both teams!

Shen, Alfred (*5)
Round 1 9:00am Village1
Pro: 12 Walji - Vijaypure
Con: 11 James - Fehr
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Alfred Shen
Dougherty
Judge's School Affiliation: Dougherty Valley High

PRO: 12 CON: 11
Team Code #: _____ Team Code #: _____
Pro Speaker #1 Walji pts 29 Con Speaker #1 Fehr pts 29
Pro Speaker #2 Vijaypure pts 28 Con Speaker #2 James pts 20

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1:

- ✗ Great analysis
- ✗ Good reasoning

Pro 2:

- ✗ Good reasoning
- ✗ Better time management. might be needed

Con 1:

- ✗ provided great evidence to support her arguments
- ✗ might want to hide body language

Con 2:

- ✗ Excellent delivery
- ✗ Good rebuttal

TEAM CODE #: 11 on the CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Team #2 had a slightly better delivery skills & was able to present confidently,

Ernst, Debra (*17)
Round 1 9:00am Village5
Pro: 1 Schloten - Condello
Con: 5 Kim - Roth
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Debra Ernst

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor HS

PRO:
Team Code #: 1

CON:
Team Code #: 5

Pro Speaker #1 Schloten pts 21

Con Speaker #1 Kim pts 24

Pro Speaker #2 Condello pts 21

Con Speaker #2 Roth pts 28+

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: Good way to define harms/benefits. Little bit flat delivery. (Better final speech though; more eye contact more tone inflection.)

Pro 2: Good reading pace & tone inflection. Good final speech.

Con 1: great content. Clever to use civil Rights Act & disparation betw. rich & poor to refute. Teach the judge, don't read too quickly. Deliver your points more powerfully. Much better final speech. ☺

Con 2: Very Good logical structure. Great delivery (not too "speechy") Good emphasis & inflection.

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: Though there was some confusion initial whether Neg had to prove harms or just not beneficial, the points they made and evidence were stronger.

Lake, Abby (*15)
Round 1 9:00am Annex4
Pro: 9 Ginsburg - Zhou
Con: 5 Kambath - Rapolu
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Abby Lake

Judge's School Affiliation: SCDS

PRO:
Team Code #: 9

CON:
Team Code #: 5

Pro Speaker #1 Jonathan Zhou pts 28

Con Speaker #1 Sakura Rapolu pts 26.5

Pro Speaker #2 Daniel Ginsburg pts 28

Con Speaker #2 Amisha Kambath pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1:

* contentions made very clear
* excellent evidence provided
* good eye contact and articulation

Pro 2:

* captivating speaker
* strong rebuttal
* good composure during crossfire

Con 1:

* good delivery of points although at times points were presented too quickly
* unclear about scholarship contention in crossfire

Con 2:

* strong presentations overall
* good points made in summary
* did not ~~make clear~~ ^{make clear} how tests ~~lead~~ increased incarceration.

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the PRO wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams presented good arguments and carried on a strong and captivating debate, however, Team 9's contentions were supported better and argued better overall. Team 5 did a wonderful job overall but fell a bit short with their refutations and evidence.

Fishlow, Dan (*9)

Round 1 9:00am Annex6
Pro: 5 Nachuri - Sakineni
Con: 1 Salkeld - Hill
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Fishlow

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PRO:
Team Code #: 5

CON:
Team Code #: 1

Pro Speaker #1 Nachuri pts 26

Con Speaker #1 Salkeld pts 27.5

Pro Speaker #2 Sakineni pts 27.5

Con Speaker #2 Hill pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

- Pro 1:
- good facts/research
 - suggest to slow down to emphasize points
 - Make eyecontact to test for vulnerability

- Con 1:
- good passion/enthusiasm for points
 - good facts and research
 - good eyecontact
 - use more pauses to help emphasize point

- Pro 2:
- solid approach to stick to the narrow definition
 - good facts/research
 - good eyecontact

- Con 2:
- good calm style
 - well researched
 - Try to use a little more voice inflection
 - said attempt to link NCLB with testing

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the PRO wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very good debate. Pro wins due to the narrow definition and burden of proof. Con tried very hard to tie all standardized testing to the specific effects of NCLB and it's flaws, however never completely showed that standard testing per se was not beneficial; Pro was able to bring data that on balance →

Standardized testing improved test scores, identified gaps, and raised achievement. And while the con did show problems; The tie to NCLB and reducing the achievement gap... did not prove that standardized testing was non beneficial on balance.

McNamara, Lana (*1)

Round 1 9:00am Village2
Pro: 9 Wang - Baum
Con: 5 Jia - MacIlwaine
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Lana McNamara

Judge's School Affiliation: EMHS

PRO: Team Code #: 9 CON: Team Code #: 5

Pro Speaker #1 Wang pts 27 Con Speaker #1 Jia pts 27

Pro Speaker #2 Baum pts 28 Con Speaker #2 MacIlwaine pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: Wang
+ very clear argument
+ unflappable
- sometimes spoke too fast
to compare head point

Pro 2: Baum
+ very professional
+ knew research - not just reading it
- need to 'adjust' to new points.

TEAM CODE #: 5

on the CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

Con 1: Jia
+ great eye contact
+ clear seques.
- watch the 'ums'

Con 2: MacIlwaine
+ appreciated the "instant" rebuttals (new proof).
+ well researched
- agree that the personal anecdote didn't help.

REASON FOR DECISION:

the pro team wasn't proving net benefit - CON stuck to testing - pro tried to move to curriculum.

Shifs, Masha (*13)
Round 1 9:00am Village6
Pro: 5 Pillarsetti - Bhakhat
Con: 9 Lee - Steinberg
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: DON SHIFS

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN MARIN

Team Code #: PRO: 5

Team Code #: CON: 9

Pro Speaker #1 TANAYA BHAKHAT pts 26

Con Speaker #1 ELAINA LEE pts 25

Pro Speaker #2 LEXHA PILLARSETTI pts 27

Con Speaker #2 ELIAN STEINBERG pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1:
PRESENTED ACCURATELY
HAD ARGUMENTS.
NEEDS TO SPEAK SLOWER

Pro 2:
SPOKE CONCISELY & ON
TOPIC
SPOKE CLEARLY

Con 1:
VERY GOOD AT PRESENTING
& REBUTTAL

Con 2:
NEW HER TOPIC WELL
BUT AT TIMES NERVOUS. SLOW
DOWN A BIT & POINTS WILL FLOW.

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

THE NEGATION PRESENTED A STRONGER CASE, ESPECIALLY
① WHERE IT RELATES TO THE POOL & ② THAT CHEATING
PREVALES EVEN IF OFFERED 2 EXAMPLES

Kenyon, Karen (*13)

Round 2A 11:00am Village1
Pro: 1 Chand - Talcott
Con: 5 Jamal - Bali
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Karen Kenyon

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

PRO:
Team Code #: 1

CON:
Team Code #: 5

Pro Speaker #1 Chand pts 23

Con Speaker #1 Jamal pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 Talcott pts 24

Con Speaker #2 Bali pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Considering it was Aff's 1st time in PF, they handled the situation with grace

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Grand cross-fire was the best of the cross fires

*You did a good job for 1st time in PF
Pro 1: Chand - need to be a bit more confident & assured. in delivering your opening speech. Volume good, need more eye contact. In last speech, don't repeat your points - get into direct clash with Neg*

*Speech. Showed drive + Reputation
Con 1: Jamal - good evidence. Consider holding computer or a paper copy - to look down at computer hurts eye contact. Good evidence. Good volume. Good questions.*

Pro 2: Talcott - speech is good, but I felt you weren't sure. need to be more familiar with your script. Watch time so you don't rush out. need more direct clash with Neg. points.

Con 2: Bali - Good analysis. I felt you jumped around. I'd like a bit more organization in your speech. In last speech, don't just give a fact - explain how it strengthens your case.

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the NEG wins this debate.

(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The affirmative dropped all Neg. contentions, so Neg. carries contention on "private test makers" and "no improvement." They show that benefits must be occurring Now, not in future.

or weakens their case. This is for aff. speaker

Kenyon, Karen (*13)

Round 2B 11:00am Village1
Pro: 5 Jia - MacIlwaine
Con: 9 Stephen - Lin
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Karen Kenyon

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

PRO: 5
Team Code #: _____

CON: 9
Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Jia pts 28

Con Speaker #1 Lin pts 26

Pro Speaker #2 MacIlwaine pts 29

Con Speaker #2 Stephen pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: Jia - Good posture, + volume. Delivering a little fast. Good evidence. Some good questions in C-X. Put a little more expression in voice. Good clash in last speech.

Con 1: Good volume; work on more eye contact. Slow down a bit. Need to state their contention more clearly. As you answer C-X questions, think a moment before answering - you get lost a little in the answers.

Pro 2: Good refutation of neg. points. Good analysis of information. Well-organized. Watch being a bit too aggressive in C-X. Good summary and synthesis of arguments in final speech.

Con 2: Good use of your time. Some good answers to Aff. Case. Need to be a bit more confident in C-X. Don't let your opponent ask all the questions in C-X. She controlled it too much.

TEAM CODE #: Aff 5 on the Aff wins this debate. (PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The negation tries to argue that the Phelps 93% statistic contains too much pre-WWII data; however aff. effectively shows that it contains many more recent studies; and that evidence proves that standardized testing has sign. benefits. I also think that aff. proves issue on NCLB deals with penalty issue - not standardized testing.

Siegel, Mike (*15)
Round 2A 11:00am Village5
Pro: 11 James - Fehr
Con: 9 Ginsburg - Zhou
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Mike Siegel

Judge's School Affiliation: SCDS

PRO: _____ CON: _____
Team Code #: 11 Team Code #: 9

Pro Speaker #1 Fehr pts 29 Con Speaker #1 Zhou pts 29

Pro Speaker #2 James pts 29 Con Speaker #2 Ginsburg pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: very thought full and well organized argument strong conclusion, good subject analysis

Pro 2: well presented well thought out very well organized excellent points and fact supported objectives

Con 1: very organized topical points fact supported arguments clear and objective points

Con 2: excellent presentational skills command of subject matter thoughtful conclusions

TEAM CODE #: 11 on the PRO wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: - COULD HAVE BEEN A TIE

Both arguments were poignant, well organized, excellently presented. I felt the Affirmation had a slight edge on argument but Opposition had a stronger presentation. I felt the edge on argument was inherent in the wording of the question.

Siegel, Mike (*15)
Round 2B 11:00am Village5
Pro: 1 Salkeld - Hill
Con: 5 Pillariseti - Bhakhat
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Mike Siegel

Judge's School Affiliation: SCDS

PRO: Team Code #: 1 CON: Team Code #: 5

Pro Speaker #1 Salkeld pts 28 Con Speaker #1 Bhakhat pts 29
Pro Speaker #2 Hill pts 28 Con Speaker #2 Pillariseti pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: Very Poised, very articulate
nicely organized
need more support for arguments

Pro 2:
good eye contact, poignant
need more support for arguments

Con 1: excellent organization in
argument, clear direction
lots of supported facts
reading from computer is distracting
causes limited engagement w/ judge

Con 2: speaks very fast
similar to above
seems to speak to the time limit
not the subject or audience

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the CON wins this debate. ~~however~~ subject

REASON FOR DECISION:

subject matter was better supported by
given evidence and argument were
better organized

matter was very strong
and evidence supported

^{Brett}
Ainsworth, Doug (*8)

Round 2A 11:00am Village3
Pro: 9 Lee - Steinberg
Con: 5 Nachuri - Sakineni
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Brett Ainsworth

Judge's School Affiliation: Mania Cavillo

PRO:
Team Code #: 9

CON:
Team Code #: 5

Pro Speaker #1 E. Lee pts 28

Con Speaker #1 Nachuri pts 28.5

Pro Speaker #2 E. Steinberg pts 30

Con Speaker #2 Sakineni pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

PRO 1: Good case. Work on your clarity of your statistics on the lines. Good job summarizing the case & how you defend.

PRO 2: Great link for point retention
Good logical responses & excellent on unique argumentation.
Great Causation vs correlation arguments.
Be careful arguing Causation Law in S.Q. currently cheating did happen so the data may be greater than the records.

CON 1: Good Con Case. I don't hear the interrelationships between the S.T & the harms of stress. Good case on clarity.

CON 2: Be careful when changing Turn. You provided a good point about outside factors this turn anything. A turn would be that the coach says 90% of teachers cheat on testing. You need to provide a better internal link story for this to really be effective.
Be careful about making new arguments in the last round.

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the PRO wins this debate.

(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The link summary for the stress & show testing = chronic long term stress. Who stress I am weighing the APT 2.5 million students study that says earnings 90%. I weigh this is positive harms of teachers cheating. The harms of outside the harms so I vote PRO

Handwritten title or header text

Handwritten text, possibly a list or notes, including the word "inspired" written vertically.

Main body of handwritten text, appearing as a series of lines or paragraphs, though the content is largely illegible due to the quality of the scan.

Handwritten signature or initials

Handwritten signature or initials

Final lines of handwritten text at the bottom of the page.

Brett

Ainsworth, Doug (*8)

Round 2B 11:00am Village3
Pro: 5 Kambath - Rapolu
Con: 1 Schlotten - Condello
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Brett Ainsworth

Judge's School Affiliation: Maria Curillo

Team Code #: PRO: 5

Team Code #: CON: 1

Pro Speaker #1 Rapolu pts 28

Con Speaker #1 Schlotten pts 29

Pro Speaker #2 Kambath pts 25

Con Speaker #2 Condello pts 29.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: Good case. Your delivery was very natural and well modulated. Good and speech. You covered a lot of ground.

Con 1: Intriguing appeal to criteria, I didn't hear many hints in your case. I don't know what the hints are, who art does it lead to less...? On balance means I need to weigh against something. Cheating is bad but you need to tell me how to weigh this harm. Is it worse than getting a diploma?

Pro 2: Good replies on Neg case. You refer to evidence that Negs p. 8 in it. Be careful to cut off your opponent during C.F. you did it multiple times. It's really rude! C.F. should be illustrative & combative. Cross fire is not a time to make arguments.

Con 2: your Con 3 could go directly against Con 1 on Aff. Rather than on your response, ~~the Aff. should be~~ Good. So on C.F. dealing with someone cutting you off. Good final speech but the Aff. had more base than you.

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the PRO wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: I am weighing on balance + I see more benefits to S. + is the harm presented by the negative. Neg in need to know why cheating or lack of diverse choices is bad. I need a harm to weigh.

Haering, Dana (*1)
 Round 2A 11:00am Village2
 Pro: 16 Sanchez - McMurray
 Con: 5 Bhargava - Adusumilli
 Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Dana Haering

Judge's School Affiliation: Friend of Lynette Williamson

PRO: 16
 Team Code #: _____

CON: 5
 Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 McMurray pts 28

Con Speaker #1 Adusumilli pts 27

Pro Speaker #2 Sanchez pts 29

Con Speaker #2 Bhargava pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior.

Ⓟ ① standardize testing plan accurately predict students
Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

lectre
hold schools
accountable

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: good definitions
nicely done cross-fire in focusing on creativity
nice calm delivery

Pro 2:
once delivery / right cadence
some teaching better than none
strong listening / questioning skills
well-summarized final argument

Con 1: spoke very quickly; use less dense material to make points stronger
narrows curriculum neglects creativity
creates stress - teachers/students
undercrossfire - did not have rebuttal well - try not to use "like" - showed lots of passion for the argument

Con 2:
not reading some notes
minority results
point in time measurement
stronger to look at opponent in crossfire - looking away lacks strength in argument

TEAM CODE #: 16 on the PRO wins this debate. (PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

- strong supporting points
- calm but confident delivery
- Sanchez had great listening & crossfire questions
- McMurray had good summary skills

Haering, Dana (*1)
 Round 2B 11:00am Village2
 Pro: 9 Zheng - Miskelley
 Con: 5 Jang - Shahi
 Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Dana Haering

Judge's School Affiliation: Friend of Lynette Williamson

PRO: Team Code #: 9 CON: Team Code #: 5

Pro Speaker #1 Zheng pts 28 Con Speaker #1 Shani pts 27
 Pro Speaker #2 Miskelley pts 27 Con Speaker #2 Jang pts 24

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:
 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: *watch descending tone*
 ✓ good delivery; good confidence
 ✓ try not to use "like"
 ✓ watch informal; argon "I'm st..."
 ✓ strong cross - Pro

Con 1: *good recovery in missing info*
 ✓ missing backup for facts but quite
 ✓ read Pro's argument only and did
 ✓ not look up; points all stronger
 ✓ use less dense info w/ audience
 ✓ good passionate arguments stronger

Pro 2: *need to keep your cool*
 ✓ nice job keeping the point
 ✓ nice energy; speaking without
 ✓ ready Am notes

Con 2: *much when connected*
 ✓ nice passion but felt like filibuster
 ✓ too many words and not enough
 ✓ could not valid pts for the 1st minute
 ✓ mean arguments

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the PRO wins this debate.
 (PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:
 Strong supporting points
 - ~~team but confident delivery~~
 - good listening and ~~cross fire~~ cross fire questions
 - ~~good delivery~~ was fairly close though

be careful about tone and frustration WWS

around it

Pro

- ① good / bad teachers differentiated
- good support data
- ② all objective
accountable teachers

Con

- ① accuracy & misuse
- ② bias

Single Flight

Young, Wendy (*17)

Round 2A 11:00am Village6

Pro: 5 Kim - Roth

Con: 9 Wang - Baum

Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Wendy Young

Judge's School Affiliation: Windson HS

PRO:
Team Code #: 5

Pro Speaker #1 Kim pts _____

Pro Speaker #2 Roth pts _____

CON:
Team Code #: 9
Con Speaker #1 Wang pts _____
Con Speaker #2 Baum pts _____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: Kim - Very quiet debater - has good knowledge of topic. just needs to be more confident in delivery

Pro 2: Roth - didn't share judges hand at end - all other did - seemed well organized and will be a great debater..

Con 1: Wang - Very clear, strong speaker - confident in topic, felt a little angry at beginning for their position. It is a debate - be confident yet not aggressive.

Con 2: Baum - terrific presentation skills - felt like I was listening to a lawyer already - Didn't rely on notes at all - knew his case.

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

showed that on balance, ST is not beneficial to K-12 education based on drop out rates, and topics that are being dropped in favor of teaching to the test.

~~DeLeon, Brigitte~~ (*1)
Round 3 1:30pm Village2
Pro: 5 Jamal - Bali
Con: 12 Walji - Vijapur
Open Public Forum

Matt
Fogerty

STAND text in good for K12.

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: MAT FOGARTY

Judge's School Affiliation: MIRAMONTE

Team Code #: PRO: ~~30~~ 5

Team Code #: CON: 12

Pro Speaker #1 Jamal pts 28

Con Speaker #1 Vijapur pts 26

Pro Speaker #2 Bali pts 27

Con Speaker #2 Walji pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1:
Good voice, very confident
Good set up.

- try to be more

Pro 2:
Great rebuttals around NCLB ≠ texting
Need more than stats (Phelps paper)
⇒ why are 93% positive?

Con 1:
• Try to give more eye contact, rather than reading paper
• need clearer points (they were over lapping)

Con 2:
• Need clearer points
• Too late to research in debate (Phelps paper)

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the PRO wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

It was quite a merry debate - lots of points. I went with prop as the problems of texting and the NCLB influence were not separated by the opp. Good debate!

Rosenthal, Alan (*17)

Round 3 1:30pm Village3
Pro: 16 Sanchez - McMurray
Con: 5 Jia - MacLlwaine
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: ALAN ROSENTHAL

Judge's School Affiliation: WINDSOR HS

PRO: 16
Team Code #: _____

CON: 5
Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 McMURRAY pts 27.5

Con Speaker #1 JIA pts 29

Pro Speaker #2 SANCHEZ pts 27.5

Con Speaker #2 MACLLWAINÉ pts 29.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: CONSISTENCY IN S.T. (+)

- (- ?) NO OTHER WAY OF ACC. SCHOOLS
- (-) NO EV. OF HOW S.T. CAN PROMOT
- (-) FUTURE SUCCESS
- (-) FLAWS IN ED. SYSTEM (PKA?)

Pro 2: IDENTIFIED FLAWS ? (-)

- NO STRONG EVIDENCE
- NO EVIDENCE OF CAUSAL (+)

Con 1: S.T. PROMOTES CHEATING (+)
INEQUALITY DUE TO INCOME LEVELS

NAUSEA SUBJECT MATTER
NOT WELL ROUNDED, DOES NOT ALLOW FOR DIFFERENT TEACHING METHODS (+)

Con 2: DO S.T. SHOW MEASURE AFTER GR. 12 OR BEFORE? (+)

↑ STRESSES
GOOD REBUTTAL RELEVANT FACTS

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

TEAM 5 STATED MORE FACTUAL DATA, WAS ABLE TO DISPROVE OPP. ARGUMENTS.

NEED STRONGER ARGUMENTS MORE FACTS (BOTH)

Blankenburg, Erik Von (*13)

Round 3 1:30pm Village1
Pro: 1 Salkeld - Hill
Con: 5 Kambath - Rapolu
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Karen Kempton

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

Team Code #: PRO: ~~Salkeld~~ 1

Team Code #: CON: 5

Pro Speaker #1 ~~William Salkeld~~ pts 27

Con Speaker #1 Rapolu pts 27

Pro Speaker #2 ~~William Hill~~ pts 27

Con Speaker #2 Kambath pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Enjoyed the debate. Both teams had some good analysis and strong arguments.

Neg. has better evidence & supports points.

Pro 1: *Need delivery speed and volume. Good factual support. Took a little more confident during CX. In last speech, made several good points. Watch that you don't repeat, but that you extend!*

Con 1: *Good facts used as support. Talking a little fast. A little more eye contact. You had some good arguments in last speech, but you jumped around and you need to show impact.*

Pro 2: *You had some good extension of arguments, but more supportive evidence needed. Pleasant speaking style and speed. Be sure to show impact of your argument.*

Con 2: *Good direct clash and extension of arguments on Aff case. Watch speed. A little too fast. Don't get too aggressive during C-X.*

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the Neg wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The neg successfully shows that standardized tests lead to inequality - test content is skewed toward males, need for textbooks that help in test aren't affordable to poor. Neg presents argument that no educational benefit b/c results not timely. Aff. drop.

Round 3 1:30pm Village5
Pro: 1 Schloten - Condello
Con: 5 Nachuri - Sakineni
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Shane Cotherman

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

PRO: 1
Team Code #: _____

CON: 5
Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Schloten pts _____

Con Speaker #1 Nachuri pts _____

Pro Speaker #2 Condello pts _____

Con Speaker #2 Sakineni pts _____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: Great presentation & CX.

Con 1: More eyecontact & have your evidence ready

Pro 2: Keep that hair out of your face!

Con 2: overall great job, slow down.

try not to repeat win/loss situations

TEAM CODE #: 1 on the Pro wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: In the end Pro argument 2 still stood, speaker 1 was ready w/ all evidence, overall more collected. Speaker 2 had a great pt based on teachers/students morals.

Att

~~CX~~
~~APPX~~

Con 1 - accountability

• Evidence → Evidence

COA 2 - transfers
• Evidence ★

Con 3 - Affects on students
Stand test → higher grade entry

Neg

APP

con 1 Stressful
11%

Benefits ↓
Stress = growth

con 2 - can't measure kids

Good, ceramics, etc


con 3 cheating kids/teachers
• Evidence

↓ scores ↓ school B

~~CX~~ Neg ★

Attitudes toward "testing" ★
regards to teachers
teachers' moods ★

? Evidence?



Peter.m.

Walji, Inaara (*12)

Round 3 1:30pm Annex5

Pro: 5 Kim - Roth

Con: 9 Zheng - Miskelley

Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Peter.m.

Judge's School Affiliation: Queen's

PRO:
Team Code #: 5

CON:
Team Code #: 9

Pro Speaker #1 Roth pts 27

Con Speaker #1 Zheng pts 29

Pro Speaker #2 Kim pts 28

Con Speaker #2 Miskelley pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1:

- needs improve body language during delivery to show on the subject.

Pro 2:

- solid delivery on topic but need to show more confidence while ~~not~~ talking about on the subject.

Con 1:

- Very confidence, ready with fact and statistics.
- very organized and refute opp point.

Con 2:

- Very effective, clear communication.
- very organized and provide to the point and answer.

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

- factual & with lot of statistics & evidence that couldn't be negative by the opp

- cross-examine the other team and with merits.

↳ - follow the structure and very solid delivery, also teamwork.

AA - 50 see was
Sutton, Emma (*6)
 Round 3 1:30pm Village6
 Pro: 9 Ginsburg - Zhou
 Con: 5 Jang - Shahi
 Open Public Forum

My - 20 (sic only) + 1/1 m -

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Emma Sutton
 Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett

PRO: 9 CON: 5
 Team Code #: _____ Team Code #: _____
 Pro Speaker #1 Zhou pts 28 Con Speaker #1 Shahi pts 27
 Pro Speaker #2 Ginsburg pts 29 Con Speaker #2 Jang pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:
 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: Your case ~~was~~ has some serious holes but they did ~~well~~ find them ~~well~~ well organized case, easy to follow.

Con 1: Introduced very good arguments but need to sustain better in ~~summary~~ summary portions. Style is a bit on the frenetic side, although appreciate the passion!

Pro 2: You are dangerously close to being a jerk. Telling your opponent to calm down, asking if they have any actual questions - be ~~careful~~ careful. Excellent, smooth delivery though, and good analysis!

Con 2: Need to understand your own evidence better. I could not understand your evidence about African American kids performing to the test. Don't allow opponent to re-state his case during XC!

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the Pro wins this debate.
 (PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: AA presented a well-organized, coherent case. Pro missed several opportunities. Example: briefly introduced racial bias/inequality of experience, but were unable to coherently explain it or follow up. 73% evidence actually says that 90% of parent income - they failed to exploit

Shahi, Pranav (*5)

Round 3 1:30pm Annex3
Pro: 9 Lee - Steinberg
Con: 11 James - Fehr
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: PRANAV SHAHI

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PRO: Team Code #: 9 Lee - Steinberg CON: Team Code #: 11 James - Fehr

Pro Speaker #1 Elaine Lee pts 27 Con Speaker #1 Fehr pts 27

Pro Speaker #2 Evan Steinberg pts 29 Con Speaker #2 James pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: Elaine
You debated well, use emphasis in your speech to highlight your points

Con 1: Fehr
Good debate, good body language

Pro 2: Evan
You were very well organized and delivered your ideas crisply.
You cross fire with James way very good

Con 2: James
Loved your confidence and speech delivery
You cross fire with Evan way very good

TEAM CODE #: 9 Lee-Steinberg on the PRO wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

team 9 laid the definition and presented their case and defended well,
team 11 did not provide a definition and relied on team 9's definition

Day, Chris (*10)

Round 3 1:30pm Annex4
Pro: 5 Bhargava - Adusumilli
Con: 1 Chand - Talcott
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: DAY

Judge's School Affiliation: Montgomery

PRO:
Team Code #: Adusumilli 5

CON:
Team Code #: 1

Pro Speaker #1 Adusumilli pts 28

Con Speaker #1 Chand pts 26

Pro Speaker #2 Bhargava pts 28

Con Speaker #2 Talcott pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Pro 1: Very good analysis that I had difficulty connecting with due to your delivery speed. Slow down and learn to use pauses as a way to land your points!

Pro 2: Solid analysis - only thought is to deliver with more confidence; but very good

Con 1: Need to work on public speaking. OK evidence + analysis - that's fine just need to work on delivery. Try taping yourself + watch.

Con 2: Could use more forceful speaking style; more animation to your points. A little sloppy with data + sources during discussion

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the PRO wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: Overall a better case argued consistently stronger than con.

Minick, Karen (*2)
Round 3 1:30pm Annex6
Pro: 5 Pillarisetti - Bhakhat
Con: 9 Wang - Baum
Open Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Karen Minick
Judge's School Affiliation: Bear Creek H.S.

PRO: 5 CON: 9
Team Code #: _____ Team Code #: _____
Pro Speaker #1 Bhakhat pts _____ Con Speaker #1 Wang pts _____
Pro Speaker #2 Pillarisetti pts _____ Con Speaker #2 Baum pts _____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

" only buy that info. online" ??*

Pro 1: Don't spread

Con 1: Strong voice, great Questions.

Questioned Question instead of answered - Don't rely on "we only have to prove"
Pro 2: Don't spread

BOTH TEAMS VERY COURTEOUS

Con 2: Strong speaker
great eye on audience !!

Roadmap counts as fine, NOT before - saved SAT until last? why?

Thank you for NOT reading off the laptop !!

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the Con (PRO or CON) wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION:
*Both evidence, Both organized presentation of Arguments
Att had biased sources and didn't mention "social accountability"
Aka State holders, US public*

** "NOT understanding" anyone's point is not a reason to drop argument.*