Iricia Maxson (*2)		LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Round 1A 9:00am P2	Ju	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate dge's Name: Chien tang
Aff: 9 Waterson		<u> </u>
Neg: 19 Kelly	Ju	dge's School Affiliation:
Novice L-D Debate		7
AFI	F: Waterson  9 pts 27 Sp	NEG: Kelly eaker Code #: 19 hts 28
Speaker Code #:	Q pts 27 Sp	eaker Code #: 19 nts 28
e distribute di la companya di santa d	and the second of the second o	
Please award eacl	h speaker points based on t	he following soale:
		standing 28 ≠ Very Good
<b>27</b> = 6		nough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair		20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
		25 Action and for mapping prince contained
	Judgin	g Criteria
Using the above c		ments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	, <b>F</b>	money and, or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS	•	
	· r develop a case in response to the reso	olution?
• EVIDENCE:		
Although value debating	emphasizes logic and persuasion, evid	lence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)
	t arguments. How effective was the ev	vidence?
ORGANIZATION  Universally did the disheader		Lw.L. L. O
VALUE CLASH:	organize both the constructive and re	buttai speeches?
	ter emphasize the value being support	ed by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
(Criterion)	ouppoint	or of money and now went was that value measured.
<ul><li>REFUTATION:</li></ul>	/	
	debater refute the arguments of the opp	position and rebuild his/her own side?
DELIVERY/COUR		
Did each debater speak in	n communicative style that was pleasa	nt, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above o	ritorio plagoloffor compli	ments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	riteria, pieasy orier compin	ments and/or suggestions for improvement to
cach debater.	/	
Affirmative:	/	Nagativa
	4 6 4 4 -	Negative Good Cross X
C766d Mate	ment of contentions	
Children o	deathy by accidenti	Good contentions of evidence support
		Delivery was clear & "good paced
	nder ex with	percent with
better cla	rity.	Granization was good with
Organizat	ion of arguments	clear statement & a well support
	h = 4	
can use	some work. Try to	by evidence.
state of a	learly your	V
contention	clearly your s & rebuttals.	
	,	
SPEAKER CODE	#:on the	NEG wine this debate
SI EMILER CODE	(AFF	or NEG)
REASON FOR DEC		of NEO)
		1
NEG 10,	more organize	a with better evidence and
handlo	d CX with 1	d with better evidence and
	-,,,, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -	The state of the s

AC: Protection of Life VC: reduce death

O Children death, anedotes NRA, more gun is more death Australia, accidents
Idaho cose,

There countries

defense tiny %

CX: Neg enidence support VC? Gun larier to use. A

IAR: Rebuttel: VC of opponent & Gun control worked in Australia Otherwepons agree. 2nd contention not addressed by opponents. 4.5 v 1.5 deathout Other countries gun control worked.

ZAR: children's dealth happeing Glove compaitment. 2nd Amendment: old & could be changed.

# NEG

CX: Ban handgunsody, how about 7 other types of guns?
A: case is only handguns.

NC: VC: Life Preservation

1) Self-Defense: 1.5-1.9 million instances. For women,

@ Ban don't helf. esp. Landgun & not semi-automatic weapons 1994 Ban didn't work

(3) Handgun ban failed. Europe cases. Russia 4x 1. 45A

Rebuttal: accidents to pools, etc. stats wooping (ough swiming pool)

WR: Repeat of evidences.

D self-défence mon fréquent I than accidents. Parents responsibility

(2) short range knives more dangerous opponent agreed other weapon's. Criminal don't follow laws. Practicality of banning guns.

No evidence for UK, Japan's

4) Defence against eriminals . Opponent dropped 2 contentions

# LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Tricia Maxson (\*2) Round 1B 9:00am P2 Chien Aff: 1 Ramirez Neg: 22 Garg Judge's School Affiliation: Novice L-D Debate AFF: Ramires pts 2 + Speaker Code #: Speaker Code #: 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 = Fair24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior **Judging Criteria** Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater: **CASE ANALYSIS:** How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution? EVIDENCE: Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence? **ORGANIZATION:** How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/har side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion) REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? **DELIVERY/COURTESY:** Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant/easily understandable, and civil? Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Negative Affirmative: CX should be more effective, e.g. the questions should be more Good delivery and statement 4 contentions pertinent to arguments. Hardling of IAR was a little Delivery can be smoother, try not dès-organized to break up sentence, "er", and Should take advantage stopping to think. final rebuttal to re-state your contentions & show Rebuttal are more organized who your arguments are than opponent's

Letter than your opposed SPEAKER CODE #: 22 on the NEGwins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

**REASON FOR DECISION** 

It is a dope call. Both sides need to be more organized and improve upon argumentations & cx. I vote for NEG because of the better rebuttal.

AC: V: Justice justice VC: Max Pres greatest H people

1) Her enable death stats ... 75% HG. HG mainte source of death

(3) HG tool of assailment 0.7% self-defence

(3) Private ownership to kill. viction had right to life violated.

CX : Clarification à evidence!

IAR:

Rebuttal:

. morally right to infunce other's right by allowing Juternalional examples.

· AG make it much easier to Kill; shotgun 12 Garymore effective

ZAR:

Rebuttel: 2nd 2nd amendmet not! to be replaced, juit out dated

'illegal trado black-market, ban makes it haves

· other countries, homicide rote ?

· Bette secured school

# NEG

CX: Shot guns are peasin to stop people?

NC: V: Justice

VC: autonomy principle

1) & peanity, + violence salready has ban for mental, criminalete England, law-abiding citizan turnedin more import & Gren in U.K. Canada and Gun not part problem. Joshaica Inchange moul right.

Fort should secure schools more

(Rebuttal: right shouldn't be taken away

- Rlock-market voailabelity: Enfant

Dilegal impart. Shotgun for oxniping hat >> phort range (?)

NR: Rebuttal:

O autonomy doesn't

\$ 200 Amendmet is NOT out-dated.

> 3 illegal trade, 4 demand forthe HG & Shot guns are défloit. Statement not relevant.

Contention:

O other countries banned guns D not offective; UK. etc.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge 2 Logan (\*11) Round 1A 9:00am P1 Judge's Name: Aff: 19 Alam Neg: 2 Littlesun Judge's School Affiliations Novice L-D Debate AFF: NEG: pts 27 Speaker Code #: Speaker Code #: Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Nery Good 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair24-20 = Poor<20 = Reseryed for rude or inappropriate behavior Judging Criteria Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater: **CASE ANALYSIS:** How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution? Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence? ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches? VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being/supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion) **REFUTATION:** How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? **DELIVERY/COURTESY:** Did each debater speak in communicative style hat was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Affirmative: Negative Crosd enunciation Need more eye contant Speak slower and entiriate. Need to work own smoother Don't say 'saps! Hide your mistakes. Well reasoned engument. What about long guns? detivery during rebutal Arguments well well reasoned. on the Will wins this debate. **SPEAKER CODE #:** (AFF or NEG) REASON FOR DECISION Stronger argument. wasn't proven to reduce spicial. Wash DC giren

The speaker for the negative was unable to refite the affinative

Claim that a gun band would reduce gun violence.

Judge 2 Logan (\*11) Round 1B 9:00am P1

Aff: 19 Zhu Neg: 20 Shvakel Novice L-D Debate

# 

Judge's School Affiliation: Jawes Logan

L-D Debate		J	udge s School Al	mation:	701NA2	TOUR CANE
AFF: Speaker Code #:	19	pts <u>25</u>	Speaker Code #:	NEG:	90	pts_ <u>2</u>
Please award each sp.  27 = Goo  26-25 = Fair	30 = Perf	ect <b>29</b> = Ou ibly not good	ntstanding 28 enough to quali	= Very fy for eli	mination rou	nds) opriate behavior
		_	ng Criteria			
Using the above critereach debater:	ria, please	offer comp	liments and/o	r sugges	stions for in	nprovement for
<ul><li>CASE ANALYSIS:</li><li>How well did the debater deve</li><li>EVIDENCE:</li></ul>	lop a case in i	response to the re	esolution?			
Although value debating empl should be used to support argu				terial, cont	mporary or his	torical examples)
• ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater orga	nize both the	constructive and	rebuttal speeches?			
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater er (Criterion)	nphasize the v	value being suppo	orted by his/her/side	e, and how	well was that va	alue measured?
<ul> <li>REFUTATION:</li> <li>How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?</li> <li>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</li> <li>Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?</li> </ul>						
Using the above crite each debater:	ria, please	offer comp	/ liments and/o	r sugge:	stions for in	nprovement to
Affirmative: Posi enunciation disticult to un ciquiments Too much of the Monotonal. No	Osesato	tion essas	Negative STG onco Excelled Well o	<b>V</b> 21CE It USR 11 GU 80	end good Scitat	d anunciation. Tions.
Main points. Need beller cit Up Contextions	rations 1					
of Coursellois	<b>&gt;</b>					
SPEAKER CODE #:_	<u>c5</u>	on the (Al	FF or NEG)	s this de	bate.	
REASON FOR DECISION	NC	0 <del>55</del> :1W	lative did	Ton	provide	e soudance for
how a	c qon 1	الاحداد المحادا	19 6N2020	publ	ic safeti	y which was
his m	oly bor	int- Smc	thing bare	of Fo	easabili?	e evidence for y which was ty was well

<del>dina</del> Habib (\*22) Round 1A 9:00am A1 Aff: 2 Nadler

Neg: 12 Choudhry Novice L-D Debate

# LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: Fairl Halit

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista High.

AFF: Speaker Code #: Nadle-	NEG: pts_26_ Speaker Code #: Chow any	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**

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

### CASE ANALYSIS:

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

### **ORGANIZATION:**

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

#### **VALUE CLASH:**

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her ide, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

#### **REFUTATION:**

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

## • DELIVERY/COURTESY:

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

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

Focusing on sayety & Violance.

Well present her case

Clear deliver's

Supported her values

Focusing Hand Guny's Gund Well prepared case analysis focused rebuttal Organization was good.

SPEAKER CODE #: Choudary on the Neg wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG) Clear points on the topic and well presented rebuttads. REASON FOR DECISION

Habib (\*22) Round 1B 9:00am A1 Aff: 19 Jerez

Neg: 8 Makkapati

Novice L-D Debate

# Judge's Name: Fais al Haris

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Viola High

Speaker Code #:_	AFF: Jenez	pts_26_	Speaker Code #: NEG:	pts_28
	each speaker p		on the following scale:	omenous contrage (Spectrum Communication)

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**

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

## **CASE ANALYSIS:**

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

#### ORGANIZATION:

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

#### **VALUE CLASH:**

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

#### **REFUTATION:**

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

#### DELIVERY/COURTESY:

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

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

Negative
Evidences and their backgrounds
Citations were presented.
Well argued rebuttal
Concise points
Focused delivery Affirmative: Clear presentation
Statistics related to gar
destabilities
Well presented an gument MEG.

SPEAKER CODE #: Making on the wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

Mahhapati presented the data for chis value criterian and his rebuttals were focused. REASON FOR DECISION

Rd I Pm P3 Novice L-D	
Rd 1 Pm P3 Novice L-D Aft: 19 Lisa Romero	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
weg: 22 Abhimanyn Gupta	Judge's Name:
<b>y</b>	Judge's School Affiliation:
AFF: Zonesis Speaker Code #: 19 pts 23	Speaker Code #: 27 pts 28
Please award each speaker points based o	
	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair <b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ging Criteria
Using the above criteria, please offer com each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS:	
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the	resolution?
<ul> <li>EVIDENCE:</li> <li>Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, should be used to support arguments. How effective was the</li> </ul>	evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) he evidence?
ORGANIZATION:  Howard life the debates are reliable to the the construction of th	d melantial an archae?
How well did the debater organize both the constructive an  • VALUE CLASH:	na reduttai speeches?/
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being sup (Criterion)	ported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the <b>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</b>	e opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pl	easant, easily understandable, and civil?
	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater: well le	no on both siles, althout naling waters
A CC	137
Thougasquents, but never	- One glang mustate hongems have ten
considered fre as gunent that	
countered fre angument that where I grow laws are reported,	used for men shootings a several untare
	7 1 -1 79.21/20 1993.) (12422134/60) (14124-300) (170-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-
Willence goes up - also down not	Case that owing a gree provides security
effectively lead with the fact That	to the mander was
Covers O. O. O. Sugar to att to set	the monge que promdes accurry
in the state of th	case that owing a gree That he made his uns. Surprised the district whomles security
SPEAKED CODE # 1272	No a min shir dahara
SPEAKER CODE # 277 on the	AFF or NEG)
REASON FOR DECISION	A = A + A + A + A + A + A + A + A + A +
The main reason way That The	aff never moved her minay coutenter that That
it is gram availability That in one	ang ques will not revove Them from Two hands
well-meaning cotineers - and b	any ques well not recove Them of your House of
7-29	1 1 0 0/1 (Munch).

I <b>ngie Sun (*8)</b> d 1A 9:00am A3 22 Cheng	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate  Judge's Name: Changie Sun					
2 Poten	Tradesia Sala al Asserta de Danda de Maria de Maria					
ce L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Doughy Valley high  NEG:					
AFF·	NFG:					
Speaker Code #: 22	pts 27 Speaker Code #: 2. pts 38. 1					
Please award each speaker j	points based on the following scale: 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 Griteria					
Using the above criteria, ple	ease offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for					
each debater:						
• CASE ANALYSIS:						
How well did the debater develop a cas  • EVIDENCE:	se in response to the resolution?					
	ogic and persuasion evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) How effective was the evidence?					
• ORGANIZATION:	The walker was the strained.					
How well did the debater organize both	h the constructive and rebuttal speeches?					
VALUE CLASH:  University of the deleter of the						
(Criterion)	the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?					
• REFUTATION:						
	the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?					
DELIVERY/COURTESY:  Did each debater speak in communication	ive style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?					
Dia cuch accure speak in communicati	The style flat was pleasant, easily understandable, and eith:					
Using the above criteria, ple	ease offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to					
each debater:						
Affirmative:	Negative   Negative					
- need build more	childence. good speak with confidence and					
- he ed build more eye - improve good venta - saateel value aga very well.	he shers					
- improve good venta	fit good eye contact good attact on there					
' , /	and rebuild her own side.					
- Stated value apo	2 contents					
very well.						
<i>J</i> ,						
CDE AMED CODE "	ALT C					
SPEAKER CODE #: 2	on the <u>NEG</u> wins this debate.					
DE LOOVED DECICES	(AFF or NEG)					

NEG did very well or debasing when attack AFF is contention and emphasized his own contentions.

Changie Sun (*8) Round 1B 9:00am A3	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate  Judge's Name: Chargre Sun				
Aff: 2 Aldana					
Neg: 22 Habib Novice L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Doughty Valley high  NEG: Speaker Code #: 22 pts 2				
AFF:	NEG:				
Speaker Code #: 2 pts 18	Speaker Code #: 22 pts 12 2				
NI	y some of the angle of department of the energy of the some the energy of the some of the energy of the some of the energy of th				
Please award each speaker points based	0				
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)				
	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior				
Juo	dging Criteria				
	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement for				
• CASE ANALYSIS:					
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the	ne resolution?				
• EVIDENCE:					
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion should be used to support arguments. How effective was	n, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) sthe evidence?				
• ORGANIZATION:					
How well did the debater organize both the constructive	and rebuttal speeches?				
<ul> <li>VALUE CLASH:         How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being su         (Criterion)     </li> </ul>	apported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?				
• REFUTATION:					
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of t	he opposition and rebuild his/her own side?				
<ul> <li>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</li> <li>Did each debater speak in communicative style that was</li> </ul>	pleasant easily understandable and civil?				
	producting capity understandable, and ervin				
Using the above criteria, please offer cone each debater:	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to				
Affirmative:	Negative				
improve eye contact and/	be nice speech and eye contact. did				
improve eye contact and he more contident on cross-examination	very well on debany and remphasize own				
and Rebuttal	Contentions.				
	the <u>NEG</u> wins this debate.				
REASON FOR DECISION	(AFF or NEG)				
Gard evidence to support NE Well	6:1 contentions. Addanted AFF's contention vory				

Karina Rehemtulla (*16) Round 1A 9:00am A2 Aff: 22 Wei	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debates  Judge's Name: Nat (Ma Kliewall C				
Neg: 8 Tang Novice L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:				
Speaker Code #: AFF: 22 Wi pt	ts 19 Speaker Code #: NEG: Speaker Code #: Spe				
	29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good				
27 = Good (but possibly a) $26-25 = Fair$ $24-20 = Poor$	not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)  <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior				
	Judging Criteria				
Using the above criteria, please offe each debater:	er compliments and/or/suggestions for improvement for				
CASE ANALYSIS:					
How well did the debater develop a case in respon  EVIDENCE:	se to the resolution?				
Although value debating emphasizes logic and per should be used to support arguments. How effecti	rsuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) ive was the evidence				
ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constr	uctive and rebuttal speeches?				
VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the deboter emphasize the value by	SH:				
(Criterion)	ater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?				
REFUTATION:  How thoroughly did the debater refute the argume	ents of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?				
• DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communicative style the	at was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?				
Using the above criteria, please offe each debater:	er compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to				
. Affirmative:	Negative				
O Good argument	1 OK arguneut				
andouce'	E) weak strained				
3 Dood Evidence	3 OK OZYAMIZATION				
3 Dood organization	(4) not vert clear.				
W Vory good	3 missed on many points				
(5) 4 x cell (6)	6 good.				
@ outstandary deleving.					
SPEAKED CODE #. '// G')0 \	on the AFF wins this debate.				
REASON FOR DECISION	(AFF OF NEG)				
She had a son	(AFF or NEG)  Id argument. Of position ded  nts made. Herei's arguments  through out.				
not attack poi	nts made. The s				
WUS consistant	- through out				

# LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Karina Rehemtulla (\*16) Judge's Name: Round 1B 9:00am A2 Aff: 22 Khan Neg: 20 Kareti Judge's School Affiliation: Novice L-D Debate Speaker Code #: 22 Khan pts 28 Speaker Code #: NEG: Wart 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 = Fair24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior **Judging Criteria** Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater: • CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution? Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted paterial, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence? • ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches? VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion) **REFUTATION:** How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? • DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? Using the above criteria, please offer/compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Affirmative: Negative wins this debate. SPEAKER CODE #: 12 Good Strong argument. a clear argument. Consistant with points REASON FOR DECISION

Yiming Yao (*16) Round 2A 11:00am A1 Aff: 12 Choudhry	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: YMING YAP
Neg: 19 Zhu Novice L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista
Speaker Code #: / 2 pts 29	NEG: 19 pts 28
Please award each speaker points based 30 = Perfect 29 =	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	
.Juc	lging Criteria
	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	
• CASE ANALYSIS:	
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the	e resolution?
<ul> <li>EVIDENCE:</li> <li>Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion</li> </ul>	n, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)
should be used to support arguments. How effective was	the evidence?
• ORGANIZATION:	
How well did the debater organize both the constructive a  • VALUE CLASH:	and reduttal speeches?
	apported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of t	he opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
• DELIVERY/COURTESY:	
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was p	pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer coreach debater:	hpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative:	Negative
Well propared	Well pared speech & argun
Fluent delivery	Well pared speech & argum Good use of evidence, Logical organisation
Carl Chard agetonia	Logical organisation
Good hand gestperin	
A lot of citations + evid	eaces
	much
Should have more eye co	netate Fry not to read too much
	from notes
	the <u>AFF</u> wins this debate.
	(AFF or NEG)

AFF won on stronger rebutal and cross examination

Yiming Yao (*16)			LINCOL	N DOU	GLAS Deb	ate	
Round 2B 11:00am A1	,		Judge's Name:		•		
Neg: 19 Alam 10:45 -5 Novice L-D Debate	how. Ju	1	Judge's School A	ffiliation:	Monte	Vista	
AFF: Speaker Code #:	_8	pts_29	Speaker Code #:_	NEG:	19	pts 28'	
Please award each s			n the following Outstanding 28	_	<del>3</del> ood	toprode Killia Albera	
27 = Go 26-25 = Fair			d enough to qual <20 = Reserve				
		Jude.	ging Criteria				
Using the above crite each debater:	eria, pleaso	•		r suggest	tions for impr	ovement for	
• CASE ANALYSIS:							
How well did the debater de  • EVIDENCE:	velop a case in	response to the	resolution?				
Although value debating em should be used to support ar				aterial, conte	mporary or historic	cal examples)	
<ul> <li>ORGANIZATION:</li> <li>How well did the debater or</li> </ul>	ganize both the	constructive an	nd rebuttal speeches!				
<ul> <li>VALUE CLASH:</li> </ul>						10	
How clearly did the debater (Criterion)	emphasize the	value being sup	ported by his/Her sid	le, and how w	vell was that value	measured?	
<ul><li>REFUTATION:</li><li>How thoroughly did the deb</li></ul>	ater refute the a	arguments of the	e opposition and rebu	uild his/her o	wn side?		
<ul> <li>DELIVERY/COURT</li> <li>Did each debater speak in co</li> </ul>	ESY:	_					
Tieine Abaabana anii			/ li 1/		······································		
Using the above crite each debater:	eria, pieaso	e oner com		or suggest	nons for impi	ovement to	
Affirmative:			Negative	acad	dolina	v La	
foreeful deli	veil 4	. Ot guman	as Merc	paren	delive	9	
Good use of	escop	encas	Eye	Corrac	t 5	of territ	e.
. Affirmative: Torceful deli Good use of Logical and	can/2	ation	Good	use	OF CIT	iations	**
		,~	evid	ene			
Try to Rave more speaker code #:			- TIO / M	+ 1	read t	oo muc	L from
Try to Rave month	Rye	contact	S I I'V	100 .00	, 00	h L	stes
SPEAKER CODE #:	8	on th	ne <u>AFF</u> win AFF or NEG)	ıs this deb	ate.		
DEACON FOR DECIC	I CON	`					
AFF won	on cla	eareav	s stron	ger	argunic	ats e re	SU NAMA.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Lucas Tung (\*11) Judge's Name: Lucas Tura Round 2A 11:00am A2 Aff: 22 Garg Neg: 2 Nadler Judge's School Affiliation: James **Novice L-D Debate** AFF: NEG: pts 28 Speaker Code #: pts\_27 Speaker Code #: 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 = Fair24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior **Judging Criteria** Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater: • CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution? Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence? **ORGANIZATION:** How well did the debater organize both the constructive and reputtal speeches? How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion) • REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of/the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? **DELIVERY/COURTESY:** Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Affirmative: Negative · decent ideas in CX, but need to articulate better. · great volume & tone, but needs to pead loss & ' good voice projection. Can work on being more make more eye contact. Lots of filler words. Placent when presenting case, I more our contact · should take advantage of the fully CX time · very clean & organized case and responses, but to attack opponents we mock no value or cert or conversing the APFs. good case construction, but very mussy response be sure to point out areas where the Aff -left many parts of Neg case unrefuted doesn't respond to cortain part

REASON FOR DECISION

**SPEAKER CODE #:** 

22

Neg had no value or crit, so White her contentions were very clean & organized, there was no direction for them. Both teams can work on fluency & delivery more comprehensive rebuttals, but the Aff did a better job of stating how their arguments uphald the value/crit

(AF) or NEG)

wins this debate.

on the AFF

# Lucas Tung (\*11)

Round 2B 11:00am A2 Aff: 20 Kareti Neg: 19 Romero Novice L-D Debate

## LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Lucas Tung

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF: NEG:
Speaker Code #: 19 pts 28 Speaker Code #: 19 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**

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

#### CASE ANALYSIS:

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

#### EVIDENCE:

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

#### • ORGANIZATION:

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

#### VALUE CLASH:

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

#### REFUTATION:

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and ebuild his/her own side?

### • DELIVERY/COURTESY:

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

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

Affirmative:

clear tone and projection, but can work on reducing filler words and improving eye contact.

Strong case with good rhetoric. (ould have linked contentions to the value and crit a little more

great explanation of framework & could have challenged the iveg value/crit more strongly.

Negative

very crisp & clean speaker. Organized case and responded very clearly to Aff case.

State econ burden too big in first contention subpoint a., but contradicts self by saying econ impacts not relevant in Aff case:

excellent response to Aff value/crit, but tell me why that does anything for your case.

SPEAKER CODE #: on the NEG wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

### **REASON FOR DECISION**

Neg value crit didn't really make much sense, but explained the link to her value reasonably well. The arguments and response generally conveyed a stronger Ney understanding of the topic. While the Att had a very organized framework, she didn't explain how her contentions uphald her criterian.

# **Andrew Schwartz (\*18)**

Round 2A 11:00am P2 Aff: 8 Makkapati Neg: 22 Khan Novice L-D Debate

# LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Andrew Schwartz

Judge's School Affiliation: North 99 te

	AFF: a	0.4		NEG:	~ <del>~</del>
Speaker Code #:	<u> </u>	pts 26	Speaker Code #:	21_	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 rade or inappropriate behavior

# **Judging Criteria**

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

#### CASE ANALYSIS:

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

#### EVIDENCE:

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

#### • ORGANIZATION:

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

#### VALUE CLASH:

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

#### • REFUTATION:

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

### • DELIVERY/COURTESY:

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

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

Affirmative:	Negative 1 2 2 2 6 in the 10 w
+ Good job explaining your/case, I	+ you do a great job explaining your
understood it & it was easy	case nowever 1 feel that a
to flow.	weakness is that your case rarely makes
to flow. + you have a calm & clear	arguments that seen unique to
speaking style but you tend	handguns as opposed to Juns
to get lost/flustered occasionally	+ you do a good job coming w with arguments on the AFF's case.
The state of the second of the	arguments on the AFF's case.
-most of the neg's claims were	I Tust he save ( ) that these
about the teasibility of unpredictability	Anickly 1 11 1 1 1 1
of crime but these go both ways!	Thickly built attachs don't
when you SPEAKER CODE #: 22 on the	NG wins this debate. Contradict one
itert a TOED (AFF	Tust be careful that these suickly built attacks don't Neg wins this debate. Contradict one for NEG) another. The AFF (could have blown big hales lust in you case with them I had he called them
REASON FOR DECISION	Translation of the state of the
point with "my opponents aid 1 1/2.	, really have blown by hales
consider instead referring 19 on Va	lust in you case with them
to where on the flow of 1 dirain . I	I had he called them
ner avgument:	+ 9 and Value Isaa - Lul

# Andrew Schwartz (\*18) Round 2B 11:00am P2

Aff: 2 Poten Neg: 22 Wei Novi

LINCOLN, DQUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: Atrivew & Judgert?

Neg: 22 Novice	z vvei L-D Debate	Jı	idge's School Affiliation	n: Northac	ite.
	Speaker Code #: AFF:	pts_ <u>28</u> S	NEG:	22	pts_2 <b>7</b>
	Please award each speak	Mark to the Control of	the following scale	2. 1277年123日報報のSpecial Property advisors are provided	CASCALLICATION COMMITTEE C
		but possibly not good e -20 = Poor	enough to qualify for exercise < 20 = Reserved for the second sec	•	
	Using the above criteria		ng Criteria iments and/or sugg	gestions for impro	ovement for
	<ul> <li>each debater:</li> <li>CASE ANALYSIS:</li> <li>How well did the debater develop</li> <li>EVIDENCE:</li> <li>Although value debating emphasiz should be used to support argumer</li> </ul>	es logic and persuasion, ev	idence (quoted material, co	ontemporary or historice	al examples)
<ul> <li>ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?</li> <li>VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)</li> </ul>				neasured?	
<ul> <li>REFUTATION:         How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/         DELIVERY/COURTESY:         Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable     </li> </ul>					
	Using the above criteria each debater:	, please offer compl	iments and/or sugg	gestions for impro	ovement to
Very + Strong - Even if it does n' evidence	Affirmative:  ong case that  exsy to  cross × sh  she did drop y  thurt to disp  behind y  the such a hu  unentation through	our value oute the ner criterion	more deve tif your to make a round is; go hard	elopment on value is a difference undoed the on it. T	several great only have like your offcas different enough in how the you need to lovel your
t 1 0000 avg	SPEAKER CODE #:	on the	AFF wins this	your OV debate. AV7u	imentation ic
- A(I)VA /A	runentation through  SPEAKER CODE #:  REASON FOR DECISION  ind great but  like you  sasily side  decinning of 2			heed	tic bat I to hear e on the ne level

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate  Judge's Name: Oleg Millingsei
Judge's Hame.
Judge's School Affiliation: Buarry Lane
NEG:
Speaker Code #: pts <u>96</u>
on the following scale:
Outstanding 28 = Very Good
ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
dging Criteria
mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
he resolution
on, evidenc¢ (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)
s the evidence?
and rabilities are called?
and rebuttal speeches?
upported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
the ppposition and rebuild his/her own side?
pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Negative
1. calm speake & -wester good
and I in some ways around att side
and 2 in some ways argued att side,
and 2 in some ways argued off side, however good points of diff methods of glan improvment
3.
the AFF wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)
(AFF or NEG)

Oleg Tiktinslei (\*20) Round 2B 11:00am A3 Aff: 22 Habib Neg: 9 Waterson Judge's School Affiliation: Novice L-D Debate NEG: pts 6 Speaker Code #: Speaker Code #: 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 = Fair24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior **Judging Criteria** Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater: CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution? Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence? **ORGANIZATION:** How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches? **VALUE CLASH:** How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion) **REFUTATION:** How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? **DELIVERY/COURTESY:** Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Affirmative: 2. Good speach, emotional. 2. Could be more prepared. 1. Studez a bit 2. Interripted opponent. tem

REASON FOR DECISION

Both speaker pretty equal.

	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: K. Juhelium			
Aff: 20 Shvakel			14 11 School	
Neg: 19 Jerez Novice L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:	John Su	eff figh screen	
Speaker Code #: AFF: 20 Shwake pts 27	NEG: Speaker Code #: 19 9e	yer	pts <u>26</u>	
Please award each speaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = 0	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very	Good	к, столом <b>ация</b> на	
27 = Good (but possibly not goo	• , •		ls)	
	<20 = Reserved for ru			
Jud	lging Criteria			
Using the above criteria, please offer comeach debater:	npliments and/or sugges	stions for imp	provement for	
• CASE ANALYSIS:				
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the	e resolution?			
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion	<ul> <li>EVIDENCE:</li> <li>Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>ORGANIZATION:</li> <li>How well did the debater organize both the constructive at</li> </ul>	nd rebuttal speeches?			
	VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?			
,				
• DELIVERY/COURTESY:				
Using the above criteria, please offer comeach debater:	npliments and/or sugges	stions for imp Themselves	provement to  provement (  proventiate  prov	
Affirmative:			homicia	
d V/VC; unclear contentions	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	sout for	for CZ? within	
devidence peins ex spood doing cross of depine after region nearch lue clish? pelmitals	- good, clear	nganitation	for CZ?	
d going after riego meerch	- work on es	1055 IN	im?	
lue closh: od vefutation/retutals	Swhat were at	of and		
sol of	-value clash.  - work on "Uhs"	etc.	18	
1 10 UVUVIL + (MA) / 1 LOVA	1- 001	ر د	inderee for all	
d delinery + controls	- clear refretation	ime + have c	ontentions	
d fluntry + contrary	- clear with all to	hate	ontentions	
SPEAKER CODE #: 20 Showke on the	- Clear wife all to which all to he AFF wins this de AFF or NEG)	bate.	ontentions	
SPEAKER CODE #: 20 5 have ke on the	he AFF wins this de AFF or NEG)	pate.		

# LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: L. **Katherine Jubelirer (\*12)** Round 2B 11:00am P1 Aff: 2 Littlesun Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett High School Speaker Code #: NEG: pts 25 Neg: 22 Cheng Novice L-D Debate Speaker Code #: 2 Little sum pts 26 Speaker Code #: 22 Chling 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) 24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior 26-25 = Fair**Judging Criteria** Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater: **CASE ANALYSIS:** How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution? Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence? **ORGANIZATION:** How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches? How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by higher side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion) • REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? **DELIVERY/COURTESY:** Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Proth timer etiquete - ask judge it heady to start time ea. time each debater: Negative - pretty good croppex - Widence for ea. contention! - Clear organization + refretation - Value clash good - not sure about case anely sis— quas trane witentions? - nee all time! - good organization - clear Affirmative: - clear speaker - good organization - all contentions need evidence (CIT) . use all time - good crops ex on value clash - good value clash nebutal - prictly good overal rebuttal - chations

SPEAKER CODE #: 2 Little on the AFF wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Very close, based on better argument

Datta Round 2	Makkapati (*8)  11:00am P3 (single flight)	Ju	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate adge's Name: Sanicili Call		
	Ramirez L-D Debate	Ju	udge's School Affiliation: PVHS		
	AFF: Speaker Code #: <u> </u>	upta pts <u>26</u> s	NEG: peaker Code #: 1 Ramirez pts 25		
	Please award each spe		the following scale: tstanding 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 be				
		Judgir	ng Criteria		
	Using the above critericach debater:	ia, please offer compl	iments and/or suggestions for improvement for		
	• CASE ANALYSIS:				
	How well did the debater develo	op a case in response to the res	solution?		
			idence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)		
	<ul><li>should be used to support argun</li><li>ORGANIZATION:</li></ul>	nents. How effective was the	evidence?		
	How well did the debater organ	ize both the constructive and r	rebuttal speeches?		
	VALUE CLASH:  How clearly did the debater emi	nhasize the value being sunno	rted by/his/her side, and how well was that value measured?		
	(Criterion)	phasize the value being suppor	ned by mis ner side, and now wen was that value measured.		
	<ul> <li>REFUTATION:</li> <li>How thoroughly did the debater</li> </ul>	refute the arguments of the or	position and rebuild his/her own side?		
	DELIVERY/COURTEST	Y: /			
	Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?				
		ia, please offer compl	iments and/or suggestions for improvement to		
	each debater:				
	Affirmative:		Negative		
1.1		le february	· Stumbled a little bit around her point		
. • He	had great com	parisons man			
between U-	S & Australia		· Good Map Key points		
· (	culd us a mac.	edo contact	le o l ke hreath fer		
<u> </u>	· Could use more este contact relar, take a breath for . Forgot cross-examination clearer speach.				
	/		clearer speach.		
: W a	. Was fairly clear and corncise Be waterful of time.  . Strong rebotted				
, 5					
	SPEAKER CODE #: 2	12 Gupta on the	AFE_wins this debate.		
		(AF	F or NEG)		
	REASON FOR DECISIO	The book of	stronger argument with.		
	VILT(LW)	ATTIVE VILOR A			
	evidence to	back It up.			

70/10	•	
Ms. Kenney (*1) Round 3B 1:30pm P1 Aff: 19 Kelly	DO Judg	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate  Drian Ames NERVEY
Neg: 22 Khan Novice L-D Debate	Judg	e's School Affiliation: Meate Vistory
Speaker Code #: AFF: 19	pts <u>29</u> Spea	aker Code #: NEG: 22 pts
Please award each speaker	-	e following scale: anding 28 = Very Good
		ough to qualify for elimination rounds)
		0 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging	
Using the above criteria, p each debater:	lease offer complim	ents and/or suggestions for improvement for
<ul> <li>CASE ANALYSIS:</li> <li>How well did the debater develop a c</li> <li>EVIDENCE:</li> </ul>	ase in response to the resolu	ation?
Although value debating emphasizes should be used to support arguments.		nce (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) dence?
• ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize bo	th the constructive and rebu	attal speeches?
<ul> <li>VALUE CLASH:         How clearly did the debater emphasiz         (Criterion)     </li> </ul>	e the value being supported	by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
<ul> <li>REFUTATION:</li> <li>How thoroughly did the debater refut</li> </ul>	e the arguments of the oppo	sition and rebuild his/her own side?
<ul> <li>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</li> <li>Did each debater speak in communication</li> </ul>	ative style that was pleasant,	, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, p each debater:	lease offer complim	ents and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative:	• /	Negative
- GREAT COMMAND	/ - /	-CLEARLY REASONED ARGIMENTS,
DEBATE PROCE		- APPROPRIATE RELEVANT
- POSITION NEED SUPPORTIVE EVID		EVIDENCE
- REFUTATION NE	_ /   -	-REPUTATIONS LARGEY EFFEAVE
BE POINTAN	WENT !	- NEED TO APPEAR MORE CONFIDENT
- GKEAT/1Je		MOKE CHIVE IDEAL
SPEAKER CODE #:	on the K	
REASON FOR DECISION	(Arr o	or NEG)

Roopali Bali (\*10) Round 3A 1:30pm A2 Aff: 19 Romero Neg: 2 Novice

# LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Livicoi	$\mathcal{M}$	JAD DEDAIL
Industry	Wasse II	Bah
Juage's Name:_		$900 \mathrm{M}$
_		<b>O</b>

Neg: 2 Littlesun Novice L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
AFF: 19 pts 2	Speaker Code #:pts_26
27 = Good (but possibly not §	= Outstanding 28 = Very Good good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair <b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	udging Criteria ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
How well did the debater develop a case in response to	the resolution?
<ul> <li>should be used to support arguments. How effective w</li> <li>ORGANIZATION:</li> <li>How well did the debater organize both the constructiv</li> <li>VALUE CLASH:</li> </ul>	e and rebuttal speeches?  supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?  f the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
Did each debater speak in communicative style that wa	s pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer co	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	- Stricter Dackground  - Stricter Dackground  - Ban will lead to uncrease  - black market a chuity  - ban will make it exclusive  to criminals.  (AFF) wins this debate.  (AFF) wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION Neg for	effected the debate due to
health reasons.	

Roopali Bali (\*10)

Round 3B 1:30pm A2 Aff: 12 Choudhry Neg: 22 Wei Novice L-D Debate

# LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

	<b>7</b> 2)' ~ '	ـ جهرت ت		, a co
Judge's Name:_	KMMI		'ARM	
dage brianio	17WV	ZV (A)L	(1) (0.1	

Judge's School Affiliation: \( \mathcal{HS} \)

AFF: 10	20	NEG:	.27
Speaker Code #:	pts 20 Speaker Code #:_	22	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**

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

### • CASE ANALYSIS:

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

#### EVIDENCE:

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or bistorical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

### ORGANIZATION:

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

#### VALUE CLASH:

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

#### • REFUTATION:

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

#### • DELIVERY/COURTESY:

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

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

Affirmative:	Megative of Life
V= Safety waters	Megative Proketion of Life
VCz Rejeding v wlence	VC=Protection of Right
HG # 1 most used firearm	
in hand call studel.	
b a a company to 100 persons	- regulate cheek needed of all
due to lack of gun laws.  -21 yr old can pup it	- regulat check helder of all C2 - Too hard to get rid of all
-21 yrold can pup it	Has. when you
w/o background sheek.	You don't know when you
2- Most guns put, oxuned,	C3 - You don't know when you need to protect yourself
2- Most guns DV+, Od Chared with family Attings.	
ann arm anna	444

REASON FOR DECISION Both dibaters aid rest a good job presenting their case. Neg. was unable to link her value to VC & her and then accepted during debate that her value was wrong & her opponents was right. Aft should work on more eye contact. Aft was able to defend the contentions & did well during CX.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Oleg Tiktinslei (\*20) Judge's Name: Ulea likelin Ski Round 3A 1:30pm P2 Aff: 2 Poten Neg: 22 Garg Judge's School Affiliation: Uva fr Novice L-D Debate AFF: NEG: pts 29 Speaker Code #: Speaker Code #: 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 Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater: CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence? **ORGANIZATION:** How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches? **VALUE CLASH:** How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion) **REFUTATION:** How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? • DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Affirmative: 1. Good speaker +1

2. Good speaker +1

3. Stronger argument.

3. Good point about Background checks. (AFF or NEG) REASON FOR DECISION While Both & debaters pretty good, AFF had Stronger arguments and better speach.

Oleg Tiktinslei (\*20)
Round 3B 1:30pm P2
Aff: 19 Zhu
Neg: 2 Nadler
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: Ofen Tiktingki

ſ

D Debate	Ju	adge's School Affiliation:	Guarry Lane
AFF: Speaker Code #:	pts <u>27</u> S <sub>j</sub>	NEG: peaker Code #:	pts_ <u>28</u>
Please award each spea	-	_	
		tstanding 28 = Very G	
	`	enough to qualify for elim	, ,
26-25 = Fair 24	1-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rud	e or inappropriate behavior
	Tudair	ng Criteria	
Using the above criteria	9	,	ions for improvement for
each debater:	, preuse offer compr	mones und or suggest	
• CASE ANALYSIS:			
How well did the debater develop	a case in response to the res	solution?	
• EVIDENCE:			
Although value debating emphasishould be used to support argume			nporary or nistorical examples)
• ORGANIZATION:			
How well did the debater organiz	e both the constructive and r	ebuttal speeches?	
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater empl	nasize the value heing sunno	rted by his/her side, and how w	ell was that value measured?
(Criterion)	lasize the value being suppor	ned by misther side, and now w	en was that value measured.
• REFUTATION:		/	
<ul><li>How thoroughly did the debater r</li><li>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</li></ul>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	pposition and rebuild his/her ov	vn side?
Did each debater speak in commu	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ant, easily understandable, and	civil?
	i, please offer compl	iments and/or suggest	ions for improvement to
each debater:		• 0	
Affirming Nea	ativela	Namina Alli	>mative:
10 10 1 9		Noguetas / 1 / /	indifferent formation of the second
1. Good Point also	ut equalizes	1. Good spec	ich. Lots of good
on I Paul	of All aug	lacks	
2. 6-60 d VOINT	1000,1 gra	Tacrs.	$a \in \mathbb{A}$
Ran -> alco	hol ban	2. Calm.	zmative: ach. lots of good may be lit
W		100 11 TO 01 2.1	iculation
s. Teip over gy	ass ! tunny	10000	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	۵		
/			
/ n		1/6/	
SPEAKER CODE #: 2	/Vaa 1e2 on the	<i>Nと</i> し wins this deba	ate.
(	(AF	F or NEG)	

REASON FOR DECISION

(19)		
Cenney (*1)	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate	
3A 1:30pm P1 2 Cheng	Judge's Name: Brian Yu Sam Kobers	
3 Makkapati e L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Monto Visto	
Speaker Code #: AFF: 22 pts 28	NEG: pts 28	
Please award each speaker points based o	,	
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)	
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior	
Jud	ging Criteria	
Using the above criteria, please offer com each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for	
• CASE ANALYSIS:		
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the <b>EVIDENCE</b> :	resolution	
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion,	evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)	
<ul> <li>should be used to support arguments. How effective was the ORGANIZATION:</li> </ul>	he eyldence?	
How well did the debater organize both the constructive an	d rebuttal speeches?	
	ported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?	
(Criterion)  • REFUTATION:		
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the	e opposition and rebuild his/her own side?	
DELIVERY/COURTESY:  Did each debater speak in communicative style that was placed as the style of the st	easant, easily understandable, and civil?	
Using the above criteria, please offer com each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to	
/	N dan	
Affirmative:	Negative Chroat (TD) trus	
Makesure tyose all	all the tree	
retime you have an all the	Con the you have	
very good to b try	lovder	
TO Speanfalithe lower		
	ne AFI wins this debate.	
REASON FOR DECISION	AFF or NEG)	
Botheradimens	-Ramare W	
· Offer any many	from app them neg	
	$\smile$	

Ta Habib (*22) nd 3 1:30pm P3 (single flight)	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: Faisch Habib
8 Tang g: 9 Waterson vice L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista High
AFF: Speaker Code #: Tang	pts 28 Speaker Code #: NEG: pts 27
30 = P	Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Using the above criteria, ple	Judging Criteria ease offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
<ul> <li>CASE ANALYSIS:</li> <li>How well did the debater develop a case</li> <li>EVIDENCE:</li> <li>Although value debating emphasizes log should be used to support arguments. H</li> <li>ORGANIZATION:</li> <li>How well did the debater organize both</li> <li>VALUE CLASH:</li> <li>How clearly did the debater emphasize to (Criterion)</li> <li>REFUTATION:</li> <li>How thoroughly did the debater refute to DELIVERY/COURTESY:</li> <li>Did each debater speak in communicative</li> </ul>	gic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)  Now effective was the evidence?
Affirmative: Well presented responses sepolution. Strong points during Shows great capacity Overcon opponents Strong performance	city to strong presentation supportive.

SPEAKER CODE #: Tang on the AFF wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Tang showed strong performances during rebuttles. She state was able able to emphysized on how value of and at the meaning was able to counter the opponent arguments in a concise manner.

Irina Kizler (*16) Round 3A 1:30pm A1			LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name:			
Aff: 1 R	amirez		1			
Neg: 20 Novice	L-D Debate		Judge's School Affiliation:			
	AFF: Speaker Code #:		295 Speaker Code #:_	NEG: /	pts_27. S	
	Please award each sp			•		
	27 – Co.		= Outstanding 28	, •	1.	
	26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor		fy for elimination rounted for rude or inappro		
			Judging Criteria			
	Using the above crite each debater:	ria, please offer o	compliments and/o	r suggestions for im	provement for	
	CASE ANALYSIS:  How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?					
	• EVIDENCE: Although value debating emp			terial, contemporary or history	orical examples)	
	• ORGANIZATION:					
	<ul><li>How well did the debater orga</li><li>VALUE CLASH:</li></ul>	anize both the constructi	ve and reduttal speeches?			
	How clearly did the debater en (Criterion)	mphasize the value being	g supported by his/her side	e, and how well was that val	ue measured?	
	• REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debat	er refute the arguments	of the opposition and rebu	ild his/her own side?		
	DELIVERY/COURTE  Did each debater speak in con	SY:				
	Using the above crite each debater:		compliments and/o	r suggestions for im	provement to	
	Affirmative:		Negative			
d	i wak buring (	<u>.</u>	-Look ax	100.10 July	CX	
· earst	Affirmative:		-Speak 1	nor clearly		
- 610		/	-Pon't	just re-read	case during	
Bring	across augumen	/ 413		Try to eng	i e	
Mod			arjumnt	s more.		
	okat opporent		1 1	police will not ate ownership	have hand juns	
	SPEAKER CODE #:_		n the Aff win	s this debate.		
	REASON FOR DECISION	ON	(AFF or NEG)			
	Aff engages	ر روز فی حدور	ments but	ter and enone	woh L.	
	gung ann't use	s site or insy	l for srlf-9	etinge and	+ K	

presence of miternatives

Irina Kizler (*16) Round 3B 1:30pm A1	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate  Judge's Name:		
Aff: 2 Aldana	Judge's School Affiliation:		
AFF: 2 pts 27	Speaker Code #:pts27. S		
	utstanding 28 = Very Good		
	enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior		
.Indgi	ing Criteria		
	diments and/or suggestions for improvement for		
each debater:			
• CASE ANALYSIS:			
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the re  EVIDENCE:	esolution?		
	vidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) e evidence?		
• ORGANIZATION:			
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and  VALUE CLASH:	rebuttal speeches?		
	orted by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?		
<ul> <li>REFUTATION:</li> <li>How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the office of the contraction of t</li></ul>	opposition and rebuild his/her own side?		
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was plea	sant, easily understandable, and civil?		
Using the above criteria, please offer comp each debater:	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to		
Affirmative: 'Look case	Negative · Solik. case		
. The arecdok is strange.	. I think discussion of assault weapons;		
· peed stats even in L	7 ( re le v « n >		
. Discussion of morality of salt-betense	· you should respond to opportunt in		
scened out of place	cirst speach		
. Need to report to opporents and more			
substandively			
SPEAKER CODE #: 19 on the			
REASON FOR DECISION	FF or (EG)		
Neg is more responsive and	shows that the ban		
	k reduct for self-definge		

# Lucas Tung (\*11)

Round 3A 1:30pm A3 Aff: 22 Habib Neg: Novic

# LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: LUCAS Tung

Neg: 20 Shvakel Novice L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan
AFF: Speaker Code #: 22	NEG:  pts 28 Speaker Code #: 20 pts 28
	based on the following scale:  29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good  not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	
Using the above criteria, please of	Judging Criteria fer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
<ul> <li>ORGANIZATION:</li> <li>How well did the debater organize both the const</li> <li>VALUE CLASH:</li> <li>How clearly did the debater emphasize the value (Criterion)</li> <li>REFUTATION:</li> <li>How thoroughly did the debater refute the argum</li> <li>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</li> </ul>	ersuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) tive was the evidence?
Using the above criteria, please off each debater:	er compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative:  crisp and clear delivery, though	Negative  Simewhat excellent understanding of fallacies and logic  analysis
monotone and shakey good job refuting the notion that nely on old documents, but contradict mentioned ontherce from 1997.	put delivery is rather monstone.
REASON FOR DECISION  The greation of why have alleged to	on the <u>AFF</u> wins this debate.  (AFF or NEG)

The question of why we ought to ban guns was never answered by the Neg & pushed by the Aff does a good jub of laying out clear votors and better links his contentions to the value

# Lucas Tung (\*11)

Round 3B 1:30pm Å3 Aff: 22 Gupta Neg: 19 Alam Novice L-D Debate

## LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Lucas Tung

Judge's School Affiliation: James Loyan.

AFF: NEG: Speaker Code #: Speaker Code #:

# 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**

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

#### CASE ANALYSIS:

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

### **ORGANIZATION:**

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

#### **VALUE CLASH:**

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

#### **REFUTATION:**

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

### **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

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

Affirmative:

'decent fluency & lack of filler words, but does a lot of distracting swaying while speaking. Also has hands in pockets a lot pretty organized case, but needs to link arguments to the value/crif more

Negative.

"Uhhh, what happened to the Aff case CX? has a decent fluency & voice projection · makes some appeals to logic. had no value/crit & didn't contest HEF. F.W.

decont eye contact, but can be more articulate and not drop arguments.

on the AFF wins this debate. LPW 22 SPEAKER CODE #: (AFF) or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION** 

Aff actually provided a value/crit for the round and it wasn't contested. Was overall more organized on a more case argument basis. Both teams need to present clear voter issues and link to the salue/cnit.

Judge 1 Logan (\*11)
Round 4A 3:30pm A3
Aff: 22 Garg Neg: 12 Choudhry Novice L-D Debate

# LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: D-Ralston

Judge's School Assission Pri have older 1

•	Judge's School Affiliation: (7.3.3) 0 0000
Speaker Code #: 22 pts 26	Speaker Code #: 12 / pts 27
Please award each speaker points based on	the following scale:
30 = Perfect  29 = C	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good)	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rade or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ing Criteria
Using the above criteria, please offer comp	liments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	and the second s
• CASE ANALYSIS:	
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the re	esolution?
EVIDENCE:  Although value debeting appropriate levil and the second	
be used to support arguments. How effective was the eviden	vidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should
• ORGANIZATION:	··· /
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and	rebuttal speeches?
• VALUE CLASH:	
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being suppo (Criterion)	orted by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	/
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the	opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
• DELIVERY/COURTESY:	
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was please	sant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer/compl	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
/ Han	Agun owness p
Affirmative:	Negative Talking too fast makes it vary hand to follow work to make sure judge can follow t undestand logic of argument, wark on eye contact
Definedterms	Talking had fast makes it very hard to follow
Social contract principa, bont need to shout.	Licex to make since induces bellew & industring
and more eye contact please. Good initial	the formation of the second second second
evidence to back contention, food	TOTIL OF OFFICIENT , WELL DI ETE TOURS
LEPONICE DO COLLEGE COMMEDIA ACRELIONI	as well-
and handling opponents attempt to trip up.	Mentioned case of Walhington Oc as case but
Refutation was a little uncled but	begs question of benefit change if at all referen
	to head for death!
good persistence to keep line boing and	Good interegation of opponent contentions.
desending contentions.	Good ability to orthulate value clash and put
	Good aging portector value con
	opponent off-bolone. Ho A little dismissive a
:	opponent's statements.
SPEAKER CODE #: 22 on the	wins this debate.
(AI	FF or NEG)
REASON FOR DECISION	

overall good ability to hold onto consistent thread it argument + balanced presentation

D.Ral your Judge 1 Logan (\*11) Round 4B 3:30pm A3 Aff: 22 Wei

Neg: 19 Kelly Novice L-D Debate

# LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: D Ralsha

Ovice L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Billy Odo
26	,
AFF:	NEG:
Speaker Code #: 72 pts	Speaker Code #: pts 27
Please award each speaker points based o	n the following goals.
30 = Perfect 20 = 0	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not go	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	120 Reserved for rude of mappropriate behavior
Jud	ging Criteria
Using the above criteria, please offer comeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS:	
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the	resolution?
• EVIDENCE:	
be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence	evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should ence?
<ul> <li>ORGANIZATION:</li> <li>How well did the debater organize both the constructive and</li> </ul>	d rahuttal anged as 2
VALUE CLASH:	a reodular speccifies?
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supp (Criterion)	ported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the	opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
<ul> <li>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</li> <li>Did each debater speak in communicative style that was ple</li> </ul>	
2 to come decade, speak in communicative style that was pie	asant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative:	Nonting
- Very sond was at date + evidence	Negative
to surport to be a feet to	Good cross examination line to ger
TO SOPPOSE CONTENTION + CAR STUDIE	Good cross examination line to get concession from opponent.  In construction - reads too much of out eye
- Nice calm collected responses to	In construction - reads too much of out ege
Cross - god si to	contact judon't put paper in front of face.
- Probably work to stand more center	Good weente han it evidence to syport
+ confident poise. A Vit too	CONTENTION ON CRUMING 120 HON VIET
	Good use of info on Japan case study & other case
tidgety distracts frust listenins	study contentions (Europe etc.)
	Good responses to coss-examination &
- Better trucking of fime will hely	
	regative rebuttal points - could be
10	more concie
SPEAKER CODE #: 19	e <u>NE9</u> wins this debate.
	AFF or NEG)
REASON FOR DECISION	•
good overall + consist	ent presentation + use of
endence be	
Endence to sypo	or point.

Irina Kizles LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Nanlan Xu (\*16) Round 4A 3:30pm A1 Aff: 20 Shvakel Neg: 22 Gupta \* Novice L-D Debate Judge's School Affiliation: AFF: Shvalul pts 2 Speaker Code #: 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 ryde or inappropriate behavior **Judging Criteria** Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater: CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution? **EVIDENCE:** Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence? **ORGANIZATION:** How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebutal speeches? VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion) REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? **DELIVERY/COURTESY:** Did each debater speak in communicative style that yas pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Affirmative: Negative

SPEAKER CODE #: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ SKILLIO on the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Speaker of affirmative was more substential and persuasive.

Irina Kizler Nanlan Xu (\*16) Round 4B 3:30pm A1

Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Irina Kiz Cer Aff: 19 Alam Neg: 2 Aldana

Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS

Speaker Code #: 19 Han	pts_28	Speaker Code #:_	NEG: Aldana	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** 

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

CASE ANALYSIS:

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

ORGANIZATION:

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

VALUE CLASH:

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

REFUTATION:

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

**DELIVERY/COURTESY:** 

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, saily understandable, and civil?

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

•	/			
Affirmative: Strong case anlysis, ovganized leasy to p well supported. Not strong in your sid speech. You in watch out for use in like a during you	2nd and	You seemed	lead with	Aff case.
*		.7		

SPEAKER CODE #: 19 Allayon the Affror NEG) wins this debate.

Aff demonstated better command of the material, was earily to follow.

#### Sineesh Keshav (\*22)

Round 4B 3:30pm A2 Aff: 2 Nadler Neg: 1 Ramirez Novice L-D Debate

-Good

#### **LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate**

Judge's Name: SIPEESH KESHAV

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon VALET

to aff on questions raved during cross

	Speaker Code #: Pts 2 pts 27 Speaker Code #: NEG: 1 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 Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:
	<ul> <li>CASE ANALYSIS:</li> <li>How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?</li> <li>EVIDENCE:</li> <li>Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>ORGANIZATION:</li> <li>How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?</li> <li>VALUE CLASH:</li> </ul>
	How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?  (Criterion)  REFUTATION:  How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
	• DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
	Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and or suggestions for improvement to each debater:
Best	Poent Moment: Crass Affirmative:  Moment: Moment: Moment: Model citize  Negative  Negative  Forors relief too much on point  first seedlerating points made
Value:	Winth / just reversing points made
Good p	out about mental illnes / by AFF  14: no execontact while / - the self elegance - right to life
Neadling	go from now. for could - Great point about rights
un a	while . needing to be based on model alizeur.
Key cho Key opp	ingth: Coross Ex Key strength: Case Analysis which they: Delivery Key opportunity: handling of cross SPEAKER CODE #: 2 on the AFF wins this debate.
	(AFF or NEG)  REASON FOR DECISION
	- Both debaters were ellecture in month

## AFF

- Great point about "tenger may be pulling the lingger but the trigger is also pulling the tenger"
- Great cross excellent quentions
  on diff between
  pain meds a guns.
  used to save used to hill
  lives
- Rebuttal could have been better. Delivery.
- Close reiterated the points made in the Constructive. More effective would have been a regute.

## NEG

- Great example for pain meds
- Good stats on ineffectiveness of boar on guns.
- good point about Stanford purson experiments not being relevant to this debate
- Guns vs other means as a delenent - great point
- Close could have been better.

#### Sineesh Keshav (\*22)

Round 4A 3:30pm A2 Aff: 9 Waterson Neg: 19 Romero

#### LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: SINEESH KESHAN

Novice L-D Debate Judge's School Affiliation: AFF: Speaker Code #: Speaker Code #: 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 <20 = Reserved for rude of inappropriate behavior 24-20 = PoorJudging Criteria Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater: CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution? Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence? ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches? **VALUE CLASH:** How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion) REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? **DELIVERY/COURTESY:** Did each debater speak in communicative style that was ploasant, easily understandable, and civil? Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Best moment: Rebuttal & cross Bert moment: Close -Good noss good points on solvency issues with AFF. Value: prolection of life e skelveing gun related deaths - value criterion of bogie was refreshing. Ban cannot be enforced. - Gunlaws & death rates correlation -Good point about NRA exploiter - Good point about Avahal - Joo much reliance on hopin to childre · suicides & mass shoolings Banning gus do not prevent criminals Goss relied too much on information from arming themselves and not on substantive points Key strength: Delivery 2 organization Key opportunity: Rebuttal to refutations acy could be shought LEG wins this debate Key shength: Content revidence uppentury belivery: Fluency & consistency **SPEAKER CODE #:** on the NEG wins this debate. (AFF or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION** - Belter rebuttal and delivery

## APP

- Loved the Sonah Palin cross .. i
- not in the near future"
  liked the rebuttal to that
  se Black markets
- Great points but I think you got a little nervous on the rebuttal.
- Good point of refutation about costs on the black maked being a delerrent to criminals.

- Good finish!

## NEG.

- Lots of numbers. to support position
- Good point on black market
- Handled cross well.
- Good point about ratinal orights encompassing the AFF value-protection of life
- Good summary of negation to close.

Suzie Kito (\*9) Round 4B 3:30pm P1 Aff: 8 Makkapati

Neg: 19 Zhu Novice

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name:	SUZIK	K	sto		
		٠,	^	1	<u>_</u> 71(
Judge's School A	ffiliation:	El	lerr	,to	M

EL-D Debate	Judge's Scho	ol Affiliation: <u>El</u> Ce	M of, 12	
Speaker Code #:pts	26 Speaker Code	NEG: 19	pts 26	
Please award each speaker points b				
30 = Perfect	29 = Outstanding	28 = Very Good		
27 = Good (but possibly 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	not good enough to	o qualify for elimination eserved for rude or inar	rounds)	
	<b>120</b> – I(t	served for rude or map	ppropriate benavior	
Haine the shows to the second	Judging Criter			
Using the above criteria, please offe each debater:	r compliments an	d/or suggestions for i	mprovement for	
• CASE ANALYSIS:				
How well did the debater develop a case in respons	se to the resolution?			
EVIDENCE: Although value debating emphasizes logic and per	suasion, evidence (quote	d material contemporary or h	istorical examples) should	
be used to support arguments. How effective was	the evidence?	a material, contemporary of the	istorical examples) should	
<ul> <li>ORGANIZATION:</li> <li>How well did the debater organize both the constru</li> </ul>	active and rehuttal speed	1057		
<ul> <li>VALUE CLASH:</li> </ul>				
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value be (Criterion)	eing supported by his/her	r side, and how well was that t	value measured?	
• REFUTATION:	,			
<ul><li>How thoroughly did the debater refute the argumer</li><li>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</li></ul>	its of the opposition and	rebuild his/her own side?		
Did each debater speak in communicative style tha	t was pleasant, easily un-	derstandable, and civil?		
Using the above criteria, please offer	r compliments an	d/or suggestions for i	mprovement to	
Value/Crite	Lier Lan bet	Value (C)	- tellow	•
Affirmative: Societal Welfa  cited stats re: Violent crim  a spocks: 32  Contention#1: Guns in the large dampan	re Negative	pray,	mati/m	مسائند
rited statistics violent crim	re/HGHI/US	Contention #1	-> HG lan i'm	predict and o's
associo: 32,	k really di	+ wout	prevent AK	, Semi-am
Confention#1: Guns in the	intrame	eoula	) still be use	ed to conse
Λ	. 1	viol	lence.	2 1
society cannot prosperdue	t.	Contention #2	. HG ban does	not Iviolence
society cannot prosper due	M & .		b/c poerople ca	met protect
contention#2' eventhook train	ad in		b/c poerople ca	
gun use can harm oth	ers.		ell skull ablair	g quns.
- h + +2 - h / 2001 10	۱ -	· Nead, rather to	educate the	bublic.
speaker code #:  REASON FOR DECISION			000	<b></b>
SPEAKER CODE #:	on the AFF	wins this debate.	IEE wins be	COLOR
	(AFF or NEG)	wins this debate.		
			from were	be 17eg
First Rebuttal Handled, re	ebuttal well.	aliand	with his v	value &
(Answered re	.buttals E	11/2		1//
good re-	-ebuttal)	value	rultalion 4	DIC his
First Rebutted Handled re ————————————————————————————————————	to Black Mo	rlet   eviden	ce support	ted those contentions.

AFF \_ NEG stated that HG bun impractical - you should have argued that impracticality does not change the US Gov't to enact laws which I societal welfare.

- quoted, 2nd amendment stated why it doesn't apply

to contemporary Ha ownership-However, NEG, interestinply, rever raised the 2nd amendment.

- Addressed the reFulation about getting people to turn in their HG's. - "law-abiding citizeny )
would turn in their pag's"

# Constructive Criticism

appreciate the AFF work on improving organizn. While I general to provide anecdates, citations of studies tends, in anecdotes when more solid proof and therefore trumps economy of words is called for.

NEG-should have brought up the 2nd amendments-- should have emphasized your value criterion more. The value of pragmatism may not be the most powerful frame of reference when debating issues of safety and health, rather the value of equality or justice may have been more appropriate the value of equality or justice may have been more appropriate.

- AFF actually did address contention#1

- Strong point about how difficult it would be to deal with

a HG black morteet.

- NEG did not address why HG ban does not address
violence from AR's (as you pointed out.)

Suzie Kito (\*9) LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Round 4A 3:30pm P1 Aff: 20 Kareti Judge's Name: Neg: 22 Habib Novice L-D Debate 0 Cerc. Judge's School Affiliation:\_\_\_ NEG: 22 Speaker Code #: Speaker Code #: 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 simination rounds) 26-25 = Fair24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior **Judging Criteria** Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater: **CASE ANALYSIS:** How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution? Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence? ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rejuttal speeches? How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion) REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? **DELIVERY/COURTESY:** Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Negative

Negative

Cleverly used the device that

Nega can simply show that the only method be the only method be the only method be the only method be establish that he can win whom each debater: Affirmative: Value Cr.t. / afe

REASON FOR DECISION See Over - Successfully argued against the Should have plated - Successfully argued against the costs are hid this least of HG violence contention that costs are hid to safety. blc/cost is not due to NG is valid - costs are hid later de facto related to safety.

AFF value - that relationship should have been argued for

NEG

wins this debate.

on the

Failed to address the issue of homicide rate in Canada

very effective use of

Specific examplei.e. "2 generations

of the Chicagost

Kid, life soipped out"

JCG

- Addressed AFF arguments that
homicides are pinp by statists
that NEG argues for closive
that NeG argues that non-lawloopholes + ways that non-lawabiding citizens may harm others
with guns.

- handled the AFFs issue c constitution's importance well.

-"won" the alternatives argument.

During last speech, Att did -"wor a great job of tying the financial cost of gan handgun violence to decreased safety.

RATIONALE FOR DECISION

NEG won due to the fact that he successfully agreed that there were afternative rolutions of the issue which would not prevent American's from defending themselves and he successfully negated the AFF's rebuttols.

Danielle Kelly (\*19) LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Round 4B 3:30pm P2 Aff: 2 Littlesun Judge's Name: Neg: 8 Tang Novice L-D Debate Judge's School Affiliation: P// H Speaker Code #: 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 = Fair24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior **Judging Criteria** Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater: CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution? Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence? **ORGANIZATION:** How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches? VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion) REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? **DELIVERY/COURTESY:** Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Affirmative: Negative · She braght up good points in her cross with evidence and spoke with conviction and passion. a Good strong points with evidence to back it. \* Spoke in a clear, strong Voice with some eye contact "· Could have used more eye contact with opponent/judge · Jumped around a 6,2 in the last related SPEAKER CODE #: X 19191 (AFF or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION** She made a stronger argument with facts and evidence to back it up. The was organized and

therough.

Danielle Kelly (\*19) LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Round 4A 3:30pm P2 Aff: 22 Khan Judge's Name: | )Khi'ellu Neg: 2 Poten Novice L-D Debate Judge's School Affiliation: NEG: Speaker Code #: 72 Kl Speaker Code #: 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** Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater: CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution? Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence? ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebutal speeches? VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion) REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? **DELIVERY/COURTESY:** Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Affirmative: Negative Nery soft spoken and Very strong cross
almost seems timed with Spoke clearly and with conviction, her debate.

She had a few good school school points but lacked conviction

She made several good points and was organized with her material. · Very soft spoken and and evidence to support it. o she did excellent with her cross. I suggest speaking clear and with conviction to your side SPEAKER CODE #: 🕜 Poten on the <u>NEG</u> wins this debate. NEG clearly had the stronger Cise and had the endence, stats and conviction to back it up. **REASON FOR DECISION** 

#### Indu Kandasamy (\*8)

Round 4 3:30pm P3 (single flight)

Aff: 19 Jerez Neg: 22 Cheng Novice L-D Debate

### LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Erika Pineda

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell High School

AFF: Speaker Code #:	19	pts_ <u>28</u>	Speaker Code #:	NEG:	22	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**

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

#### **CASE ANALYSIS:**

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

#### **ORGANIZATION:**

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

#### VALUE CLASH:

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

#### **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

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

Affirmative: Great job! Good use of Try Keeping papers on the podium - it was a little distracting to have them in your

Really great-well thoughtont rebuttal. Your rationalizations rebuttal. Your rationalizations

The infrequently used words to improve pronunciation.

Argument was very well organized and thoughtfont.

The infrequently used words were very clear.

Watch the use of "uh", "um" your points are valid - you do not need the fillers.

SPEAKER CODE #: 22 on the Neg wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

**REASON FOR DECISION** 

This was a very close argument. Both sides did a great job presenting their argument. The negative side was able to present an effective rebuttal with appropriate rationales.