u cas Tung (*11) Jund 1A 9:00am R3		LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: Lucas Tung
f: 16 Fang		
eg: 8 Chillappagari arsity L-D Debate		Judge's School Affiliation: Janus Logan
AF	F:	NEG:
Speaker Code #:	<u>16 pts 29</u>	Speaker Code #: pts_27
Please award eac	h speaker points based or 30 = Perfect 29 = 0	n the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Gøod
27 =		l enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor	
	Judg	ing Criteria /
	riteria, please offer comp	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:		
CASE ANALYSIS		
	develop a case in response to the r	resolution?
	emphasizes logic and persuasion, e t arguments. How effective was the	evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) e evidence?
ORGANIZATION		
	organize both the constructive and	i rebuttal speeches?
 VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the deba (Criterion) 	ter emphasize the value being supp	ported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION :		
	debater refute the arguments of the	opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
DELIVERY/COU		
Did each debater speak i	1 communicative style that was plea	asant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above c	riteria, please offer comr	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:		siments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative:	/	Negative
	A stand mark	. good energy during CX. Needs to stand still 100 k
contact the	put need more leve	forward or straight.
too consistent	s but need more eye sust quick glances. ace. slow down for	
	rcc. now down for	· can't just say "it's clear to see" as replacement
inportant stats	· /	for stats. Need theory therough logical analysis
d job grilling la	ck of Neg epidence, bu	at to make up for lack of hard evidence.
	varied than "do yo	on could have pursued the minority oppression argument
we evidence for.	,	a lot stronger. Really push that Aff world
re focused more	on solvency than	freedom, equality
	esented. Stress mpx	
life much st	orger	- need more stats to support
SPEAKER CODE		e <u>AFF</u> wins this debate.
	A	FF or NEG)
REASON FOR DEC	SISION	nost of case, which wouldn't have been a prob

if there was clear & thorough logical analysis, Impact man calc on oppression of mine vs. arguably nonunique gun deaths would have been much stronger. Aff was a lot cleaner and more prepared & refuted the value crit really well.

	Tung (*11) ^{9:00am R3} athiva			LINCOLN Judge's Name: L			bate	
Neg: 16				Judge's School Afi	filiation:	ames Lo	<u>ugan</u>	
	A Speaker Code #:	AFF: 8	pts_29	۲_ Speaker Code #:	NEG:	6	pts_30	
	Please award ea			on the following Outstanding 28 =		and	analanan kanalan s	
	27 26-25 = Fair	= Good (but po	ossibly not goo	od enough to qualif <20 = Reserve	y for elimi	ination round		
				ging Criteria				
	Using the above each debater:	e criteria, plea	ise offer com	pliments and/or	suggesti	ons for imp	provement for	
	• CASE ANALYS	ete.						
	How well did the deb		in response to the	e resolution?				
	• EVIDENCE:	-						
	Although value debat should be used to sup			, evidence (quoted mat the evidence?	erial, contem	porary or histo	rical examples)	
	• ORGANIZATI							
	How well did the deb	-	he constructive a	nd rebuttal speeches?				
	• VALUE CLASH How clearly did the d (Criterion)		ne value being su	pported by his/her side.	and how we	ell was that valu	e measured?	
	• REFUTATION							
			e arguments of the	e opposition and rebui	ld his/her ow	n side?		
	DELIVERY/CO Did each debater spea		e style that was n	leasant, easily understa	ndable, and o	civil?		
			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
	Using the above each debater:	e criteria, plea	ase offer con	pliments and/or	suggesti	ons for imj	provement to	
	Affirmative:		/	Negative				
· asod de		O may the main			പ്പ	and aver	tioning ancess c	luring (X
falle int	liver, but to	attern	ling tone o	i need to a			tioning process c stwn hundgun b	
	o speech p				1		stant torreflere t	
	"public suppo						l more on th	~
	the do.							
	tions didn't re			the me			ound rather th	
other th	nn establish	now you ton	ld win the	· annumente	that c	pjoumt	didn't ropound +	to.
round r	ather than h	elp you getu	ally win.	expanded +	ro tair.	y complex	could have e	••••••
-						anon's Man	it a ban represe	snrt5.
		1						
	SPEAKER COD	DE #:6		he <u>NEG</u> wins AFF or NEG	this deba	te.		
	REASON FOR D	DECISION	(
Ney 5	eemed muc	h more	clean ar	ud prepared.	Aft v	ery thro	wn off bala	nce
				nrefuted & h				

-

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: Ken Schneider
Judge's School Affiliation: 0 W(1)
pts_29 Speaker Code #: 20 pts_28
s based on the following scale: et 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
ly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) or <20 = Reserved for rule or inappropriate behavior
Judging Criteria
ffer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
ponse to the resolution?
persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) ective was the evidence?
nstructive and rebutal speeches?
ue being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
uments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
e that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
ffer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Negative
of Strong Wastintional argument,
or of Well-cretted rebuttal and use
04 (0~) tituto2.
d Nes'l Good greationing of Att. Cross.
ritain Argud that Attis tor argument
Australia world not achieve stated goal
hun. Of reddents violence, 64 dix
not refite empirical evidence.
on the
(AFF or NEG)
· · ·
well argued by both sides. Atty
till and addressing Negu constitution
osing way strategil and ultimately wo
civil, whill is important to me

-

Datta Makkapati (*8) Round 1B 9:00am R4	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: 16 - Charlide	
Round 1B 9:00am R4 Aff: 11 Kona , جريان ا Neg: 2 Jones-Solari , ۲۹۵ Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:	
AFF: Speaker Code #:	:	
Please award each	speaker points based on the following scale:	
	30 = Perfect $29 = Outstanding$ $28 = Very Good$	
27 = G 26-25 = Fair	bood (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 24, 20 = Poor	
20-25 – Fair	24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior	
	Judging Criteria	
Using the above cri each debater:	iteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for	
• CASE ANALYSIS:		
	develop a case in response to the resolution?	
• EVIDENCE:		
should be used to support a	emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) arguments. How effective was the evidence?	
ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater of	organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?	
• VALUE CLASH:	signifize both the constructive and rebuttal specches:	
How clearly did the debates (Criterion)	er emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?	
• REFUTATION:		
 How thoroughly did the del DELIVERY/COURT 	ebater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?	
	communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?	
Using the above cri	iteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to	
each debater:	nerna, prease orier complitacitis and/or suggestions for improvement to	
Affirmative:	Negative	
harly stated valu	is and well - clearly stated value, emphasized in	
cutted arry al	it with sood up with up to people as your element	
of endlace.	Responded depty responsibility presented good alternat	ייה
the chord Ack	insuladged tift policies and excellently reteried to	
	was in alignment the r value as an unbielly over all other	h.
Wigh Att. (Good use At Ruized Continue of Affi	
	King inticut gusting of the counter	
metaphor an	ad strategic lesidence but presented little counter	
	Brady Lan evidence.	
1- cloring -		
SPEAKER CODE #:	: on the AFF wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)	
REASON FOR DECIS	ISION	
But were c	contros and acknowledged the validity of the	
other's value	" VIt mately, in a very closer content, AFF	
WID 0- pris	x-tatio- of evidence although NEG gets Kidos	•
For a A- what.	ing the importance of the will of the people	

Ro	laudia Ault (*23) ound 1A 9:00am S2 ff: 1 Rothblatt-Kenney	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: <u>C. ALT</u>
Ne	eg: 16 Yu arsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: $SRUHS$ (23)
	AFF: Speaker Code #:/p	28 NEG: ots 28 Speaker Code #: 16 pts 28
	Please award each speaker points b 30 = Perfect	based on the following scale: 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	$27 = Good (but possibly r)$ $26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Using the above criteria, please offe	Judging Criteria fer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
	 each debater: CASE ANALYSIS: 	er compriments and/or suggestions for improvement for
	How well did the debater develop a case in responEVIDENCE:	
	 Although value debating emphasizes logic and pershould be used to support arguments. How effecti ORGANIZATION: 	ersuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) tive was the evidence?
	How well did the debater organize both the constr • VALUE CLASH:	
	(Criterion) • REFUTATION:	being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
47	 How thoroughly did the debater refute the argume DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communicative style that 	ents of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
outwers his		er compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
B F.	each debater: 34N private ownership	28 28
mej er	Affirmative: oppressed groups 1. wowen	S/ Negative of equality - sometimes
20 7	2. mentally ill	aitticult to tollow on city
t to	3. Raciam / classism	P changed value to justice - banning gun allomership brokaty right of property 2) violates agents to self defense
Jet len	Well or ganized w/ 3 contents watch pace of speech - gonuter watch pace of speech - gonuter	mes Watch voice valume - scinetiner too loud
A HA	watch found Paperscon dung Cro	055 Might be Debter to more
der of	when esting question - p	- well organized - clear way construction
lord inter	in cross -you did back loop ba	- on the <u>Neg</u> wins this debate.
t ope	REASON FOR DECISION Margmanized economic - tie	- stroy argument on rus lits of majouty us. those oppressed - challinge of statistics - abjective Range of statistics - abjective
	bach to ban on all gans	

Claudia Ault (*23) Round 1B 9:00am S2 Aff: 11 Grewal	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: <u>C. 4 LT</u>
Neg: 16 Nielsen Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: 23
AFF: Speaker Code #://	NEG: pts_29_ Speaker Code #:16pts_29
Please award each speaker point	ts based on the following scale: ect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	bly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Po	oor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
This was a very close debate	- Dotte a peakers did a great job 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 re	esponse to the resolution?
• EVIDENCE: Although value debating emphasizes logic an should be used to support arguments. How eff	nd persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) iffective was the evidence?
• ORGANIZATION:	
 How well did the debater organize both the co VALUE CLASH: 	onstructive and rebuttal speeches?
V	alue being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
S • REFUTATION:	
 How thoroughly did the debater refute the arg DELIVERY/COURTESY: 	guments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
Did each debater speak in communicative sty	(le that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? $e \in$
δUsing the above criteria, pleaseδeach debater:	offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
& how we achieve morality	and the second
Affirmative: 1. lens sums lans heaths	Negative fout challence met by aff you
Sy 2. we ? Hand juins more us us	Aquica + court -
3. correlation between homicide/9 019. 019.	oun outer charter jer mere more Effective value - should be liberty Areedom Above all other rights
& watch pace - experially when quoting Atatustics - y you're taleg	1: how have no at the fellenty -
B fast can be harker to follow	
Pin answery first robustal, and	pace sold - lasy to read
je between assault/hand gur i was week	have and desugart re. Callout and
D' don't give up your poutron f Looen at opponent ching Cross	effecture neg. cross - evpocently with Challing of
SPEAKER CODE #: \ / C	$L_{e_{1}}$ on the $\sqrt{N_{eq}}$ wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION	(AFFORNEO) - good intro. in Meg. Fabrication between condition
I at times could be louden but	& causation.
& pasically very much leved & conversational tone rather the	An domestie verlence adquiment effective - - domestie verlence adquiment effective - re cognize vour but refuted as answer to hank surs
Attading with loudness - fust	as answer to have sus

Aff: 16 Hanif	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: Denielle Kell				
Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>PV HS</u>				
AFF: Speaker Code #: 16 Hanif pts 08	NEG: Speaker Code #: 11 Gray pts				
Please award each speaker points based on $30 = Perfect$ $29 = Or$	a the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good				
	enough to qualify for elimination rounds)				
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior				
Judg	ing Criteria				
Using the above criteria, please offer comp each debater:	liments and/or suggestions for improvement for				
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the r	esolution?				
 should be used to support arguments. How effective was the ORGANIZATION: 					
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supp	How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speecher?				
 (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 plea	asan, easily understandable, and civil?				
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	iments and/or suggestions for improvement to				
Affirmative:	Negative				
Great eye contact and	He brought yp à feur very good rebuttals.				
posture,	One of his Key pain's was possibly				
He speke very fast and was hard to follow at times.	Atternet incorrect.				
11 1 from foots to spoort					
He had many facts to support his argument	His speech was clear with just some stambling over words				
SPEAKER CODE #: 16 Hanif on the	AFF wins this debate.				
REASON FOR DECISION	FF or NEG) (1)				
The AFF argument	- was strangor with facts and				
numbris to backhim u	ρ				

Danielle Kelly (*19)	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Round 1B 9:00am \$3 Aff: 8 Pandey	Judge's Name: Daniche Kelly
Neg: 16 Yao Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>PVHS</u>
AFF: Speaker Code #: <u>8 PSndey</u> pts26	NEG: 2 Speaker Code #: <u>16 Ya 0</u> pts <u>79</u>
Please award each speaker points based	on the following scale:
30 = Perfect 29 =	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
$27 = \text{Good (but possibly not go}$ $26-25 = \text{Fair} \qquad 24-20 = \text{Poor}$	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Ju	dging Criteria
Using the above criteria, please offer cor each debater:	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 persuasio	n, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)
 should be used to support arguments. How effective was ORGANIZATION: 	s the evidence?
How well did the debater organize both the constructive	and rebuttal speeches?
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being su (Criterion)	upported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of t	the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
 DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communicative style that was 	
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was	preasant, easily understandable, and ervit?
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative:	Negative
"Used the word "like" way too mu	ch . He asked good questions on the Cross examination
the hod some good	Very good pants with statistics
points but headed a	Very good points with statistics to a support them.
Strongen augument for them	itle effectively chilling of one ch
Good ege contact and very courteas	I the concinence hay Drints Ilsuicide ou surgers
Ver, Scourteas	Strong speech, eye contact use pills
SPEAKER CODE #: 400 on	$I = \frac{1}{2} \int $
REASON FOR DECISION	
The NEG side h	ad a very Strong speech with
Valid points and statist	tics. He addressed his opponents
points thoroughly and i	hell

Andrew Schwartz (*18) Round 1A 9:00am R7	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: Abdyce Schwartz
Aff: 11 Goduco	$\sim \frac{1}{\lambda / \lambda / \lambda}$
Neg: 2 Wilson Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: NGIThgate
AFFr Speaker Code #: DO 1 pts 2	NEG: 2 Speaker Code #: pts_29
Please award each speaker points base 30 = Perfect 29	d on the following scale: = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	udging Criteria
each debater:	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to	the resolution?
 should be used to support arguments. How effective w ORGANIZATION: 	
 How well did the debater organize both the constructiv VALUE CLASH: 	e and rebuttal speeches?
	supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	
 How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments o DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communicative style that was 	
Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater:	/ ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
A ffirmative:	Nagativa
+ Strong well constructed case	Negative + Great cross X + use of your
- The neg case (& on case attacts)	own case on cross application
seened scattered but there we	re - you do a great job putting
a lot off arguments. That being	arguments on the flow but I
Said to ensure your /case is	Nould have lined to you to
air tight you need to respond to	crystalize & focus on the most
Q Via con 111	
+ Great Evidence, consider preppin	- Could have formalized the property rights
+ Great Evidence, consider prepping Cross × more.	- Could have formalited the field in move
SPEAKER CODE #: or	the <u>Neg</u> wins this debate. Offense (AFF or NEG)
REASON FOR DECISION	(AFF or DYEG)
Neg woon through	effective refutation, evidence
analysis & defense a	of status quo.

Andrew Schwartz (*18) Round 1B 9:00am R7	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate, Judge's Name: Andrew Schwartz
Aff: 16 Park Neg: 9 Sterling Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Northgete
Speaker Code #:	NEG:pts_ZB
Please award each speaker points based of 30 = Perfect 29 = 0	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
Jud	ging Criteria
	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
 CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the EVIDENCE: 	
 Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion should be used to support arguments. How effective was to ORGANIZATION: 	, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) the evidence?
 How well did the debater organize both the constructive as VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being sur- 	nd rebuttal speeches?
(Criterion) REFUTATION: 	
 How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of th DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communicative style that was placed by the style of the st	
Using the above criteria, please offer com each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative: + well researched Cage you seemed Very Knowledgeable on this topic	Negative + Great use of own case to
t great job crystalizing the debate on your suicide point.	cross apply for take outs but don't vely too heavily on it.
on your suicide point. - felt like you could have worke	- if you wann win on preservation d of life you should hit the
harder on the Value & critorio.	n point of suicide harder.
-I also need you to take out both Molley contentions bequire they were so heavily applied onto	point about reducing violence more a more often. It fixes the suicide
VENT COC. SPEAKER CODE #. V O on th	Λ (1) wing this denote (1) (1) (1)
give you your case if AFF. ca her's still stands. (rucial	AFF or NEG) Were very prepared on Jed a Jun crime but less so drop defensive gun use & gun accidents
+ good cocaine argument / RFD	jun accidents

	sh Keshav (*22)		LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name:SINEESH &ESHAV
	v 9:00am R6 Bronshteyn		Juges Name
	Qadeer		Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY
Varsity	L-D Debate		
	AF	ver and a second	29 NEG:
	Speaker Code #:	16 pts	Speaker Code #: 10 pts $\sqrt{7}$
	 Annalização de la construição de la	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY O	
	Please award eac	h speaker points base	ed on the following scale:
			9 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	27 =	Good (but possibly not	t good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
		J	Judging Criteria
	Using the above of	criteria, please offer c	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
	each debater:		
	• CASE ANALYSIS	S:	
	How well did the debate	er develop a case in response to	to the resolution?
	• EVIDENCE:		
			asion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)
		ort arguments. How effective v	was the evidence?
	ORGANIZATION How well did the debate	er organize both the constructiv	ive and rebuttal speeches?
	• VALUE CLASH:	-	ive and rebuild specenes:
			ng supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
	(Criterion)		
	• REFUTATION:		
		-	s of the opposition and rebuild kis/her own side?
	• DELIVERY/COL		
	Did each debater speak	in communicative style that w	was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
	Using the above	criteria, please offer c	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	each debater:		to be trefuting
- Gre	at point abo	out womens	- Great pour about Australia
(Affirmative	ont womens ongeto vol	Le Negative The UC, Chicago Stato
			te de de de la contration de la contrati
-0 G	rod point	about role e	
ġ	out to a	ave luies	
0		498	6st - Constitution -> great point
-0 ?	to every 10	(fe soved, 93	- Excellent cross in a very fact
		a number:	s a Dased and then and for
-06	ood conter	nt e orumbers rovided to purol position	e manner
	P	rovided to put	not following laws : Guntching to more -o Good rebuttal cleantly les except womens right to vote
	(Australia)	posigeon	home made
	Chicago		not journey with the
	1. reliance	on reacting to	on -o Good rebuttal and
	the the the	not	tes furnish work to vote
पुण्ल्य	repuire po	10 constitu	ution except wonder stop on les to that
	SPEAKER CODE	;#:0	om -o Good rebuttal ready les except women right to vote ation except women right to vote on the <u>NEG</u> wins this debate. Cno coulter to that (AFF or NEG)
			(AFF or NEG)
	REASON FOR DE	CISION	1 1 Levi sounts
-	> Both are	excellent	speakers and drove their print
	effectur	<u> </u>	opeakers and drove their points
	-06		etter rebuttal (narrowty)
-)	Neg wi	ns on a be	eller reputral ()/
	U		

Sineesh Keshav (*22) Round 1B 9:00am R6 Aff: 16 Massey	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: SINEESH KESHAV
Neg: 8 Tallapeneni Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY
AFF: 16 pts 26	NEG: 8 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
Ju	lging Criteria
	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the	e 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) the evidence?
• ORGANIZATION:	
 How well did the debater organize both the constructive a VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being su (Criterion) 	and rebuttal speeches?
 REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of t DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communicative style that was 	
Using the above criteria, please offer cor each debater:	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
	Best point made:
Best point made : Affirmative:	Negative
-o Gun ownership breads to volence -o Avshalia as example	-SUICER and area
- Handled cross well' /	
-o Grovs of Neg should ve applied over reliance on Fricioles US	
homiciales. reputed minor	ty -o during initial
- Rebuttal good unent by forcusny a o self deforre rebuttal good barry os con	-o Delivery was too fast - no at all. during initial pres. are biggert sheigth: magnitudents liveybiggert Opportunity: delivery-speed he <u>AFF</u> wins this debate. AFF or NEG)
Biggest strength : ugspristion 2 erd	liverBiggert Sherry delucy - speed
biggert SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on 1	he <u>AFF</u> wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION	
Belter evidence	e, and beller refutation

MARSES HEREMAN

SAN RAMEN JANUEY

Reput in the provide the second second second

34

and a start of the second s Second $\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1$ $E_{1}^{2} = E_{1}^{2} + E_{2}^{2} + E_{2$

. Oast peart made:

to cruss succed in one subjectif where and complet have been more comprehenses inc. Inverse of blag show have skiple cled a binna montant of population memory and the population of the second of the shows and the second of the

a grant warrant in the section of a o Madrahae - Career per

the main defining feal

a Handled even will.

beller enirance, and beller refutetion

Katherine Jubelirer (*12) Round 1A 9:00am R1	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: K. Juhelifur
Aff: 8 Vogety Neg: 16 Patel Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's Name: <u>C. Jukel Fir</u> Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett High School NEG: 16 Patel
AFF: 3 Vugity pts 29 Speaker Code #:	NEG: 16 Pate pts 27 Speaker Code #:
Please award each speaker points based 30 = Perfect 29 =	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Ju	dging Criteria
	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to t	the resolution?
• EVIDENCE:	
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion should be used to support arguments. How effective wa	on, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) s 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 s (Criterion) 	supported by his/per 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	pleasant easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer co	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to

each debater: Affirmative: - good evidence Negative - good evidence clear organization / ca - contentions are a bit of a stretch, particularly liked asking how the sam have to connect to resolution clearly value clash needs to be clear - clear, easy to follow value clash -well related to english good reputation, breed to emphasize more clearing how his value encompass of the - good eye contact - don't need 36 lap top: distract -ourall, good crops et - wait opponent to finant speaking clear nefutation but value scended trip all to ability to clearing nefuto - good SPEAKER CODE #: 16 - good & delivery / courting 10 on the <u>NEG</u> wins this debate. (AFF or NEG) had a court PREASON FOR DECISION Both wery good Neg vena clever case.

Katherine Jubelirer (*12) Round 1B 9:00am R1 Aff: 11 Gerardo	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: K. J. Milliy
Neg: 8 Yu Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: John Swell My South
AFF: 11, Genard of pts 20	Judge's Name: <u>C.</u> JWYLUGY Judge's School Affiliation: <u>John Swett</u> High School _ Speaker Code #: <u>NEG:</u> <u>9</u> <u>yn</u> pts <u>30</u>
	on the following scale: 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	lging Criteria
	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	
• CASE ANALYSIS:	
 How well did the debater develop a case in response to the EVIDENCE: 	e resolution?
	, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) the evidence?
How well did the debater organize both the constructive a	nd rebuttal speeches?
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being su (Criterion)	pported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
 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 p	leasant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer cone each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative: - clear case, good organization/evidence - the mattal heard to follow at timps, but	Negative
"I mutal heard to follow at timps, mit	- queat depater: éléar, Knows en dence inde + ont; concedis appropriatepts. to aff while defending clear in
clearly verponds to convention	to all all a contractions of the
- "in mutal hard to follow at trungs, mut clearly very content is content is me - very callegial	White
I TAD CLEAK	makes 11 miles
- uneven negotation - some clear + good, others divorganized	portion ex-excellent
	+ Wenn colle & N
Clicking per anythig heg within	-excellent when the grand of the care public sophical
SPEAKER CODE #: $\frac{0}{1}$ $\frac{1}{100}$ on the formula of the second seco	he <u>$N \in G_1$</u> wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISIONIL + Alberter	clear, articulate, + extremely
Was an excellent and	0
Capable	

Mohammed Asif Qadeer (*10) Round 1A 9:00am R8	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: A. A. Doubles
Aff: 9 Podkor	
Neg: 11 Monasterial Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: This for thigh (10)
AFF. 8 Red Kou	NEC
Speaker Code #: pts	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Thvington High</u> (10) <u>NEG:</u> <u>S 28</u> Speaker Code #: <u>I Mon as Ferrial</u> pts <u>29</u> pred on the following scale:
Please award each speaker points ba	used on the following scale:
	29 = Outstanding 28 = Very 3 ood
	ot 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 each debater:	r compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response	a to the resolution?
• EVIDENCE:	
	suasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) we was the evidence?
• ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the construct	ctive and rebutal speeches?
• VALUE CLASH:	
	eing supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	(we Come aver S
How thoroughly did the debater refute the argumen	its of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
• DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communicative style that	the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? the war pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? the cause of the second o
Using the above criteria, please offer each debater:	r compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to fix with
Affirmative:	m' Negative Afrit with Dig
Gas d Defractions, Chrild. A Swepter Home derive VS Accident use	cross here a significant become
Horne definice VS Accidental use	
(yrince of ans vac.)	Nour and wegen Resp. Might pour
80% swede 5> fileann	
Ni (G. o dos Rt.)	
and had repts of 9 ante	Ar Rebutted 21 otten ways. Warter (A) Alter ber Whe va Matter Guer ways. (And Cant. B) Curie Sel Whe va Matter Guer Williams used and Cant. B) Curie Sel 17 any
Gune & with Can pitt. g. Life	Alephre Rubbtton Sing is siller (oppub Coust Aching seperty.
(by Abb A haptich for the formation of the formation of the formation of the state of the matternes)	Mond vs life Comet Com bar 2nd Wolart Isiter menos Reputts are better on not ? 2nd Wolart Isiter menos
SPEAKER CODE #: 11 Moncustuin	on the NEG wins this debate. (201 (mF) it and it
REASON FOR DECISION	(vrytwo
After Cas & Cone Arelysis, poor ipecch	PRE Grey Case Andres Dign specie
not very well organized. Good Rebutted. (hurt paits).	y o-k Rebuttel. Config
Frankal, is weather the	- Las Endia
Reputation _ FEX Cullent Jo Gon	I reputch weak Better

Rebutted , Marchen offiction Alpunh md cart G: sugarde > 80% wilt Finin -> other will & surcirde sid Cont earsy Accen. / dageons ? A' Remit & decte + inpudickele

·· · ·

Mohammed Asif Qa Round 1B 9:00am R8	adeer (*10)	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Del Judge's Name: M. A-	bate
Aff: 16 Su Neg: 11 Turner		1. 0000	11 -8 (10)
Varsity L-D Debate		Judge's School Affiliation:	Frement.
		41	Frement.
Speaker Code #:_	AFF: <u>650</u> pts <u>29</u>	NEG: Speaker Code #: <u>////UNNe/</u>	pts_ <u>28</u>
	each speaker points based (າສາວເສຍເຮັດໃຫຍ່ສາຍປະຫຍຸດເຊິ່ງກາງ 2000 ແລະ ກິດແລະ ກິດແລະ ແລະ ແລະ ເປັນການການເປັນແຜ່ນອດເອດເອດເອດເອດເອດເອດເອດເອດເອດ	ANNA ANN ANNA ANNA ANNA ANNA ANNA ANNA
	30 = Perfect 29 = 0	$28 = \mathbf{Very} \ \mathbf{Good}$	
2	7 = Good (but possibly not god	od enough to qualify for elimination round	ls)
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inapprop	,
	Jud	ging Criteria	
Using the abo	ve criteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for imp	provement for
each debater:			
• CASE ANAL			
	ebater develop a case in response to the	e resolution?	
• EVIDENCE:			
	bating emphasizes logic and persuasion, upport arguments. How effective was t	, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or histor	rical examples)
ORGANIZAT			
	ebater organize both the constructive a	nd rebuttal speeches?	
VALUE CLA			
How clearly did the (Criterion)	debater emphasize the value being sup	oported by his/her side, and how well was that valu	e measured?
 REFUTATIO 			
	_	e opposition and rebuild his/her own side?	
DELIVERY/			
Did each debater sp	eak in communicative style that was pl	leasant, easily understandable, and civil?	
		pliments and/or suggestions for imp	provement to
each debater:			
Affirmative:		Negative (, O (
6	Lee Beau	Negative fre Bell	
\subseteq			Casol
All. Const.	very Good	HUNNI POPULI HUS .	hinam in her,
- La clarke	to test (bedeen, Some		
Good ewanning	to fast Speaker, Sime		
fore different to	fillow . S Comprehend		shict Mats,
		Repeating, have in the	in not to she wet left.
CAN' Ram Isv	of Control!	11 Report to added is effe	ctive Nepher Rebitt
Bassip is af	son & Gon after.		
Result & hun	& Cornes, therefied chard	Can wr Cont enthe Stant	Will Das - had fan Nou
Austube Gu	Cortroll.	FAirmut-	- no onla. (Self dyna

No onlice, (Self dyna. on the <u>Aff</u> wins this debate. SU 16 **SPEAKER CODE #:** (AFF or NEG) REASON FOR DECISION A 16. (an Archyni vy Gast Ernlice Mone Sppontive & Cesse organijahun well organijad Value Clash / Reputation: Policy : two the glase de vergense de vergense well appropried well appropried vergense Delvy : two fast some time but notnesse Delvy: Excellent.

AFF Case Arelyson Grans Jusha. Detriked. Prostron of fudented night 7) Her aller. b. ACUINT Austribe Zero/ Man shoutp 1910 Cood . 11 over + Huraide (Erich G 12,9 1 Joh's oridates Grauth Prental (orgenij, very well appul Racut o-K (Value anh CRebutohun Fexcellet Delwy / Contry Good

Nepahni

Саран Gard

Case Gard Case Cum met band Controlled wir Arthelic

Not physical by may ownedle.

organized or

0-K

Fex allet

Oleg Tiktinslei (*20) Round 1A 9:00am R5	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: 0) eg Tiktinski
Aff: 16 Sohi Neg: 10 Bali Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Quarty Lane
AFF: Speaker Code #:pts_2&	NEG:pts27-
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
$27 = \text{Good (but possibly not good)}$ $26-25 = \text{Fair} \qquad 24-20 = \text{Poor}$	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	ging Criteria
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
 CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the EVIDENCE: 	
 organization: 	
 How well did the debater organize both the constructive a VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being su (Criterion) 	pported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
 REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of th DELIVERY/COURTESY: 	e opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was p	leasant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer com each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative:	Negeting
1. good points 2. treed to slow down just a bit	Negative incorrect point about automatic guns (ban expired in 2004) - just lyi
2. treed to slow down	automatic guns (ban expired
just a bit	1h 200 () =)
Bit nerviouse, but good	good likkage to 2nd amendment Bit of studez on speacha
	catmento the point.
16 Soh:	
	AFF wins this debate. $AFF - wins$
	AFF or NEG)

i

Oleg Tiktinslei (*20) Round 1B 9:00am R5		LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: Oleg Tiktinski
Aff: 11 Cooper Neg: 1 Mallah Varsity L-D Debate		Judge's School Affiliation: Quarry Lane
AFF:		0
Speaker Code #:	pts <u>27</u>	NEG: Speaker Code #: pts
		Dutstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = G 26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judę	ging Criteria
Using the above cri each debater:	teria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
	evelop a case in response to the	resolution?
 EVIDENCE: Although value debating er should be used to support a ORGANIZATION: 	nphasizes logic and persuasion, rguments. How effective was th	evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) he evidence?
• VALUE CLASH:	rganize both the constructive and r emphasize the value being supp	d rebuttal speechee? ported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
 REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the del DELIVERY/COURT 	TESY:	e opposition and rebuild his/her own side? easant, easily understandable, and civil?
		pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
• Affirmative:	nds about	Negative 1. good question about real vs theoretical 2. the good expression
Saving lites 2. Speaking very	. LI	2. the good expression
3. good point	on NRF,	3. Very good speaker +1
	1Mallah	
SPEAKER CODE #:	NES on the	e <u>NEG</u> wins this debate. <i>i.e</i> NEG-wins FF or NEG)
REASON FOR DECIS		
in general - very to	Juans impress good & deba	sed with Roth sides-

Jeff Eng T ricla Maxson (*2)	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Round 2B 11:00am S3	Judge's Name: Jet Eng
Aff: 1 Mallah Neg: 16 Hanif Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell High School pts 28 Speaker Code #:Hanifpts 28
AFF: Speaker Code #:Mallah	_pts 28 Speaker Code #: Hanifpts 28
Please award each speaker poin 30 = Perfe	ats based on the following scale: ect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possi) 26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Point Point$	bly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) oor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
	offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in re	esponse to the resolution?
• EVIDENCE: Although value debating emphasizes logic an should be used to support arguments. How e	nd persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)
• ORGANIZATION:	
How well did the debater organize both the c • VALUE CLASH:	onstructive and rebuttal speeches?
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value	alue being supported by pis/her side, and how well was that value measured?
(Criterion) • REFUTATION:	
	guments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
 DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communicative sty 	yle that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please each debater:	offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative:	Negative
t good prenunce /	1 Strong factul / evidence based support
t Lilee voice inflection	when I good organization of information
emphasis on point	3 + estecture reperior of and points
+ Clean presentation s	tyle - Delivery can be entrance better is ealing your lour body
- Need better support a	t - with much (of the shifts
- Need better support à Cross examination	E on the Neg wins this debate
SPEAKER CODE #: 16 Han	3 on the $-$ while this debate. (1) we will show the second se
REASON FOR DECISION	
Very Cloxe Both	sides provided the goot is the try to emphasize
String evidence 15	acts. Aft would Durint - have a
have un debate if during reputrice	Performance was better Dists on ratio through nuyback program not addressed sufficiently

Tricia Maxs Round 2A 11:00an	on (*2) n S3	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debat Judge's Name: ブバ 「アエッハ	e
Aff: 9 Sterling Neg: 16 Masse Varsity L-D De		Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELY	<u>L</u>
Speake	Code #: 9/Sterling_pts27	Speaker Code #: 16 Massey	pt 17
Please	award each speaker points based or	U	Successive and
		utstanding 28 = Very Good	
26-25	z = Good (but possibly not good) $z = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropria	te behavior
	Judg	ing Criteria	
	the above criteria, please offer comp lebater:	liments and/or suggestions for improv	ement for
	SE ANALYSIS:		
	Il did the debater develop a case in response to the r	esolution?	
Althoug	IDENCE: h value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, e e used to support arguments. How effective was the	vidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical) e evidence?	examples)
	GANIZATION: Il did the debater organize both the constructive and	ratiuttal anagahaa?	
• VA How cle	LUE CLASH: arly did the debater emphasize the value being supp	orted by his/her side, and how well was that value me	asured?
	FUTATION:		
	roughly did the debater refute the arguments of the LIVERY/COURTESY:	opposition and rebuild his/her own side?	
Did eacl	n debater speak in communicative style that was plea	asant, easily understandable, and civil?	
	the above criteria, please offer comp lebater:	liments and/or suggestions for improv	
Affirm meech, your (x	native: Don't read constructive and reported sharped that yo	Negative Good convertetional	of forre words.
Fun topici - 4	s reed to make/better eige	Us werd to that can't	enton and the
inter during	fut peech ford of inse	ate to paylabele; yo on constructive greach to padres, you lost all	in how with a
too when here	- veed to pary greed,	for consprictive greech	na pot any
length of wet	Rufene, dr. God sunate		between off
I dolate in	veltal-pood tob fellig of		ven wind it
Mich pant	ge most important	vels pri- gun in listy for	I and back pourd
a the wash had	Mon don't pie people ide a second chance.	Check. Need conclusion	for both of
G (/e of SPEA)	KER CODE #: (9) on the	e wins this debate. FF or NEG)	NM puly
region in REAS	(A)	FF & APEG)	on and which where
you hand u	Need imeliant in bo	h ys vere veglande	d to apprent
speecher.	, Need wonderion in bo	And people burn Dan 4 pt perad	house,
,		<i>, , , ,</i>	

Aff: 10 Qadeer	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate dge's Name: <u>Charfie</u> Sun
Neg: 11 Kona Ju Varsity L-D Debate Ju	dge's School Affiliation: Downly Valley
AFF: Speaker Code #: <u>10</u> pts <u>2</u> Sp	NEG: pts_2 peaker Code #:
Please award each speaker points based on t 30 = Perfect 29 = Out	the following scale: standing 28 = Very Good
	nough to qualify for elimination rounds) 20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
6	g Criteria
Using the above criteria, please offer compli each debater:	ments and/or suggestions for improvement for
 CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the res EVIDENCE: 	olution?
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evi should be used to support arguments. How effective was the	
• ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constructive and re	ebuttal speeches?
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being suppor (Criterion)	ted by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
 REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposite o	
Using the above criteria, please offer complieater each debater:	ments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative:	Negative
Noce speech and debarry.	Constructive and rebuttal speeches are
Value is clearly emphasized on both	organized very well. Good rebuttal on
constructive and rebuttal	both refirming self contentions and againt
	other side. Toose could be a little bit
	more pleasant.
	<u>MEG</u> wins this debate. For NEG)
REASON FOR DECISION	on speech and debuting. NEG was she dealaste
for more efficance endence to suppor.	his contactions.

Changia Sun (*8)		LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: <u>Changgie Sun</u>				
Changie Sun (*8) Round 2B 11:00am R8		Ju	dge's Name:	Changie !	Sun	
Aff: 2 Jones-Solari				0,		
Neg: 16 Su Varsity L-D Debate		Ju	dge's School Af	filiation: <u>Dry</u>	vy Valley	
	AFF:		נ	NEG:		
Speaker Code #:	2	pts <u>8.</u>] beaker Code #:	16	pts	!
Please award	each speaker point				333)(01000000000000000000000000000000000	
			standing 28			
	27 = Good (but possib					•
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Po	or <	<20 = Reserve	d for rude or ir	happropriate beha	VIOT
			ng Criteria		/	C
each debater	ove criteria, please (:	oner compi	ments and/or	suggestions f	or improvement	IOr
CASE ANAI						
• EVIDENCE:	debater develop a case in re	sponse to the res	olution?			
Although value de	: bating emphasizes logic and support arguments. How ef			erial, contemporary	v or historical examples))
ORGANIZA			/			
How well did the c	debater organize both the co	onstructive and re	ebuttal speeches?			
VALUE CLA						
(Criterion)	e debater emphasize the va	lue being suppor	ted by his her side	, and how well was	that value measured?	
REFUTATION How thoroughly divident	ON: id the debater refute the arg	uments of the or	nosition and rebui	ld hic/her own side	0	
	COURTESY:	guinents of the of		ia mis/ner own side.	ţ	
	peak in communicative styl	le that was pleas	ant, easily understa	indable, and civil?		
		. /				
Using the abo each debater	ove criteria, please (offer compli	iments and/or	r suggestions f	or improvement	to
cach utbatti	•					
Affirmative:			Negative			
	per speech . va	lug and	effec	the evidence	to support a	intention.
	are constructed	/ /	speech is	well const	mited speech	lsontimes
,	he examples is fl.	•	is too for	A without p.	auses.	
	ably should be s	stated in				
first spece	h. /					
	/		1			
SPEAKER CO	DDE #: 2		<u>AFF</u> wins For NEG)	s this debate.		
REASON FOR	DECISION		,			
Both	side did very her value and re	well in	construtive	speed and	Cross-examination	n.AFF
reconstate a	her value and re	pute tes	the argument	of Goog op	powent better	than
NZG.				•		

Roopali Bali (*10) Round 2A 11:00am S2	Ju	LINCOLN DOUGI	
Aff: 16 Lee Neg: 11 Gerardo Varsity L-D Debate	Juo	lge's School Affiliation:	
AFF: Speaker Code #:	pts_29 sp	NEG: eaker Code #:	pts_28
Please award each speak 30		he following scale: standing 28 = Very Good	1/ 1/10/2012/2014/00/2014/2014/2017/2017/2017
27 = Good (b) 26-25 = Fair 24-		hough to qualify for elimina 20 = Reserved for rude o	
	Judgin	g Criteria	
Using the above criteria, each debater:			s for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a	case in response to the resc	lution?	
• EVIDENCE: Although value debating emphasize should be used to support argument	es logic and persuasion, evid s. How effective was the evidence of the second	ence (quoted material, contempor vidence?	ary or historical examples)
 ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize VALUE CLASH: 	both the constructive and re	puttal speeches?	
How clearly did the debater empha- (Criterion)	size the value being support	ed by his/her side, and how well v	vas that value measured?
 REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater ref DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in commun 			
Using the above criteria,			
each debater:			
V= Justice VC= Pro	tectus rights,		for C1 t
(1 Banning HG reb	yice qui	1 Lette an and al	ays to commit availability X
- corelate to g	in availabilit	NC CI · Bans	doit Azerk, CDC Study.
C2 HG provide mor than protection -	e hann > 2nd Amendrum	- Mars shoot	don't work, CDC study. Narker ng -> assault weapon
"Rt to feel safe at co	st of actual		
than protection - salequard life, "Rt to feel sale at co salety ?" which immune not "reaponer for speaker code #:	use assault	AFF	
REASON FOR DECISION	AFE	or NEG)	Both speakers had
Jood fluency and eye cor Aff was successfully	Hact. Neg faul	ed to respond t	o Att's CI & CZ.
REASON FOR DECISION Jood fluency and use cor Aff was successfully a good case of putte of handguns Neg	ing more rest	nctions on black d more stat	market arâ Jability
UN NOVER S	U -		

Roop	ali Bali (*10)		LINCOLN DOUGL		
Round 2	B 11:00am S2		Judge's Name:		
	Chillappagari 6 Huang		Indee's School A filiption.		
	L-D Debate		Judge's School Affiliation:		
	AFF	00	NFG	٥C	
	Speaker Code #:	pts_ZD	NEG: Speaker Code #:	<u>pts_28</u>	
	- 	na an a	and a constitutions, a consectory particular pressentations		
	Please award each s	speaker points based o 30 = Perfect 29 = C	n the following scale: Putstanding 28 = Very Good		
	$27 = G_{0}$		d enough to qualify for elimination	on rounds)	
			<20 = Reserved for rude or		
		Judg	ging Criteria		
	Using the above crit	teria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions	for improvement for	
	each debater:				
	• CASE ANALYSIS:				
	 How well did the debater de EVIDENCE: 	evelop a case in response to the	resolution?		
		nphasizes logic and persuasion.	evidence (quoted material, contempora	ry or historical examples)	
	should be used to support a	rguments. How effective was the			
	• ORGANIZATION:		t when the second second		
	• VALUE CLASH:	rganize both the constructive an	a reduttal speeches?		
		r emphasize the value being sup	ported by his/her side, and how well wa	is that value measured?	
	(Criterion)				
	REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the del	hater refute the arguments of the	opposition and rebuild his/her own sid	e?	
	DELIVERY/COURT	-	opposition and reduce institler own sid		
			easant, easily understandable, and civil	?	
	Using the above ori	teria nlesse offer com	pliments and/or suggestions	for improvement to	
	each debater:	teria, picase offer com	principles and/or suggestions	ior improvement to	~
					N
	Affirmative:	in hit is he d	Negative	91% more ukely to dre ke away from crimin omphance	JWT
V= Socie	ital melfare, l	/C= Minin, hunda suffering	n co - children	11/0 man crunir	rab
			- Why not ta	Ke away fre	
CI GU	n' support a	uture of viglence	-low ban c	omphance	. 16
- (gun safety ver 4000 childr	and id nome		notical, cruminals w	\mathcal{D}^{u}
	voor bandark	s = more hance	ide (1 - ban ump	ractical, criminals w	
	more renages	andler net of	1 gill have		
C2 -	HG Causes	greater rek of	- blackmark		
	suiciai .		C2 HG1 protect	against crime. Nord armed citizens.	
AR	Gunbuyback	system.	-creatinate a	- ar henefilmost	
1	\mathbf{O}	U	- MURICICIO DO	vord armed cutter. poor benefilmost.	
		10	NEC GUILLOUIS		
	SPEAKER CODE #:	on th	e NEG wins this debate.		
		(A	FF or NEG		<u>.</u>
	REASON FOR DECI	sion this was	a very tough d	ecision, Both debater	2
(ond a good 1	OB OF presentin	P their coo UTA to	and NEQ WOR	
	httle - upu	L TO altero	their stand	and abon	
	handles the	e CX mell.			
		•			

Judge 1 Logan (*11) Round 2A 11:00am R6 Aff: 8 Yu	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: Dele K Barles	
Neg: 16 Fang Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan	
AFF: 8 pts 29	NEG: 16 pts	7
	Outstanding $28 \neq$ Very Good od enough to quadify for elimination rounds)	navior
Juc	lging Criteria	
	apliments and/or suggestions for improvements	nt for
 CASE ANALYSIS: 		
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the	e 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 exampl	es)
 ORGANIZATION: 		
 How well did the debater organize both the constructive VALUE CLASH: 	nd rebuttal speeches?	
	pported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?	?
• REFUTATION:		
 How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of t DELIVERY/COURTESY: 	he opposition and rebuild his/her own side?	
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was p	leasant, easily understandable, and civil?	
	npliments and/or suggestions for improvements	nt to
each debater:		
Affirmative: Spoke too guickly	Negative Spoke gurchly but enuncrated wel Made good eye contact	X
Excellent use of citations	Made good eye contact	
The argument that gun swaar reduces good influence is weak	shiq	
Low point win intended		
SPEAKER CODE #: on 1	he wins this debate. AFF or NEG)	
REASON FOR DECISION	·	f
Provident a pursuasive argun would not reduce violance	next that the impracticality of a ge	nbun

Judge 1 Logan (*11) Round 2B 11:00am R6		LINCOLN DOI Judge's Name:		bate
Aff: 2 Wilson Neg: 16 Sohi Varsity L-D Debate		Judge's School Affiliation:		DR QWL_
Varsity L-D Debate		-		3
AFF: Speaker Code #:	<u>2</u> pts	NEG: Speaker Code #:	16	pts <u>28</u>
Please award each		d on the following scale: = Outstanding 28 = Very	Good	TELE AND ANNA ANALYSI
27 = G	ood (but possibly not	good enough to qualify for eli	imination round	ls)
26-25 = Fair		< 20 = Reserved for ru		
		udging Criteria		<i>_</i>
Using the above cri each debater:	iteria, please offer co	ompliments and/or sugges	stions for imp	provement for
• CASE ANALYSIS:				
	levelop a case in response to	the resolution?		
• EVIDENCE:				
	mphasizes logic and persuas arguments. How effective w	ion, evidence (quoted material, cont vas the evidence?	temporary or histor	fical examples)
• ORGANIZATION:				
How well did the debater o VALUE CLASH: 	organize both the constructiv	e and rebuttal speeches?		
	r emphasize the value being	supported by his/her side, and how	well was that valu	e measured?
(Criterion)				
 REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the de 	hater refute the arguments of	of the opposition and rebuild his her	own side?	
DELIVERY/COURT	=	in the opposition and rebuild instite	own side:	
Did each debater speak in o	communicative style that wa	as pleasant, easily understandable, an	nd civil?	
Using the above or	itaria plansa offar a	ompliments and/or sugges	stions for imr	rovement to
each debater:	actia, picase offer ex	omphinicitis and/or sugget		
Affirmative:		Negative	1	
Excellent spec	aker	Very good 5	200000	
Argument in th	a astromativa			Crun arcident rates
was fersuas		are per pers	in not by c	with willing alls
Grand itse of	citations	No and is fil		svilly.
4		Tell that for	MIK US	For what they say
Seemed to ho	ne a good grow		man.	
of the Topic	well prepared,			
•	•_^			
	-6	050		
SPEAKER CODE #	:0	n the \underline{AFF} wins this de	bate.	
REASON , FOR DECI	SION	(AFF or NEG)		
Sonabac Fin	the afficient	the made Antonen	io menen oi	< that
GUA DIAN	active day not	ive made pursuasm reduce vislance.	e ajoniem	
2011 00011	1011 (2000 11:00	reaved violance		

.

und 2A 11:00am R4		LINCOLN DOUGI Judge's Name: Suzie	
f: 16 Yu eg: 8 Sathiya arsity L-D Debate		Judge's School Affiliation: <u></u>	
•		NEG: Speaker Code #:	pts 29
Please award ea	ach speaker points based o	n the following scale:	an y de la character en la character de la character en la character en la character en la character en la char
27	30 = Perfect $29 = O= Good (but possibly not good$	utstanding $28 = \text{Very Good}$	
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor	/ -	
		ing Criteyia	
Using the above each debater:	e criteria, please offer comp	oliments and/or suggestion	s for improvement for
• CASE ANALYS How well did the deba	SIS: ater develop a case in response to the r	resolution?	
• EVIDENCE:	ing emphasizes logic and persuasion, o		rary or historical examples)
	port arguments. How effective was th		
	ater organize both the constructive and	i rebuttal speeches?	
	H: ebater emphasize the value being supp	ported by his/her side, and how well w	was that value measured?
(Criterion) • REFUTATION:	. /		
	he debater refute the arguments of the	opposition and rebuild his/her own s	ide?
• DELIVERY/CO Did each debater spea	DURTESY: k in communicative style that was ple	asant, easily understandable, and civi	il?
Using the above	e criteria, please offer comp	oliments and/or suggestion	s for improvement to
each debater:	1.1. shi	in Value = Socie	tal Welfare fety (Freedom from harm
Valve Affirmative:	- the moral in the interior	Criterion = Sa	fety (freeding flowing)
		st un conditione	well-prepense ground
learly laid ou	et 3 contentions and	Jet up	well- prepared pround
tied the	~ to value / criterian	would with	AKC
Held ground m	ell in the face of	for underm	ing AFF argument
A mult even all	Ation		1 1 1 1
CLOW CUT	NOTIONS.	Failed to use avide	unce to support that
	to value / criterian ell in the face of nootions.	Vano san 1)	in would actually beingite.
	1) I was deal 710 C	Vano san 1)	in would actually decisions
	1) I was deal 710 C	Vano san 1)	in would actually beingib.
	1) I was deal 710 C	Vano san 1)	in would actually decisions to
	1) I was deal 710 C	Vano san 1)	in would actually beingite.
	1) I was deal 710 C	Bhi Brought up stron stron e AFF wins this debate. FF or NEG	in would actually & suicides 22 a mendments to a effect. argument that handpen ban violates 1st amendmen
Slightly mun oppo Good argumon evide SPEAKER COD REASON FOR D	ddy choraden 2n of onents argument t re: lack of statistics the for contention that gyn ownership correlate Efficiency (A ECISION	Bhi Brought up stron es E Over-reached T e AFF wins this debate. FF or NEG	in would actually & suicide 2 20 amendments to a effect. argument that handpun ban violates 1st amendme for interruption
Slightly mun oppo Good argumon evido SPEAKER COD REASON FOR DI	ddy choraden 2n of onents argument t re: lack of statistics me For contention that gyn ownership cornelation Efficiency (A ECISION at interruption	A pologized	in would actually & suicide 2 20 amendments to a effect. Sangument that handpun Som violates Ist amendme for interruption ad opponents of base
Slightly mun Good argument evide SPEAKER COD REASON FOR D	1) I was deal 710 C	A pologized	in would actually & suicides 22 a mendments to a effect. argument that handpen ban violates 1st amendmen

black monket would increase, but AFF pointed out that black morket guns were not a significant fraction of total gun purchases AFF: had better (stronger) support for his contentions L more evidency NEG: somewhat tortness argument re: why AFFs contentions not supported, However NEG has a smoother presentation otyle which helped his argument come across more roundly than the empirical evidence cited would justury.

, .

Suzie Kito (*9)	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Round 2B 11:00am R4	Judge's Name:K, to
Aff: 11 Turner Neg: 16 Park	
Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: 61 Grr, 70
	NEC
AFF Speaker Code #:	
Speaker Code #	$\frac{1}{1} \qquad pis \underline{\alpha_1} speaker code \#. \qquad 16 \qquad pis \underline{\alpha_1}$
Please award each	speaker points based on the following scale:
	30 = Perfect $29 = Outstanding$ $28 = Very Good$
27 = 0	ood (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 cr each debater:	teria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS:	
	evelop a case in response to the resolution?
• EVIDENCE: Although value debating e	nphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material contemporary or historical examples)
	rguments. How effective was the evidence?
• ORGANIZATION:	
• VALUE CLASH:	rganize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
	r emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
(Criterion)	
REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the definition	bater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
DELIVERY/COUR	
	communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
—	iteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater: Value : Mo Affir mative:	rality Justice = Monality his right
Affirmative:	Negative Contentions Protecting people it
Cri	suffering and
	HG bants Vsuicide take Branght up impracticality of gitting rid of
117: 777 h	
CITE VIXON. 70/	HG banks Vsvicide tate all HG elrendy in circulin wirder by hundsing the
A Logar Valle Clean: Or	urder by hum)
(Information	nicht by hundjin nicht by hundjin nise minder by handjin used to gelf pretect.
	used to gelf pretect.
	VINCE VINCE VINCE VINCE I OTTO I OTTO I III
atremely cla	outentions outy 1 out of 16 Felons got though gun legally.
Petended content	ions very well during I are would not
Frist AR. T. F. T.	(contentions) ions very well during only low of 16 Felons got theirs gun legally. 7. vs 7070 NG hurmed in Domestic <u>HG helped II</u> on the AFF wins this debate V Violence b/c of (AFF or NEG)
	(AFF or NEG) V Violence b/c of
REASON FOR DEC	sion the juns already in
	sion the juns already in orad a great circulation
In rebuttal - s	
point about HG	E> 14 round capa UTY
apparently ackno	is red a great circulation $\overline{c} > 10$ round capacity whedged by NEG as "ban-worthy" ble of the amount of people that can be killed quickly.

Zring Kizler Banger (*16) Round 2A 11:00am R7			LINCOLN D	OUGLAS De	bate.
Aff: 11 Monasterial Neg: 8 Pandey Varsity L-D Debate			Judge's School Affiliati	ion:1_6	
AF Speaker Code #:	?F: \ \	pts?;	NEG Speaker Code #:	ř: 8	pts_27. S
Please award eac			the following scal atstanding 28 = Ve		Шуллан на радиона на ифила
27 =			enough to qualify for	• /	ls)
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Po		<20 = Reserved for		-
		Inda	ing Criteria /		
Using the above	criteria nlease		liments and/or sug	agestions for imr	provement for
each debater:	erneria, picase		minents and/ov sug	gestions for mit	n ovement ioi
CASE ANALYSI	(\$•				
How well did the debate		sponse to the r	esolution?		
• EVIDENCE:					
Although value debatin should be used to suppo			vidence (quoted material, e evidence?	contemporary or histor	rical examples)
ORGANIZATIO					
How well did the debate		onstructive and	rebuttal speeches?		
VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the deb			orted by his/her side, and I	how well was that yeld	a maccurad?
(Criterion)	bater emphasize the va	nue being supp	oned by institer side, and i	now wen was that valu	c measureu?
• REFUTATION:					
		gumerits of the	opposition and rebuild his	:/her own side?	
• DELIVERY/COU Did each debater speak		le that was ple	asant, easily understandabl	le, and civil?	
		/ 	1	A* 6 *	
each debater:	criteria, please	oner comp	liments and/or sug	ggestions for imp	Srovement to
Affirmative:			Negative		
Ammauve.			Negative	more effectiv	· L
-solid case -pring in solvening evide	nu in case		- Francwork se	bake is in high	nbut of topic
- Time nungement in AK	reepes work		-NC is very	rept (, t , v C	• -
- Did not really address	enarch of hi	is cope		concurs of	AC inst say fo
-framwork hebete is int	apen hat of	topic	- Have to actua	iny extend you	er
-Neez to weigh havens 1		-	- winning two	is not a up t	ited to respond "
- solvency became an is			rispond to	merry where I	, s win he didn't
SPEAKER CODE	E #: 8	on the (A	$\frac{N \in G}{FF \text{ or NEG}}$ wins this	s debate.	
REASON FOR DE	FUSION				ing them would be
Aff shows handgung ca	vy viola	ce / dea th	AFF JOAS NO?	+ Srow Dann	nappen so
am(thing about the	4. Nej has				· ·
I son't have ;	AFF so	Wency.			

Zrinn Kizler Round 2B 11:00am R7 Aff: 10 Bali	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name:
Neg: 11 Goduco /arsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
AFF: Speaker Code #:pts_2 ۹	Speaker Code #:pts_28
Please award each speaker points based o	n the following scale:
	Putstanding 28 = Very Good d enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
-	ging Criteria
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the	resolution?
• EVIDENCE:	
should be used to support arguments. How effective was the	evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) he evidence?
• ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constructive and	d rebuttal speeches?
 VALUE CLASH: 	a reduttar specency:
	ported by his/ber 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 ple	easant, easily understandable, and civil?
	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
Affirmative:	Negative
- Good cuse	- Tore doion of yession in CX when opport 4+
- Look at judge Luring CK	isn't build unhassing of
- Look at judge Luring CX	-Need mon substantial responses to interne
-very solid responses to N/C	warrants of AC
Erhod your are more expectively	- Making a face is his a response in CX
(like the suicide evidence any SX more likely) - I think is weith to rely on England while trij
careful about new evidence in 2AF,	to Eisquality Australia.
she can't respond. Forfs on bringing	-Made new responses to original argument in
writing points together (weigh . 13	securs or blettal
SPEAKED CODE # 10 on the	e <u>A { F</u> wins this debate. (EF or NEG)
SI EARER CODE #: 01 th	
REASON FOR DECISION	
(A REASON FOR DECISION	
A) REASON FOR DECISION Aff shows how burnin) Juns wi	le arguments flow AFF due to

Sam Karetti (*20)	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Round 2A 11:00am R1	Judge's Name: SAM KARTEN
Aff: 16 Nielsen •	
Neg: 8 Vogety · Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Quarry Lane
	NEG:
AFF: 11	NEG:
Speaker Code #: 16 pts 2°	_ Speaker Code #: pts
Diago award agah apaptar - sinta hagad	annear an tha fallonning a salla
Please award each speaker points based 30 = Perfect - 20 =	Outstanding $28 = Very Good$
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	
Juć	lging Criteria /
	apliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	
• CASE ANALYSIS:	
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the	e 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) the evidence?
• ORGANIZATION:	
How well did the debater organize both the constructive a	and rebuttal speeches?
• VALUE CLASH:	
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being su (Criterion)	pported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of t	be opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
• DELIVERY/COURTESY:	
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was	bleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer con	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	iphinents and/or suggestions for miprovement to
Affirmative: .	Negative
and the flood & eve Conta	
excellent flow æ eye konta	very good it o
Keep up good work. Nery	
O Las thowrangh	enayte evidence.
lopical and had the harry	Lotical Ereasonis is very good
Research & evidence to	
Kersceller /	maintained tirrings very well.
Support your 2 contention	me feed salle, you could have
I LIDA is to Watch	A last a sepurities
only feed back is to watch	re paper instrad & Laplop. your focus
aut tim ge maintainthe well	was more on haplog adjustment. rather
SPEAKER CODE #: on (he <u>AFF</u> wins this debate.
	(AFF or NEG)
REASON FOR DECISION . well on	sanded, enner evidence, timely, by the
	•
analysis, good deliver	1 and Analysis
·	

Sam Karetti (*20) Round 2B 11:00am R1 Aff: 11 Gray	LINCOLN Judge's Name:	DOUGLAS AMKA	Debate HEFT Larylane pts_28
Neg: 8 Redkar Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affili	iation: <u>Q</u>	avy Lane
AFF: Speaker Code #: pts_29	NE Speaker Code #:	EG: 8	pts_ <u>Z8</u>
Please award each speaker points based	on the following sc	ale:	NORMAGINATIONS NOTION
27 = Good (but possibly not go	••••	for elimination ro	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	< 20 = Reserved :	for rude or inap	propriate behavior
Juc Using the above criteria, please offer con	lging Criteria	uggestions for	improvement for
each debater:	nphilicitis and/or s	uggestions for	improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the	e resolution?		
• EVIDENCE:			
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion should be used to support arguments. How effective was		ai, contemporary or i	nistorical examples)
 ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constructive a 	and rebuttal speeches?		
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being su	upported by his/her side a	nd how well was that	value measured?
(Criterion)	ipported by marier side, d		
• 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	pleasant, easily understand	lable, and civil?	
Using the above criteria, please offer cor	npliments and/or s	uggestions for	improvement to
each debater: 1-5 Rank	. /		
Affirmative:	Negative		
Case Analysis: 5		Analysis	
organizetur : 5	Oregam	the :	. S
Vilee Claew: 5	Value	clash :	
Evidence : 5	Evid	ence :	2 5
Refer tetur = 5	Reput	ctm 2	S
Kefu Letin -	conte	ly =	= 5
constucy = 4/		. /	
	the <u>AFF</u> wins the	his debate.	
REASON FOR DECISION : excel	(AFF or NEG) lent debal	ion Cas	c Asahuss referthin
REASON FOR DECISION : encl grod eye contact, on	d Usage A	Larploy a	for evidence, have
reasoning - soth	home	done se	od Job.

David Ral ston Round 2A 11:00am R3 Aff: 8 Tallapeneni Neg: 16 Bronshteyn Varsity L-D Debate	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: David Ralston Bishop Judge's School Affiliation: O'dowd
AFF: Speaker Code #: <u> </u>	<u>27</u> Speaker Code #:16pts <u>26</u>
	9 = Outstanding $28 = $ Very Good
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	t good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Critoria
	Judging Criteria compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response	to the resolution?
 EVIDENCE: Although value debating emphasizes logic and persus should be used to support arguments. How effective ORGANIZATION: 	asion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) was the evidence?
How well did the debater organize both the construct • VALUE CLASH:	
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value bein (Criterion) • REFUTATION:	ng supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
 How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments DELIVERY/COURTESY: 	
Did each debater speak in communicative style that w	was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer each debater:	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative: please (reduce) Need to slow down speaking +	Negative
Malle points clearer. The opening of	Thught process. Very 5000 presenter non
too convoluted + confusing. No eye contr This made it hard to follow. The	act. on guestions of effectiveness + holes
connections to us soft power/+ terror	
The term cross - channing with The	Problems with not addressing the issue of alternatives background check.
rebutted however was excellent, good	" I really in peterd explaining why self-dense
of debati + using opponents logicajeint	- nin. slavery example. Good relation cross -
SFEARER CODE #:	on the <u>AFF</u> wins this debate. examination (AFF or NEG) examination
REASON FOR DECISION Very clox debate th	at went back and furth. Ultimately
	at went back and furth. Ultimately rul issue of saving lives + doing a ban + not invation point managed to make at the end.
Both very courteous and well	spo)cen. Good de balo.

David Ralshon Paul Stein (*1) Round 2B 11:00am R3	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: David Ralston
Aff: 16 Patel Neg: 11 Grewal Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's Name: David Rallton Judge's School Affiliation: Bilhop Oldocal
Speaker Code #: <u>16</u> pts 28	NEG: Speaker Code #:pts_27-
Please award each speaker points based or 30 = Perfect 29 = O	the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good
	enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ing Criteria
Using the above criteria, please offer comp each debater:	liments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS:	
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the r	esolution?
• EVIDENCE:	
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, e should be used to support arguments. How effective was the	vidence (quoted material, contemporary or instorical examples) e 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 supp (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 plea	asant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer comp	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
good ett	И., .
Affirmative:	Negative response to Excellent Varuss - examination However
Excellent opening prefertation + /	Excellent Veruss - examination - However
especially cless left of evidence of	hu own cross didn't make clear link of points
citations. Very well-spoken +	and questions almost irrelevant.
calm demeans a Clear out you ot	Prepentation - included a lot ofpoints, talked
contentions.	almost too fair and agitattor
Good points on presenting case	Again, very nice arguments in addressing
histories + understandyly + resulting	and having connections LIW constitutionalimet
point on constitution pasures.	morality + hinging argument on this -
Probably not good of conceeding	
2 points as it weatened position	Seemed like trying to win by technicalities
	l of apponents concessions. Didu't respond
SPEAKER CODE 4: 6 on the	E <u>AFF</u> wins this debate. a degualely to
REASON FOR DECISION	FF or NEG) cake history of ban on assault we apoils.
ultimately, lague it conversion	assault we apond. lity + the argument that
of constitutionalum VIZ- mora	to a single band are could be considered
asjault weapons banned server and anundment could be made it	to suggest hand jurg could be considered rec.

Fainel	
-Hina Habib (*22)	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Round 2A 11:00am R5 Aff: 16 Yao	Judge's Name: Faisal Habib
Neg: 11 Cooper Varsity L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Viota High
AFF: Speaker Code #: ۲۹۰۰ pts 29	NEG: _ Speaker Code #: <u>Coopex</u> pts_27
Please award each speaker points based 30 = Perfect $29 = 1$	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Juc	Iging Criteria
	apliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	
• CASE ANALYSIS:	
How well did the debater develop a case in response to th	e resolution?
• EVIDENCE: Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasior should be used to support arguments. How effective was	n, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) the evidence?
• ORGANIZATION:	
How well did the debater organize both the constructive a	ind rebuttal speeches?
 VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being su (Criterion) 	prorted by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the	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 con	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
Affirmative: Defined the terminologies Criterios: Justice, Sunde onte.	Negative Well presented data and statistics. Coordinated discussions & arguments Coordinated presentation. Organized presentation.
Will reduce homocide rote	a Coordinated presentation.
Well reduce homocide red & doct	ion - Focused a volues
Focused and sources forcitation	ms - 1000
Well defender ressources	
Well presented tacins a Focused and clear presented well present sources fricitation Well defended rebuttals Strong Closs-exminition Emphasized his volues and Emphasized his volues and Emphasized his volues and Emphasized his volues and SpeakER CODE #: Yaw on t	ing
the opponent	
REASON FOR DECISION	AFF or NEG)
You had presented the	data and was ablective. He was
that his presented va	AFF or NEG) data and was able to convinced lues are more affective. He was bout of views in all rebutlales.
able to depend the f	

Hina Habib (*22) Round 2B 11:00am R5	L	INCOLN DOUGL 's Name: Faiのふ (-	AS Debate	
Aff: 16 Chen				~
Neg: 1 Rothblatt-Kenney		's School Affiliation:	lanto Viata	Hish
Varsity L-D Debate	Judge	's School Affiliation:		0.
AFF:		NEG; er Code #: <u>Rothblat</u>	1 10	
Speaker Code #: Chen	pts Speak	er Code #: Kothblat	I-Kenny pts_	
Destablished and the second		an a cara an	V.	
Please award each speaker poin	s based on the	following scale:		
30 = Perfe	ct $29 = Outstar$	nding 28 = Very Good	1	/
27 = Good (but possil	oly not good enou	igh to qualify for elimina	tion rounds)	
		= Reserved for rude or	· · /	havior
	Judging C	Criteria		
Using the above criteria, please			s for improveme	nt for
each debater:	r			
• CASE ANALYSIS:				
How well did the debater develop a case in re	sponse to the resoluti	on?		
 EVIDENCE: 	sponse to the resoluti			
Although value debating emphasizes logic an	d persuasion evidenc	e (quoted material contempor	rary or historical examr	oles)
should be used to support arguments. How e			any of motorious examp	
• ORGANIZATION:				
How well did the debater organize both the c	onstructive and rebutt	al speeches?		
• VALUE CLASH:				
How clearly did the debater emphasize the va	lue being supported b	by his/her side, and how well w	vas that value measured	1?
(Criterion)				
• REFUTATION:				
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arg	uments of the opposi	tion and rebuild his/her own si	ide?	
• DELIVERY/COURTESY:				
Did each debater speak in communicative sty	e that was pleasant, e	asily understandable, and civi	1?	
Using the above evitoria places	ffan aanmlina	nto and/ou augastism	a fou increasions	
Using the above criteria, please	mer complume	nts and/or suggestion	s for improveme	ent to
each debater:				
Affirmative:		egative		
Absent				
		7		
٢	$\int C M$	$\gamma \omega$		
	$\langle \Sigma H \rangle$)		
\square				
./				
$\rho/\mu_{\rm res}$		~ G		
SPEAKER CODE #: <u>Rothbat</u> - Kenny REASON FOR DECISION Opponent is	on the <u>N</u>	\underline{r} wins this debate.		
Kenne	(AFF or	NEG)		
REASON FOR DECISION	J			
Anna + 100	p absent.			
upponent bi				
• •				