

Andrew Schwartz (*18)

Round 3A 1:30pm S3

Aff: 8 Yu

Neg: 16 Hanif

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Andrew Schwartz

Judge's School Affiliation: Northgate

AFF: 8 pts 27 Speaker Code #: 16 NEG: 16 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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:

+ good case built I really like the domestic abuse angle.
 - your opponent conceded definitions but he did offer a conflicting value which was important to this ballot
 + good catch on the "counter plan"

Negative

+ great job hitting all points in the AFF case
 + good speech style, very easy to flow.
 - I'm not sure I bought the feasibility arguments based upon "Banned" as "should" has a strong backing to be divorced from policy

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the Neg wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

+ if the value debate matters at all you should show how you win under his framework cause you could win on both.
 RFD Neg won value which was crucial

+ great job trying to win value
 + you need to work more on the specifics of the AFF case gun culture, domestic violence, etc

Andrew Schwartz (*18)

Round 3B 1:30pm S3
Aff: 11 Grewal
Neg: 8 Pandey
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Andrew Schwartz

Judge's School Affiliation: Northgate

AFF: 11 pts 28 Speaker Code #: 8 NEG: 8 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 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:

Close Round

Affirmative:

+ fantastic evidence + analysis
+ so the neg built his case on cross application of his own arguments so if that happens all you need to do is take out his contentions to win your points
+ good work on the value debate especially since yours was vague

Negative

+ I loved how well the whole case was linked to your value
+ good argumentation on value
+ way to not care to his evidence however I suspect your analysis of his long card could have been in more depth
+ your case seemed to demonized criminals a bit too much which in a debate that "potentially" could be about life. Makes it hard to weigh impacts.

SPEAKER CODE #: 8 on the Neg wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

- I don't know if "how long" it took to read reinforces your point

RFD Immense Clash minimized retained Impacts, The Neg Managed & operated the flow so as to outweigh

Mohammed Asif Qadeer (*10)

Round 3A 1:30pm R7
Aff: 11 Cooper
Neg: 16 Nielsen
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: TAI PHAN H

Judge's School Affiliation: P.V.H.S

AFF: Speaker Code #: 11 30 pts NEG: Speaker Code #: 16 30 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 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: COOPER

- Good Analysis. very good
- Evidence ^{from document} _{about number - year}
- Organization ^{handgun} _{good speak.}
- Reason ^{crime - murder} _{suicide - law}
- good point Rebuttal.
- good questions to cross exam.
- Delivery / courtesy. good
- Homework good
- Clear - very good job.

Negative Nielsen

- good analysis very good
- Evidence ^{FR: Document} _{number evidence - year}
- Organization ^{handgun} _{good.}
- Solve problem: good _{self defend.}
- Good point Rebuttal. _{law - freedom}
- good questions to cross examination
- Delivery / courtesy: good.
- Homeworks good.
- Clear - very good job.

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the Neg wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

- Really to make up my mind. Because they are really good.
But I do to choose. speaker code # 16

Mohammed Asif Qadeer (*10)

Round 3B 1:30pm R7
Aff: 8 Sathiya
Neg: 11 Goduco
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: TAI PHAN - H

Judge's School Affiliation: P.V.H.S

AFF: Speaker Code #: 8 29 pts NEG: Speaker Code #: 11 28 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 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: SATHIYA

- Analysis - From document
- EVIDENCE - Reason - Result handgun
- good questions? - Crime
- good speak
- ORGANIZATION - Home Work good.
- Refutation - Need more about ^{effect} handgun ~~as~~ suicide murder - law.
- Delivery/Courtesy

Negative Goduco

- Analysis
- good cross examination
- Evidence - good HW
- good point: black market handgun.
- number-year
- ORGANIZATION - clear, good point
- good speak.
- Refutation - good, but need more evidence, should solve problem in US
- DELIVERY/COURTESY
- Work ~~for~~ very good,

SPEAKER CODE #: 8 on the AFF wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Both ~~speakers~~ working hard, & Home Work. But speaker code #/8 better ~~than~~.

(27)

Judge 2 Logan (*11)

Round 3A 1:30pm R3
Aff: 1 Mallah
Neg: 16 Yu
Varsity L-D Debate

us private ownership of
land just right to be owned

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Peter Barnes

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF: Mallah 1 pts 29 Speaker Code #: Yu 16 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 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 delivery. Great rebuttal.
Strong evidence

Negative
Great case analysis. Very strong speaker.
Very organized

SPEAKER CODE #: 1 on the aff wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION Very strong round. Very clear. The aff was able to use the criterion to his advantage thus receiving the win.

Judge 2 Logan (*11)

Round 3B 1:30pm R3
Aff: 16 Sohi
Neg: 10 Qadeer
Varsity L-D Debate

*US Private Ownership of
hardjuns ought to be banned*

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Jack Barnes Peter Braun

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan Wmbr

AFF: Speaker Code #: Sohi 16 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: Qadeer 10 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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:

*Good refutations
Very organized
Great delivery*

Negative

*Very good cross exam.
Good reference and case analysis
Very confident speaker
Great delivery.*

SPEAKER CODE #: 10 on the neg wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION *The neg presented a stronger cross exam followed by a solid constructive round. Both speakers are very strong.*

Suzie Kito (*9)
Round 3A 1:30pm R8
Aff: 16 Massey
Neg: 8 Redkar
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: Suzie Kito
Judge's School Affiliation: El Cerrito HS

AFF: 16 pts 28 Speaker Code #: _____
NEG: 8 pts 28 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?

● **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:

Value: Protection of Life is primary
Affirmative:
- established contentions clearly
- cited evidence adequately
- First rebuttal was strong
- established framework as Safety.
- good extension of illegality of tanks etc to proposed illegality of HG

Value: Gov't Legitimacy
Negative
Criterion: Prevent Gov't Abuse of Power
- contentions somewhat more clearly stated than AFF.
- cited evid. adequately
- not totally valid to say that suicide will not go down when HG banned b/c suicidal thoughts remain.
(~~the~~ availability/ease makes suicide easier than by other route)
- counter-rebuttal did not adequately disprove AFF's essential message.

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the AFF wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

- should have brought up 2nd amendment not completely stated
- 2nd rebuttal also very specific
- "Florida study was actually a survey"

Over

RATIONALE FOR DECISION

AFF wins because NEG failed to refute/disprove adequately

AFF's basic contentions regarding banning of HG resulting in greater safety and NEG also failed to prove/show that the right to safety trumps the right to government legitimacy and justice.

Suzie Kito (*9)
Round 3B 1:30pm R8
Aff: 20 Luo
Neg: 1 Rothblatt-Kenney
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Suzie Kito

Judge's School Affiliation: El Cerrito HS

Speaker Code #: AFF: 20 pts 28 Speaker Code #: NEG: 1 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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:	Value: maximize individual potential	Negative:	Value: Justice
Criterion:		Criterion:	Gov't must act to benefit its citizens

marvelous indictment of NRA
 Value criterion somewhat missed the point that the way HG ban would maximize human potential is primarily thru ↑ life (↓ing murder and suicide) rather than by ↓ing power of NRA.

Self-defense is always justified.
 Self-defense is advanced by HG use.
 Did not state why HG ownership is a right.
 Good point that opponents did not make a strong link btwn NRA power + how that power's loss would result in ↑ people's potential.

SPEAKER CODE #: 1 on the NEG wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION → See next page (over) at bottom.

→ The argument relied too much on the NRA's power as a proxy for the argument that a HG ban would ↑ human potential.

Proved why her value was superior to AFF - more real world impact.

NEG contentions were very clear & linked to closely to the value statement.

AFF → good recovery ^(against NEG's contentions) in 2nd Rebuttal

Strong citations re: stats of how infrequent "victims" are helped by HG ownership

57% of murders done w/ HG; ~25% of rapes involve HG's

Should have emphasized the harm that HG cause in terms of ↑ freq. of suicide in places where HG allowed

NEG Equality comes before Justice

AFF Strong ending - re-stated how many suicides & murders are due to Hand-guns.

Constructive Criticism

NEG → You could have attacked more strongly the AFF's basic strategic error in focusing on the power of the NRA.

→ AFF: ~~Due~~ to your impressive argumentative and rhetorical skills you were able to ~~make~~ the debate about the NRA's power - but a more powerful strategy would have been to focus more on the essential argument that HG's are strongly linked to violence, and violence hinders the maximization of human potential.

Sineesh Keshav (*22)

Round 3A 1:30pm, R5

Aff: 11 Turner

Neg: 8 Vogety

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: SINEESH KESHAV

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY

AFF: 11 pts 29 NEG: 8 pts 27
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?

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:

Best moment: Framework & value question
Affirmative:
- handgun homicide rates compared: good
- suicides: ok - mass shootings: good
- Domestic issues: weak
- Effectiveness of ban - good - DC example
- Good handling of cross. Great point about this is not about enforcement but the idea
- Great cross - on morality & ought minority point was refuted well.

Best moment: Why enforcement matters
Negative
- Cross had several questions that were open ended - unless it was a set up to the constructive, wasn't sure where you were going
- minorities - constitution: good point - ninth amendment
- Opp case: morality code - good point. suicide & effectiveness: the argument did not address the off argument. Not feasible: already addressed
- Great point about 9th amendment in context of this:
Key strength: Delivery
Key opportunity: Better refutation

Key strength: Case analysis, Delivery, refutes
Key opportunity: constructive could be better.

SPEAKER CODE #: 11 on the AFF wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Aff presented a very compelling case that was not refuted well. Also neg failed to win on the question of justice vs. morality. (PTO)

Pos

- Rebuttal of minorities: good
- Eg of slavery and morality of constitution: excellent -
- Right to life over ~~the~~ 9th amendment
→ excellent point
- Gun control vs Gun ban
- very effective argument
- Framework question was effectively addressed.

Neg.

- good point about impacts needing to be considered
- Good argument about gun control not working
- Reiterated minority point
- but failed to address other ways than policing to enforce ban
- Did not address the slavery & morality of constitution

Sineesh Keshav (*22)

Round 3B 1:30pm R5
Aff: 8 Chillappagari
Neg: 16 Yao
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: SINEESH KESHAV

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY

AFF: 8 Speaker Code #: _____ pts 26 NEG: 16 Speaker Code #: _____ 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 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 moment: Initial constructive

Affirmative:

- value: societal welfare, minimize suffering
- harmful to children: too many numbers that took away from the point
- more homicides: good comparison to other countries
- more suicides:
- Culture of violence point was rebutted
- didn't provide a convincing rebuttal to it

Key strength: Value & just justification

Key opportunity: delivery -> more fluent

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the NEG wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

- Better refutation
- Better evidence
- Better delivery

Best moment: Initial cross

Negative

- Good cross: solvency & harmful items around children. Great point about will ban solve the problems off marriage
- self defense: good stats
- Deterrent to crime.
- Ban is impossible to implement
- how do you confiscate
- black market
- Burden of aff to provide solvency good

Key strength: Evidence, Refutation

Key opportunity: cant think of one - great debater

(PTO)

AFF

- Rebuttal was not very effective.
- The point about Australia should have been presented sooner. It is an excellent point.

NEG

- Good rebuttal on
 - culture of violence
 - women
- Good handling of cross
- 65%, 9% stat very effective
- Correlation vs solvency
 - good point

Sam Karetti (*20)
Round 3A 1:30pm R1
Aff: 9 Sterling
Neg: 16 Huang
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: SAM KARETTI

Judge's School Affiliation: Quarrylane

AFF: Speaker Code #: 9 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 16 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 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: scale (1-5)

Affirmative:

Case Analysis — 5
Evidence — 5
Organization — 5
Value clash — 4
Refutation — 5
Delivery / Courtesy 4

Negative

Case Analysis — 5
Evidence — 5
Organization — 5
Value clash — 4
Refutation — 5
Delivery / Courtesy — 5

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the NEG wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION excellent eye contact, good delivery, just reasoning
logical reasoning

Sam Karetti (*20)
Round 3B 1:30pm R1
Aff: 8 Tallapeneni
Neg: 11 Gerardo
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: SAM KARETTI

Judge's School Affiliation: Quarry Lane

AFF: Speaker Code #: 8 pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 11 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?

● **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:

scale 1-5

Affirmative:

Case Analysis - 5
Evidence - 5
Organization - 4
Value clash - 5
Refutation - 5
Delivery/Courtesy - 5

Negative

Case Analysis - 5
Evidence - 4
Organization - 4
Value clash - 5
Refutation - 4
Delivery/Courtesy - 5

SPEAKER CODE #: 8 on the AFF wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION Good eye contact, evidence, & logical reasoning & flow.

Claudia Ault (*23)

Round 3A 1:30pm S2

Aff: 16 Patel

Neg: 11 Kona

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: C. ALT

Judge's School Affiliation: 23

AFF: Speaker Code #: 16 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 11 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 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: Value - justice

Good that you gave some references using Australia & proxy similarities to us good when making comparisons

I liked the fact you faced the 2nd amendment issues

effective org. in rebuttal

well organized - delivery effective + clear

not sure if you made case that ban on handguns would have substitute to rifles shotguns

SPEAKER CODE #: 11 on the

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

watch dropping off at end of rebuttal - almost sounded like you gave up

Negative

control vs. BAN

look at opponent when doing cross Avoid smirking

- 1. Critical for self defense - some lives
2. Criminals get guns illegally no effect on

effective in contemporary Australia example Be careful not to talk so fast - that one can't absorb info.

can you prove ban caused homicide rate to go up?

in terms of organization - you seem to bounce back & forth on Australia several times

did effective job in cross-exam by Affirmative

good rebuttal of rifle/shotgun argument org. strong on neg. rebuttal you did not address issue of suicide clearly

Claudia Ault (*23)
Round 3B 1:30pm S2
Aff: 11 Monasterial
Neg: 16 Su
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: C. ALT

Judge's School Affiliation: # 23

AFF: Speaker Code #: 11 pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 16 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?
- **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:

minimizing suffering - value
Affirmative:

1. reduce crime + violence
2. more crime w/ high rates of gun ownership
3. Bans are efficient + work

Aff - answer was effective

*good pace - volume + speed
analogy in opening of child drowning brought
issue morality to surface -
well organized in aff cross exam by
affirmative - easy to follow*

*work on organization in neg. rebuttal -
seems to be jumping around. might be that
you're talking too fast*
Negative
*in cross-exam - interesting question
re "is it best"*
*watch dropy voice at end of
sentences - avoid looking down
when asking question - ready too fast*
*1997 Wales - is 1840 old data? do it effective
to use*
*you have lots of pertinent material but
if you'd slow down, try to organize
more directly so arguments would be
easier to follow*

SPEAKER CODE #: 11 on the AFF wins this debate. ~~DEBATE~~

REASON FOR DECISION

*argument about other countries vs us -
effective - good distinctions*

*both effective -> {
in affirmative rebuttal - do careful
about saying "OK ok sure" - you were
not real conceding but at times sound of
like it
good rebuttal on other countries vs U.S.*

In the US private ownership of handguns ought to be banned.

Indu Kandasamy (*8)

Round 3A 1:30pm R4
Aff: 16 Fang Raymond
Neg: 10 Bali - MARYA
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Alex M. Schwartzman

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

AFF: Speaker Code #: 16 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 10 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 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:

- Speaks too quickly - should slow down and adjust tone throughout.
 - Explained his position very clearly.
 - Understood the logic and knew the facts.
 - provided supporting evidence.
 - was able to respond to rebuttals effectively.
 - Did not cross well - ???; were not effective to his position.
 - Rebuttal was not strong. Said Australia was a usually implying her example of storing wasn't?
- | | |
|---|----------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explained position well Gave good points rebutted Aff's position and provided suggestions on what better options are (ie. gun control, background checks) spoke calm and clearly. rebuttal were solid and provided statistics to support. | Negative |
|---|----------|

SPEAKER CODE #: 10 on the NEG wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

she was more clear and effective in her argument. And she rebutted the aff argument well.

Indu Kandasamy (*8)

Round 3B 1:30pm R4

Aff: 16 Lee

Neg: 11 Gray

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Alex M. Shvartzman

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

AFF: 16 pts 29 Speaker Code #: _____ NEG: _____ 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 = 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 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:

- spoke clearly but somewhat monotone.
- laid out her argument well
- solid rebuttal. Refuted his arguments by using his points against him. well done!
- speaks calmly
- close was good. best debate today.

Negative

- spoke clear and argued well
- was able to ~~answer~~ answer all of Aff's cross ex. ???
- too rushed.
- rebuttals are inaccurate
- ~~not~~ not really arguing her side - mostly trying to pick on Aff's argument.

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the Aff. wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Very effective argument. Rebutted all of Neg's pts. closed well and was articulate.

Danielle Kelly (*19)

Round 3A 1:30pm R6

Aff: 16 Park

Neg: 2 Wilson

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Danielle Kelly

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

Speaker Code #: AFF: 16 Park pts 27 Speaker Code #: NEG: 2 Wilson 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 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:

- He came in with strong argument and statistics
- He backed up his case with facts and figures.
- AFF is a strong speaker but argument became weaker after cross-exam.

Negative .

- Cross examination was very good and AFF seemed to contradict himself somewhat
- Neg stayed calm, cool and collected while making and ~~def~~ defending her points logically and with examples

SPEAKER CODE #: 2 Wilson on the NEG wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

NEG was consistent with her argument while presenting her case confidently. She made excellent points with her cross examination which weakened AFF's case.

Danielle Kelly (*19)

Round 3B 1:30pm R6

Aff: 16 Bronshteyn

Neg: 2 Jones-Solari

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Danielle Kelly

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 16 Bronshteyn pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 2 Jones-Solari 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 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:

- He came in with strong points and stats to back it.
- He spoke clearly and wasn't rattled by cross exam.
- He had several great points with examples

Negative

- She gave a good argument for her case
- She was strong under cross exam and made a valid argument with examples
- Her cross-exam was very logical and was supported with evidence
- Less use of "um" "

SPEAKER CODE #: 2 Jones Solari on the NEG wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

This was difficult because both sides did a good, thorough job and supplied evidence. In the end I felt the NEG'S case was stronger with more points given

Ms. Kenney (*1)
Round 4A 3:30pm R8
Aff: 11 Gray
Neg: 16 Sohi
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Sam Robertson

Judge's School Affiliation: FVHS

Speaker Code #: AFF: 11 pts 30 Speaker Code #: NEG: 16 pts 20

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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:

good job great eye contact and body language as well as eye contact while speaking

Negative

good job, great eye contact and volume while speaking in the beginning while speaking you were stuttering a bit try to relax and complete your thoughts

SPEAKER CODE #: 11 on the AFF wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

DROPPED POINTS $\frac{1}{2}$ lack of relevant evidence from neg

Ms. Kenney (*1)
Round 4B 3:30pm RB
Aff: 11 Goduco
Neg: 8 Chillappagari
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: Sam Robinson
Judge's School Affiliation: SVHS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 11 pts 30 NEG: Speaker Code #: 8 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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:

great job good volume and articulation when speaking

Negative

great job good volume while speaking but make sure you ask the judge if they prefer speaking before rounds

SPEAKER CODE #: ~~11~~ 11 on the AFF wins this debate. (AFF of NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Dropped points by neg

Claudia Ault (*23)

Round 4A 3:30pm R1
Aff: 16 Yao
Neg: 11 Turner
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: C. Ault

Judge's School Affiliation: 23

AFF: Speaker Code #: 16 pts 28

NEG: Speaker Code #: 11 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 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:

Slow down — hard to absorb major points *advocacy control vs ban*

Affirmative: *look at opponent's duty cross* → Negative: *look at opponent in cross*

improve welfare
reduce homicide rate
16% mississippi decline - was it study
just on hand guns
affirm. in cross - direct & specific

Ban - reduces black market
some restrictions - ie CT
suicides - but this evidence was not a ban?
interesting in final rebuttal about alternative

control
control (?)
Banning guns ineffective — proof statement
good that in mass shootings no right to defend; however aren't most mass shootings using other than hand guns
Bar guns Ban gun better to ~~control~~
effective use of Japan vs US statistics
- well organized a good looping back to AFF issue
- Japan vs US - good rebuttal
- not sure you can tell opponent what we can/cannot come back to
- might want to include what other things Australia is doing

SPEAKER CODE #: 11 on the (AFF or NEG) wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION

Final rebuttal was your strongest.
I think you'd be much stronger if you slowed down - perhaps not cramming so much info - let ideas sink in

Final summary well organized
- nice style + delivery

Claudia Ault (*23)

Round 4B 3:30pm R1
Aff: 8 Pandey
Neg: 16 Park
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: C. Ault

Judge's School Affiliation: 22

AFF: Speaker Code #: 8 pts 27 NEG: Speaker Code #: 16 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Very close debate

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: I think you ought to stand for your presentation - unless you have a reason not to do so.

Negative

protection of rights

in cross - clear, direct questions avoid getting into argument - but good to clarify points. - well delivered questions

- banning guns impractical (couldn't remove from private owners)

- protects innocent lives

to support your points - good references

- correlation of gun ownership questioned

Challenged

- did good job in cross by aff.

- liked your opening to negative rebuttal.

on causation/correlation

- not harm to society - ? proof?

Be careful not to show indignation but - tone down that one in Neg. reb.

- 15/16 criminals - good argument

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the Neg (AFF or NEG) wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION

glad you did this in neg. rebuttal much more effective in this portion of debate

This would have been higher if first 6 minutes had been stronger & I even to understand work on this for next debate

need from computer / did not stand for aff. constructive or cross

private ownership prod. more crime

slow down - too fast & look down at computer - make it hard to follow & complicated knowing what major issues were

suicide - should address - whether a proof statement for this - came to this - good

2000-2002 - rather old for stats

don't be dismeasure of cross questions

Andrew Schwartz (*18)

Round 4A 3:30pm R4
Aff: 10 Bali
Neg: 16 Massey
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Andrew Schwartz

Judge's School Affiliation: Northgate

AFF: 10 pts 19 Speaker Code #: 16 NEG: 16 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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:

+ Great job explaining your case
+ good arguments on the key value
+ his refutation was focused on how aus isn't a good example but immediately before he talked about Europe which is vulnerable to the same criticism
+ your list of mass shootings in the 2AR was good but

Negative

+ Great job laying out your case, clear speaking voice
+ I don't think your CL really relates to your value, hard to weigh as a result
+ In your rebuttal you claimed that the her 1, 2 & 3 cs were non-unique. However her ~~initial~~ initial cards & 1st rebuttal info explained how alternatives are less

SPEAKER CODE #: 10 on the AFF wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION

I would have preferred voters + a reiteration of your value's importance

The debate had abundant clash but at the end the AFF better crystalized how they'd won and why. + great refutation throughout. + good points on the black market one of your best pieces of argumentation + you could clarify crime's relation to your value

Andrew Schwartz (*18)

Round 4B 3:30pm R4
Aff: 11 Gerardo
Neg: 8 Sathiya
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Andrew Schwartz

Judge's School Affiliation: Northgate

AFF: U pts 27 Speaker Code #: _____
NEG: 8 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 = 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 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:

+ I think you did a great job laying out a diverse & thorough case + if your opponent won't let you finish a point in cross x just say NO.
+ I think your work on the value debate was good but this should've been your focus

Negative

+ your one of the clearest, most understandability debater I've heard today.
+ I feel like you conflate crime & safety in a dangerous way, as your debate world is extremely unsafe for criminals and those w/o access to guns. I think the argument about guns being a threat can diminish this point but had it been called it would have derailed your whole case.

SPEAKER CODE #: 8 on the 27 wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION

The AFF spent a lot of it's time on ~~points~~ ~~at the debate~~ ~~contentions & lost value~~
It was super important throughout the debate
+ good contention debate work on value level

but had it been called it would have derailed your whole case.
great cross X

Lucas Tung (*11)

Round 4A 3:30pm R5
Aff: 16 Nielsen
Neg: 9 Sterling
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Lucas Tung

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF: Speaker Code #: 16 pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 9 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 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:

- excellent speaker, but reads too much during speech. Minimal eye contact although very articulate.
- contentions tie to value/crit very well.
- lack of mut. excl. for 2nd neg cont was very strong response.

Negative

- great fluency and pacing. Makes speech very easy to listen to. Reads a lot, but has organized case.
- not seeing conflict over which value/crit I should prefer in this round.
- refutation of causation in Boston study was very strong.
- great at analyzing minute details of opponent case.

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Without much discussion or clash ~~one~~ on the framework, I defaulted to the line-by-line. Both sides were very equal on number of arguments won, but the lack of sign posting on neg and "Ireland is diff country, yet Australia is negated" argument in Aff rebuttal pushed the round in favor of Aff.

Lucas Tung (*11)

Round 4B 3:30pm R5
Aff: 16 Yu
Neg: 8 Yu
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Lucas Tung

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF: Speaker Code #: 16 pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 8 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 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

- excellent voice projection and fluency, but not enough eye contact or tonal variation.
- Decent push back during Neg CX.
- good job pointing out flaws in neg rebuttal in the voters.
- started strong, but lost balance after the 'value contradiction'.

- very strong presence during CX. Excellent presentation. Very sharp and poised, but reads too much.
- work on time management or word efficiency.
- excellent analysis of broader issues (i.e. minority arg)
- assumptions on behavior of suicide and Black Market not very strong.

SPEAKER CODE #: 8 on the NEG wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Neg made a very strong response to Aff framework early on and snowballed from there. While Aff had a solid standalone case and delivery, Neg excelled at expanding the debate to more impactful issues, like oppression of ethnic minorities. Could have done some impact calc to really make the distinction clear.

Datta Mokkalah

Tricia Maxson (*2)

Round 4A 3:30pm S2

Aff: 16 Hanif

Neg: 11 Monasterial

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Datta Mokkalah

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

AFF: 16 Speaker Code #: _____ pts 29 NEG: 11 Speaker Code #: _____ pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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:

Handwritten notes for Affirmative: well organized speech, control the pace of the speech, meaning slowdown a bit, too much use of words right, etc.

Negative

Handwritten notes for Negative: well organized speech, Do not hesitate to convince the Judge, (you need more convincing to do), you don't have to agree to your opponent, need to have a plan for this, handling the situations, Also address all the contentions

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the AFF wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Datta Mokkaapati

Tricia Maxson (*2)

Round 4B 3:30pm S2
Aff: 20 Luo
Neg: 11 Grewal
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Datta Mokkaapati

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 20 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 11 pts 30

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 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:

Very well organized speech.
Need to provide ^{more} specifics /
in your plan. Any
Example references would help.
(pointing to studies articles etc.)
you need to address opponents
points in detail.

Negative

Very well organized speech.
You have a great potential
to succeed in debates.
Controlling / maintaining
the pace of the
debate will help

SPEAKER CODE #: 11 on the NEG wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

In VS. handguns should be banned
outright

Hina Habib (*22)
Round 4A 3:30pm R3
Aff: 16 Su
Neg: 1 Mallah - (VAN)
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: Alex M. Shrivastava
Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

AFF: 16 pts 26 NEG: 1 pts 28
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?
- **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:

- Speaks too quickly and not clearly.
- hard to follow all the info.
- ~~too much info~~ too many different points brought up, not coherent argument
- Ask questions during cross but doesn't give opportunity to answer, cuts off opponent.
- Arguments are all over the place. Sources back and forth making it hard to understand the point
- Close was pretty good - recapped well.

Negative

- overly cross questioned hard!
- Speaks too quickly but clear
- Made several good points
- cross was solid but didn't refute all ~~good~~ points
- Stayed on topic, kept arguments coherent

SPEAKER CODE #: 1 on the Neg wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

• Argument was more clear and coherent. Had a better grasp of the material and does able to respond faster.

Hina Habib (*22)

Round 4B 3:30pm R3
Aff: 10 Qadeer Horra
Neg: 16 Patel, Neil
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Alex M. Shrestha

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

AFF: Speaker Code #: 10 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 16 pts 25

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 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:

- o laid out argument clearly. Made good points that I haven't heard especially regarding statistics on DC ban
- o refuted neg's points effectively but should push harder.
- o rebuttal was good.
- o spoke clearly and coherently.
- o understood the argument.

Negative cross was very weak. Didn't seem to know what to ask.

- o constructive portion was good but as soon as he's questioned on points he concedes his position.
- o Why didn't he bring up the 2nd round?
- o Brought up statistics that aren't clear: "guns used for self defense millions of times?"
- o Misunderstood DC case and spent a lot of time arguing it incorrectly.

SPEAKER CODE #: 10 on the AFF wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Had a much stronger argument. Understood both sides whereas Neg seemed confused and lacked confidence in his argument.

- misfire only?
- D.C rates drop?

Oleg Tiktinslei (*20)

Round 4A 3:30pm S3

Aff: 2 Jones-Solari

Neg: 1 Rothblatt-Kenney

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Oleg Tiktinslei

Judge's School Affiliation: Quarry Lane

AFF: Speaker Code #: 2 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 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:

- 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. Good point about freedom of speech
2. Confident speaker #1
3. Govs - reduce democracy? interesting

- 1. Good speaker, fast but speech is clear & understood.
2. Good point about law abiding ppl vs. criminals.
3. Bit nervous.

SPEAKER CODE #: 2 Jones-Solari on the AFF wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Very equal debate. Both provide good evidence & argument. However I feel the AFF won by being more confident.

Oleg Tiktinslei (*20)

Round 4B 3:30pm S3

Aff: 11 Kona

Neg: 16 Lee

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Oleg Tiktinski

Judge's School Affiliation: Quarry Lane

AFF: 11 Speaker Code #: 11 pts 28 NEG: 16 Speaker Code #: 16 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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:

- 1. Good speaker ship, very expressive.
2. Good presentation overall

Negative

- 1. Very good presentation
2. Nice flow of speech.
3. Some times too loud.

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 Lee on the NEG wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

One of the strong debates of the day. Both are very good I granted equal points to both. However I think in this case Negative won.

Roopali Bali (*10)

Round 4B 3:30pm R6
Aff: 8 Vogety
Neg: 16 Bronshteyn
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Roopali Bali

Judge's School Affiliation: IHS

Speaker Code #: AFF: 8 pts 28 Speaker Code #: NEG: 16 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 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:

Value - Utilitarianism
 VC - Min. human suffering
 C1 - Handguns compromise safety
 - cause suicides X
 - hunts minority grps. X
 - fails to protect others. X
 C2 - Handgun perpetuates gun culture/militarism
 - compromises foreign policy

Negative Value - Justice

VC - Protection of rights.
 C1 - Ban ineffective in achieving goal
 C2 - Ban would cost many lives
 - Inc. in organized crime as demand still there.
 Person alive but no choice?
 Autonomy? ban alcohol?

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the NEG wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION This was a very close decision. Both debaters presented a good case for their position. Aff needs to provide more eye contact. Neg was able to provide more evidence for the case, and refuted well the arguments provided by Aff.

Roopali Bali (*10)

Round 4A 3:30pm R6
Aff: 8 Redkar
Neg: 11 Cooper
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Roopali Bali

Judge's School Affiliation: IHS

AFF: Speaker Code #: _____ pts _____ NEG: Speaker Code #: _____ 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 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: _____

SPEAKER CODE #: 8 on the Aff wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Neg: 11 Cooper - No show. Waited for 45 min.

Katherine Jubelirer (*12)

Round 4B 3:30pm R7
Aff: 16 Huang
Neg: 8 Tallapeneni
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: K. Jubelirer

Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett High School

AFF: Speaker Code #: 16 Huang pts 29

NEG: Speaker Code #: 8 Tallapeneni 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 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:

- good organization
- very clear explanation of evidence
- good case, well constructed
- good responses to cross X
- good cross X
- great value clash
- great rebuttal - reviewed + rebuts neg points very well
- ~~great rebuttal~~
- good evidence
- great speaking - clear w/ good emphasis

Negative

- strong cross X
- this is a very fast speaking speed
- good case
- good evidence
- good refutation of aff case
- great value clash
- speak more slowly in cross X
- good responses
- good philosophical response
- speaker should be standing for their arguments

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 Huang on the AFF wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

This is a very close round. AFF had better organization, neg certainly had a lot of evidence. AFF wins - easier to understand argument, organization, + evidence.

Katherine Jubelirer (*12)

Round 4A 3:30pm R7
Aff: 2 Wilson
Neg: 16 Fang
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: K. Jubelirer

Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett High School

AFF: 2 Wilson pts 29 NEG: 16 Fang pts 30

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 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:

- good, clear speaker
- good rhetoric + logic
- good evidence, but not enough -> some well supported contentions, but many unsupported contentions in CI
- good responses to cross in reframing argument - that said, you do need more evidence - you make ~~many~~ many claims that should be backed up by evidence
- good response to CI in rebuttal
- ok value clash
- Why should logic function as evidence?

Negative

- good cross X -> going after lack evidence
- great evidence - esp. C 2
- clear speaker, good emphasis
- good organization
- good philosophical response to Value/VC
- good response to C's
- good responses to cross
- great balance of evidence + philosophy
- great value clash
- very clear in responses - excellent organization
- excellent work

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 Fang on the NEG wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Both extremely capable debaters. AFF needed evidence. Great debate to watch! One of the best of the day!