Jay Menon (*5)		LINCOLN			
Round 2A 11:00am Room 15 Aff: 9 Dhakal		Judge's Name:	JAY	MENU	<u>N</u>
Neg: 12 Habib JV L-D Debate		Judge's School Affil	liation:	DUBLEN	HISH
AFF: Speaker Code #:	<u>9 pts</u> 27	N. Speaker Code #:	EG:	12	<u>pts_28</u>
Please award each spea				2011/2 <sup>10</sup> 10.0 <sup>1</sup> 20.01	
	30 = Perfect $29 = O$				<b>、</b>
26-25 = Fair 2	l (but possibly not good 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved	for rude of	or inapprop	;) riate behavior
		ing Criteria			
Using the above criteri each debater:	a, please offer comp	oliments and/or s	suggestio	ns for impi	ovement for
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develo	p a case in response to the r	esolution?			
• EVIDENCE: Although value debating emphas should be used to support argum	sizes logic and persuasion, e	widence (quoted materi	ial, contempo	orary or historic	cal examples)
• ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organized					
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emp	hasize the value being supp	orted by his/her side, a	nd how well	was that value	measured?
<ul> <li>(Criterion)</li> <li><b>REFUTATION:</b></li> <li>How thoroughly did the debater in</li> </ul>	refute the arguments of the	opposition and rebuild	his/her own	side?	
• <b>DELIVERY/COURTESY</b> Did each debater speak in comm	:				
Using the above criteria	a, please offer comp	liments and/or s	uggestior	ns for impr	ovement to
each debater: Note: one observer	was present f	on Neg's teau	n, when	asked	Aff did not explicitly chief.
Attimative:	The arguments	Negative C,	ossex	of Aff	was good & effectively
however was of	weak	. TE	nideting	p Though	ke points, pordered
Wag unable to prove the gest ponses ma	de dunig crosses	However	Aff le	ments c	bave the upper
Good Crossepo of 1	Nep.		trons	ex. "Go	a strong claim to
However rebuttel of stronger: Nep did information but A	If claimed than	innune te malee, ceul	2) have	= provide	el cridence &
info was not for lifes sowed by Nucle	ded. (millions e)	Over flowed timer foil	constru lure.	uctive tr	el evidence & itself. mette speech itself. verset due to self. rebuttal & strong
SPEAKER CODE #:	,	NEGy wins th	is debate.	, 5009 K	finish.
REASON FOR DECISION	More confid.				r Crossex :
AFF	seemed to	lose steam	n in	2no ha	ff of the debate.
Neg	rebuttal wo	vs very sto	rente L	finishe	iff y the debate. I well.



Jay Menon (*5)	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Round 2B 11:00am Room 15	Judge's Name: JAY MENOW
Aff: 11 Banisadr	
Neg: 9 Vatturi JV L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: DUBLIN HIGH
A TTT.	
Speaker Code #: $11 pts_2$	$\frac{1}{2} \text{ Speaker Code #:} \qquad \qquad$
Please award each speaker points based	on the following scale:
30 = Perfect 29 =	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not go	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair <b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Juc	lging Criteria
each debater:	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)
• <b>ORGANIZATION:</b> How well did the debater organize both the constructive a	
• VALUE CLASH:	
(Criterion)	pported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• <b>REFUTATION:</b> How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the	te 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 eviteria places offer and	
each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative: Constructive Speech &	Negative weak crosses of Aff not
Affirmative: Excellent Constructive Speech & Delwing: Very good worrers reponses.	pour any mayor rates in 1110 cares.
weak crossess of Neg, some	- Constructive Speech was delivered straply. - Crossess reesponses were weale, but
missed opportuniting	Aff's crossex questions were weak too.
First Rebuttle way pood but	Pit the account of "I of for
seemed less strong then the first constructive. Key contention was that best way to shift development to renew ables in to bom micleon . New cild they com	comprimises / as justments to make nuclear
first Constructive that best way	Latter, instead of barres nuclear entirely" as looked convincing.
to Ishift development to rener ables in	as looked convincing.
to ban nuclear Neg said they can coexist; Aff only neale future-look	
SPEAKER CODE #: on th	AFF or NEG)
REASON FOR DECISION This was	a tough one to call, Aff was
better on speaking, can fi	dence & delivery; However did not arguments or rebuiltab to reject Neg. half; Neg had upper hand in 2 <sup>ND</sup> half.
have sufficiently convincin	parguments or rebuttab to reject Neg.
AFF was superior in the first	+ half; Neghad upper hand in 2" half.



Round 2A	<b>Diamant (*6)</b> 11:00am Room 11			LINCOLN Judge's Name:	DOUGLAS De DAM Djama	ebate
Aff: 11 I Neg: 12 JV L-D	Raja			Judge's School Affili	ation: EL Cer	rito HS
	AF	F:		NE	EG:	. 4 - 4
	Speaker Code #:	11	pts_26	_ Speaker Code #:	12	pts_27
:		30 = Pc Good (but pc	erfect $29 = 0$	on the following scDutstanding28 = 1od enough to qualify<20 = Reserved to	Very Good	
			Ind	ging Criteria		
	Using the above of a contract of the second se	eriteria, plea		pliments and/or s	uggestions for im	provement for
	• CASE ANALYSIS How well did the debate		in response to the	resolution?		an a
2	<ul> <li>EVIDENCE:</li> <li>Although value debating hould be used to suppor</li> <li>ORGANIZATION</li> </ul>	t arguments. Ho	ic and persuasion, ow effective was t	evidence (quoted materia he evidence?	al, contemporary or histo	orical examples)
I	How well did the debate VALUE CLASH:	2170 200	he constructive ar	nd rebuttal speeches?		
(	Iow clearly did the deba Criterion) • <b>REFUTATION:</b>	ater emphasize th	ne value being sup	ported by his/her side, an	d how well was that val	ue measured?
I	Iow thoroughly did the <b>DELIVERY/COU</b>	RTESY:		e opposition and rebuild h		
I	Did each debater speak i	n communicative	e style that was pl	easant, easily understanda	able, and civil?	
	Using the above c each debater:	riteria, plea	se offer com	pliments and/or su	uggestions for im	provement to
o preser	Affirmative: sted a cleor cl st able to prov	ase with str ide clear a	ong contentio		core clearly	. and purrudeal
effect	welly used negs	s evidence fo	or hiscun (A	Je opposidede	evidence that	helped the AFE
Chave	bled more bala	in. very a	upant is	19) angument onc	ury detend his	velue criterion
O EXDA	evotind. Stop	h equan	Neria	sle to improve	rebuildighes of	e NGF CASE, but needs um case
to use A	jogs argumoit	r against l	1101.	" Clear del	very, good an	etculation, too
rebuilt	reputation of his	the.	1 carjos	this della		cen and speak mule
	PEAKER CODE	10	on th	AFF wins th		
	EASON FOR DEC		C	LFF or NEG)		
The	AFF provided	a strong	er ord C	learer cone	ord effective	y used the
hea	is evidence to	bleck up	his own (	AFF) CASE. The el. While the A	of wins the n	a not clearly oud, I found his
<000	king stylets b	e poor ord	In need o	f improvement.		

Adam Diamant (*6) Round 2B 11:00am Room 11 Aff: 5 Bedi		LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: ADAM DIAMANT
Neg: 9 Goulart JV L-D Debate		Judge's School Affiliation: EL CERVITO HS
AFF Speaker Code #:	: <u>5 pts 29</u>	NEG:pts28
Please award each	speaker points based $30 = Perfect 20 = 0$	on the following scale: Outstanding 28 = Very Good
2.7 = 0		od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair	24-20 = Poor	
		lging Criteria
Using the above cr each debater:	iteria, please offer com	apliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS:		-
How well did the debater of <b>EVIDENCE</b> :	develop a case in response to the	
Although value debating e should be used to support a <b>ORGANIZATION:</b>	mphasizes logic and persuasion arguments. How effective was	, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) the evidence?
	organize both the constructive a	nd rebuttal speeches?
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debate	er emphasize the value being sur	pported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
(Criterion) • <b>REFUTATION:</b>		
	bater refute the arguments of th	e opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
• <b>DELIVERY/COUR</b> Did each debater speak in		leasant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above cri	iteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:		
Affirmative:		Negative
Strong Case development	it, clear roadmap	Presented a clear case with strong cententions.
end Contentions. STR	ing use of evidence	· WAS notable to address several important
powerful AFF Cross X		
negatives value criter	ion and key content	tion " Strong speaker, but occassionally got
In his Argument. Very	good speaker.	confused or stambled on his words.
polished speaker with	good presentation.	· Inedvententy provided Support to the ABFS
ponerful 1st NFF Confer	in; Aff X and 2 Ak	R. Cose and argument. Did a good jab of trying to emphasize the Vehre clash.
Very strong me of evide	ence and refutation	> Did a good job of thying to emphablic the
of the Neg CASE. STr	ong detense of his	Verne Clash.
Our CASE. Supers 1 SPEAKER CODE #:	5 on th	<ul> <li>Dida good job of trying to emphasize the Vehne clash.</li> <li>Used too many terms of A-t like "Ufil"</li> <li>AFF wins this debate. and veterred to his "lands"</li> <li>AFF or NEG)</li> <li>Strong performance overall</li> </ul>
		AFF or NEG) Strang performance overall
REASON FOR DECIS	SION (Below)	The defense of
- Shonger case	= Malusis: STIDA	den Use of evidence, short of the state
CAJE. EFUELTIP	ATTAOL ON THO MY	Pas case that has not fluc
54 The May, Att	thas Able to shi	ow how MJ Vame Criterion aport on e
the neas rahe Cr	iterion ord how y	the Affs case did a better job of even Achieving the Neg's value objective.



Veronica Rogers (\*9) Round 2A 11:00am Room 9 Aff: 14 Pollard ~ Neg: 5 Thurgam JV L-D Debate

nica Rogers (*9) 2A 11:00am Room 9 9 Pollard – 9 Thurgam 9 Debate	Judge's Name: <u>Amie Esslinger</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>James Logo</u>	
Speaker Code #: POILO VO	NEG: 	_pts_28

I INCOL N DOLICI AS Debate

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 · Knew subject well enough to refute opponents points · clear, speaking voice · could read slower at . some terms of subject seemed to confuse you, some of his contentions were not sealt with. · Clear speaking voice, but speed up at times a used different tones. - More convinging  $\frac{1}{1}$  on the  $\frac{Nlg}{(AFF \text{ or NEG})}$  wins this debate. **SPEAKER CODE #:** Better Knowledge of sabject, was best at refutation while remaining polite. **REASON FOR DECISION** 



### 

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 - clear, powerful, convincing -very passionate yet professional - Some may think it rude to not let your opponent answer during - not sure whu didn't state your even if she didn' it in your papers, you could have stated it. -clear speaker, could have spep up at times. -great point about lack of Jeuidence - you did a gread job of keeping your cool + restating your facts. D on the 2 **SPEAKER CODE #:** wins this debate. (AFF or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION** at presentation of material, and refutation.



Ben Goldstone (*3) Round 2A 11:00am Room 12	1404 No. 1 N. 2 N	Judge's Name: SEN GullStone
Aff: 9 Andrade		
Neg: 1 Korchin IV L-D Debate		Judge's School Affiliation:
AFF:		NEG:
Speaker Code #: 9	pts_70	Speaker Code #: /pts_2/
Please award each sp	-	on the following scale:
		Dutstanding 28 = Very Good
		od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair	<b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judg	ging Criteria
	eria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	1 7 3	$\sim 2$
	9- 23	
	relop a case in response to the $\hat{1}$ - $\hat{1}$	
• EVIDENCE: Although value debating emp		evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)
	uments. How effective was the	
• ORGANIZATION:	9	70 1 20
How well did the debater orga	anize both the constructive an	nd rebuttal speeches?
• VALUE CLASH:	9	26 1 26
How clearly did the debater e	mphasize the value being sup	ported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
(Criterion) • <b>REFUTATION:</b>		7.7 77
	ter refute the arguments of the	e opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
DELIVEDV/COIDTE	STV.	
Did each debater speak in cor	nmunicative style that was ple	easant, easily understandable, and civil? were Kind + Supportione of pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to EAC
	Roth	were Kind + Supportinged
Using the above crite	ria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:		Y.
		dru
Affirmative:	Next,	Negative
Affirmative: Meds merce	Applysis	Appreciated Her Conviction of Pris. Premise
more Evide	met ili	or prist recent
	Specific E.b	Needer more evidence
	Inces	+ Forts
		+ Better argnovizan.
	· ·	The wins this debate.
REASON FOR DECISION	ON BALL	Seemed Very But #1 WAS A little Fareful
	Nov - (	R + 11 / 1/1/
XALAN	nonena os	put # MAS A little

delightion - anglt (EBS: Burnt OSac. Welfare . Quintity of life Mumlity - Utoletarony , Policy Denver John - B3/K - 255 Nogle Boon + Informas anality of lik DMust Altiphle For at Panyy Nullar holifepotre Cunnchn Judium Julia 3 Juhnt Safly - Orfl (2) Emmulal Horms meltdums # Enbre Peleren Nuclear 3 Deven the phitol Conuchur Marolity truthe a/ reditation VA

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Pinole Judge 1 (\*14) Round 2A 11:00am Room 16 Judge's Name: Howard Murayanece Aff: 12 Zhou Neg: 9 Agustin JV L-D Debate Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan AFF: NEG: pts 28 Speaker Code #: pts 28 Speaker Code #: 12 Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good27 = 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? 0 **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 affirmative brings up good

points on possibilities of proliferation environmental harm and renewable energy options, efficiency orguments on both sides negates option contention 3. Try not be be boxed in corner on Iran (North Korea examples. utilitarianism argument and efficiency started well. Efficiency should be based on costs, but argument on production effectively countered AFC, There could be more arguments made to societal well being and environmental concerns to differentiate from AFC.

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

REASON FOR DECISION Asual from countering Aff on proliferation with Iran and North Korea, Neg needs more arguments on how proliferation concerns can be addressed. Environment argument leans to Aff as plags counter of more morey needed to claim environment is too general.

en en fres a serie e serie de la compañía de la com

file of a second second

at in an ion of the second s

(1) A set of the se

Ben Goldstone (*3)	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Round 2B 11:00am Room 12	Judge's Name: Ren GoldStand
Aff: 12 Zhou Neg: 9 Grover	
JV L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
AFF: Speaker Code #: <u>/ 2</u> pts_ <u>2</u> &	NEG: 77
ptspts	Speaker Code #: <u>9</u> pts <u></u>
Please award each speaker points based o	on the following scale:
30 = Perfect  29 = 0	Dutstanding $28 = $ Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair <b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	ging Criteria
Using the above criteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	2
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the	
• EVIDENCE:	resolution?
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion,	evidence (quoted material contemporary or historical average)
should be used to support arguments. How effective was the	ne evidence?
• ORGANIZATION: 28 How well did the debater organize both the constructive an	d whyttel an archeve
• VALUE CLASH:	23
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being sup	ported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
(Criterion) • REFUTATION:	8 7 (
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the	O composition and rebuild his/her own side?
DELIVERY/COURTESY:	
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was ple	asant, easily understandable, and civil?
each debater:	oliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
the states.	
Affirmative:	Negative
Affirmative: Good Endence t Good Endence t Refutestant	Inegative (A)
Solid Ons, Endenee, 1	Neede strongen Rebutes Neede strongen Rebutes Fondunce
Good Pur Latonen	I dromen Retrivers
Reputer	Needle Son Strange
V	1 Andunal
	Art
SPEAKER CODE #: 1 on the	
REASON FOR DECISION (AI	For NEG) Detrikel Etoilel Enderice in Arguent Funderice in Arguent
in it hatter argpnized	. /.
IL WAY LOUT SA	ecitic - A
Shangen mine 1	Expiled N WGUM
	Endunie ' I ble but s
	T



RODNEY	GOTHEL	f						
Round 2A 11:0			P		LINCOI	<b>N DOUGL</b>	AS De	bate
Round 2A 11:0 Aff: 6 Yu	0am Room 1	13			Judge's Name:	ROAVET 6	STATL	<u>,</u>
Neg: 9 khan JV L-D Deba					Judge's School A	Affiliation: Son	Omp	ACADIME
		AFF:				NEG:		
Speak	ter Code #:_		6	pts_ <u>78</u>	Speaker Code #:	NEG: 9		pts_27
Pleas	se award	each sp	eaker poin	its based or	n the followin	g scale:		Taga Ang de anti-ser a ser
			30 = Perfe	ect $29 = 0^{-1}$	utstanding 28	= Very Good		
	2	:7 = Goo	d (but possi	bly not good	l enough to qual	lify for elimination	on roun	ds)
26-2	25 = Fair		<b>24-20</b> = P	oor	<20 = Reserv	ed for rude or i	nappro	priate behavior
				Judg	ing Criteria			
Using	g the abo	ve crite	ria, please	offer comp	liments and/o	or suggestions	for im <sub>l</sub>	provement for
eacn	debater:						-	1 In the second seco
	ASE ANAL		1 .					
	VIDENCE:	soaler deve	top a case in re	esponse to the re	esolution?			
Althou	gh value deba	ating emph	asizes logic an	d persuasion, e ffective was the	vidence (quoted ma	aterial, contemporar	y or histor	rical examples)
• 0]	RGANIZAT	<b>ION:</b>	inchts. 110W C.		e evidence?			
How w	ell did the de	ebater organ	nize both the c	onstructive and	rebuttal speeches?			
• V	ALUE CLAS	SH:						
How cl (Criterie	early did the on)	debater em	phasize the va	lue being suppo	orted by his/her side	e, and how well was	that value	e measured?
	EFUTATIO							
How the	oroughly did	the debate	r refute the arg	uments of the c	opposition and rebu	ild his/her own side	?	
• DI	ELIVERY/C	COURTES	Y:					
Dia cac	n debater spe	sak ili comi	nunicative sty	e that was plea	sant, easily underst	andable, and civil?		
Using each o	; the abov debater:	e criter	ia, please o	offer compl	liments and/o	r suggestions f	or imp	rovement to
Affirn	native:				Negative	$\mathbf{i}$		
(						JELL CONS	TRUC	TED CASE
			CP52 +		SLIGHT	LT 4555	PLA	SUPSIUZ
					wett	RECOLUT	2	
	ALON		LLP30 \$4					
SPEAR	KER COD	E #:	6		Aff_wins	this debate.		
	ON FOR D				F or NEG)			
Bo	TH SIT	D 25	vant c	2000	Aff mo	az P-ps-	PSIV	ž_
m	CAS3	- 602	APLL, I	Aff HAJ	DZASIZA	FIMZ SUPPO	anne	= THEOR
Sii	is w	シレノリス	ncz, No	EG, Cour	-DZT RZFJ	ż Somi PT	3.	



DWET GDTUZIF TIMIRAGHUMATBAD(B) d 2B 11:00am Room 13 6 Taban	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Deb Judge's Name: Rod Wat Gott	ate =LF		
-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: SoNOm A	ALADZMY		
AFF: 6 pts_2	NEG: Speaker Code #: / Z			
Please award each speaker points based 30 = Perfect 29 = 27 = Cood (but people)	= Outstanding <b>28</b> = Very Good	ananaana ahaa ahaana		
$27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)$ $26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor \qquad <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate b$				
Ju	idging Criteria			
Using the above criteria, please offer co each debater:	mpliments and/or suggestions for impre	ovement for		
<ul> <li>CASE ANALYSIS:</li> <li>How well did the debater develop a case in response to t</li> <li>EVIDENCE:</li> </ul>				
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasic should be used to support arguments. How effective was • ORGANIZATION:	s the evidence?	l examples)		
<ul> <li>How well did the debater organize both the constructive</li> <li>VALUE CLASH:</li> <li>How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being st (Criterion)</li> </ul>		easured?		
<ul> <li>REFUTATION:</li> <li>How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of t</li> <li>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</li> <li>Did each debater speak in communicative style that was p</li> </ul>				
Using the above criteria, please offer cone each debater:		vement to		
Affirmative:	Negative			
VIAN Gross STPRT up	HID STROWG REFIT	Lasta		
LLIPR POINTS / USZ OF	ON ALMOST ALL POL	uts		
ZVIDINCZ - ABLZ TO	B-T UTTLITRIPMSM			
REF-TZ MANZY POUNTS	JUST SLIGHTLT LISS P	UNLUPSIUT		
w2/2 11/2 10/1/2 10001)				
•	OW THAT AND CHANG ENIDENCE W/A/T 340			
wzh				
SPEAKER CODE #: 6 on the	he Aff wins this debate.			
SPEAKER CODE #: 6 on the case of the case	be Aff wins this debate. AFF or NEG			
SPEAKER CODE #: 6 on the second seco	he <u>Aff</u> wins this debate. AFF or NEG	Z ovzk Lecondo		
SPEAKER CODE #: 6 on the REASON FOR DECISION VERT CLOS & DZBATZ -> 1 PUBSUASWE ON THE 10 65	he Aff wins this debate.	Z ONZA Lasned		



Chien Fang (*12)	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Round 1B 9:00am Room 12	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: Chien Favor
Aff: 6 Garrison Neg: 11 Banisadr JV L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vieta
AFF: AFF: pts_2	NEG:
Please award each speaker points based	on the following scale:
30 = Perfect 29 =	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not get	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair <b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Ju	dging Criteria
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS:	
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the	ne resolution?
• EVIDENCE:	
should be used to support arguments. How effective was	n, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)
ORGANIZATION:	the evidence?
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 the	te opposition and rowild high an arm with a
DELIVERY/COURTESY:	
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was p	leasant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative:	Negative
. Good clearly-stated	. Excellent Cross-exam and
contentions.	Rebuttel arguments.
· Cross-exam could be mon	e " Clean case analys
· Delivery could be to smoth	" NR in an excellent summary.
	of the both sides, with
	child, strong reputation & good
· LAR lacks impact	weighing
SPEAKER CODE #: on th	e <u>NEG</u> wins this debate.
(A REASON FOR DECISION	LFF or NEG)
NEG has better cro	35-exam, rebuttal and can
clearly analyze an	guments an both kides and
weigh the impacts	



Chien Fang (*12)		LINCOLN DOU	<b>GLAS</b> Debate	
Round 1A 9:00am Room 12 Aff: 9 Vatturi		Judge's Name: Chie	in tang	_
Neg: 6 Taban JV L-D Debate		Judge's School Affiliation:	Monte Vis	ta
AFF: Speaker Code #:	9 pts 28	NEG: Speaker Code #:	pts	29
Please award each spe	eaker points based of $30 = Perfect$ $29 = 0$	<b>n the following scale:</b> Outstanding <b>28</b> = Very G		Super-
27 = Goo	d (but possibly not good	d enough to qualify for elim	rood	
<b>26-25</b> = Fair	24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rud	e or inappropriate b	ehavior
	Judg	ing Criteria		
Using the above criter	ia, please offer com	oliments and/or suggest	ions for improvem	ent for
each debater:				
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater devel	lon a case in reamonas to the	1./: 0		
• EVIDENCE:	top a case in response to the r	esolution?		
should be used to support argui	asizes logic and persuasion, e nents. How effective was the	evidence (quoted material, conten e evidence?	aporary or historical examp	ples)
• ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organ	ize both the constructive and	rehuttal spacebac		
• VALUE CLASH:			a di sa sa si	
(emerion)	phasize the value being supp	orted by his/her side, and how we	ell was that value measured	1?
REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debeter	and Cate at			
<ul> <li>DELIVERY/COURTESY</li> </ul>	refute the arguments of the o	opposition and rebuild his/her ow	n side?	
Did each debater speak in comm	nunicative style that was plea	sant, easily understandable, and o	civil?	
each debater:	a, please otter comp	liments and/or suggesti	ons for improveme	nt to
Affirmative:				
	inati a	Negative	0	a d
· Good organi	salon co	· Excellent	Cross-exam	and
cleare cont		rebuttal		+ 1
. Flent exan	uple is	Clean log	ical argume	als and
indirect	at best		ical angumo lectrice case	analysis
' (AR could	( Me more	· Good el	mdence	
organizetie	n and bette			
refetation				
SPEAKER CODE #:		NEG wins this debate	e.	
REASON FOR DECISION	1	F or NEG)		
NEG can	- effective.	ly rebut	and cross-	exa
oppohents.		0		- Care along

er i sul hersten a roefstud konsert som steller ver med en ogsårs av som en ander som en er en en en en en en e Afrika sjores

a sector de la sector de la company de la construction de la sector de la construcción de la construcción de la Altra sector

1 - and 2

Pinole Judge 2 (*14)	LINCOLN DO	DUGLAS Debate
Round 1B 9:00am Room 15	Judge's Name:	alfor Munan
Aff: 5 Thurgam Neg: 12 Zhou		Allere Plus Delel. 1
JV L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliatio	n: Whe Prop Oaldand
AFF:	NEG:	
Speaker Code #: pts	NEG: _ Speaker Code #:	pts_2&
Please award each speaker points based 30 = Perfect 29 =	Outstanding $28 = Ver$	v Good
$27 = Good (but possibly not go$ $26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	od enough to qualify for	elimination rounds) rude or inappropriate behavior
Jud	ging Criteria	
Using the above criteria, please offer con	pliments and/or sugg	estions for improvement for
each debater:		r
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the	1.0	
• EVIDENCE:	e resolution?	
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion should be used to support arguments. How effective was	evidence (quoted material, co	ntemporary or historical examples)
<ul> <li>ORGANIZATION:</li> </ul>	he evidence?	
How well did the debater organize both the constructive as	nd rebuttal speeches?	
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being sup (Criterion)	morted by his/hon side and 1	11
(ontorion)	ported by mis/ner side, and no	well was that value measured?
• <b>REFUTATION:</b> How thoroughly did the debater refute the provements of all		
<ul> <li>How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of th</li> <li>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</li> </ul>	e opposition and rebuild his/he	r own side?
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pl	easant, easily understandable,	and civil?
Using the above criteria, places offer some	1°	
Using the above criteria, please offer com each debater:	pliments and/or sugge	estions for improvement to
	1	
Affirmative:	Negative	
- evidence whis borong	evidence was	Strong
- well developer cubx	- well bevelop	sex cuse good thoughts,
- Will briganized	- mood organi	ration of data questing a x
- Value - good	- Your evider	Strong sex case good thoughtful ration of data - questions at x we and orzentization Net utation. No, hidut
- reputation	did grent	refutation. You diduit define you with this question.
- Convertion, MULL Brook Style		
a little fast but understalds	k - your delivery	Min Un programized - Morring
a muc p ist more that	burnund, lige	in a lot '
SPEAKER CODE #: 5 Thursym on the	AFF wins this de	bate.
(A REASON FOR DECISION	FF or NEG)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	man 1 1151	101 110 pminized
Both Were on topic, well re delivery needs polish & could	NUSDICA. NEG I	MNZ CONTER CONTENT
delivery when s polish & could	ibuce.	

AC/Gubjective monity / 1. pover tenda to Whypen 2. UNVIDonnat

AI Organized, Ovideria good D: considered Rs

NC Societal Welfare - Denefit 1. Good layout of 1. Good layout of Case - Some jevidence

Yez A. N: Gon are not letting yourself be defined by In question.

AR nuvinfo - z-Ayrad

20 80 0000

NR

eNillence DO

good Summy

Dalfrind reuse DCON

nniter Buchanas Pinole Judge 2 (\*14)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 15 Aff: 8 Rema Neg: 9 Dhakal JV L-D Debate LINCOLN-DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's School Affiliation: College Prep Daleland

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

pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

pts 28

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:

Negative = you didn't develope your case for the appendent degitioning fully enough, you let the affette AFF define what the Affirmative: - rapid-fire delivery at beginning had to follow, as time what on got bater flad. - in cross examining, you interrupted & almost rolled your eyes = almost rude. debute was what. - payer shuffling looked lack orgunized - 1 Tited your slower parc of speech - vefudation was strong - tou defined You consistenting brought brow your - evidence who was strong - evilue ven not htmug - believe in yourself SPEAKER CODE #: <u>B</u> Rema on the <u>Aff</u> wins this debate. (AFF or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION** AFF had better organization, held ponition will, her Value was consistent throughout.

notes (morality) AC strong presentation Mind to follow at first-go from falt like word salad

N/C -Averment legitimmy Vien gruce good

X ex - confusion of hulles power ve Wzapog NE A- Oxallut depetatu

Yex -

ACR Joint her proof for # dying / hauth Visk good data on renewable vous

NR - argued morality instand of own Value

242

N-Server a little disorgnized,

Jodi Cahn (*1) Round 1B 9:00am Room 9	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: JODI CAHW			
Aff: 9 khan Neg: 12 Wadwa JV L-D Debate				
AFF: 9 pts 23	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>AUBALLE UTSU</u> PCCCEDU NEG: Speaker Code #: <u>12</u> pts_28			
Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect $29 = Outstanding$ $28 = Very Good$				
$27 = \text{Good (but possibly not good)}$ $26-25 = \text{Fair} \qquad 24-20 = \text{Poor}$	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior			
Jud	ging Criteria			
Using the above criteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for			
<ul> <li>each debater:</li> <li>CASE ANALYSIS:</li> <li>How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?</li> <li>EVIDENCE:</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)</li> <li>REFUTATION:</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?</li> <li>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</li> <li>Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?</li> </ul>				
Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:				
Affirmative:	Negative			
-suggestion: Prepare so you are	- argument was			
clear about the pros	well constructed			
and cons of your argument. Lista	how ever you could			
carefulles to your	expand The # of			
product. practice public speaking.	- Logic was great. - Don't downplay			
SPEAKER CODE #: 12 on the NEO wins this debate a deathy				
SPEAKER CODE #:       12       on the NEG wins this debate. So much         REASON FOR DECISION       (AFF or NEG)       A hit insensitive.				



Jodi Cahn (\*1) Round 1A 9:00am Room 9 Aff: 9 Agustin Neg: 11 Berger JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

4002

Neg	: 11 Berger		Judge's School Affiliation	A BAASI IL LOIL PO	
JVL	D Debate		- ange s sendor i i i initiation.	ALBANY IT GH JC	
	AFF: Speaker Code #:	9 pts 3	NEG: _ Speaker Code #:	pts2_6	
	Please award each	speaker points based	on the following scale:	alle anno a na suit ann a suit ann a tarain ann a san an gcluir an gcluir ann ann ann ann ann ann ann ann ann	
	30 = Perfect $29 = Outstanding$ $28 = Verv Good$				
	27 = G	ood (but possibly not go	od enough to qualify for eli	mination rounds)	
	<b>26-25</b> = Fair	<b>24-20</b> = Poor	<20 = Reserved for ru	de or inappropriate behavior	
		Jud	ging Criteria		
	Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for				
	each debater:				
	CASE ANALYSIS:     How well did the debater de	evelop a case in response to the	1.4.0		
	• EVIDENCE:	evelop a case in response to the	resolution?		
	Although value debating em	phasizes logic and persuasion, guments. How effective was t	evidence (quoted material, conte he evidence?	emporary or historical examples)	
	• 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)				
	(Criterion)	emphasize the value being sup	ported by his/her side, and how w	vell was that value measured?	
	• <b>REFUTATION:</b>				
		ater refute the arguments of the	e opposition and rebuild his/her o	wn side?	
	<ul> <li>DELIVERY/COURTING</li> </ul>	ESY:			
	Did each debater speak in co	mmunicative style that was plo	easant, easily understandable, and	1 civil?	
	Using the above crite	eria, please offer com	nliments and/or suggest	tions for improvement to	
	each debater:	, prouse offer com	phinenes and/or suggest	tions for improvement to	
	Affirmative:				
	Slow down a	1 54	Negative		
				nent was	
	make Sur			y semaintic	
				cel yourself	
	Remember			s or more	
aug	our oppon	en s	- Deeper		
	argumai		arque		
E	x Cellent O	<b>v</b>	4 great	energy but	
	$\mathcal{L}$	lasita	ann	enunerate.	
	SPEAKER CODE #:	on the	AFF wins this deba	ite.	
	DELCONTRA-	(A)	FF or NEG)		
	REASON FOR DECISION	ON			



Narayan Bhagavatula (*8) Round 1B 9:00am Room 13	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: Marya Rhagan file		
Aff: 9 Goulart			
Neg: 14 Pollard JV L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Irving ton High Schul		
AFF: 9	pts NEG: pts		
Please award each speaker points 30 = Perfect	<b>based on the following scale:</b> 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good		
27 = Good (but possibly	y not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)		
<b>26-25</b> = Fair <b>24-20</b> = Poor	r $<20$ = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior		
	Judging Criteria		
Using the above criteria, please of each debater:	fer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for		
• CASE ANALYSIS:			
How well did the debater develop a case in respo	onse to the resolution?		
• EVIDENCE:			
Although value debating emphasizes logic and po should be used to support arguments. How effect	ersuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)		
ORGANIZATION:			
How well did the debater organize both the const	tructive and rebuttal speeches?		
• VALUE CLASH:	and a second		
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value (Criterion)	being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?		
REFUTATION:			
	ents of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?		
DELIVERY/COURTESY:	fly		
Did each debater speak in communicative style th	at was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?		
Using the above criteria, please ofference of the second s	er compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to		
Affirmative:	Negative		
7 Constants MI 11.			
Too much Aundling u presention	tile weed to prove the more		
Jan			
Hud Stry Evidence	Criter Sevred 4 Loin on One powerful evidence hat Climate Chage con value officentation of Attentore Eng.		
700. my weighty on	Jeuree 4 With on one fint		
Elevision Envirence	Evidence hat Climile Chage Con		
e levour envior	house afficutory of Atter. The Eng.		
SPEAKER CODE #:4	NEG With Wind		
	on the <u>MEG</u> wins this debate. WEG Win s (AFF or NEG)		
REASON FOR DECISION			
Ney Lon Over Aft	+ becase strong Point of Herobie to Noke can reduce Affisiate four led to Conside		
how Climate Chy- 1, A.	Herobie to Noke con reduce		
enerthe Emply Jobs 1000	, Affilmon Jailes in contect		

heg 1: 3. rec 1: 15: AFT AFF Contract Crowner Cross by beg Such part A gunda (3/10) - Mevoluty Volor direconautic Apric 5/10 7/10 Mevony les evolues Late tim I min Questra il Cra ileconti al un te in Carta + pa i plolar for. Donge. (6/0) prove not rular weapon Stin by Evertia in indet Loti 1 Stundlig wola plats volently (10/12) Haris Silv effete \$10 Cividen - 19 - Alternot No 1.101 Energy Clean & Free 6/10 7.04 yoec To volu. . C.I.h / welfor Woten Kesaus as in Suffact 7:07 Cartud : ( ) would reed i stul Dopp Hule torned Il cond Dopp Hule torned Il cond Cost or Enu nik to gud nt Cost by Ca you had to FID Global Depat Eng. Itray (FID) p.t (9/10) most fortre dyrite ull time Terroully contract auch long \$10 Sula days day a Jun gu In + 1.1/1. Heren Overall OTIO (4110) Ele prud-lin 1 yobs D June Has Weg > Revent time van sat is van pav. argunt Cost vor lang like \$10 Sky could not refute de tra ? see De tra ? see Meder Arentotion (570) D. mail Englis a Terrora but feat quiti-First of Lehrten Eviden Very Stry te Alter te engre Eviden Very Stry te need to Worke Engry. Deg Rehetted Real Mente Charles it Noka and Denty 41. te loth up Climate Charles beccus Altentive Tenty 41. te loth up is wooded way Us deht will 5.00 Depense Altente Carry Gy brit affected proder lot by the Altente Courses mor Softer (10/D Under time lovin And post Behilter Hack wit with to about baller to Jug at Analy Given, Rever Attack with to about baller Enviring Carles at 370 Under time 9/10
Narayan Bhagavatula (*8) Round 1A 9:00am Room 13	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: Norgan Phoyourfile
Aff: 12 Habib	
Neg: 6 Yu	Judge's School Affiliation: Fringt- Hy Lichul
JV L-D Debate	Judge's School Anniation.
AFF:	NEG:
Speaker Code #:pts	27 Speaker Code #: 6 pts 2'S
Please award each speaker points ba	sed on the following scale:
30 = Perfect 2	9 = Outstanding $28 = $ Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly no	ot good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
<b>26-25</b> = Fair <b>24-20</b> = 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:	
should be used to support arguments. How effective	asion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)
• ORGANIZATION:	
How well did the debater organize both the construct	tive and rebuttal speeches?
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being	
(Criterion)	ng supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments	s of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
• <b>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</b> Did each debater speak in communicative style that w	was pleasant easily understandable and simila
	was preasant, easing understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	i and suggestions for improvement to
Cont Offirmative: Controlme, Value 9 Cont office all Controlme, Value 9	
(i))to all Cutohan, Vale 9	Negative
Cont - Sty E.	C = T
Cr. ty Wa	Crucky Aff
III Mal Star	
-Affiretus l'ince ofig	ht- Los Id not we cross examine. Los Id not we his Ewidence dispresse Aff on his Ewidence
Descritition 1 hours	11. Augerve very pess presentation
Atria Cose, Pidde + 16/12	Costd with the Cross examine. Called with
Suffe Mel Value	dispresse Aft on his Easilieur.
Energy Crite	
SPEAKED CODE # 12	AFF
SPEAKER CODE #:0	(AFF or NEG) Wins this debate. AFF Win s
SPEAKER CODE #: 2 0 REASON FOR DECISION	(AFF or NEG)
Attim. the way strong	in presentin Exidence to support
	All I de franke de la
rus vove (r, ten, ketele n	TIL of Nego I've a regutive hos
Vary Pour presentation, 1	in presenting Exidence to support ALL of hiero five a Negotive hos No. Evidence to bock up Volve. Exa

Prop time i / in... Peg 200 3/10 Akg Covers playing 3/10 Cris of Cast pour Coust Cris sypets Affirit in dent a state foreal pour la Aff thought 1;14 me 9 10 10/10 ATT Cart: Sty Carta his. 0110 Volve Aguit Piestohim Skulls 9 10 E a fote Great Army by Aft - Loute Norles ince Fuel Late 10 Ly for of toxic of Fuel Late 10 Non Cont: Volo: Specifil Wefne Crita: Layter Statily, N. grea has Critary 9/10 Crayy Ctrut & 9/10 1.67/Kark US NUT NILL 9/10 Ag at Redeent rock for back Rel 10 Dove Parapita Skill, Mandiky 3/6 Dete Stole for bonky each the Adving to tenerist Volice Critic free of how Cost 9/10 Van Par on Toxe Not 1100 Love Cast by 70 B 10 Van Good mil up the Jodia 10 present Shalls (air) kul by gay Up 19 (TD Very Pour Presentit Skills (1/10) Cross by Artta 7:03 I he aver Use time by Green (3/10) h, Agtim Volve Quanda hypothim E Carlent Answer Cruss Euchto Carl Ontra E How my Cartin and the Carl Carl and refut (10)0 Fort Aff Kehotta Sting Prentite 10/2 Aff Northhed coll of Ney - Pollupia Guida by Ney not 12 h, An Catecture Like by Affin Plan Prive ally few Contry to Wellin an 10/10 and time 14 see - 2 pFs (Plan Anne prive whether by 10/10 and time 14 see - 2 pFs (Plan Cost y proto whether be Contry have 1. 111 Cost & proche by high 1000 constra have him Nehrtful Canaut eloquer my never rehutted bill, per Country have him Nehrtful Conaut eloquer hucke porer. Two much Aun history provide Ho condone & Lers P. Matron hucke porer. Cost Cribien Countris, Crieffut is voyre (10 3/10) Uva 200 mich the Countris, Crieffut is voyre (10 3/10) Uva prese we Altractive Whitte Why FAtt won Read O Cont & Lit, Stating 10/10 proved pathy Conceded path Looks Accel I Hype 10/10 proved how Rooke Accel 1 vin dagerous Alt Hoi verfahle endence Alt Hoi verfahle endence over by lorce -2 pt (5/10)

<b>Siva Arunachalam (*5)</b> Round 1A 9:00am Room 16 Aff: 1 Korchin	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: SIVA ARUNIACHALAM
Neg: 12 Zhou JV L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: DUBLEN HIGH SCHOOL
AFF: \pts	Speaker Code #: <u>V</u> pts <u>V</u>
Please award each speaker points based 30 = Porfact 20 =	on the following scale:
37 = Good (but possibly not a	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
$26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	<pre>ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds) &lt;20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior</pre>
In	dging Criteria
	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	mpriments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS:	<b>C</b>
How well did the debater develop a case in response to t	ne resolution?
• EVIDENCE:	
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasio should be used to support arguments. How effective was	n, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)
• ORGANIZATION:	1.W
How well did the debater organize both the constructive	and rebuttal speeches?
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the delater error having the rule 1	lan tota
(Criterion)	upported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	I word she of
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of t	he opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
• <b>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</b> Did each debater speak in communicative style that was j	and rebuttal speeches? and rebuttal speeches? apported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? of the get of the he opposition and rebuild his/her own side? bleasant, easily understandable, and civil? appiments and/or suggestions for improvement to Mark the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? appiments and/or suggestions for improvement to appiment to the opposition and the opposition and the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? appiments and/or suggestions for improvement to appiment to the opposition and
Using the above exitence - here of	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Negative Negative More many caused by Nuclear Edited Negative More many radiation Sickness? Negative More many - 167.
each debater.	apliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
-dente for Alexand	the a norm coursed by Nuclear
NO Evidence for Muclear radiation	Negative 1 How many radiation Sille
Safet a cuit	Negative DHOW many coursed by Nucle Negative DHOW many. radiatin Sickness? Decontractor How many. radiatin Sickness? Decontractor How Electricity -> 16%. These eacles VS. Fossi fuel Reference
Contentia # 1: Environmental	Prentate S Electriculty Reference Food cost 7 VS- Fossi fuel Reference Food cost 7 Renewab Lewercom Reference 73 7 Renewab Leverence / #37 / Vadianti Sizos 7 Ny timetr Peference / #37 / Vadianti Sizos
Vadão autive waves	Food Beneward Demonee (#37/ vadiani sizes
Vadão active waves Sontenti #2: Bonning of Nuclea Souliferation - Material / tai turi	F3 7 reference perference
proliferation	7 0-19.
BOOCHARDER OCH - Maten Alive	i a a Glab 1 1 10
Sontenti #2: Bonned & White And Ferate - Material / the there Contents #3 - Material / the the	a energy CO cause more flotte in
-) DEGROOTS - 1827	Renewant and clear on Supporting
me	Eye contact a contact acting
aland more Supporting & Reference de	We confident and on delivery message
SPEAKER CODE #: on t	Renewal energ CO cause nere global him Eye contact and clear on Supporting details Confident and advieng Message he <u>New</u> wins this debate. AFF or NEG
(AREASON FOR DECISION	AFF OF NEG)
Eye contact and C	Burly articulated his argument. He
has supporting details with	Reference defaild.

akting ber her version (Mixeriaeu Mereria), Azaanke est en state of the second second second second second seco State her Afric

et a production de la construction de la constructi

and the second second

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Helen Liu (\*11) Judge's Name: Helen Lin Round 1B 9:00am Room 11 Aff: 12 Raja Neg: 9 Andrade Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte JV L-D Debate AFF: NEG: pts\_28 Speaker Code #:\_ Speaker Code #: 12 pts 20 Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good27 = 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 Socital Walfere -too nervons at cross-examinations well developed statement - no questionspiraised to show his value poor constructive stateme not clear what the value he Well prepared his rebutted Very polite 2, han good manner eniphase his value in his - not clear Siddunts - can't cleanly answer the opponent's questions s - poor rebutter - need more preparitus rebiller \_\_\_\_ on the \_\_\_\_\_ on the \_\_\_\_\_ debate. **SPEAKER CODE #:** 12 (AFF or NEG) Value & supporting it. **REASON FOR DECISION** 

**LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate** Helen Liu (\*11) Judge's Name: - e le u Round 1A 9:00am Room 11 Lin Aff: 12 Murthy Neg: 5 Bedi Tiramonte High Judge's School Affiliation: JV L-D Debate AFF: NEG: Speaker Code #: pts Speaker Code #: Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good27 = 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? 0 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: olitely - at cross examination. ty of life)- support newclear production - detailed evidence Affirmative: Negative polite cleanly stated his value-sty Very clear power production. 2 Nevous-Baldressed the questions right on the point. Further support his criterium in the second rebuttal professional prosentations weak rebuts enough evidence not his CN **SPEAKER CODE #:** on the Advins this debate. (AFF or NEG) better rebuttel **REASON FOR DECISION** more detailed

and the second secon

a 2 5 1

Aileen Agustin (*9) Round 3A 2:00pm Room 16 Aff: 1 Korchin	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: MEHER GEDRGE
Neg: 12 Wadwa JV L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: 1000565 PREP
AFF: pts_27	NEG: Speaker Code #: 12 pts_29
	utstanding 28 = Very Good
$27 = Good (but possibly not good)$ $26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor$	d 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:	pliments 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 was the	evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) e evidence?
• <b>ORGANIZATION:</b> How well did the debater organize both the constructive and	l rebuttal speeches?
• VALUE CLASH:	orted by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	
<ul> <li>How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the</li> <li><b>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</b></li> <li>Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleater speak in communicative style specific spe</li></ul>	
Using the above criteria, please offer comp each debater:	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to BOTH * MAKE EYE CONTRCT IN CROSS
Affirmative:	Negative
very passionete debater "	Very logical arguments, well done
Reference your evidence more	reauce # of meaks in speech
speak with fewer superiatives	I liked case a lot- wal is strong any
In speeches - great eye contact	make more eye contact w/ judge in round
Include voting issues at the end of your speech.	Don't ask hypotheticals in cross examination
TEll me more about indigenous people!	
	CON wins this debate.
	F or NEG)
	s to NEG'S case behiddes "logical
failages " & NEG responded	to rul o cuse more guily.



<b>Cynthia Nakahara (*12)</b> Round 3A 2:00pm Room 11 Aff: 6 Yu	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name:	
Neg: 9 Andrade JV L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:	
AFF: Speaker Code #:	pts_22 Speaker Code #:pts_25	
Please award each speaker 30 =	<b>points based on the following scale:</b> Perfect <b>29</b> = Outstanding <b>28</b> = Very Good	
<b>27</b> = Good (but	possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) P = Poor $<20 = Reserved$ for rude or inappropriate behavior	
	Judging Criteria	
Using the above criteria, pl each debater:	ease offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for	
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a ca	se in response to the resolution?	
should be used to support arguments.	ogic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) How effective was the evidence?	
<ul> <li>ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both</li> <li>VALUE CLASH:</li> </ul>	h the constructive and rebuttal speeches?	
How clearly did the debater emphasize (Criterion) • <b>REFUTATION:</b>	the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?	
<ul><li>How thoroughly did the debater refute</li><li>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</li></ul>	the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? ive style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?	
each debater:	ease offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to	
Affirmative:	Negative researched but oregall prep	- 11
+ Well prepared. Deli.	very was - lacked evidence ( citing for prior in behelp	ful
Elean well organiz	had _ (make prestions made to be concise)	
citings (undence i)	ith daga.	
+ Refuted opponent with questions. Showed N	leg d'is At times, statements were	
		Q
= Humbles glightly whe	n trying to speak faltered.	
SPEAKER CODE #:	(AFF or NEG) wins this debate.	
REASON FOR DECISION	citings for each conjustion. NEG had no	
		re.
an contention - Risk Man	regement-global safety terrorist group.	



Cynthia Nakahara (*12) Round 3B 2:00pm Room 11 Aff: 6 Taban	LINCOLN DOUGLAS I Judge's Name:	
Neg: 8 Rema		
JV L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:	
AFF: 6	_pts Speaker Code #:	.29
		pts
Please award each speaker point $30 = Porfor$	ts based on the following scale: ct 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good	
	bly not good enough to qualify for elimination ro	
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Po$	For $<20 =$ Reserved for rude or inapp	propriate behavior
	Judging Criteria	
Using the above criteria, please of each debater:	offer compliments and/or suggestions for i	mprovement for
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in res	sponse to the resolution?	
• EVIDENCE: Although value debating emphasizes logic and should be used to support arguments. How eff	d persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or hi fective was the evidence?	istorical examples)
• <b>ORGANIZATION:</b> How well did the debater organize both the con		
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value (Criterica)	ue being supported by his/her side, and how well was that v	value measured?
(Criterion) • REFUTATION:		
	iments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?	
• <b>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</b> Did each debater speak in communicative style	e that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?	
	ffer compliments and/or suggestions for in	
	H - Excelent Delivery	Evidence Case Analysis
Affirmative: tt Evidence / Citin how well second-	H Excellent Delivery/ Negative Uno y both were. Knew w	strong. Indicated
WOSS & repositions.	a it life it to make	a final
decision	e it difficult to make	
++ Questions à 21/2	vility to refute argume	nts à rebuild own
When thereagh and po	ve data.	
, signed a suggestion, and the	is is all slight slow do	wn Sugning
- firs would give audience a	ne data. is is any slight slow do bilityto - this would allo idata more calm, togo a on the AFF wins this debate. any	Little uss agguessive
SI EARER CODE #:	(AFF or NEG)	
		mation that
This was only due	- TO The parts from Duri	FF did give / ut
was connect = neg	bronght up only (all but A AFF turned to Negs frame	evore disproving
due to Nuclean 2	cridents	л J

Don Berger (\*11) LINCOLN Round 3B 2:00pm Room 13 Judge's Name: Aff: 12 Zhou Neg: 5 Bedi JV L-D Debate Judge's School Affiliation: Speaker Code # Speaker Code #: Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) **26-25** = Fair <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior 24-20 = Poor**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 Wel

on the

(AFF or NEC

wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION

**SPEAKER CODE** #

Negation Offirmation Bedi Zhou 2) Not war White D Societal welton Cher noble Well being of citizen Problemp w/Nulse Poo been fixed Nuke power = Nuke weapon End of humanity? Waste is a problem 443 - good fact E 3) Nuke = Green Nulse power = Sale France & Nuke Power Nake is renewable? France makes No waste 3) Nuke power causes Weapon Escalation Ogod foots F France (7) Same Values 2/4

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Don Berger (\*11) Judge's Name: Round 3A 2:00pm Room 13 Aff: 9 Grover Neg: 12 Zhou Judge's School Affiliation: JV L-D Debate AFF: 2000 Speaker Code # Speaker Code Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior **Judging Criteria** Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

## CASE ANALYSIS:

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

### **EVIDENCE:**

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

#### **ORGANIZATION:**

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

#### 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:**

7

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 9 0 RG. in SPEAKER CODE on the wins this debate. (AFF or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION** Juke Power

Negative Afirmative Zhou Grover 2) fe stumped for good questions D Morality Not Bollowing the Wielerce Point. Æ Nake Power = Nukewn 3 good Sacts (relevant BroLiferation & Nuke bamb CO2 from Mining Nake waste - good Paint Nuke = 16% energy U.S. = 20%/France 75% Nuke is efficient () Coal is Bad Sea water is corrosive @ coal is dirty @ 5) Nuke weapon for OU.S. duty as superformer? Killed that Many other then Greenmany was a good Japan. Tapan. The U.S. Cannot tell other O the U.S. Cannot tell other Countries to dropa Nuke Dwasn't making point well 1/2

Lisa Jacobs (*18) Round 3A 2:00pm Room 15	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Aff: 12 Raja Neg: 9 Goulart JV L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Sonoma academy</u> .
AFF: 28 Speaker Code #:pts_28	NEG:pts
Please award each speaker points based o 30 = Perfect 29 = 0	Dutstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not goo 26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ging Criteria pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
<ul><li>each debater:</li><li>CASE ANALYSIS:</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>How well did the debater develop a case in response to the</li> <li>EVIDENCE:</li> <li>Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion</li> </ul>	resolution? evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)
<ul> <li>ORGANIZATION:</li> </ul>	le evidence?
<ul> <li>How well did the debater organize both the constructive and</li> <li>VALUE CLASH:</li> <li>How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being support (Criterian)</li> </ul>	orted by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
<ul> <li>(Criterion)</li> <li><b>REFUTATION:</b></li> <li>How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the</li> </ul>	opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
• <b>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</b> Did each debater speak in communicative style that was ple	asant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer compeach debater:	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative: 102 are an increa Apeaber and presenter, beet het your opponet finish	Negative
het your opponet bruch	Keep up the good work. You had a very strong
are intrupting often -	Apender In Roofs S
are intrupting of the - Vuegotrong use of analysisperidence and organization. Couldave so	pumbers, Be confidence!
	I UNIN A MARKANS - AUG
Much more parsion in were bar Your off SPEAKER CODE #: 12 on the Mr. 34MREASON FOR DECISION	AFE wins this debate.
It is a set of the set	1 Dece. 50
policy distento France Francedi	ble Delivery and Passion
adjuster (counter Neg.	ble Delivery and Passion vidence and analysis to Just adapt and After to Just adapt and After agreed terms.



LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Lisa Jacobs (\*18) Round 3B 2:00pm Room 15 Judge's Name: der rol Aff: 11 Berger Neg: 9 Vatturi Judge's School Affiliation: JV L-D Debate AFF: NEG: pts 29 Speaker Code #: Speaker Code #: Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior 24-20 = Poor**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 Very prepared depeters. of evidence. - Neg. have sta nows to back. lent ysc **SPEAKER CODE #:** on the wins this debate. (AFF or NEG **REASON FOR DECISION** to counter the Negse of evidence



Steve Wasserman (\*1) Round 3A 2:00pm Room 9 Aff: 12 Habib Neg: 5 Thurgam JV L-D Debate LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: STELE UKSERMAN

Judge's School Affiliation: ALBANY HIGH SCHOOL

A	FF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #:	12	pts 29 Speaker Co	de #: 5	nts 27
				P ***

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)

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

## **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 Clear presentation clear presentation but not as in command and succincitly presented, with strong use of facts & authorities cited to less nimble when respinding to opponent's critique. Also a pronovaced tendency to rush through his argument, buttress overall argument. Consistent, coherent, confident, courteous without to speak too quickly and making concessions. a (armingly capable of being Clustered by opponent's rhetorical wins this debate. gambits. SPEAKER CODE #: AFF or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION** The lawrels q. to Mr. Habib for a polished & Confident presentation that made his case - and defended it with envieble (mviction and admirable zeal.

Sandy A. Star

A BOL PARTY AND

2. . . .

and a contrage of the contraction of the second of the sec

Steve Wasserman (\*1) Round 3B 2:00pm Room 9 Aff: 11 Banisadr Neg: 9 Agustin JV L-D Debate

## LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: STELE () ASSERMAN

Judge's School Affiliation: ALRAWY HILL SCHOOL

AFF: NEG: Speaker Code #: <u>11</u> pts <u>28</u> Speaker Code #: <u>9</u> pts <u>26</u>

# 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 debates

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 marshallin Good pushback on opponents ot apposite arguments assentions and clear and good at rebuttal & concise exposition especialk deft use of evidence in defense of values exemplified particularly in reb at heart of argument. marred only by occasional repetition of neither advanced nor deepened breathlessness as he endeavored to readers pluck essence of his argument which as would have arrows to Meash for wasn't made as SPEAKER CODE been ideal. AFF on the wins this debate. or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION** Victory goes to Mr. Banisade for having more concisely constructed and more convincingly made his argument. He was particularly effective in his use of relevant widence and sources.

han and a star

assessed was the first factor for the

الموسر من المحدة الالملاق من 11 مرجع مارية و ماري مسملين 12 مرجع مارية و ماري مسملين مربع 12 مرجع مارية المحالين مربع 12 مرجع ماري مربع ماري مربع ماريم 12 مرجع ماري مربع ماري مربع ماريم 12 مرجع ماريم ماريم ماريم 12 مرجع ماريم ماريم ماريم 12 مرجع ماريم ماريم ماريم

الكُلُونَ من المعنى لا فالن يكون المعنى و المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعن المالي المحكوم الماليون المعنى المعنى المسلم المسلمات المعالي المعنية المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المحيد المروك المالية الماليون المعنى المعنى المعنى المحالية المعالية المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى

Afr: 9 Dhakai Neg: 6 Garrison JV L-D Debate Ju AFF:	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate dge's Name: <u>Berwie</u> Kamps dge's School Affiliation: <u>Albawy</u> NEG:
Speaker Code #: pts $2\%$ Speaker Code #:	peaker Code #:6pts_26
	the following scale: standing 28 = Very Good nough to qualify for elimination rounds)
	$\sim 20$ = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
T., J. *	
Using the above criteria, please offer complied each debater:	g Criteria ments and/or suggestions for improvement for
<ul> <li>CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the res</li> <li>EVIDENCE:</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evishould be used to support arguments. How effective was the e</li> <li>ORGANIZATION:</li> </ul>	vidence?
<ul> <li>How well did the debater organize both the constructive and re</li> <li>VALUE CLASH:</li> <li>How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being support</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>(Criterion)</li> <li><b>REFUTATION:</b></li> <li>How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the op</li> </ul>	
• <b>DELIVERY/COURTESY:</b> Did each debater speak in communicative style that was please	nt, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer complieach debater:	ments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative:	Negative
· Very good job of presenting the	· Unclear statement of exchanic Cause.
to the never and economic	steetility religence of politiceil steetility through Mytually Assured
Costs of Nuckeur power. Could have held more precise shertistics related to loss of	Destruction, A position case For Nuclear maynes. Not a strong direct case For use of N power.
life and property. Costs of plant construction decomissioning	· Lacking in detailed statistics
etc. Pebrilal for used on meaninless SPEAKER CODE #: Proceedural points on the	· lobittale not wood ca demal!
SPEAKER CODE #: on the (AFF REASON FOR DECISION	AFF wins this debate. With AFF candentin's or NEG) Did not directly address them.
	All case much cleanen for
Shald have focused rebutter on substance of Neg	Moreel and vtilidanian case to end N production.

Suneetha Sarala (*8) Round 3B 2:00pm Room 12	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: Benne Kamps
Aff: 14 Pollard Neg: 9 khan JV L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Albany</u>
AFF: Juin pts	NEG: 9 pts <u>&gt; 4</u>

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)

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

## **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:

Negative Affirmative: Indecision clear and succi Ven Steri precise use of neran C021 drova prepare tel houro been good Wor ic and unente Strong 10 demoure the e Environment normail marine aperation ( remain e Rhechin an clamayne) \_\_\_\_wins this debate. on the **SPEAKER CODE #:** (AFF or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION** Overwhelmight strong case from the AFF in all respects.

g stagente des environtes diferent album en presentation de la constituie de la constituie de la constituie de environtester An des 1850 enviro

• An entry of the second state of the birth of the second state of the second state

1 - 14

15 M (16 M (17 M (16 M (16 M (17 M (16 M (

a de la companya de la comp

rdady – Bardonev – Kristian (Sweder) (Sweder) – styl films, a children and a strandard (Server) – sen all free Des Bardes Ser