Judge
Round 2B 11:00am Room 65
Aff: 5 Sharma
Neg: 6 Wallis
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: PRANAV SHAHI

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

AFF: 5
Speaker Code #: SHARMA pts 28

NEG: 6
Speaker Code #: WALLIS 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:	Negative
Clear thoughts, good emphasis very structured with good callouts throughout debate	Liked how you kept coming back to your key arguments with cross-exams & rebuttals

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

REASON FOR DECISION
Felt that NEG side conceded on the environmental contention.

Judge
Round 2A 11:00am Room 65
Aff: 8 Venkat
Neg: 1 Lewis
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: PRANAV SHAHI

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

AFF: 8
Speaker Code #: VENKAT pts 28

NEG: 1
Speaker Code #: LEWIS 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
Needs to leverage allotted time efficiently Good arguments on renewals vs. Nuclear around reliability	Very good emphasis in speech Did not effectively used available time Did not address radiactive waste concern

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

REASON FOR DECISION
Strong conclusion highlighting own points that were not refuted and at the same time effectively refuting opponents key arguments

countries ought to prohibit nuclear power

Judge
Round 2B 11:00am Room 62
Aff: 8 Kurlagunda Twisha
Neg: 15 Maram Anish
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: GAIL KERNES

Judge's School Affiliation: ALBANY HS

AFF: KURLAGUNDA
Speaker Code #: 8 pts 27

NEG: MARAM
Speaker Code #: 15 pts [redacted] 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?

AFF knowledge - more ~~understanding~~ than NEG but style less polished/experience detracts.

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

Affirmative: Twisha
+ very emotional argument
- ~~more practicing~~
- 1 start over, + well prepared.
++ support/reasoning strong
+ mention of ISIS effective to create fear ~~prove prohibition~~ & health risks well presented.
++ organized & ~~clear~~ ~~presenting~~ ~~presentation~~, clear reasoning
++ strong use of evidence to create Native Americans & poor at risk of exploitation
++ emotional & logical case
+ Rebuttal - had evidence for 33%
+ prepared - would be more effective to state at least once sources
- forgot to ask if ready for construct & rebuttal.
+ good argument re. cost of operation of plants.
- wrinkled shirt

Negative: Anisha
+ more experienced.
+ primarily factual argument.
+ good use of questions.
+ good argument that evidence is not presented. e.g., challenged 33% chance of nuclear attack.
+ confident & clear speaker
++ effective use of facts/numbers to demonstrate his preparation as required.
+ very good posture & eye contact
+ effective response to Aff's contentions about safety/fear
++ stronger argument re: costs
++ safety rebuttal

SPEAKER CODE #: 15 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

countries ought to ~~prevent~~ prohibit nuclear power

Judge
Round 2A 11:00am Room 62
Aff: 6 Hanin Sophie
Neg: 18 Stromberg Reece
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: GAIL KEDNES

Judge's School Affiliation: ALBANY

AFF: Speaker Code #: 6 Sophie Hanin pts 28

NEG: Speaker Code #: 18 REECE STROMBERG 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: could use more practice to be more relaxed/smooth

Affirmative: SOPHIE HANIN (6)	Negative: REECE STROMBERG (16)
+ emotional argument	+ LOGICAL ARGUMENT
• GLOBAL SAFETY	VS.
+ stayed focus through visitor entering ~~[illegible]~~ ROOM LATE	+ asked if "everyone ready" in cross by neg oponent and judge. - nervous
+ evidence in construct & cross ex.	- said didnot ↑ CO2 w/out evidence
+ contentions clear.	+ evidence presented that environmental impact of coal is "the problem" and nuclear is a better alt cheap safe, etc
cross - didnt ask if ready.	++ ~~[illegible]~~ very large amount of evidence
++ on target w/ Questions.	++ articulate/clear speaker,
++ Rebuttal very strong to New plants cost effectiveness + POISED	++ extremely well prepared.
better rebuttal - more evidence provided.	++ very confident in his answers to questions.
++ ~~[illegible]~~ Long time to market for alternative nuclear energy evidence	interesting argument promotes nuclear w/ Lifter safe vs thermal - unsafe
strong 2ND Rebuttal - VERY convincing. clear & concise	Rebuttal strong, convincing safety and economic growth

SPEAKER CODE #: 18 on the NEG wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Judge
Round 2B 11:00am Room 64
Aff: 17 Fine
Neg: 14 Chang
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Laurie Murthy

Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 17 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 14 pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

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

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

Judging Criteria

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?

✓6
✓3
✓7
✓3
✓4
✓6
✓3

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

Affirmative: Please Stand when Speaking.
value = health
Criteria = safety
- nuclear accidents
gave supporting info
danger to environment
- radioactivity affects on wild life
waste storage a problem
Pointed out lack of sources for opponent's argument
Pointed out this is a global issue not just U.S. that Neg kept referring too

Negative: Please construct a stronger Cross examination. think more about what your opponents arguments and how you can strike down their points
value = governmental obligation
well-being
1. Prohibition + regulation is key Proliferation
2. will create a global deficit of energy
3. Alternatives are expensive

SPEAKER CODE #: 17 on the AFF wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
Better argument construction. Listened well to opponant and had Strong rebuttal.

Judge
Round 2A 11:00am Room 64
Aff: 1 Chen
Neg: 8 Nagle
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Laurie Murthy

Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 1 pts 28

NEG: Speaker Code #: 8 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:

Watch your time - good examples & structure

- morality
envir damage & accidents - gave examples to support
radiation emissions - uranium waste/product ratio
water pollution
waste storage problems
health problems
thermal pollution
went over time on cross exam.

Negative

Good research + examples
maybe offer an alternative such as regulation vs banning

- prohibition leads to increase in fossil fuels - supportive info
- greenhouse gases - supportive info
- air pollution - health problems.
limit technology development.
- MSR - simple + less expensive
- environmental damage limited to near the source
Creates pollution that reaches more fossil fuel
facts regarding mortality

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

REASON FOR DECISION

More cohesive argument.

Judge
Round 2A 11:00am Room 67
Aff: 6 Schutte
Neg: 8 Thant
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Chien Fang

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

AFF: Speaker Code #: 6 pts 26 NEG: Speaker Code #: 8 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:	Negative
• Good organization of contentions and evidence • Good & relevant CX questions	• Contentions are clearly stated • Need to refute AFF's contentions in Negative Constructive. Don't wait until Negative Rebuttal to refute. • Need to address AFF's waste disposal more effectively. • Speeches could be longer.

SPEAKER CODE #: 6 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

AFF wins because of better organization, cross-exam questions and overall delivery.

Judge JAHAN RAISSI
Round 2B 11:00am Room 66
Aff: 5 Lenka
Neg: 14 Alcantra
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: JAHAN RAISSI

Judge's School Affiliation: SACRED HEART CATHEDRAL

Speaker Code #: AFF: 5 Lenka pts 27 Speaker Code #: NEG: 14 Alcantra 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:

Good organization + use of material

Good use of cross to point out flaws in opponent's case

Clear speaking style

Good at pointing out where opponent not refuting points

Negative

Good to use cross to make points for your position

Work on addressing the points made by opponent

The better you know your case and facts the better you can defend it and refute your opponents points

Nice speaking style

Good reasons to supp. argument

SPEAKER CODE #: 5 Lenka **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Well organized, clear message. Opponent did not effectively rebut points while prevailing party did address opponent's points

Judge JAHAN RAISSI
Round 2A 11:00am Room 66
Aff: 14 Alam
Neg: 8 Odaiyappan
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: JAHAN RAISSI

Judge's School Affiliation: SACRED HEART CATHEDRAL

Speaker Code #: AFF: 14 Alam pts 27 Speaker Code #: NEG: 8 Odaiyappan pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

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

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

Judging Criteria

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:

Nice easy going speaking style

Good organization + easy to follow

Not addressing contentions of opponent was costly and gave opponent an advantage

Negative

Good eye contact

Work to directly address the points the opponent makes

Good job of pointing out what opponent did not address

Use the cross to get info but also to point out weaknesses in opponent's case

SPEAKER CODE #: 14 Alam **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Very close. Better organization and clarity; also slightly better at refuting the issues addressed.

winston Thant

~~Winston Thrant~~ (*8)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 66
Aff: 2 Brabo
Neg: 6 Seyoum
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: WINSTON THANT

Judge's School Affiliation: 8

AFF: Speaker Code #: 2 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
Forfeited	

SPEAKER CODE #: 6 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

#2 forfeited

Mizhele Kito (*6)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 65
Aff: 14 Alcantra
Neg: 2 Housman
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Michele Kito

Judge's School Affiliation: El Cerrito High School

Speaker Code #: AFF: 14 pts 27 Speaker Code #: NEG: 2 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: nuclear

I liked the summary of your contentions at the end, that really helps the judge consolidate their understanding of your case. I would have liked more explanation of how nuclear power results in greater CO_2 emissions (interesting!). ~~on your~~ Your 2nd contention (about being burdensome) had interesting points, but the heading seemed wrong - maybe "not practical" for other countries or due to drought, perhaps.

Negative - civil disobedience

Sorry this didn't work out, but your civil disobediance case was interesting and I liked how you essentially boil it down to simple points - CD not necessary, can be destructive to the fabric of society, and may lead to violence. I'm sorry we were not able to hear the rest of the debate!

SPEAKER CODE #: 14 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Unfortunately, the negative did not have the nuclear power case prepared, but was under the impression that she would be debating the civil disobediance resolution, so I give this to the AFF - due to this misunderstanding.

Bodhi Nadler (*2)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 64
Aff: 8 Odaiyappan
Neg: 6 Hanin
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: BODHI NADLER

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

AFF: Speaker Code #: Odaiyappan pts ~~24~~ 25

NEG: Speaker Code #: Hanin pts ~~30~~ 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
Some rebuttals were missed - you could have challenged some points which you didn't	fluid speech - very well done
3	
4	5 excellent refutation of arguments
4 * work on pronunciation & delivery	5
4 fragmented presentation - need something to tie it all together, or make your point more clearly	5
4	~~5~~ 4 points were very clear & well documented w/ good organization
5	5
very courteous, work on the delivery	5 Excellent delivery & very courteous

SPEAKER CODE #: 6-NEG on the NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Speaker was much more organized, spoke more clearly & addressed the points & rebuttal points the best - w/ more well documented information & sources

Aff

Should

more deadly?

Iran:

- theft

pronunciation

* - challenges

Terrorist

* Discrimination

- cancers

compete for water

nervous

* Climate change

-

Cross X by Neg

questioned sources?

Value - moral obligations

social welfare

percentage?

Aff Rebut -

life is going down?

Neg

ought - moral oblig

prohibit - forbid

produce - make

$ - less polluting?

- smallest carbon footprint

* - highly efficient -92% eff.

- good stats -

$ power imbalance - good point

MAD - mutually assured destruction

- hasn't failed so far

- Good rebuttals & speaking

Cross X by Aff

question sources - produce source?

carbon footprint?

- repeat of last stat?

- bias of source - question?, lost opp.

pollution - what about leaks?

~~ox~~ pollution!

Bodhi Nadler (*2)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 64
Aff: 8 Nagle
Neg: 5 Lenka
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: BODHI NADLER
Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

Speaker Code #: AFF: Nagle pts 28½ Speaker Code #: NEG: Lenka 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: -seemed very nervous
Good catch on your opponents multiple misleading points. They are arguments used often but most people ignore the points you challenged him on.
28
- work on speech flow - it was choppy & seemed disorganized
- covered all bases, made good points

Negative very calm
- Good work on presentation, very organized, calm delivery,
- ~~ex~~ Extremely cordial, very civil,
- Excellent appearance
- Case developed very well, easy to understand your points & opinions.
- Some points raised ~~about~~ ~~ex~~ got challenged, but you could have challenged back

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

REASON FOR DECISION

~~Better~~ Even though the Neg side was more organized & better prepared, & spoke more calmly & had better pronunciation the AFF was excellent at Rebuttal & Refutation

Aff

~~term~~ term def ✓

Value - morality

value crit - societal welfare

contention -

* proliferation

Body language — need help

- no leaning forward
- loud speech

* terrorism
  - waste stolen

* Carbon footprint

1/3 as much is less

Cross X

look at person who asked quest.

- Source - ~~~~
- good answers - well done

Rebutt

good point on rebutt

good job on catching opponent's multiple ~~~~ misleading ~~~~ point

Neg

Ronald Reagan lied

value - Quality of Life / prosperity

Value crit - potential cost of prohib.

* less detrimental
  - pollution sources

* - IAEA - Safer - fatalities

* Business lost
  - recession

*

*

Cross X

- ask for sources

✓ very cordial

✓ very clear speaking

Rebutt

Laurie Murthy (*12)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 67
Aff: 1 Lewis
Neg: 5 Sharma
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name:__________

Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 1 pts 27

NEG: Speaker Code #: 5 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

All Countries Should Prohibit Production of Nuclear Power

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: You brought up some very good points that no one else brought up.

value-morality
-maximize safety and well-being
1. reduce effects of environmental racism, air, water + food contamination - radiation + health
global warming
2. Nuclear proliferation - risks of war increases, - terrorism
3. terrorism
- went over time on constructive

Negative: You had some really good sources of info and offered a solution ie. regulation vs banning
- believes in regulating - not banning
- cross-exam: technology advancements
relationships btw energy and weapons.
- Value - utilitarianism
- alternatives are weak
other sources cannot produce enough
- regulation + technology advancements
least amount of Carbon emissions

SPEAKER CODE #: 5 **on the** Neg **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION very strong arguements supported by facts and offered solutions. ie regulation instead of banning

2° C

Laurie Murthy (*12)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 67
Aff: 18 Stromberg
Neg: 8 Kurlagunda
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Laurie Murthy

Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 18 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 8 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: very good organization and arguments

waste can be used for nuclear weapons

Utilitarianism

- Quality of Life

Dangerous - weapons

Plutonium

terrorism

health - pollution

Uranium mining

lung cancer + tub

radioactivity + heavy metal

Global warming

- Dangerous
- Dirty
- inefficient
- uses gov. subsidies (expensive)

Negative: very good rebuttal points and good research on constructive

value - morality

- Cleaner than other fuels

renewable sources cannot scale fast enough and are inconsistant

- Cheaper than other fuels.
- safest (regulated)
- natural disasters attribute to more deaths

SPEAKER CODE #: 18 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION - Better arguments regarding health risks and global warming

Ocean life destroyed

Water used to cool plants have runoff that is radioactive

carbon 14

molton salt reactor (MSR)

- mutually assured destruction.

winston Thant

~~Winston Thrant (*8)~~
Round 1A 9:00am Room 66
Aff: 6 Wallis
Neg: 14 Alam
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: WINSTON THANT

Judge's School Affiliation: 8

AFF: Speaker Code #: 6 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 14 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:	Negative
very clear on delivery great preparation good summary	very clear on delivery could improve on counter-attacking the main contention, which was safety & risk courteous

SPEAKER CODE #: 6 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
very close but the summary put AFF over the line

Mizhele Kito (*6)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 65
Aff: 8 Thant
Neg: 17 Fine
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Michele Kito

Judge's School Affiliation: El Cerrito High School

AFF: Speaker Code #: 8 pts 27

NEG: Speaker Code #: 17 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:

Your contentions were clear, but you did not clearly explain the nexus between nuclear bombs and nuclear power. You could speak a little more slowly and forcefully. I liked your last affirmative rebuttal where you addressed your opponents city claims and had good arguments about less harmful alternatives. You accidentally missed cross-examination - I would just slow down overall in your next debates. Also, summaries are good for us parents :)

Negative:

You spoke at a nice clear pace and your contentions were clear, and well-articulated. Your rebuttals were good as well. As for areas of improvement, you might try to use all of the available time - you can summarize, if necessary. Also, while you focus on GDP (& money) the city aspect really is about people, environment & the planet (not necessarily just $).

SPEAKER CODE #: 17 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

The NEG more clearly articulated the argument for nuclear power with good organization, clear points and rebuttal that was on-point.

Dawn Cutler (*17)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 62
Aff: 14 Chang
Neg: 8 Venkat
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name:______________________________

Judge's School Affiliation:____________________

AFF: Speaker Code #: 14 pts 28   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:	Negative
good speaker - go back to your framework and make sure to bring out the points you make in cross-x in your actual rebuttal/speech.	good speaker you did a good job of summarizing + bring forward your points to rebuttal

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

REASON FOR DECISION both were good speakers but neg did a better job of bring her points forward especially as relates to jobs/economy + less emissions

Dawn Cutler (*17)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 62
Aff: 6 Schutte
Neg: 1 Chen
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name:______________________________

Judge's School Affiliation:______________________

Speaker Code #: AFF: 6 ~~25~~ pts 25 Speaker Code #: NEG: 1 ~~26~~ pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

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

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

Judging Criteria

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
calm demeanor you had good arguements but you need to bring through on 1st rebuttal - you left me with agreement as to the criterea & I feel he better supported his contention on global warming being the biggest risk	good job of summarizing on rebuttal and pulling your arguements through

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

REASON FOR DECISION

~~[illegible]~~ — overall good round for a novice team
make sure to go back to original points

Ben Goldstone (*3)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 67
Aff: 14 Alcantra
Neg: 1 Lewis
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Ben Goldstone

Judge's School Affiliation: CPS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 14 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:

	14	1
CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?	28	26
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?	Solid 28	27
ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?	27	26
VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)	28	28

- **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) Strong Affirmative Constructive
(2) Well organized good evidence w/ good level of detail

Negative
(1) Needed better CE
(2) Strong Neg. Constructive Spoken w/ conviction
Need to work on Refutation + Rebuttals

SPEAKER CODE #: 14 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
AFF argument had better Evidence + solid organization

Seema Ahluwalia
~~Chien Fang~~ (*12)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 62
Aff: 8 Odaiyappan
Neg: 6 Schutte
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: ~~Chien Fang~~ Seema Ahluwalia

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

Speaker Code #: AFF: 8 pts 28 Speaker Code #: NEG: 6 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: 8 good eye contact. Knows information on topic w/out only reading. About case analysis. Organized both constructive and rebuttal questions/answers well in cross examination. Refute opponents claims (neg) dropped first contingence.

Negative (6) value, value criteria - less polution. Current (2016) facts discussed. Had good evidence. Good on constructive and rebuttal responses. Presented case well. Questioned 1st contingent. Shouldn't fidget with notebook while ~~talking~~ speaking. Answered all contingence

SPEAKER CODE #: 6 on the Neg. wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION - (Aff) - knew information, but kept on with Native Americans and land vs. nuclear power.

Seema Ahluwalia

~~Chien Fang~~ (*12)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 62
Aff: 17 Fine
Neg: 6 Seyoum
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Seema Ahluwalia

Judge's Name: ~~Chien Fang~~

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

AFF: Speaker Code #: 17 pts 26 NEG: Speaker Code #: 6 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:

didn't build his side.

Affirmative: Fine(17)

Wasn't quite sure what the point was. Didn't Answered the opponents questions. Renewables. Only picked out minor points of opponents rebuttal. Needs more information on topic - only responded to opponents ideas - didn't have own. Did a good job but needed to be prepared.

Negative Seyoum(6)

nuclear power plants - long term stability. nuclear power less 50% of energy. power imbalance will violate law - not follow law. If nuclear power was prohibited other countries couldn't defend themselves as it would cause a power imbalance. Didn't address all contengents. Reliable ~~needs to keep track~~ source of energy. 3rd world countries can't afford to start from scratch. Didn't comment on AFF's 3rd contingence.

SPEAKER CODE #: 6 **on the** NEG. **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION (AFF) Didn't have all of his information only put neg. down on everything she stated. Didn't talk about the topic to bring up new information. talked about same idea over & over again. (Neg) - Spoke about topic and answered most contingence but hard to because (AFF) didn't have rebuttal ~~[illegible]~~

Jay Menon (*5)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 66
Aff: 8 Nagle
Neg: 6 Hanin
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: JAY MENON

Judge's School Affiliation: DUBLIN HIGH

AFF: Speaker Code #: 8 pts 26 NEG: Speaker Code #: 6 pts 28 JM

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:
Clear & Slow Constructive speech however seemed to be less familiar with the material being 'read'/stumbled a few times. Seemed low on confidence, but this can definitely improve with practice/experience! Good point about Nuclear having a significant Carbon footprint in mining. Had good ideas in rebuttal. 2nd rebuttal had a few holes, but overall it was a good attempt.

Negative:
Excellent Constructive speech. Good contentions, arguments & delivery. Countered contentions of Aff. In crossex, Exhibited points of confidence and was able to question & respond well. Appeared as a more mature debater for a Novice category, compared to Aff. But was courteous & respectful at all times. Was a little less confident/more nervous in the 2nd half. But had good points in rebuttal & overall did a great job!

SPEAKER CODE #: 6 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
Higher confidence, clarity, better arguments and rebuttals.

Jay Menon (*5)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 66
Aff: 15 Maram
Neg: 14 Chang
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: JAY MENON

Judge's School Affiliation: DUBLIN HIGH

AFF: Speaker Code #: 15 pts 27 NEG: Speaker Code #: 14 pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

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

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

Judging Criteria

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 Constructive arguments, contentions, delivery. Crossex of Neg was not too productive. Some missed opportunities. Neg ~~[illegible]~~ asserted unreliability of alternative (renewable) energies, but Aff rejected that in first rebuttal without any convincing arguments to go with it. Rebuttals came out as somewhat confused in some parts. But overall a good showing for Novice. Showed potential!

Negative Crossex of Aff was not effective, there were not many probing questions in the Crossex., even though speaking/delivery was good. Constructive contentions were good but some were too long-winded and hard to follow along. In the rebuttal could have challenged Aff on his assertion that renewable energy sources are reliable, ~~&~~ i.e explained why they are unreliable. Also used only about 60% of the time allowed for rebuttal. Could have made use of the extra time. Overall, a good attempt. Will improve a lot/potential with practice & experience!

SPEAKER CODE #: 15 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
Both sides had points of inconsistency/confusion/missed opportunities. But overall Aff wins for Confidence, Delivery, ~~Rebuttals~~ and better rebuttals.

Williamson
~~Pinole Judge 2 (*14)~~
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 65
Aff: 5 Lenka
Neg: 8 Kurlagunda
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Les Williamson

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 5 Lenka pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 8 Kurlagunda 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:
Delivery often sounded as if you didn't believe yourself.	More evidence is not better evidence.

SPEAKER CODE #: 5 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
Evidence was stronger & more believable

Pinole Judge 2 (*14)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 65
Aff: 8 Venkat
Neg: 6 Wallis
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Les Williamson

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 8 Venkat pts 28
NEG: Speaker Code #: 6 Wallis 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:	Negative
Global climate change after nuclear war has nothing to do with this. Fewer details w/out evidence. Bring your timer. Wikipedia is Never a source.	Coal & oil are Not renewable resources. Don't verbalize self-doubt or self-correction. Beware redundancy: "..already exist energy that exists today."

SPEAKER CODE #: 6 **on the** Neg **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
Presented more evidence that was believable.

Sherica Goduco (*9)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 64
Aff: 18 Stromberg
Neg: 5 Sharma
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Sherica Goduco

Judge's School Affiliation: Logan

AFF: Speaker Code #: 18 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 5 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:	Negative

Both speakers presented a well-researched speech, presented yourselves professionally and both spoke in a clear and organized manner.
Both of you started strong.

SPEAKER CODE #: 5 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

NEG was able to elaborate more on ~~[illegible]~~. The informations presented during ~~the~~ rebuttal

Sherica Goduco (*9)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 64
Aff: 14 Alam
Neg: 1 Chen
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Sherica Goduco

Judge's School Affiliation: Logan

AFF: Speaker Code #: 14 pts 27

NEG: Speaker Code #: 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:
You had a well-researched piece, but you were not able to deliver them confidently. Your answer to your opponent's rebuttal was poor because you did not explain them further.

Believe in your case, you can only persuade people if you believe it.

Negative
- do not pace too much - it's dizzying.
- Convincing evidence
- strong probing on your opponent

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

REASON FOR DECISION

Strong delivery and detailed response in rebuttal.