Judge Round 2B 11:00am Room 65 Aff: 5 Sharma	i -	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: PRANAV SHAHI
Neg: 6 Wallis Novice L-D Debate	_	Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS
4	AFF: S	NEG. 6
Speaker Code #:	SHARMA pts 2	NEG: 6 Speaker Code #: WALLIS pts 28
Please award e	ach speaker points based	8
		= Outstanding 28 = Very Good
		good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair	24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Ju	udging Criteria
0	e criteria, please offer co	ompliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:		
CASE ANALY How well did the deb	SIS: bater develop a case in response to	the resolution?
• EVIDENCE:	ater develop a case in response to	
	ting emphasizes logic and persuasi port arguments. How effective wa	on, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) as the evidence?
ORGANIZATI How well did the deb	ON: pater organize both the constructive	e and rebuttal speeches?
VALUE CLASE		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
(Criterion)		supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
	the debater refute the arguments of	f the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
• DELIVERY/CO Did each debater spea		s pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above each debater:	e criteria, please offer co	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative:		Negative
and the second second second	ought, good em	their liked how you kept coming
veluy stu	netwed with g	od back to your key arguments;
	throughout deba	
SPEAKER COD	E #: SHARMA on	the AFF wins this debate.
DEACONTOD	VECTSION	(AFF or NEG)
REASON FOR D Felt Hood		conceded on the environmental

contention. in

1 CC

ात्र स्थितन्त् हहे। दुव्हार्थन्त्र स्थिति दिन्हे । स्थितवे निवला पुत्र स्थिति हेन्द्र होत् स्थिति । उद्यान अर्थव्या विस्तार होत्य स्थिति । दिर्द्रां के पुरुष्ट्र । हिन्दु व्यक्तराह्य इत्या करी सीतियन्त्र (स्थान्स्य के हत्या । क्योंनिव, राजन्त्र व्यक्तराह्य, हा किर्वत्या (

Judge		LINCOLN D	OUGLAS Deb	ate
Round 2A 11:00am Room 65 Aff: 8 Venkat		Judge's Name: PRA	NAV SHI	AHL
Neg: 1 Lewis				
Novice L-D Debate		Judge's School Affiliation	DI: DVHS	
AFF: 8		NEG		-
Speaker Code #: VENKA	<u> </u>	Speaker Code #: LE	wis	pts2%
Please award each speaker	r points based o	on the following scale	5 : Isaania ana maratsi na kasa ana ana ana ana ana ana ana ana ana	te da por construir de la terra de manetas e de
-		Dutstanding $28 = Vert$		
$27 = \mathbf{Good}$ (but	t possibly not goo	d enough to qualify for	elimination rounds	s)
26-25 = Fair 24-2	$0 = \mathbf{Poor}$	<20 = Reserved for	rude or inapprop	riate behavior
		ging Criteria		
Using the above criteria, p	lease offer com	pliments and/or sug	gestions for imp	rovement 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 Allimative: Needs to leverage allotted time efficiently Good arguments on neverals vs. Nuclear anound reliability Oid not address radiactive worth Concern

SPEAKER CODE #: $L \in \mathcal{U} \setminus S$ on the $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{S}$ wins this debate. (AFF or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION** Strong conclusion highlighting own points that were not rejuted and at the same time effectively rejuting opponents Key auguments

(고) (24년 ⁻ 1776년 - 17

0.11

معمدان الرابط تعريد مالك الدار الدار الإربية ويتناط في في المعار المار التيكر. - الإكار تصافي الرابط في المعار الذي المارية المارية المارية الإرابط في المارية المارية المارية المارية المعار المعار المعال ال المارية الحصار معارضة المارية ا

1,254 N 13 12 2

ਿੱਖ ਕਰਨਾ ਦੇ ਇਸ ਨੇ ਦਰਜਿੰਗ ਨੇ ਸ਼ੁਰੂ ਸਮੱਖ ਨੇ ਸਿੰਘ ਨੇ ਸਾਹਿਤ ਦੇ ਸਾਹਮ ਪ੍ਰਾਉਂਡਾ ਨੇ ਦੇ ਇੱਕ ਸਿੱਖ ਨੇ ਸਟਾਂ ਕਰਨਾਂ ਦੇ ਦੇ ਸੱ ਇੰਗੂ ਕੀਤਾ, ਜਿਸ ਨੇ ਨੇ ਸਾਹਿਤ ਨੇ ਸਮਾਦ ਦੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਉਨ੍ਹਿੰਦ ਦੇ ਸ਼ੁਰੂ ਜੀ ਸਿੰਘ ਨੇ ਉਹ ਦੇ ਸਿੰਘ ਜਾਂ ਦੇ ਤੋਂ ਤਾਂ ਦੀ ਨੇ ਦੇ ਦੇ ਸ ਇਹ ਸ਼ੁਰੂ ਸੁਰਦਾ ਸ਼ੁਰਦਾ ਸ਼ਹੀ

		Co	untriesover	nt to pro	molt	nuclear	power		
F	Judg Round 2 Aff: 8 M	e B 11:00am Room 6 Kurlagunda TN	² visha		LINC Judge's Nam	OLN DOU e:GAIL	GLAS Deb KERNE	ate 5	
1	Neg: 1	5 Maram L-D Debate	Anish		Judge's Scho	ol Affiliation:	ALBANY	145	
		Speaker Code #:	AFF: KURLA	tounda pts 27	Speaker Code	NEG: M #: 15	Aram		
		Please award		points based o Perfect $29 = 0$		-	ood	ng na	
	wee	26-25 = Fair		possibly not good = Poor	2775 C			s) riate behavior	
	ie.			Judg	ing Criteri	а			
				ease offer com			ions for impr	rovement for	
No.	St	• CASE ANAI							
R	DD		lebater develop a cas	se in response to the	resolution?				
SM	ishe	Although value de	bating emphasizes lo	ogic and persuasion, o How effective was th	evidence (quote	ed material, conten	nporary or historic	cal examples)	
A A	00	• ORGANIZA	TION:						
JAN .	22	• VALUE CLA	ASH:	h the constructive and	-				
NA.		How clearly did th (Criterion)	e debater emphasize	e the value being supp	oorted by his/he	r side, and how w	ell was that value	measured?	
	16	• REFUTATIO How thoroughly di		the arguments of the	opposition and	rebuild his/her ov	vn side?		
14	E	• DELIVERY/	COURTESY:	tive style that was ple					
Fé -	5								
1	0	Using the abo each debater:	ve criteria, pl	ease offer comp	oliments an א זי	d/or suggesti	ons for impr	ns, at evidence at evidence	
1977/199C	oper	actioning	TWISHA +	emotional argument area. Ng		Anisha	1	+ factual	
-1:	star-	Affirmative: FOVER, F	-well prep	anex.	Negative	e ligo of	-nup ctir	argument.	
3 3 6	sup	port/reas	oning stro	Nig	+ + 200	d aravi	mentthe	at evidence	
1 -1	rent	ion of 1	sis effect	The to creat		is not p	resente	ed. # e.g.,	
4	pre	S prototo	THE E HER	ulth RISKS presented	2 C	navenge	D3570 (N	ance of nuclear	
++	ong	puned &	, alang p	fear alth Risks bressited		avitac	K.		
	Dr	PRIMATIO	sh clur	1245011119	1+ (0	sident	ecilar	speaker	
†† ?	stor	la use of Nratw. Amer	Mansegge	to cheate case expl $case for 3(15)$ on the	tt.ef	fective	VSC Of-	facts/numbers	
++ y	Me	tionale	Logical	case expire	370	a evilor	1911 UTCA	preparation.	
TK	SED	SPEAKER CO	DE #:	(15) on the	NEG	wins this deba	te.		
Tpn	epau	EA - WOI REASON FOR	DECISION to	ore effect	He or NEG)	r/m 1000	t poct	ne & eue contact	4
-Sove	107	to ask if	ready for	Constructer	cootal.	Cle CLID	1 JUDIU	no to Affis	
+000	dar	gument R	C cost o	foperation	7 1.0	SMALINTION	13 a.hon	nce to Affs nce to Affs nt safety/fear	
			- Ofp					meet Re: costs	

nanna annsaithe - Annan Marthag Marthagan an 1966 annsaithean

gaster Krennes Hernen Mer e en Sigel Storgin

12 WV CONTRACT

t prest disposibilité les productions précedents productions appointent pourse du plant La managemente officients production par activitient producte per costis

	Conntril ^S ought to	prehibit NUCLCAR POWER
	-01111 9 0109111 15	LINCOLN DOLICE AS Debete
Judge Round 2A 11:00am Ro	20m 62	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: GAIL KENNES
Aff: 6 Hanin		Judge's Ivalle. 6412 TEDINES
Neg: 18 Stromber		Judge's School Affiliation: ALBANY
Novice L-D Debate	Reero	
	AFF. Sophie	NEG: 10 STROMBERG
Speaker Coo	le #: pts 22	2 Speaker Code #: 51Kompts 28
Please aw	ard each speaker points based	8
		Outstanding 28 = Very Good
		ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = 1	Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
TT •		dging Criteria
		mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each deba		
	NALYSIS: the debater develop a case in response to the	he resolution?
• EVIDER		
	e debating emphasizes logic and persuasio d to support arguments. How effective was	n, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) s the evidence?
	IZATION:	
• VALUE	the debater organize both the constructive :	and rebuttal speeches?
		upported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUT.	ATION:	
How thorough	ily did the debater refute the arguments of f	the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
	ERY/COURTESY:	
Did each deba	ater speak in communicative style that was	pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the	above criteria, please offer cou	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
+ each deba	ter: Cauld use more prac	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to the to be more relaxed/smooth) REFOS STRAMBED G(16) + LOGICAL
emotional s	SOPHIE HANIN (G)	REECE STROMBERG(16) + LOGICAL
argu menatifirmativ	" GLOBAL SAFETY	Negative In cross by neg ARE uneut Masked If leveroyene ready U.S. mervous
		maken if leverbrone ready U.S.
T stayed to	an through visitor ont	about and suday - nervous
ALA GELLIN	ROOMLATE	oponent. and jouge.
+ evidence	e in construct & cross	ss said didnot TI CO2 W/ovteridence
+ contention		TEVIDENCE PIESENTED IVIAI CITATION
cross - Didn.	Fask If ready.	" unpart of coal is "the problem"
tt on thract	-W/ QUESTIONS.	and noclear is a better all oheap
tt papettal in	Ary changed to Magol	ants to the work is safe, etc
Colleina V	en on ong it was pro	articulater arge amount of eulance
C. cost geet	viren + Poised	ants ++ the very large amount of evidine 1+ clear speaker, interesting argument (AFE OF NEG) with well promoter
SPEAKER	CODE #: 0 on t	the NEG wins this debate.
puttal -	in a certalemente provided. ((AFF or NEG) 1 + expressed. nuclear w/
KEASUN F	UK DECISIUN '	Ht very confident ufter stafe
With Bandy tin	eng he to market for alter	Flating Lind All and Land Land
shanal kro -	huclear energy cu	MADIA AURTONG
STUIGENU Rebu	stal-	Rebuttal strong, convincing of
VERI COTIVINCI	ng. Elear & concise	nobotiacours, safety and of

and the property where a model of the second s

E. Merrial Her

and the second SS WE SOLOR

anomicante publications an analyse material produces of the contract and a second second of the contract of th

Judge

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

LINCOLN	DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name:	Lawric Murthy

Judge's School Affiliation: MV HS

 AFF:
 IT
 pts
 NEG:
 pts
 IC

 Speaker Code #:
 IT
 pts
 28
 Speaker Code #:
 IT
 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?

Please Construct a Stronger ass examination. Affirmative: Negative ink more about what your opponent Value = heal Oriterea = Sa remental oblight nuclear a nlar to enviropm idioactivity 2. 3 Sources anox tointed ou this sag obal 15sue not 0 that wins this debate. SPEAKER CODE #: on the (AFF or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION** Better argument construction. Listeged well to opponant and had strong rebuttal



LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge Round 2A 11:00am Room 64 Judge's Name: [Judie Aff: 1 Chen Neg: 8 Nagle Novice L-D Debate Judge's School Affiliation: AFF: NEG: pts X Speaker Code #: Speaker Code #: Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior **Judging Criteria** Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater: **CASE ANALYSIS:** How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution? EVIDENCE: Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence? **ORGANIZATION:** How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches? VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion) **REFUTATION:** How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? **DELIVERY/COURTESY:** Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Good research texamples maybe offer an alternative such as regulation vs banning Watch your time good Affirmative: E Structu Negative -moralitu prohibition leads to increase onvir damack Laccident examples - supportive to suppo radiation emissions - un ases - supportive into waske / product ratio Water Dollition health problems. waste storage problems chnology developmin health Problems mple + less expensive remal pollution went over time on cross exam. damage lim to near the source Pollution that reaches more **SPEAKER CODE #:** on the AF Fwins this debate. facts regarding mortality (AFF or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION** More cohesive argument



	N/ J J
8 Thant e L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista
AFF: 6 pts 2	b Speaker Code #: pts_25
Please award each speaker points based	l on the following scale:
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
	ood enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Ju	dging Criteria
	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the	he resolution?
• EVIDENCE:	
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasio should be used to support arguments. How effective was	on, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) s the evidence?
• ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constructive	and relevated an apple of
 VALUE CLASH: 	and reduitar speeches?
	supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	
 How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the DELIVERY/COURTESY: 	the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was	
	pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
 Contraction defined by a sub- stantistic state of the sub- state of the sub- sub-state of the sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-	
 Contraction defined by a sub- stantistic state of the sub- state of the sub- sub-state of the sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-	pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater:	
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater: Affirmative: Good aganization of	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Negative · Contentions, are clearly stated
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater: Affirmative:	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Negative · Contentions are clearly stated
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater: Affirmative: Good organization of contentions and evider	Negative · Contentions are clearly stated · Need to refute AFF's contention
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater: Affirmative: Good aganization of	Negative · Contentions are clearly stated · Need to refute AFF's contention in Negative Constructive. Don't Wait will Negative Rebutted to
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater: Affirmative: Good organization of contentions and eviden Good & relevant CX guestions	ne Negative · Contentions are clearly stated · Need to refute AFF's contention in Negative Constructive. Don't wait will Negative Rebutted to refute -
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater: Affirmative: Good organization of contentions and evider Good & relevant CX zvertions	neliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Negative · Contentions are clearly stated · Need to refute AFF's contention in Negative Constructive. Don't wait whil Negative Rebutted to refute. · Need to address AFF's waste
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater: Affirmative: Good organization of contentions and evider Good & relevant CX zuestions	neliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Negative · Contentions are clearly stated · Need to refute AFF's contention in Negative Constructive. Don't wait whil Negative Rebutted to refute. · Need to address AFF's waste
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater: Affirmative: Good organization of contentions and evider Good & relevant CX zuestions	neliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Negative · Contentions are clearly stated · Need to refute AFF's contention in Negative Constructive. Don't wait whil Negative Rebutted to refute. · Need to address AFF's waste
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater: Affirmative: Good organization of contentions and eviden Good & relevant CX questions	ne Negative • Contentions are clearly stated • Need to refute AFF's contention in Negative Constructive. Don't wait will Negative Rebutted to refute -
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater: Affirmative: Good organization of contentions and evider Good & relevant CX zuestions SPEAKER CODE #: on 1	neliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Negative · Contentions are clearly stated · Need to refute AFF's contention in Negative Constructive. Don't wait until Negative Rebutted to refute. · Need to address AFF's weste disposed more effectively. · Speeches could be longer.
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater: Affirmative: Good organization of contentions and evider Good & relevant CX guestions SPEAKER CODE #: on 1 REASON FOR DECISION	npliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Negative · Contentions are clearly stated · Need to refute AFF's contention in Negative Constructive. Don't wait until Negative Rebutted to refute. · Need to address AFF's waste disposed more effectively. · speeches could be longer. the <u>AFF</u> wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)
Using the above criteria, please offer con each debater: Affirmative: Good organization of contentions and evider Good & relevant CX guestions SPEAKER CODE #: on 1 REASON FOR DECISION	mpliments and/or suggestions for improvement to Negative • Contentions are clearly stated • Need to refute AFF's contention in Negative Constructive. Don't wait while Negative Rebuttel to refute. • Need to address AFF's waste disposel more effectively. * speeches could be longer. the AFF or NEG



Round 2B 11:00am Room 66 Aff: 5 Lenka	RAISSI	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: JAHAN RAISSI
Neg: 14 Alcantra Novice L-D Debate		Judge's School Affiliation: SACRED HEART CATHEDRAL
AI Speaker Code #:	FF: 5 Lenka pts 27	Speaker Code #: 14 Alcantra pts 25
Please award eac	ch speaker points based o	
		28 = Very Good
27 = 26-25 = Fair	Good (but possibly not goo 24-20 = Poor	d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
		ging Criteria
Using the above each debater:	criteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSI	۶.	
How well did the debate	er develop a case in response to the	resolution?
• EVIDENCE: Although value debating should be used to suppo	g emphasizes logic and persuasion, rt arguments. How effective was th	evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) ne evidence?
• ORGANIZATIO How well did the debate	N: r organize both the constructive an	d rebuttal speeches?
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the deb (Criterion)	ater emphasize the value being sup	ported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	debater refute the arguments of the	opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
• DELIVERY/COU Did each debater speak		easant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above of each debater:	criteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative:		Negative
Good organization	tion + ur J	Good to use cross to make points for your position
material		
Good use A cross in opponents	s to point out flaw	by opposent
Clear speaking	style	The better you how your case and ficts The better you can defend it al
Good at points a	out where opponent	Nice spraki stule
SPEAKER CODE	#: <u>5 Lenkh</u> on the	e AFF wins this debate. Good reasons to supp.
REASON FOR DEC		FF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

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

Judge JAHAN KAISSI 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: _____ NEG:

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?

Affirmative: Negative Good eye contact Nice easy going speaking state Work to directly address the points ne opponent makes Good job of pointy out what oppont did not address Good organization + easy to follow Not addressing contentions of opponent was costly and gave opponent an advantage Use the cross to get in to 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 of clarity; also slightly better at reliting to issues addressed. In many



ston Thant			
	LINCOL	N DOUCI	LAS Debate
ston Thrant (*8)	Indee's Name	LA DOUGI	ON THANT
1B 9:00am Room 66 Brabo	Judge S Mame.		A Illinon :
6 Seyoum	T 1 1 0 1 1 1	0011	C
e L-D Debate	Judge's School A:	filiation:	0
4.00			
AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #: F	ts Speaker Code #:		pts
Please award each speaker points l			
	29 = Outstanding 28		
27 = Good (but possibly		fy for elimina	tion rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved	ed for rude of	r inappropriate beha
	Judging Criteria		
Using the above criteria, please off		rangeostion	a fan improvement
	er compriments and/o	r suggestion	s for improvement
each debater:			
• CASE ANALYSIS:	and a second		
How well did the debater develop a case in respon	use to the resolution?		
• EVIDENCE:			
Although value debating emphasizes logic and pe should be used to support arguments. How effect	rsuasion, evidence (quoted ma	terial, contempor	ary or historical examples)
 ORGANIZATION: 	ive was me evidence?		
 OKGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constr 	notive and reputted march - 0		
 VALUE CLASH: 	active and rebuild speeches?		
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value l	saing supported by his/hor side	and how wall u	ing that value massive 19
(Criterion)	supported by mis/net side	, and now wen w	vas mai value measureu?
• REFUTATION:			
How thoroughly did the debater refute the argume	ents of the opposition and rebui	ild his/her own si	de?
• DELIVERY/COURTESY:			
Did each debater speak in communicative style th	at was pleasant, easily understa	andable, and civi	1?
에는 1월 2013년 1월 한 사망에는 이번 가지 있다. 1995년 1월 1997년 1 1월 1997년 1월 1		,	
Using the above criteria, please offe	er compliments and/or	r suggestion	s for improvement
each debater:			mpiorement
Affirmative:			
Ammauve:	Negative		
Here adverte the tax of a			
n señes)			
Kell, a			
Frankly Frank			
FOR			
Sellig Brother and			
P	1		
SPEAKER CODE #: 6	on the NEG wins	this debate	
	(AFF or NEG)	uns uedate.	
REASON FOR DECISION	(ALL OLINEO)		
	. 1		
#2 forte	Lided		
11 100 2000 f C			

Mizhele Kito (*6)	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Round 1A 9:00am Room 65	Judge's Name: Michele Kito
Aff: 14 Alcantra Neg: 2 Housman	
Novice L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: El Cercipo High School
Speaker Code #: 14 pts27	Judge's School Affiliation: <u>El Cerrito Hish School</u> NEG: Speaker Code #: <u>pts_27</u>
Please award each speaker points based or	n the following scale:
	utstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good	l enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Judg	ing Criteria
Using the above criteria, please offer comp	liments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	
CASE ANALYSIS:	
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the r	esolution?
• EVIDENCE: Although value debating amphasizes logic and permusing	vidence (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 amphasize the value being over	orted by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
(Criterion)	orted by his her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the	opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
• DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did and delate small in a survey indianal 1 of 1	
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was plea	isant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer comp each debater:	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each uebater:	
Affirmative:_NUCleo-F	Negative - Civil dissbudicence
I liked the summary of way (astruthat	Sorry this didn't work ant, but your civil
I liked the summary of your contentions at the end, they really helps the fidge	disobediance case was interesting and F
passidate page understanding of the	liked how you essentially boil if down to
Consolidate their understanding of your	Simple points - CD not necessary, can be
asc. I would have liked more explanation	decharching to the file of a construction
of low nuclear poner icsults in greater	destructive to the fublic g society, and
Or emissions (intreshing!). Or the your	may lead to hislence. I'm sorry we
Erd untention (about being burdensome) and	were not able to hear the rest of
intreshing parts jour the heading demed	The debade!
wrong - maybe "not practical" for other countril	9
or diverto throught, gerhaps.	

SPEAKER CODE #: 14

on the <u>AFF</u> wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

١٨

Unfortunately, the negative did not have the nuclear pover case prepared, but was under the impossion that she wind be debatily the civil disobeduance resulution, so I give this to the AFF. dire to this misunderstanding.

Make Private

가슴에 있는 것 같은 것 같아요. [3]

a ser a A ser a s

i peter Abra Abra ana se

kter de fan de keine de stere de stere de stere de stere de stere de stere op de stere op de de stere de stere De stere de sterekter de stere fan her de stere stere de stere de stere de stere de stere op de stere de stere De stere de sterekter de stere de stere

Bodhi Nadler (*2) Round 1A 9:00am Room 64	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: BODH NAO LEP
Aff: 8 Odaiyappan Neg: 6 Hanin Novice L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: Analy
AFF: Speaker Code #: Odaiyappan	pts peaker Code #: NEG: Han in 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) $26-25 = Fair \qquad 24-20 = Poor \qquad <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior$

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:**

3

4

4

4

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?

Affirmative: Some vebuffels Negative Inid cellent retu Co chal 5 5 pronuncia e very clear & well w/ good organ; zation 5 NO togett more clear Colvery con SPEAKER CODE # EO wins this debate. on the (AFF or NEG) **REASON FOR DECIS** speaker was much more argonized, spoke more clearly ! addressed the points is rebutted points the best - w/ more well documented information : Sources

- bias of Surree - questrun? lost-pollution - which about leades? opp. MAD - methally assured betreather has hit folled so the - repeat 36 1 ant Stat? questron Source - Porduce Source? & power and amen - Jovel purit # - highly efficient -9220 eft. - Goul rebuttals & speeking 9 - Less pulleting? - Smellet curber fatherent orgent - moral dilig Cover × by AA porture - make out pollution ? Value mor al objectations - concerts for worker questimet Survey? provin clatton If the is brig down? more deadly? # Digerium when K Climate churge (ross y by Neg Per Show le percentaryo. mer wy 1 for 5 -theft AR peart -

Bodhi Nadler (*2) Round 1B 9:00am Room 64	Judge's Name: BODY, NADLEP)
Mf: 8 Nagle leg: 5 Lenka lovice L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:	_
Speaker Code #: AFF: Nagle	pts 28 / Speaker Code #: NEG: Len Ka pts	. 18

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:30 = Perfect29 = Outstanding28 = 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</td>

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:

E

N

28

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?

seemed Negative very colum - Good work on presentation, very organized, calm de liverig Affirmative: -very nervous Negative Good catch on your opponents meltiple misleading points. They are arguments used offer ese Exptremely ordial, very cruz) most people ignore the points Excellent appearance gov challinged him on. - Case Levelopul very well, lary to - work on Speech flow - it was Chuppy ? Seine & dis organized understand your points ' pinnins. - covered all bases, made good points - some points raised at got challenger, but you could have challenger hadk **SPEAKER CODE #:** wins this debate. on the **REASON FOR DECISION** organized & better prepared, & spoke more calmly & had better pronunciation the AFF was excellent at Rebutal & Refutation

Neg APF Romald Reagan lied term dit v value - paulity of Life / mapmity Value - morality Value crit - potential cost of prihib. volue crit - societal welture & less Letrimutul contention -- pollation sources * proliferation - ItEA - Safer - Antalitry Body l'anguage - new hulp - no l'eur. y farmel - l'ourd Speech & Busines lost - recession * ferror ism - wante shiku (pross x very cordial very clear speaking & Car bun fortprint 13 as much is less ask for sourcest (00055 ¥ Rehrtt look at person who asked quit. - Source - Peo -good answers - well done Rela It good point on rebut good jub on catching sponists multiple misleading son point

	Murthy (*12)			LINCO Judge's Name:	LN DOUG	LAS Deba	ite	
Round 1B Aff: 1 Lev	9:00am Room 67 wis			to age of the later_		mille		
Neg: 5 S Novice L	harma -D Debate			Judge's School		NHS		
Sp	A peaker Code #:	AFF:	pts	Speaker Code #	NEG:)	<u>pts</u>	7
PI	lease award ea		oints based o	n the followin	ig scale:		unt kindere eta 120 eren (un 1960 eren	
	27	30 = Point = Good (but point poin	erfect $29 = 0$					
2	26-25 = Fair		= Poor					or
		- Count	ries S	hould ing Criteria	Prohi	jbit F	rodu	ction
	sing the above the second s	e criteria, plea	L L		- 1		V I SV	or
•		SIS:						
	ow well did the deb	ater develop a case	in response to the	resolution?				
	EVIDENCE: though value debati ould be used to supp				naterial, contemp	oorary or historic	al examples)	
•	ORGANIZATI				2			
Ho	w well did the deba VALUE CLASI		he constructive and	l rebuttal speeches	?			
Но	ow clearly did the d riterion)		ne value being supp	oorted by his/her si	de, and how well	l was that value r	neasured?	
• Ho	REFUTATION ow thoroughly did the		e arguments of the	opposition and rel	wild his/her own	side?		
•	DELIVERY/CO		e arguments or me	opposition and rea	Juliu IIIS/IICI Own	Side?		
Die	d each debater spea	k in communicative	e style that was ple	asant, easily under	standable, and ci	ivil?		
	sing the above	e criteria, plea	se offer comj	oliments and/	or suggestio	ns for impr	ovement to	
ea	ich debater:	+ hrought	UPSOMEX		you he	ad some	Veale	y lat
Af	ffirmative:	tu brought ery good t	else brough	Negative	good 20 Offer	runces of red a sol	ution je	pegna s
	iy.		ý v	-belier	vesin r-	equilation	g-not	bannin
	lue-mi				vesin r- SS-el	tam:	tech	nologi
-	maxin	rize st	flety	1 ans	uncem	ente		0
) J. re	nd well	-being	1) consol	rei	itional	upstr	tw er	rergy
e v	duce eff	COS GRAM	ator cond		1 UNLO	Dana		- ()
May C	Duclear of coar in terrori	nation	ad ation the	BH - Va	210-1	, til it		Sm
02.	Nuclear	Proliferati	m-risks	al.		wes wr	P VI VO D	
3.	torrori	Succession	-techorism	er er	her so	wiles (annot f	Sroduce
	ent ove	1 time (on constr	yctive	gulagai		od in a	00 040
- We		m m <u>1 time</u> 5	011 110	: <u> </u>	ns this debat	e.	least	· amount
T we	PEAKER COD	E #:	()					
SP	EARERCOD		(A	FF or NEG)		1	1 c	0 1
SP	EASON FOR D	ECISION N	me Str	ZOD Com Council	suement	3	1 24	. Carbon
SP	EASON FOR D	ECISION N	me Str	ZOD Com Council	guement	S	1 24	0 1
SP	EASON FOR D		me Str	ZOD Com Council	guement	is ad of ba	1 24	. Carbon



Laurie Murthy (*12)	Judge's Name: Laurie Murthin
Round 1A 9:00am Řoom 67 Aff: 18 Stromberg	Judge's Name: <u>recurre recurrent</u>
Neg: 8 Kurlagunda Novice L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS
AFF: 10 20	3 Speaker Code # NEG: 8 nts 21
Speaker Code #: pts	2 Speaker Code #: pts <u>21</u>
Please award each speaker points based	
	Outstanding 28 = Very Good
$27 = \text{Good} \text{ (but possibly not go}$ $26-25 = \text{Fair} \qquad 24-20 = \text{Poor}$	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	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	n, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)
should be used to support arguments. How effective was	the evidence?
• ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constructive a	and rebuttal speeches?
• VALUE CLASH:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
(Criterion)	pported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
REFUTATION:	
 How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of t DELIVERY/COURTESY: 	ne opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was p	pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please offer con	apliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater: Very good orgo	
Affirmative: Waste con be Used for nucl	Negative / and good research on Constructive
S Utilitarianism weapons	Value-morality
Nov.	- Cleaner than other
The side is a solution the second states	tures
- Miner Jun Dangerous - Weapons instruction Plutonium	renewable sources cannot
- used by Plutonium - used by terrorism - used beauth - pollution - uranium mining	Deale tast on a 1
-Valor health - pollution	- chare inconsistant
Sanswer Uranium mining	Capor Thom Stan
(etting) beach -pollution (etting) beach -pollution Uranium mining Vadioactivity + heavy	- safest (regulated) tueles.
Metule warping	
SPEAKER CODE #: 18 \mathcal{I} on t	he ATFT wins this debate. May attribute
REASON FOR DECISION 5 Better	AFF or NEG) minufuments regarding health risks
Oneun the deground	THIN CHANNEL
Water used to coop	(msr) Salt reactor
Dlants have runoff	- mutually assured
that is about the	destruction.
Eurbon 14	



Winston Than	+				
Winston Thrant (*8)		LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate			
Round 1A 9:00am Room 66	J	Judge's Name: LO INSTON THANT			
Aff: 6 Wallis Neg: 14 Alam Novice L-D Debate	J	Judge's School Affiliation:			
AFF: Speaker Code #:	<u>6 pts 28</u> s	Speaker Code #: 14 pts 28			
Please award each sp	beaker points based on 30 = Perfect 29 = Ou	the following scale: utstanding 28 = Very Good			
27 = Goo		enough to qualify for elimination rounds)			
26-25 = Fair		<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior			
This 4b a base out	•	ing Criteria			
each debater:	ria, please offer comp	liments and/or suggestions for improvement for			
• CASE ANALYSIS:	elop a case in response to the re	esolution?			
• 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?					
	• 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 crite each debater:	eria, please offer comp	liments and/or suggestions for improvement to			
Affirmative:		Negative			
Very clear	r ion delivery	very clear on delivery			
great pre	paradion	could improve on counter -			
good summ	ary	which was safety & risk			
		COURSEOUS			
	r.				
SPEAKER CODE #:		FF or NEG)			
REASON FOR DECISI	ON SP 60+ The	L SUMMERY PUT AFF over the			
line	why me				

and the second second





.

Mizhel	e Kito (*6)			LINCOLN DO		
Round 1B	9:00am Room 65			Judge's Name: MCCV		
Aff: 8 Th						
Neg: 17 Novice L	-D Debate		j	Judge's School Affiliatior	El Ornto	HEN School
	A -					0
C.		FF:	, 12.	NEG: Speaker Code #:7		24
Sp	eaker Code #:	Ū	pts	Speaker Code #:		pts <u>28</u>
PI	lease award ea			the following scale:		Bandon-Galdato da Jungo (Janon)
	0.5			itstanding $28 = Very$		
	27=	= Good (but poss	ibly not good	enough to qualify for e	limination rounds)	
2	6-25 = Fair	24-20 = P	oor	<20 = Reserved for r	ude or inappropri	ate behavior
				ng Criteria	1	
		criteria, please	offer comp	liments and/or sugg	estions for impro	ovement for
	ch debater:					
• Ho		IS: er develop a case in r	esponse to the re	solution?		
•	EVIDENCE:	er develop a ease in r	esponse to the re	solution:		
Alt	hough value debatin	g emphasizes logic ar ort arguments. How e	nd persuasion, ev effective was the	vidence (quoted material, con evidence?	ntemporary or historica	l examples)
•	ORGANIZATIO	N:				
Ho		er organize both the c	onstructive and	rebuttal speeches?		
•	VALUE CLASH					
(Cr	iterion)	bater emphasize the va	alue being suppo	rted by his/her side, and how	w well was that value m	easured?
•	REFUTATION:					
Ho	w thoroughly did the	e debater refute the arg	guments of the o	pposition and rebuild his/her	r own side?	
٠	DELIVERY/COU					
Did	l each debater speak	in communicative sty	le that was pleas	sant, easily understandable, a	and civil?	
Us	ing the above	criteria nlease	offer compl	iments and/or sugge	ations for impro	Nom ont to
ea	ch debater:	eriterita, picase	oner compi	ments and/or sugge	stions for impro	vement to
	to see the Comp			1		
Af	firmative:			Negative		
	Your contenti	his were clear,	, bit you	You spoke at a 1	mic clear pac	e and your
		the nexus by		sontenhous were	- clear and	an articulated.
nucleor box	mbs and me	clear power.	VM COND	Digeonius hel	elocity of the	er upli
SUCAL A	lifte man	de il a d	Pro O.H.	You related!	s were good	as the
C liked	a la lachad	slavly and f	ocenny.	As for area	s of improv	even, you
if unca y	for last al	Primative rel	attal	might try to	ver an q'	the anallouic
mere you	addressed	Var opponer	BUTY	ture in the	- CA 101000 [70	e, if necessary
clarms an	rel had goes	d arguments	aunt	Thre-you ca	a summeries	and the state
less harn	nful alterno	thics. You ac	cidevally	Also, while 1	you tous on	GDP (& money
missed and	155-exampa	tim-Furnd	jost	the arty asp rople ennor	ect really 1	s about
Slave down	areray in yu	no nixt debut	is. Allo,	ropk ennor	ment + the	planet Cost
summarics	are good for	us pacents		NEG Necescan NEG wins this de	Ly ich A	3
SPI	EAKER CODE	#:			bate.	
DT	A CON EOD DE	CICION	(AF)	F or NEG)		
RE.	ASON FOR DEC	UDIUN				Y (2)

The NEW more clearly asticulated the argument for nuclear power min good arganization, clear paints and related that was an-point.

Alekaler Ferhal

노...(고. 12세 ~ (~~)) 17

terr of the second second second second

an an an ann an an ann an an an Ann an Ann. An Ann an Ann

Dawn Cutler (*17)		LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Round 1B 9:00am Room 62		Judge's Name:
Aff: 14 Chang Neg: 8 Venkat		
Novice L-D Debate		Judge's School Affiliation:
A	.FF: 14 nts 28	_ Speaker Code #: pts
Speaker Code #:	pts	Speaker Code #: pts
Diago award as	an an allow a subscription of the second s	
r lease awaru ea	ach speaker points based of $30 = \text{Derfect}$ $20 = 0$	0
27		Dutstanding $28 = $ Very Good
26-25 = Fair	- 0000 (but possibly hot god24-20 = Poor	od enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
20-25 Tall	24-20 - 1001	-20 - Reserved for fude of mappropriate behavior
	Ind	ging Criteria
Using the above		pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	, criteria, picase oner com	priments and/or suggestions for improvement for
CASE ANALYS	SIS:	
	ater develop a case in response to the	e resolution?
• EVIDENCE:		
		, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)
ORGANIZATIO	port arguments. How effective was t	ne evidence?
	ater organize both the constructive ar	nd rebuttal speeches?
VALUE CLASH	I:	ti sa kalenda ing katerak bagehègindate behasi in
	bater emphasize the value being sur	oported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
(Criterion) • REFUTATION:		
		e opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
 DELIVERY/CO 		
Did each debater speal	k in communicative style that was pl	leasant, easily understandable, and civil?
. ET LOENCE.		
	criteria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:		
Affirmative:	Salado for a sub-secol	Nagativa
		Negative
good spear	h - go bode to	good speak
Vinter Fran	evole and make	my and a good jub of
YOUR CLOUNT	avia more	ummenzin - Linna Fernard VAV
sure to b	pring out the	you and a good jub of summenzing + bring forward you points to rebutal
painte VIDU	make in cross-p	points to rabe you
1700000 1	a inter the D longraft	
in your a er	rol related /speal.	
1 h Barren		
	C	1 lunio
SPEAKER CODI	E #: on th	ne NEG wins this debate.
	(A	AFF or NEG)
REASON FOR DE	ECISION both whe	and speaking but neg did a
better xob	of pring his in	- I comand Personally an Admite
-1 1	o no por	good speaking but neg did a This formand espeantly as relate
to woolla	mony " less en	nusions
. 0 1		
Dawn Cutler (*17) Round 1A 9:00am Room 62 Aff: 6 Schutte Neg: 1 Chen Novice L-D Debate AFF Speaker Code #:

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name:

Judge's School Affiliation:

NEG:

pts25

Speaker Code #:

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: ۲

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:

an a	
Affirmative:	Negative
Calm demeanar	and pulling your arguments
you had good arguements but	and pilling your arguements
you held to bring through	Through
on 1strebuttor - you left me	
with agreement as to The	
Criterea & I feel he better	
supported his contraction on global wasming being the	
global wasming being the	bigget hise
	wins this debate.
(AFF	or (NEG)
REASON FOR DECISION	
gannabace - overall go	od round for a nonre ear
make sure to go tack to	onginal points

Ben Goldstone (*3)	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: Ben Cold Store
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 67	Judge's Name: Ben Coldstone
Aff: 14 Alcantra	
Neg: 1 Lewis Novice L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation:
Novice L-D Debale	
AFF:	NEG:
Speaker Code #: 14 pts	28 Speaker Code #: / pts_27
	pts
Please award each speaker points ba	sed on the following scale:
	9 = Outstanding $28 = $ Very Good
	ot good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Poor$	
20-25 Fail 24-20 - F001	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
Using the above criteria, please offer	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	compriments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS:	75 TA TA
How well did the debater develop a case in response	to the resolution?
• EVIDENCE:	74 77
	asion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples)
should be used to support arguments. How effective	e was the evidence?
• ORGANIZATION:	27
How well did the debater organize both the construct	tive and rebuttal speeches?
• VALUE CLASH:	25 28
	ng supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
(Criterion)	
• REFUTATION:	
How thoroughly did the debater refute the argument	s 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?
	compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	
Affirmative:	Negative / // / E
O String A Grenn the Constr	anchen Negative ONceded Better CE
	Encl. Ma Constructure
B well orgonized	OStong Neg. Constructure
good evidence	
n/bood level	Spoken of Conviction
Deoz 1	S I DALL
level	Need to wark on Refutation
Netro	
1/0/00	+ Rebuttols
111	Att
SPEAKER CODE #: 14	on the MFF wins this debate.
	(AFF or NEG)
REASON FOR DECISION	nt had better Eudence
AFE ALGINOMO	at had better pudence
IVI I IVI Journa	the second have
+ Solid	Lispavization
V	

Seema Ahluuad Chien-Fang (*12) Round 3B 2:00pm Room 62 Aff: 8 Odaiyappan Neg: 6 Schutte Novice L-D Debate	ja	LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Judge's Name: <u>Chien Cang</u> Judge's School Affiliation: <u>Monte Vista</u>
AFF: Speaker Code #:	<u>pts_28</u>	Speaker Code #: 6 pts 28
Please award each sp		on the following scale: Dutstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Goo 26-25 = Fair		d enough to qualify for elimination rounds) <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
Using the above crite		ging Criteria pliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
each debater:	in, prease offer com	priments and/or suggestions for improvement for
 should be used to support arg ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater org: VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater e (Criterion) REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debate DELIVERY/COURTE 	hasizes logic and persuasion, uments. How effective was the anize both the constructive an emphasize the value being sup- ter refute the arguments of the SY:	evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) he evidence?
Using the above crite each debater:	eria, please offer com	pliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
Affirmative: good IGnows infor topic wlaut analysis. Organized bot and rebutta Well in Cross	About the About	Dese well. Questioned Montagent
SPEAKER CODE #: REASON FOR DECISION WITH NOTTING	ON - (AFF) - (M e Americans	e wins this debate. LFF or (NEG) W INFORMATION, but Kept ON Cond Land. VS. NUCLEAR POLLUT.



Seema Ahluwalia

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Seema An Iuwala Chien Fang (*12) Judge's Name: Round 3A 2:00pm Room 62 Aff: 17 Fine Neg: 6 Seyoum Judge's School Affiliation: Novice L-D Debate AFF: NEG: pts 29 Speaker Code #: Speaker Code #: Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior 26-25 = Fair **Judging Criteria** Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

• CASE ANALYSIS:

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

• 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:

Fire(n) Negative Seyaum(6) Enucliner power plants long term Stabilits. Affirmative: didn't Wasn'+ quite sure Didn't St of Gorsh. what the point was answerd Mickey power pour imbalaree will violate law the opponents questions, side. Renewables. Only picked out power was prohibited Pollaw What points of opponents other countries couldn't defend themselves as it would cause a power imbalaces rebuttal. Needs more Didn't address all contargents Reliable Formation on topicneeds to keep treach o source OF 3 where I countries can't approved @ responsed to YOM SCIAtch. Didn't comment onersy. Ideas-didn't start str poner on mars 3^{cd} contingence, Did a sood job when the prepared jave O on the Ne **KER CODE #:** wins this debate. information (AFF or NEG) SP OF his Didn't talk REASON FOR DECISION Didn + nake only put nos. down on everything she stated mation, take about w_infor to brine u about The tipic (Nes)-spoke about topic Over Edner am but hard to because answered wast contratence Cind EFFI didn't have rebuild - Sphonaspeed

educe a state of the

Jay Menon (*5) Round 3A 2:00pm Room 66		LINCO Judge's Name:_	LN DOU IA	GLAS Debate	
Aff: 8 Nagle Neg: 6 Hanin Novice L-D Debate		Judge's School	Affiliation:	DUBLIN	HICH
AFF: 6	<u>}pts</u> 26	Speaker Code #:	NEG:	6	pts_28
Please award each speaker 30 =	points based o Perfect 29 = C			rood	-
27 = Good (but 26-25 = Fair 24-20	possibly not good = Poor			ination rounds) e or inappropriate	e behavior
	Judg	ging Criteria			
Using the above criteria, pl			or suggesti	ions for improve	ement for
each debater:			00		
• CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case	se in response to the	resolution?			
• EVIDENCE: Although value debating emphasizes lo should be used to support arguments.	ogic and persuasion, How effective was th	evidence (quoted m le evidence?	aterial, conten	nporary or historical ex	xamples)
ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both WALLER CLASH	the constructive and	d rebuttal speeches?	,		
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize (Criterion)	the value being supp	ported by his/her sid	le, and how we	ell was that value meas	sured?
• REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater refute	the arguments of the	opposition and reb	uild his/her ow	n side?	
• DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communication	ive style that was ple	asant, easily unders	standable, and	civil?	
Using the above criteria, ple each debater:	ease offer comp	oliments and/o	or suggesti	ons for improve	ement to
Affirmative: Clear & Slow Constr	dive speech	Negative	Excell	ent Const	retive speech. 5 & deliny.
however seemed to be	less femilia of 'read' stumb	M Comter	red & Cont	enrious of riff	In crossex
a few times. Jeense t	low on	able t	a questi	on of respons	1 well. debater for
confidence but this ca miprove wilk prochice/ exp good point about Nucl	evience!	a Novi	ie cates	my compare	of to AFF.
Had good ideas in reb	enttal -	p But w times in	a court	the less o	nfident/more Bit had good & did a great
2"rebuttal hard on fier overall it was a good	attempt.	paints 1	n rebut	tal & overal	e ded a great
SPEAKER CODE #:		E <u>NEG</u> win FF or NEG)	s this deba	te.	U
REASON FOR DECISION Higher confidence				and rebui	Itals.



and the second second

Jay Menon (*5) Round 3B 2:00pm Room 66	Judge's Name: TAY MENON
Aff: 15 Maram	
Neg: 14 Chang Novice L-D Debate	Judge's School Affiliation: DUBLIN, HIGH
AFF: 15	
Please award each speaker point	ts based on the following scale:
30 = Perfe	29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possil) 26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Po$	bly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair $24-20 = Po$	oor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior
	Judging Criteria
Using the above criteria, please of each debater:	offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for
• CASE ANALYSIS:	
How well did the debater develop a case in res • EVIDENCE:	sponse to the resolution?
	d persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) fective was the evidence?
• ORGANIZATION:	
 How well did the debater organize both the co VALUE CLASH: 	nstructive and rebuttal speeches?
	lue being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?
• REFUTATION:	
 How thoroughly did the debater refute the argu DELIVERY/COURTESY: 	uments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
	e that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?
Using the above criteria, please o	offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to
each debater:	firer compriments and/or suggestions for improvement to
e koya, s test e s. t.	
Affirmative: Excellent Constr	nelive Negative Crosses of AFF was not
arguments, contentions, d	elivery effective there were not morny proceed
Crosses of Neg was no	abortion Negative Crossess of Aff was not elivery. effective there were not many probing questions in the Crossex. even though apportune speaking/delivery was good.
productive . Some miced	opporter speaking delivery was good.
- nitres. asserted unrelia	builty of Constructure to order of the day of the
alternative (renew able) ever	gies but filme were too long-winder one
alternative (renew able) ever Aff rejected that in first	the have the
without any convincing ang go with it. Preputtals came o	whents to Aff on his assertion that renewable every not as sources are reliable to explanced why they
go with it. O Reputtals came o	has sources are reliable is explanced why they

some what confused in some parts. But overall a good showing for Novice- Sources are rehable only about 60%. If the filme allowed for rebutfal - Could have made use of the allowed for rebutfal - Could have made use of the expression time overall, a good attempt will SPEAKER CODE #: <u>15</u> on the <u>AFF</u> wins this debate. improve a lot / potential with (AFF or NEG) practice & experience!

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

eksen (der Konstantioner) in einer eine Der Stehen

and the set of the set

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: PUHS		
AFF: Speaker Code #: <u>5 Lenka</u> pt	s 28 Speaker Code #: 8 Kurlagunda pts 27		
Please award each speaker points ba			
	29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good		
$27 = \text{Good (but possibly n} \\ 26-25 = \text{Fair} \qquad 24-20 = \text{Poor}$	not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)		
20-23 - Pair 24-20 - Poor	<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior		
	Judging Criteria		
Using the above criteria, please offer	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 respons EVIDENCE: 	se to the resolution?		
Although value debating emphasizes logic and person should be used to support arguments. How effective	suasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) we was the evidence?		
• ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constru	active and rebuttal speeches?		
• VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value be (Criterion)	eing supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured?		
• REFUTATION:			
How thoroughly did the debater refute the argumen	ts of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?		
• DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communicative style that	t was pleasant easily understandable and civil?		
Using the above criteria, please offer	r compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to		
each debater:			
A 60			
Affirmative: Delivery often	Negative: More evidence is not		
sounded as if you	a better evidence.		
Affirmative: Delivery often sounded as if you didn't believe you self.	15-		
self.			

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

REASON FOR DECISION Evidence was stronger & more believable

denote using strengther in the second states in the

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Pinole Judge 2 (*14) Judge's Name: Round 3B 2:00pm Room 65 nson Aff: 8 Venkat Neg: 6 Wallis Judge's School Affiliation: PNovice L-D Debate AFF: NEG: Speaker Code #: V en pts 28 Speaker Code #: () Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 26-25 = 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:** 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 Coal & oil are Not renewable Global climate change resources. war has verbalize self-dru huckeo -correction. edupdancy; evidence ready exist energy that edia asource **SPEAKER CODE #:** wins this debate. on the (AFF or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION**

Presented more evidence that was believable.

ા ના ગામ કે દેવના છે. તેમ મુખ્યત્વે છે કે પ્રેલ મુખ્યત્વે છે કે તેમ મુખ્યત્વે છે. તેમ મુખ્યત્વે છે કે તેમ મુખ્ય

and the second sec

the control and the concentration of the control Alternation of the control of

الم الم الم 1979 - في يكون المعادية الم المحمد التكويل المحمد التكويل المحمد التكويل المحمد التكويل المحمد التك 1979 - محمد المحمد ا

and and the first second second

Li e e construir de la constru La construir de la construir de

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate Sherica Goduco (*9) Round 3B 2:00pm Room 64 Aff: 18 Stromberg Neg: 5 Sharma Judge's School Affiliation: 10 Gan Novice L-D Debate NEG: AFF: ots 28 Speaker Code #: 18 pts 28 Speaker Code #: Please award each speaker points based on the following scale: $30 = Perfect \ 29 = Outstanding \ 28 = Very Good$ 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds) 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior **Judging Criteria** Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater: **CASE ANALYSIS:** How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution? **EVIDENCE:** Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence? **ORGANIZATION:** How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches? VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion) **REFUTATION:** How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side? • DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil? Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Affirmative: Negative the speakers presented a well-rescanded the presented investives professionally ad SPEAKER CODE #: wins this debate. on the (AFF or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION** NEG mas able to clabonate more on humperson. the Informations presented duing the ubuffal

HERICA APRICO 10 Gar

6

8.

Bill quality proceeted a well - precanded Spending presented ynorshies profession ally and bit spice in a dreek and onganized manny. Josh of your started strang. -

NEG

S.

13

NES may appe to elaborate more a disciplination. He informations placement of damy the monthal

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: JEFICA GODUED

Judge's School Affiliation: 10 GAN

 AFF:
 NEG:
 1
 pts 17
 Speaker Code #:
 1
 pts 18

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:

Jun had a nell-ruscauched piece, Jun had a nell-ruscauched piece, Junt yn were not able to deliver them canfident 6. Youn answer to zma apprent's rubuttee une provincing evidence - do not paee too much-it's dizzying. - Convincing evidence - Streng probing on zma oppoint we in Jun case, ym can on the <u>NEG</u> wins this debate. **SPEAKER CODE #:** (AFF or NEG) **REASON FOR DECISION** String dilicary and detailed response in rebuttal.

106001

20

In sur 2 and - and a de gar pare to some to some to some the source to some and a last garage age of the source of a some and a last garage age of the source of a source of the source

3.5

15

Stary suitede and destabled pregnage on provided.