

Pinole Judge 4 (*14)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 55
Pro: 13 Lee - Marcus
Con: 11 Deng - Gill
JV Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: MEHER GEORGE

Judge's School Affiliation: COLLEGE PREP

PRO: CON:
Team Code #: 13 Team Code #: 11

Pro Speaker #1 MARCUS pts 28 Con Speaker #1 DENG pts 30

Pro Speaker #2 LEE pts 28 Con Speaker #2 GILL pts 30

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

** BOTH TEAMS NEED TO PROVIDE IMPACTS!!!*

Pro 1: ^{ASSOCIATION}
 1) rights - ^{NEWS} violation ^{WAS} ~~was~~ ^{NEED}
 2) bad relationship - ^{SYSTEM}
 3) criminalization
 GOOD SPEAKER
 USE EVIDENCE MORE IN ARGUMENTATION, DON'T JUST READ IT

Pro 2:
GREAT SPEAKING STYLE
 SMART ARGUMENTS

Con 1: GOOD CROSS-FIRE PERFORMANCE

Con 2: DON'T NEED TO SPEAK THAT SLOWLY

TEAM CODE #: 11 on the CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

REFUTED POINTS W/ MORE SKILL.

McLoone

Amy McLead (*2)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 219
Pro: 14 Knight - Phan
Con: 5 Kasi - Paila
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Amy McLoone

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PRO:
Team Code #: 14

CON:
Team Code #: 5

Pro Speaker #1 Kenny Phan pts 27

Con Speaker #1 Samir Paila pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 Knight pts 29

Con Speaker #2 Kasi 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1:
Organized and Polite

Con 1:
Clear voice and presentation

Pro 2:
Calm, Confident and Clear
Consistent with addressing what your opponents stated

Con 2:
Nice job summarizing your points

TEAM CODE #: 14 on the Pro wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Your argument showed that Probable Cause could decrease racial profiling and increase trust between students and school authority

Probable Cause - ^(ought) Should to be the procedure
moral debate - the rights of students matters most, benefit the
student body as a whole

- ① Decrease in discrimination, protect rights, remove bias
- ② Increase trust relationship between students, authority, and law

Public Schools, K-12
poorer quality of life

- ① Racial Profiling
- not applied correctly - outside of schools, police target minorities
- distrust law enforcement
- ② Lo parents
School as Parent Figure, same control as parents for a child
efficient, useful
decreases crime ✓

① decrease in discrimination
increase in privacy
same rights for students as when they are adults
how would it change our school system, allow for more privacy
good for schools because of students' rights

- ② Increase trust
less searches
only legitimate searches, "abuse of power"
civil liberties - teaches students

- Cannot trust the Probable Cause Process
- Protect minorities from unlawful searches
confused - is local parents different than reasonable suspicion?

"School officials are less racist than police"

refute negs pts. during crossfire

What are the allowable reasons for "reasonable" search?

Probable Cause takes away the powers of school authority?

Probable Cause means the reasons have to be admissible in court

* Right are not achieved

Time involved? Quickness protects more students

* Did not show that reasonable suspicion is a better procedure?

McLoone

Amy McLead (*2)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 219
Pro: 17 Cutler - O'Brien
Con: 13 Cheng - Cheng
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Amy McLoone

Judge's School Affiliation: Analy

PRO: 17
Team Code #: _____

CON: 13
Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Lucy Cutler pts 28

Con Speaker #1 Annie Cheng pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 Claire O'Brien pts 27

Con Speaker #2 Joshua Cheng 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1:

Clear voice, nice & concise description of cited evidence

Con 1:

Excellent delivery and clear presentation of points

Pro 2:

Thorough and steady, you were able to keep addressing your opponents' specific arguments

Con 2:

Calm and thoughtful, however your delivery was a little confusing

TEAM CODE #: 17 on the Pro wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

your case showed that Probable Cause would protect students' rights and decrease targeting of minorities

Kids not searched w/o probable cause

Search
Not w/o probable cause

Safety vs. Privacy
level of consequence

2- inadmissible evidence
public → school community

racial inequality

Columbine - no probable cause

constitutional right

School safety - decrease flexibility
quick discipline - many incidents w/ no consequence
teachers - "arms of police"

4th amendment
taking away rights
in a govt.
institution

When do "rights"
start for
juveniles?

no age
restrictions

Probable cause - evidence of criminal activity?

happened before is enough reason for probable cause

* Targeting minorities w/ reasonable ~~suspicion~~
suspicion

taking away rights

link to criminal justice system is inevitable

"flexibility" takes away rights

What are the limits for searches? How are students protected?

reasonable suspicion - 21 yrs., has been effective that long?

Will probable cause create a better school environment?

"Safety for all" is the most important

minority suspicion?

evidence admissible in court

Discipline vs. Prosecution

When should kids get sent to the criminal justice system

Inadmissible in Court - how does this protect schools?

Minorities vulnerable to abuse from school authorities

Human Rights

1. Historic precedence
2. Safety comes first
- 3.

Sanjeev Ohawla (*8)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 217
Pro: 5 Kim - Deivaprakash
Con: 2 Cree - Chand
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Sanjeev Chawla

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School

PRO: 5
Team Code #: _____

CON: 2
Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Kim pts 27

Con Speaker #1 Chand pts 25

Pro Speaker #2 Deivaprakash pts 28

Con Speaker #2 Cree 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1: = Good content
- Positive body language
=> Need a bit more asshire.

Pro 2: Very good in content & delivery
Very good in cross exam
+ speech clarity
Focus in Rebuttal

Con 1: Did not participate in cross exam
Did not speak with confidence
~~Did~~ speech clarity focus.

Con 2:
- confident
- Not structured
=> Repeating the same argument.

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the PRO wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: Pro was strong in asshire, evidence & cross examination.

Kim (3:52)

Chanel (4:14)

Core (4:00)

DP (3:57)

- Human right to Privacy

- Self Esteem & Achievement Evidence (v)

- Racism

→ color ↓

- 5% white school

- 16% black

- ~~Prayer~~

→ + style

Consequential

→ Mistake (Majority vs Minority)

→ back of Exam for Glavin

1:45 sec

NO big rebuttal

Not Beneficial to Student

School Safety

Reasonable Suspicion

(NO Evidence)

Money

\$900 M. suit

vs

Imp. at school

- Confused

- NO Eye Contact

High crime

Hesitant Confiding

Reason / bias Teachers get paid

(2:00 min)

→ Violation of Privacy

↓ Safety of School

← Racism

Safety ↓

← Bias

Probable Cause

Rebuttal

Trains with cost

Cross

→ Positive

→ Money

(e)

→ Rebuttal

Hesitant

True

→ Safety to Student

Anecdotal

(2:00)

→ Aff - lack of Evidence

→ NO Policy change

→ "Counter"

Money

→ Drugs

↳ Probable Cause

→ Strip Search NJ

→ Liberty

(2:00)

Positive

Account

- Good

Rebuttal

+ Reinforces

- Assch.

Sanjeev Ohawla (*8)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 217
Pro: 1 Chen - Jiang
Con: 17 Johnson - Klaiman
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Sanjeev Ohawla

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School

PRO: Team Code #: 1 CON: Team Code #: 17

Pro Speaker #1 Chen pts 24 Con Speaker #1 Johnson pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 Jiang pts 26 Con Speaker #2 Klaiman 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1: → very low on content
 Hesitant
 Long Pause
 Abrupt ending

Pro 2:
 NO Evidence,
 NO strong Rebuttal
 Focus on delivery

Con 1: + Analysis
 + Evidence
 Good cross Examp & Reasig
 Good delivery

Con 2: Didnot participate in
 Grand cross Exan,
 No strong Rebuttal with
 'Evidence'

TEAM CODE #: 17 on the Con wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Chen (3:0)	Johnson (4:0)	Tiang	Klarman
- Emergency - Less Invasive - Long period of time - Terrorist Attack	1. Right (give up) when you join PS → Does not violate Constitutional right	Probable Cause vs Reasonable suspicion Rebuttal	Safety } High Academic Perf Money
	2. Safety / Low damage when & Sch. Phdty 1600 stu Substance Abuse	Focus on "what if" Agrees with "what if" ↓ hurry millions of student	Free Search vs Reasonable supervision or Probable Cause
	3. Inefficient implementation (91.113) long	(Not any rule)	Does not Violate 4th Amendment
→ Hesitant → Long Pause → Shaking nerves	Style need to		CPE (3:0)

Rebuttal → Confused	(2:0) Cross Exam → Not supporting reasonable suspicion Good Cross Exam	→ true Reason → Defining of Prob. Cause (5) → No evidence	Cross Exam → true Impudent
	4 Amendment NY Post 65% GED	(Emph)	→ <u>NO</u> rebuttal → Focus on their own arguments

Debbie Crosby (*19)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 215
Pro: 5 Sinha - Kulkarni
Con: 14 Andola - Nguyen
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Crosby

Judge's School Affiliation: SVHS

PRO: Team Code #: 5 CON: Team Code #: 14
Pro Speaker #1 Kulkarni pts 28 Con Speaker #1 Andola pts 26
Pro Speaker #2 Sinha pts 27 Con Speaker #2 Nguyen 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1: good voice & organization
very poised
points well presented
*did not clarify
relevance
1st cross*

Pro 2: good addressing pts
but do need more support
& clarity

Con 1: nice organization
very fast
good questioning

Con 2: clear speaking
good map
need clarity of response
+ pts
- got confused as debate progressed

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the Pro wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

- Pro presented more clearly stated points & responses to question
- Carried clarity & points through out debate

Debbie Crosby (*19)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 215
Pro: 1 Hsu - Qiu
Con: 15 Anand - Quintal
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Crosby

Judge's School Affiliation: SVHS

PRO: Team Code #: 1 CON: Team Code #: 15

Pro Speaker #1 Qiu pts 26 Con Speaker #1 ~~Hsu~~ Quintal pts ~~27~~ 27

Pro Speaker #2 ~~Quintal~~ Hsu pts ~~25~~ 25 Con Speaker #2 Anand 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1: showed confidence
- voice was quiet, but clear speech
- seems as though you have a well thought out argument, but need more assertion

Pro 2:
difficulty presenting info + answering questions
- voice tone is good + clear
- could improve organization

Con 1: - speaking quickly
- no eye contact
- good confidence + organization
- good assertion in questioning

Con 2:
nice eye contact
+ enunciation
good voice tone + volume

TEAM CODE #: 15 on the ~~PRO~~ CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Pro did not present info compellingly and did not defend
Con - good job presenting info + assertion in questioning

~~Rose Macias (*9)~~
Round 1A 9:00am Room 221
Pro: 5 Mehta - Manjrekar
Con: 17 Gaffney - Laffey
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: P. Neuhaus

Judge's School Affiliation: JLHS

PRO: Team Code #: 5 CON: Team Code #: 17

Pro Speaker #1 Manjrekar pts 27 Con Speaker #1 Laffey pts 27

Pro Speaker #2 Mehta pts 27 Con Speaker #2 Gaffney 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1: You project well and speak quickly.
Great in cross-ex.
Good reasoning.

Pro 2: Good delivery.
Excellent courtesy.
Good evidence.

Con 1: Good delivery.
Nice rebuttals.

Con 2: A few mispronunciations.
Good reasoning.

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the PRO wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: Argument + evidence more persuasive.

Both teams very polite, clearly worked well together. An excellent first round. THANK YOU!

~~Rose Macias (*9)~~
Round 1B 9:00am Room 221
Pro: 17 Ayers - Naeve
Con: 1 Fedyk - Albert
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: P. Neukhaus

Judge's School Affiliation: JLHS

PRO: 17
Team Code #: _____ Team Code #: _____
CON: 1

Pro Speaker #1 Ayers pts 25 Con Speaker #1 Albert pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 Naeve pts 26 Con Speaker #2 Fedyk 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1: Your speaking is very clear, you're well-spoken - great delivery.

Pro 2: Great courtesy, great reasoning.

Con 1: Please stop clicking your pen. Please lower your voice during prep. Very good use of evidence.

Con 2: Great rebuttals, great reasoning. Great delivery.

TEAM CODE #: 1 on the CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: Neg team well prepared, well spoken. Excellent crossfire.

BOTH TEAMS NEED TO BE BETTER AT TIMING!

Selena Wong (*5)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 60
Pro: 12 Xu - Zhu
Con: 9 Guerrero - Chen
JV Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: SELENA WONG

Judge's School Affiliation: DUBLIN HS

Team Code #: PRO: 12

Team Code #: CON: 9

Pro Speaker #1 Xu pts 29 Con Speaker #1 Chen pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 Zhu pts 27 Con Speaker #2 Guerrero 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1:
Delivery of was too fast on format
made mistake re: affim vs. negim
good citations

Con 1:
Delivery too fast on format better
as it went on
Good citations

Pro 2:
Too aggressive on crossfire -
asked multiple ?'s without
allowing other side to finish
answer
made mistake affim vs. negim
good citations

Con 2:
Bit waver on citation -
well organized but some ~~iss~~
points not quite on topic

TEAM CODE #: 12 on the PRO wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Xu
Delivery too fast - ① decrease trust ② ineffective searches ③ perception -
good citations ④ ② decrease ability to connect reports ③ racial
well organized arguments - impact -
w/ long duration to credibility of evidence -

Chen
in beginning - did slow down a bit -
Cornell dictionary - ought duty obligation 1992 -
Delivery too fast ① safety - school aren't safe - safety of students
weapon 5.1-12.8% - injured - profaned interview - safety of students
↓ staff - serious violence - 61,000 - safety increased - reasonable
suspicion - ② efficiency - shows inner - 2004 - Colorado Springs -
more searches ② dropped - near fail to Guernero Zhu - how's possible cause

Xu vs. Chen
reasonable suspicion - schools ① standard - safety teachers - SKOS complete,
edue - not safety - reasonable suspicion ② impacts - success rate
Statistics - not safety - reasonable suspicion ③ switch in stand. increase
attain probable cause - more safety - not more used - increase
anonymous tips - reduces - students ④ anonymous tips - little rebuttal
probable cause - video film - school ⑤ one student - broken window
Can I have another question - who's going to let it - racist id. will still
subjective vs. objective - admin school. be discern -
teacher - anybody that trained - admin school. be discern -
bullied - anonymous tip - says find out ⑥ anonymous tips - violent weapons

Zhu
agree on def. - 4th Amendment - violence in schools 5.8% - 12.8%
probable cause / reasonable suspicion - who solve who weapons -
efficiency - anonymous tips - prevent suicides / murderers -
decreased trust in school - creates worse educ - probable cause
reasonable - worst educ. exp. - learning exp. - can't trust
w/ anonymous - majority of students - don't trust school -
can't do anything about it - gain respect -
90% success - not effective at finding anything -
racial bias - school terrorism - pipeline -

Guerrero
don't state standard - who can prove more safety -
do not resp. to threats w/ weapons - safety - not educ
anonymous tips - less and/or prob. cause -
safety - more SKOS - probable cause - SKOS racially
trust - more SKOS - probable cause - SKOS racially
SKOS - have rt. to search students -
let one student's health affect other students -
weapons harming other students -
searches - aren't random - reasonable sus -
run by gov't - reasonable sus -
racial profiling - school officials - can implement metal detectors
↓ drug sniffing dogs - SKOS - see SK disorderly conduct
more safety - increase violence etc - only 1/2 children
felt safe - students can't learn in
increase violence
increase crime
safety decreases or safety -
put search for weapons -
keep avoiding? -
primarily -
evidence -

Zhu vs Guerrero
Education - focus on educ. - never set standard for educ. -
goes w/ safety - fail to state that in 1st speech -
SKOS - racist - must have real evidence -
Zhu - must ps - drug sniffing → probable cause -
SKOS - learn less - have harder time - next -
could be - aggressive on crossfire -
SKOS - racist -
- arrests + searches -
unarmed teachers 12% -
90% - targeted hit with
educ + safety -
statistics were refute - increase

Xu summary - safety + educ -
probable cause -
racism - objective -
still state standard - 4% of educ + safety
probable cause - increase
statistics were refute - increase

Chen summary -
racism exists w/ that
SKO still find out

Selena Wong (*5)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 60
Pro: 2 Scholten - Condello
Con: 9 Lin - Izadi
JV Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: SELINA WONG

Judge's School Affiliation: DUBLIN HS

Team Code #: PRO: 2

Team Code #: CON: 9

Pro Speaker #1 Scholten pts 28 Con Speaker #1 Lin pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 Condello pts 26 Con Speaker #2 Izadi 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1:

No citation - where is source of information in format
lack of transition between theory & cause racism
Reasoning needs more work -

Pro 2:

~~Needs to slow down delivery~~
~~Spoken too fast~~
No citation of information in format
Fumbled on bit on crossfire between 2nd speakers
did better on 2nd round crossfire

Con 1:

~~No citation where is source of info~~
Need to slow down delivery way too fast on format
had difficulty following into presented some info seemed off topic
spouting statistics

Con 2:

interrupting other side -
needs to allow others side to finish argument
rhetorical question at crossfire

TEAM CODE #: 9 on the CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Better questions. More information on sources - better counter to other side arguments

Standard of safety - more info.
dogma - what base
Moral - 06/10/11
Safe + happy

Scholten

- Def
- Observation
- Intuition

probable cause - less search means less things
 terrorism - lawsuit impacted
 better equipped against edu. suits
 edu. empowers society - go to school for educ.
 not safety - probable cause not same as need 10/17

Probable Cause - laws applied schools - Supreme Ct. - reasonable suspicion -
 training + exp. - status quo in s still safety + educ.

Observ. - more evidence needed, increased
 contextual - racism - bias req. - past personal exp. - evidence
 less - less minority groups - reasonable suspicion - remove a
 2005-2010 - study - black student 16% - 35% suspended 46% -
 39% expulsion - 3 1/2 x more likely

unfairness occurred - unequal party able to sue - ^{to} Raelin -
 reasonable suspicion - prevents effect - probable cause not work in real world
 speed of Raelin - liability - more CO - safety - with school
 school held accountable - schools unable to keep safe - not be able to

Lin too fast

adding onto schools - 3rd - 185 incidents - 2011 - CDC - not be able to
 safety - maintain safety - (weeping) 18-19 - 101 85% -
 s.v. gun / knives - homicide - 18-19 - 101
 high risk - more searches - long ways in state
 drug alcohol - Nat'l ctr. - local parents - school to be
 marijuana - bit off topic - dry - wet - consent
 4/14% - proper term - more efficient

responsibility - reasonable - more efficient
 safety outbreaks - reasonable - more efficient
 TLO - school - cigarettes - may view - owned way - Yes -
 moved to suppress - keep selling dry - educate -
 urge to know w/ fighting

Crossfire

1st? - invade privacy of students
 need more evidence - provide evidence -
 source - 185 incidents w/ guns - CDC -
 racism - probable cause work in real world - based off bias incl. racism -
 diminish racism - state -
 Search student - if we think dogma - race - few searches more
 concrete evidence - race won't matter - accurate - schools
 alarming # of violence in schools - objected to search -
 educ in schools - if potential harm - probable cause - can not
 move degree - psych w/ racism

Condello

Quality of educ - use of probable cause - increase aut. -
 decrease - increase
 probable cause - more welcome space - collective resp. - benefit
 mutual respect - proven more searches - feel - increase -
 reasonable suspicion allow -

baeli

racism - can focus on minorities - can still look evidence
 not suspended for no reason - something was found
 decrease in trust - less searches - less chance fire -
 safety concerns over educ - education + students
 prob. cause - more time - more students -
 probable cause in real world - no re racism -
 parents - expect them - more danger -
 more time looked at evidence - Black student
 not with evidence - susp -
 mistrust - reason or
 trust - decisions higher % -
 looking at other C - very significant

Definition

privacy of one student - moral obligation
 safety of 100s - moral obligation of safety to entire
 student - yes - not necessary arguing other
 privacy - formula racism - bias -
 probable cause in school - probable cause from (more)
 add - more cause - warrant

Pranav Shahi (*4)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 54
Pro: 9 Chan - Inamdar
Con: 13 Fehr - Wadhvani
JV Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: PRANAV SHAHI

Judge's School Affiliation: DUHS

PRO:
Team Code #: CHAN - INAMDAR

CON:
Team Code #: FEHR - WADHWANI

Pro Speaker #1 CHAN pts 26

Con Speaker #1 WADHWANI pts 29

Pro Speaker #2 INAMDAR pts 28

Con Speaker #2 FEHR 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1:
Need to manage time
Had good thoughts, but
struggled to find right words

Con 1:
Very confident and courteous

Pro 2:
Had very good recovery on
responses.
Good choice of words

Con 2:
Very good summary & rebuttal
Extremely good clarity of thoughts

TEAM CODE #: FEHR-WADHWANI on the CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

It felt like a one-sided debate. Pro ^{team} was not able to lay their complete case, struggled defending on cross-fires.
Con team had very strong arguments throughout the debate

Pranav Shahi (*4)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 54
Pro: 9 Uppal - Virk
Con: 13 Wong - Jones
JV Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: PRANAV SHAHI

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PRO:
Team Code #: UPPAL-VIRK

CON:
Team Code #: WONG-JONES

Pro Speaker #1 VIRK pts 29 Con Speaker #1 WONG pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 UPPAL pts 27 Con Speaker #2 JONES 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1:
Good emphasis, strong cross
fires and summaries

Con 1:
clear speech and very good
summaries

Pro 2:
conclude your cross-fires;
good summaries

Con 2:
confident speech & cross-fires

TEAM CODE #: UPPAL-VIRK on the PRO wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Successful in debating that reasonable suspicion vs. probable
cause is in their favor. Opponents could not defend discrimination
contention.

Besides that it was a very good & close debate.

Ruby Kaur (*9)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 26
Pro: 17 Halls - Raissi
Con: 3 Kelley - Lopez
JV Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: ~~Ruby~~ (Ruby)

Judge's School Affiliation: Logan

PRO: Team Code #: _____ CON: Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Halls pts 28 Con Speaker #1 Lopez pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 Raissi pts 25 Con Speaker #2 Kelley 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1: V. Good, confident
Need evidence

Con 1: ~~good~~ good but ~~too~~ fast
so slow little bit.
Have some patients.

Pro 2: Good but need
to improve body
posture. speak clear.

Con 2: Good, confident
Need to calm while
argument in crossfire

TEAM CODE #: 3 on the Con wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: They are good, evidence
confident, arguments.

Ruby Kaur (*9)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 26
Pro: 1 Kireeff - Zhong
Con: 14 Pareja - Byrne
JV Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Ruby

Judge's School Affiliation: Logan

PRO:

CON:

Team Code #: _____

Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Kireef pts 28

Con Speaker #1 Pareja pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 Zhong pts 28

Con Speaker #2 Byrne 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1: V. Good confident. Need to improve in more eye contact

Con 1: Good. Need to improve. pronunciation

Pro 2: Good, need to improve pronunciation speak clear.

Con 2: Good Need to improve pronunciation. speak clear, eye contact more

TEAM CODE #: 1 on the Pro wins this debate. (PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: V. Good, confident, good Evidence, arguments. Reasoning organized

Pinole Judge 4 (*14)

Round 1B 9:00am Room 55
Pro: 17 Clark - Hawk
Con: 1 Smithies - Zhong
JV Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: MEHER GEORGE

Judge's School Affiliation: COLLEGE PREP

PRO:
Team Code #: HAWK 17

CON:
Team Code #: -

Pro Speaker #1 CLARK HAWK pts 28

Con Speaker #1 SMITHIES pts 29

Pro Speaker #2 CLARK pts 27

Con Speaker #2 ZHONG 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1: GOOD SPEAKING STYLE
MORE EYE CONTACT NEEDED

Pro 2: 6 EYE CONTACT !!!
GOOD CROSS-FIRE TACTICS

* EVERYONE: DON'T REPEAT YOUR FULL CONTENTIONS!

Con 1: 2ND HALF OF SUMMARY WAS GREAT, DO THAT FROM THE BEGINNING.

Con 2: VERY SMART ARGUMENTS MAINTAIN EYE CONTACT WITH ME
* MAKE SURE TO HAVE EVIDENCE READY WHEN THEY ASK FOR IT

TEAM CODE #: 1 on the CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Carol Lloyd (*13)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 59
Pro: 1 Yoon - Chou
Con: 9 Barakzoy - Juinio
JV Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Anab Chopra

Judge's School Affiliation: College Prep (#3)

PRO: Team Code #: 1
CON: Team Code #: 9
Pro Speaker #1 Yoon pts 28 Con Speaker #1 Barakzoy pts 27
Pro Speaker #2 Chou pts 27 Con Speaker #2 Juinio 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1: Use all of your time!!

Con 1: Eye contact! Answer questions more clearly in CX

Pro 2: Try not to pace - stand still
More organization - don't plug with papers

Con 2: Use all of your time in the last speech

TEAM CODE #: 1 Yoon-Chou on the Pro wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

if warrantless case under prob cause is efficient and neg says they are same - no disadvantage to prob cause and keep constitutional rights.

Carol Lloyd (*13)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 59
Pro: 2 Nadler - Garvin
Con: 4 Sharma - Janjanam
JV Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Ahlab Chopra

Judge's School Affiliation: College Prep (#3)

PRO:
Team Code #: 2 Nadler-Garvin

CON:
Team Code #: 4 Sharma Janjanam

Pro Speaker #1 Nadler pts 29

Con Speaker #1 Janjanam pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 Garvin pts 27.5

Con Speaker #2 Sharma pts 27.5

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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1: speaks slower
be nicer to partner /
opponents

Con 1: speaks slower

Pro 2: more confidence in CX

Con 2: chill - don't need to
get worried -
stide w/ args you
have

TEAM CODE #: 2 on the PRO wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

SPO's in both worlds - no reason to mess off
world if they take for racism, etc

Orna Maoz (*6)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 216
Pro: 17 Luppino - Ertsey
Con: 1 Butiong - Parajuli
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: REICHEL

Judge's School Affiliation: HEAD ROYCE.

Team Code #: PRO: 17 Team Code #: CON: 1

Pro Speaker #1 LUPPINO pts 26 Con Speaker #1 BUITONG pts 26

Pro Speaker #2 ERTSY pts 27 Con Speaker #2 PARAJULI 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1: Good openings statement
evidence could have been better
working knowledge needs improvement

Con 1: Needs stronger delivery
and statement

Pro 2:
sharp rebuttals + questions
presented new evidence

Con 2: working knowledge adequate

TEAM CODE #: 17 on the PRO wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Better analysis and relevant evidence -

PRO Lupino + Luty

YES PC

u u

arg PRO - 1

CON - 1.505.

- good opening statement - eye contact
- poor narrative
- good facts
- Definitions

Preparation
Working knowledge

- ① searches invades 4th Amend.
- ② student don't lose rights in school grounds
- ③ Racial profiling
- ④ mental health of students by unwanted teacher.

undermines children's trust in law

privacy violations

- self esteem -

- racial profiling caused by reasonable suspicion

Need more evidence
cont cases?
Psychology
studies?

good recap of position statement - New evidence on summary

CON

putting + Parajuli

- good opening statement

- C = delivery / Need better close stronger

NO PC should apply to students,

- working knowledge -> ?

- Other amendments not applied in school - Not same political right.
- reasonable suspicion - less targeted / likely to vary context in school
- if students are acting suspicious - teachers need to act to keep students safe -

trust in law allows go high

guns + drugs to be present because standard

PC won't affect kids self esteem ->

- racial profiling - not related Both P.C. + reasonable susp.

ROLAN REICHEL (HEAD ROYCE)

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Orna Maoz (*6)

Round 1A 9:00am Room 216
Pro: 5 Kachinthaya - Kachinthaya
Con: 15 Gupta - Kotadia
Novice Public Forum

Judge's Name: ROLAN REICHEL

Judge's School Affiliation: HEAD ROYCE

PRO: 5
Team Code #: _____

CON: 15
Team Code #: _____

(Gink)

Pro Speaker #1 KACHINTHAYA pts 27

Con Speaker #1 GUPTA pts 26

Pro Speaker #2 KACHINTHAYA pts 27

Con Speaker #2 KOTADIA 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

- **ANALYSIS:** Did the debater explain the most important issue(s) in the topic? Was the explanation clear and concise?
- **EVIDENCE:** Did the debater support arguments with facts, expert opinions, or illustrations? Was the evidence credible?
- **REASONING:** Were the conclusions reached by the debater drawn from evidence and analysis? Were arguments logically built?
- **CROSS EXAMINATION/CROSSFIRE:** Were questions relevant and brief? Were answers on point? Was the cross fire conducted in a civil manner?
- **REBUTTAL:** Did the debater effectively counter the arguments of the opposition with analysis, evidence, or reasoning?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater speak in an organized, communicative style that was pleasant and easily understandable?

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

Pro 1: Laid out arguments well
provided relevant case law
clean delivery
Needs to open + close better

Pro 2:

Con 1: good clear delivery
supporting evidence
relevant + Federal

Con 2: Needs to slow delivery
strong closing statement
relevant evidence

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the PRO wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: Better Rebuttal and Questions
overall delivery was slower + cleaner.

PKD 34

① Better rebuttal / Better evidence - Federal law
Prey time Conv.

probable cause YES PC. in P.S.

each Reasonable \rightarrow 1st - on rights - health

① - misuse of power. - evidence

ex. constitutional cases

- prob. cause standard.

② - psychology of students.

- pressure of security - neg. effect -

ex. study.

- involving students in crim. system -

- Needed better closing statement

Spide mass searches -

No PC in public schools

Conv: ① PC. will cause SRO to go down. PC. will encourage searches. train to teachers.

③ PC. will encourage 2nd amendment

② loopholes increase cancers, drug use etc.

more clear / Built narrative style

NEW good evidence

effective rebuttal

- Strong closing statements
- good evidence.

delmay - not good
slow doesn't relax

one fact = Georgia town LAW.

Second Crossfire -
strong Questions / rebuttal.
② good clear style
SRO - not needed.
good support
same facts -
Basic rights
protects students
4th Amend rights
citizens first - happier?

1972 - Supreme Court
don't shed. Con rights
the search
sales