Lu Zhang (DVHS)

Judge
Round 2B 11:00am Room 216
Pro: 13 Cheng - Cheng
Con: 5 Mehta - Manjrekar
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Lu Zhang

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #:	13	Team Code #:	5
Pro Speaker #1	Annie Cheng pts 29	Con Speaker #1	Manjrekar pts 29
Pro Speaker #2	Joshua Cheng pts 25.5	Con Speaker #2	Mehta pts 28.5

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: 1. ~~Good~~ Very nice presentation with clearly definition and reasoning
2. Good job in crossfaire round, brief and relevant

Pro 2: 1. presentation needs work, ~~there~~ argurments are weak, lacking of support.

Con 1: 1. arguments are clearly defined and backed up with sufficient solid data.
2. Good job in ~~debate~~ crossfair round, brief and relevant

Con 2: 1. Good argument with evidences and clearly reasonable debuttals
2. Nice rebuttal works to pick up the opponents weak points

need more prep work!

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Both teams presented their arguments well, and Pro team speaker #1 did an excellent job to open the debate. However, pro team #2 did not prepare well for the debate, hence cause ~~the pro~~ team lost.

Judge
Round 2A 11:00am Room 217
Pro: 2 Cree - Chand
Con: 17 Cutler - O'Brien
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Mamta Sabar

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista High School

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #: 2		Team Code #: 17	
Pro Speaker #1 Chand	pts 27	Con Speaker #1 Cutler	pts 28
Pro Speaker #2 Cree	pts 27	Con Speaker #2 O'Brien	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: Little hard to hear but good presentation. Good job catching metal detectors won't catch drug offenders. Site source for eg Cornell univ source for searches being scary. Very nice segway to guns at school to gun laws.

Pro 2: Nice convincing, firm voice. Use more facts to support your argument. You did very well in Grand crossfire but still need little more facts.

Con 1: Had very exhaustive list of real incidences of casualties to support the statistics. Good job but couldn't finish in time.

Con 2: Nice friendly way of delivering the message. Nice cross examination but maybe it can be little less personnel for eg would you want your child to never come back home

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

REASON FOR DECISION: CON was more prepared, had some questions that PRO didn't have answers to including not able to provide proof for one of the contentions.

Judge Lu Zhang (DVHS)
Round 2A 11:00am Room 216
Pro: 17 Johnson - Klaiman
Con: 5 Sinha - Kulkarni
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Lu Zhang

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #:	17	Team Code #:	5
Pro Speaker #1	Klaiman pts 28	Con Speaker #1	Kulkami pts 27.5
Pro Speaker #2	Johnson pts 28	Con Speaker #2	Sinha 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: ① Good speaker, easy to follow points
② less supporting evidence
③ Good cross examinati question and rely on the

Con 1: ① Nice presentation, ~~points could~~
③ ~~be~~ arguments are supported by a lot of solid data.

~~Pro 2:~~ Con 2: Pro 2 ① Nice presentation style
② very clearly defined ~~addresses the~~ your points
③ Also very good reasoning

Con 2 ① Nice job to present
② ~~but~~ And also set the opponents points, ~~but~~ but

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

REASON FOR DECISION: → see the other side

③ but failed to rebutt the opponents points well
a. did not give out definiti of reasonable suspicion b. ~~did~~ didn't address racial profi

~~only~~ weak points for pro team is could provide more numerical data

Both teams presents their points, analyze the topic and offer arguments well. I liked con team supported their arguments with a lot of solid data. But they failed to ~~give~~ define the reasonable suspicions as the Pro team asked. They also failed to address Pro's third contention racial profiling as well. So the Pro team won the argument clearly. in this sense. ~~Con's argu~~ Pro team did not address quite well the Con's team's contentions but ~~lacks~~ overall, their arguments are much stronger than Con team

KEVIN CLARK
Judge
Round 2B 11:00am Room 219
Pro: 1 Fedyk - Albert
Con: 5 Kim - Deivaprakash
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: KEVIN CLARK

Judge's School Affiliation: SACRED HEART CATHEDRAL PREP

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #:	1	Team Code #:	5
Pro Speaker #1 Fedyk	pts 29	Con Speaker #1 Kim	pts 28
Pro Speaker #2 Albert	pts 29	Con Speaker #2 Delvaprakash	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: (29) OPENING SPEAKER Outstanding job. Your delivery and content were excellent. You presented and supported your case very well

Pro 2: (29) Outstanding job! Your presentation and arguments were well-organized, clear, and easily understandable. You were very effective in the crossfire

Con 1: (28) Very good! Your presentation was very clear and understandable. The only thing I would focus on is being clearer on the relevance of statistics during your opening

Con 2: (29) Outstanding job! Your presentation and arguments were well organized clear, and easily understandable. You presented and supported your case very well.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
~~It~~ Both teams debated and supported their position very well with supporting evidence. They all spoke in an organized and easily understood manner. If I were able, I would mark this as a tie. Pro & The PRO team did a little better focusing the ~~questions~~ discussion on main question.

P1: C1: Constr. rights - po-accorder
NJ vs TLO -
Zero tolerance pc. - whole body
C2: search biased against racial desc
Teachers bias
C3: Unwarrent search ACLU lawsuits

C1: po to students as general.

C1: A. Individual in
2015 - 9-12 8% suicide att
2016 - 59.3% succeed success
B. safety school shooting
C2: discipline - 5.5% weapons.

- Texas survey

- Teacher qualified to prevent suicide
- Shootings are planned.
- Env. hint → drugs and guns

Other advancements.
-All search → unity
-school → prison pipeline
-racism - probable cause vs. reasonable

KEVIN CLARK

Judge
Round 2A 11:00am Room 219
Pro: 1 Butiong - Parajuli
Con: 5 Kachinthaya - Kachinthaya
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: KEVIN CLARK

Judge's School Affiliation: SACRED HEART CATHEDRAL PREP

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #: 1		Team Code #: 2	
Pro Speaker #1 Butiong	pts 25	Con Speaker #1 Kachinthaya	pts 28
Pro Speaker #2 Parajuli	pts 25	Con Speaker #2 Kachinthaya	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: (25)
More preparation is needed, and you need to speak more clearly with fewer non-words

Pro 2: (25)
More preparation is needed. and you need to speak more clearly with fewer non-words

Con 1: (28)
Very good job! Your presentation and arguments were well-organized, clear, and easily understandable. You supported your position very well

Con 2: (28)
Very good job! Your delivery and content were excellent. Great job in supporting your position.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Team 5 presented their arguments and backed them up with evidence through citations. They responded to questions during the crossfire section.

PROBABLE CAUSES PUBLIC SCHOOLS

P 1. SPEAK NOT READ - NON WORDS
CONTENTIONS - ①
3- DESC

site SOURCES.
ACLU Berkely.

C1: CONSTINV ① - NOT CITIZENS YET
- 4th admend.
- EASYING OF RESTRICTIONS
- SCHOOLS GOVERNMENT entity

② Safety of students
- time to warrant.

- evidence
- statistics

P 1: Alex evidence: BERKELEY JOURNAL
Teacher did not find probable cause
Probable cause / handled in school but police outside world.

P2: ① Students don't understand rules as officials
↳ traumatized.

② Gov't trust schools w/ children

• Alex P. principal reading text message. Reasonable suspicions

C2: A1 relationship between parties (official/students)
A2 schools (gov't) acting behalf of parents.
juvenile system w/ probl. cause. → Racial profile
Reasonable susp - req. of probable cause
Probl cause → warrant.

Alex P.
Reasonable suspicion - ~~should~~ not not probable cause
→ School official "parent"?
Granet.
- No source how bond increase
-

KISHORE KUMAR KAPARABOYNA (DVHS San Ramon)

Judge
Round 2B 11:00am Room 221
Pro: 15 Gupta - Kotadia
Con: 17 Ayers - Naeve
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Kishore Kumar Kaparaboyna

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PRO: Team Code #: 15

CON: Team Code #: 17

Pro Speaker #1 GUPTA pts 29 Con Speaker #1 Naeve pts 29

Pro Speaker #2 KOTADIA pts 28.5 Con Speaker #2 Ayers 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: Strong Speaker. Opened the debate very well. Provided solid evidence.

Pro 2: Strong Analysis. Great Communicator. Improve on Courtesy.

Con 1: Great Speaker. ~~Ver~~ Stays focused on providing facts and statistics Excellent on refuting. Well organized and courteous communication.

Con 2: Very good speaker. She did not use the time alloted. Very quite during Cross fire. Provided Evidence and statistics. She can cover topic more if she uses her time

TEAM CODE #: 15 **on the** "PRO" (PRO or CON) **wins this debate.** ✓ "PRO" WINS.

REASON FOR DECISION:

Thorough Analysis. Provided Statistics & evidence Very Relavent question over Cross-fire. Outstanding Rebuttal. "PRO" WINS.

KISHORE K. KAPARABOYNA (DVHS San Ramon)

Judge
Round 2A 11:00am Room 221
Pro: 15 Anand - Quintal
Con: 17 Luppino - Ertsey
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: KISHORE KUMAR KAPARABOYNA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS San Ramon

PRO: Team Code #: 15

CON: Team Code #: 17

Pro Speaker #1 QUINTAL pts 28.5 Con Speaker #1 LUPPINO pts 27

Pro Speaker #2 ANAND pts 29 Con Speaker #2 ERTSEY 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 speaker, very precise and analytical. Thorough in ~~An~~ and courteous.

Pro 2: Highly Analytic. Delivery well organized, very pleasant. Provided ample evidence. Great in Rebuttal Facts & Statistics

Con 1: Good Speaker. Should bring more Evidence Response to rebuttal was not good. Very courteous.

Con 2: Good Speaker. However provide more reasoning in her argument. Should come prepared for rebuttal.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Excellent Analysis. Provided advance to arguments Very good at Rebuttal. They provided good statistics and ~~beg~~ tried to provide evidence for facts.

Seema Ahluwalia

Judge
Round 2B 11:00am Room 215
Pro: 14 Andola - Nguyen
Con: 1 Hsu - Qiu
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Seema Ahluwalia

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	1
Pro Speaker #1	Andola pts 29	Con Speaker #1	Hsu pts 27
Pro Speaker #2	Nguyen pts 29	Con Speaker #2	Qiu 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: Reasonable Supision picks on students. Read slower Talks with hands-good Has eye contact-good

Pro 2: Talks with hands-good Good explanation of argument. stays on topic. Good explanations of opponents argument

Con 1: Needs to listen to opposing side and elaborate on why they don't agree. Introduce yourself. Students should have some rights with parents as teachers. Search Students w/out warrant. Make sure the words are pronounced correctly. Make sure you have proof of evidence for todays world, not years ago. not Fully prepared.

Con 2: Not Fully prepared. to argue or discuss pro's view. Don't be so Fidgety- ripping paper. Says umm a lot, umh

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

5

REASON FOR DECISION:
Pro - spoke well, stayed and supported topic.

Con - didn't have evidence to support 2016 laws - not current information

Seema Ahluwalia

Judge
Round 2A 11:00am Room 215
Pro: 17 Gaffney - Laffey
Con: 14 Knight - Phan
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Seema Ahluwalia

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #:	17	Team Code #:	14
Pro Speaker #1	Laffey pts 28	Con Speaker #1	Phan pts 27
Pro Speaker #2	Gaffney pts 28	Con Speaker #2	Knight 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:

37 sec. prep time

Pro 1: Should be practiced rights infringed; protect; Unconstitutional. Ruins trust. If trust broken, relationship broken
Very clearly understood.

Pro 2: Better for Students, Do not violate students rights.

Con 1: decrease in student safety hinders learning environment leads to contraban, full body necessary to reduce child abuse. read slower, no responses not very rushed. says it reduces abuse. Clear

Con 2: they can't just pick on you to pick on you. need probable cause - hinders productive learning environment. If you search kids - leads to not learning speaks clearly - putting down Pro's - asks for evidence -

Should not be searched unless Probable cause

reasonable suspision

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Had evidence to support argument.

Con - Didn't stay on topic - ex. Child abuse wasn't topic

Judge
Round 2B 11:00am Room 217
Pro: 5 Kasi - Paila
Con: 1 Chen - Jiang
Novice Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Mamta Sabnor

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista High School

PRO:			CON:		
Team Code #:	5		Team Code #:	1	
Pro Speaker #1	Kasi	pts 28	Con Speaker #1	Chen	pts 26
Pro Speaker #2	Paila	pts 27	Con Speaker #2	Jiang	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: Nice delivery and supporting sources. It was very nice to see your enthusiasm. Well prepared but maybe don't laugh at what you hear from your opponent.

Con 1: Friendly delivery but not well prepared

Pro 2: Very pleasant, non-offending delivery encouraging respectful discussion. Maybe don't sway so much while talking. More facts for your arguments will be helpful. You went over time.

Con 2: Used brief prep time, on podium before speaking w/o asking for it. Very effective voice, eye contact with everyone in the room. Cross fire could be seen little intimidating.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: More convincing & prepared and confident.