Stephen Ramm (*19)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 8
Pro: 9 Meda - Doshi
Con: 3 Bhasin - Dovichi
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _STEPHEN RAMM_

Judge's School Affiliation: _SAINT VINCENT_

PRO:	CON:
Team Code #: _9_	Team Code #: _3_

Pro Speaker #1 _MEDA_ pts ____   Con Speaker #1 _DOVICHI_ pts ____

Pro Speaker #2 _DOSHI_ pts ____   Con Speaker #2 _BHASIN_ pts ____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:
30 = Perfect   29 = Outstanding   28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair   24-20 = Poor   <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **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:
NEEDS TO SLOW TO
SPEED OF COMMUNICATION

Con 1:
SLOW DOWN COMMUNICATION

Pro 2:
COMPLIMENT: EXCELLENT
PRESENTATION
REASONING!
NEEDS TO SLOW   DELIVERY! 6
DOWN.

Con 2: SLOW DOWN COMMUNICATION

TEAM CODE #: ___9___ on the __PRO__ wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:
BETTER BUILDING - LESS ARBITRARINESS

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _Mary Rook_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Logan_

	PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	3	

Pro Speaker #1 _Sun_ pts 28 Con Speaker #1 _Wornow_ pts 27

Pro Speaker #2 _Huang_ pts 28 Con Speaker #2 _Clark_ 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:
Passionate speaker but be careful not to yell. Good clarification on key points in KF

Con 1:
1st speech - strong delivery + points 2nd speech a bit confusing - more clarification would be helpful

Pro 2:
Strong pts made in 1st speech. Good clarifications in H

Con 2:
Speaks well - not a lot of new content.

TEAM CODE #: 4 on the _PRO_ wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: CON dropped Qualified Immunity. PRO wins on increased accountability.

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Mary Rook

Judge's School Affiliation: Logan

PRO: 3
Team Code #: _____

CON: 12
Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Thomas pts 29   Con Speaker #1 Ahluwalia pts 27

Pro Speaker #2 Oh pts 28   Con Speaker #2 Roy 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: Strong opening
Good questions in XF
Very strong point in summary

Con 1: Good job presenting case
Had some trouble in XF-
make sure to listen to question

Pro 2: Passionate speaker-
strong rebuttal speech
strong XF & FF (easy to follow)

Con 2: Good points, but harder to connect. Abrupt ending to 1st speech.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Clearly called out that con's evidence isn't the cause of decrease of crime. con's immunity Win on safety + econ. arg doest work.

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _SRINIVAS NACHURI_

Judge's School Affiliation: _DVHS._

	PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #:	9	Team Code #:	12	

Pro Speaker #1 _____28_____ pts _____   Con Speaker #1 _____28_____ pts _____

Pro Speaker #2 _____27_____ pts _____   Con Speaker #2 _____28_____ pts _____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

- **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: C/E
Good cross examination and point on the evidence and impact.

Pro 2: A/R.
Good on analysis but missed the impact on there analysis

Con 1: A/R.
Good argument on the safety and reasoning of the discrimination

Con 2: CC/R/D.
Liked the point on effectiveness and safety. Cross examination on point not raised was good

TEAM CODE #: _____12_____ on the _____CON_____ wins this debate.
(PRO or ~~CON~~)

REASON FOR DECISION: Con team was able to convince safety comes first before anything for good & and safe learning environment in school.

PRO

(P1) Reasonal basis, 4th amd.
Criminal. Stats - 1032
Privacy - alcohol gun.

(C) 2 cases.

(P2) Suspicion - SSd - impact
safety than education
gun search - 05/09
minority behavior
dumb gun / legal std
abuse of powers - tips
not justified. PC make
it alternate - drug no
link adm. search not
effective

(P) Privacy - Snicer - 2 cases - inaccurate
8% Sould 12V
discrimation - racism - R.S. - need
evidence - bias.
preventive measure /

(⊘ tips - useful - ? 2104 - 216 resolved
- time - tips are useful - ?

- adm searches / random - No Studies

(P3) no refute / PC - no proof -
accuracy -
lc - not obligation -
discrimination -× high burden.

Production
• loan
+ ve climate
responsiblity
- search
discrimination
minority
civil   16 Y.
Black
- Black - race.
- minority
Own subjective
- impact School
drops
- discrimation
- School guideline
-

Con.

(C) Curriculum -
justified
violated
reasonable
objective
age)
suspicion.
warrant less
search.
Small majority
anonymous tips
good example
Columbian -
room / stats
266 School
attack
life / death
Safe learning
drug abuse -
- regulated
- custody.
- Safety.
- proxy parent.

(C) - loss privacy
- Safety.
resolving / destructive
env. - Safety -
not allowed.
- no screen proof.
PC - discrimination.
- Safety
- notices Student
- drug education
- evidence / example.
- anonymous tips.
- affirmation.
not implementing
loan points

distrust / unmet
danger
(C1) warrant less search.
no evidence on the
# of loans / theory
obligation

(C) Waiting
- Safety / harm - impact
Comfort
- tips - act directly.
evidence.
- discrimation - target
minority
- teacher /

Promenal info -

(P) Criminalized
no evidence.
evidence / Burden
bias - Std.
impact - /
check / balance
400%.

drug / examples

— help educate ?

Privacy - constant   evidence - ? ×

- two tips - effectiveness.
- circumstances - occur
- Safety / Values / educate / privacy.
- education focus

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _____SRINIVAS NACHURI_____

Judge's School Affiliation: _____DVHS._____

	PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #:	12	Team Code #:	3	

Pro Speaker #1 _____28_____ pts _____   Con Speaker #1 _____28_____ pts _____

Pro Speaker #2 _____27_____ pts _____   Con Speaker #2 _____28_____ pts _____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

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

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

Judging Criteria

- **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:
Team has good argument on the racial bias and unconscious judgement

Pro 2: On the person implementing the PC. They clearly argued against evidence and aspects.

Con 1: Good evidence for the locker search.

Con 2: Good arg on the framework and school safety on education.

TEAM CODE #: _____12_____ on the _____PRO_____ wins this debate.
(**PRO** or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:
(Reasoning is mentioned above)

Pro

(S₁)

① minority

② Racial / Bias

Block 3½ term lower std.

Safety

objective

un conscial Racist

high level Black

criminal

---

industry - harmful ✓

locker Search

$1.88 - 1994 / outdated?

target search
random Search
P.C.
trans-
criminal P.C.
lower std.
constitutional
rights
racism-
objective std
less bias

Con.

(S-1)

Drug / Student test

educated adult

Seeing

3- Search.

decrease marijuana

15% dropping out of School

Safe learning / higher education

locker Search contraband

⅓ victimization ↓

metal detector - weapons

7% ↓

academic environment

not Searching-

Safety - education

research - P.C - evidence

Pro- reasonable /

trans = discrimination.

(S₂) Quality / Safety

Targeted Search.

not fall under - P.C

School need ?

Blanket Search -

reasonable Suspicion, 4th Amend.

Constitutional rights -

Sub continuous bias, evidence.

learning env.

trans - violated -

- Blanket Search - no consent
  no evidence.

- non School Violation - officer

- remove objective / evidence

- Targeted Search

random Search - not.

Framework - Safety - education

✓ trans - reasonable Suspicion

collective information - harassment.

racism ; evidence racial bias

- discrimination

collect information - based on race.

good

Safety - quality education.

normal / reasonable Suspicion.

harassed for evidence.

locker evidence - yes / 1994. 2016

Status quo - trans - incentive learn change?
luck.

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _STEPHEN RAMM_

Judge's School Affiliation: _SAINT VINCENT_

	PRO:		CON:
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	12

Pro Speaker #1 ___LEE___ pts ____   Con Speaker #1 ___KIM___ pts ____

Pro Speaker #2 _STEINBERG_ pts ____   Con Speaker #2 ___CHOU NO SHOW___ pts ____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect   29 = Outstanding   28 = Very Good

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

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

Judging Criteria

- **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:

Con 1:

Pro 2:

Con 2: NO SHOW

TEAM CODE #: ___11___ on the __PRO__ wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

NO DEBATE TOOK PLACE. CON SPEAKER #2 NO SHOW

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _Joshua Prine_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Quarry Lane_

PRO:	CON:
Team Code #: _4 Srinivas - Mundres_	Team Code #: _19 Page - Crosby_

Pro Speaker #1 _Mundres_ pts _28_   Con Speaker #1 _Crosby_ pts _25_

Pro Speaker #2 _Srinivas_ pts _28_   Con Speaker #2 _Page_ 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 introduction of sources
Set-up argument
Framing ideas
Needs to speak more clearly

Con 1:
Fewer sources, appeared unclear about stance. Strong appeal to emotions
Rebuttals need improvement

Pro 2:
Clear + concise - Good delivery
Backed up evidence
Convincing reasoning

Con 2:
Delivery could be improved
Good sources, appeared prepared
Rebuttals were indirect
Reasoning not fully explained

TEAM CODE #: _4 Srinivas - Mundres_ on the _PRO_ wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _Joshua Prine_____

Judge's School Affiliation: _Quarry Lane_____

PRO:	CON:
Team Code #: _1 Xu-Li_____	Team Code #: _11 Kapoor - Weiner_____
Pro Speaker #1 _Li_____ pts 28	Con Speaker #1 _Kapoor_____ pts 28
Pro Speaker #2 _Xu_____ pts 28	Con Speaker #2 _Weiner_____ 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 delivery
Cross exam needs some improvement
Good Very good reasoning & analysis
Very Good rebuttal

Con 1: Good delivery
Purposeful question
Very Good rebuttal
Focused on main points

Pro 2: Delivery needs improvement
Cross exam needs improvement — Questions' purpose unclear
Good reasoning & analysis
Rebuttal mostly re-statement

Con 2: Good delivery
Purposeful questions
Very good rebuttal
Focused on main points

TEAM CODE #: _11 Kapoor - Weiner_ on the __CON__ wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _Jielei Xu_

Judge's School Affiliation: _AHS_

PRO:	CON:
Team Code #: _15_	Team Code #: _13_

Pro Speaker #1 _Shvakel_ pts _28_   Con Speaker #1 _Hopcraft_ pts _29_

Pro Speaker #2 _Dhatchi_ pts _28_   Con Speaker #2 _Reicher_ 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:
- Reading alot
- need time control
- clear and strong argument
- stutter in crossfire

Con 1:
- Clear counter argument - 3
- clearly sound preparation
- good question on cross-fire

Pro 2:
- point to point count
- clealy and camly speak

Con 2:
- Good start with real example.
- Good presentation, look into judge's eye
- Safty is requirement for school.

TEAM CODE #: _13_ on the _CON_ wins this debate.

(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _____Jielei Xu_____

Judge's School Affiliation: _____AHS_____

	PRO:	**CON:**
Team Code #:	9	4

Pro Speaker #1 __Ganesh__ pts _28_ Con Speaker #1 __Nachui__ pts _27_

Pro Speaker #2 __Donthi__ pts _28_ Con Speaker #2 ___Lee___ 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: - Definition clear
- too fast speak
- look at judge, not often
-

Pro 2: • benefit, quick solution, exapple of bringing gun to school
• propal cause vs. law enforcement
• Anxious

Con 1: - observation clear   other set
- speak too fast - cut short of
- keep reading, not lookup at all
- a little bit over time limit
- student benefit over school benefit
- strong tone, and presentation skill

Con 2:

TEAM CODE #: ____9____ on the __PRO__ wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Rajan Wadh

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _Rajan Wadh_

Judge's School Affiliation: _MV HS_

PRO: 3   CON: 4

Team Code #:_____   Team Code #:_____

Pro Speaker #1 _Levi_ pts _26_   Con Speaker #1 _Bhakat_ pts _28.5_

Pro Speaker #2 _Magid_ pts _26_   Con Speaker #2 _Kuang_ 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: Strong start with good analysis, and evidence & reasoning. Weak Questions and response. Not a very Strong rebuttal. Lack of fluency and reasoning

Pro 2: in 2nd round
Good start with supporting evidence and analysis. But became weaker as the debate progressed. With analysis and reasoning becoming weaker. Lack of fluency and hard to understand the logic

Con 1: Strong Start, evidence and reasoning. Very clean in ~~expla~~ linking small issues to larger impacts. Strong Cross examination and responses. Strong Rebuttal

Con 2: The Best candidate in the group. Very fluent and clear delivery. Very logical and strong argument. Strong Rebuttal

TEAM CODE #: _4_ on the _CON_ **wins this debate.**
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PRO1 (Lani)

A Strong analysis

E Strong Evidence. Multiple studies &
    quotes

R Good linkage of school level issue
    to larger issue
2nd round → Could not connect cause & effect
    properly
CE Weak Questioning
    weak responses

RB

D

PRO2 (Magid)

A ~~not~~ Solid enough

E Evidence was good
Round - Good Reasoning
R was weak

CE Bo Strong Q & A ✓
RB

D was weak, ~~stop~~ was and smooth

CON1 (Bhakat)

Strong Analysis

Strong Evidence

                    Risan
Good linkages of all
aspects

~~Stro~~ Good Responses
    Good question

CON2 (Kuzap)

Very strong and clear
points and arguments
Good connection of all
issues

Strong Q&A
Very effective
Strong Rebuttal of Primary
issue

RAJAN WADHWA

Round 1A 9:00am D205
Pro: 3 Dyke - Jung
Con: 4 Zhang - Jeong
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Rajan Wadhwa

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

PRO: 3

CON: 4

Team Code #: _____

Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 DYKE _____ pts 25   Con Speaker #1 Zhang _____ pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 JUNG _____ pts 26   Con Speaker #2 Jeong _____ 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: Strong Start. Good evidence and reasoning. However did not have strong rebuttals and responses to the questions. Became less fluent as the debate progressed.

Pro 2: Strong Start, evidence and analysis. But the arguments got weaker. Cross examination was not strong. Responses were weak. Needs to be more polite and respectful to competition

Con 1: Strong Start. Strong analysis & reasoning. Clear thinking. Good connection of the dots. Good Rebuttals & Cross Examination

Con 2: Strong Start. The Best candidate. Apart from standard stuff, was very good in rebuttals and responding effectively to questions

TEAM CODE #: ___4___ on the ___CON___ wins this debate.
                                    (PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

RRO 1

Analysis ✓ Strong Start   CRO 1   Strong Start —
     study — +Review   A   B   C   ✓   ✓ Good evidence.
Evidence ✓ Govt study   Strong Reasoning
Reasoning ✓ Numbers

CE von   Weak answers: Good question
     Strong Weak Question   Strong Answer
Rebuttal   SRO cannot be racist because of higher
         Standard → Weak reasoning ─────────→ Good rebuttal
       Rights → Misinterpretation   Coercion —
Decn!   did not

PRO 2

A   Not strong questions   COW 2   Good response on why SRO will
                                                     escalate

E   Not enough   Good evidence & arguments
                                   about PC not reducing Racism

R   Not strong reasoning on "why   Teachers leaving law
     students being sued"
     Not strong rebuttal "why teachers cannot ─────→ Decent response.
CE   implement - Probable law"

Reb   Weak on 1st Rebuttal (cons.)
Reb (Good on other points)

Delivn!

Can be more gentle & courteous

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: __NANCY CHEMALY__

Judge's School Affiliation: __Monte Vista HS__

	PRO:	CON:
Team Code #:	11	5

Pro Speaker #1 __KHAN__ pts _29_   Con Speaker #1 __Anderson__ pts _28_

Pro Speaker #2 __Fox__ pts _28_   Con Speaker #2 __Menon__ 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: Ready Sloly, good expression, well constructed good evidence, rationale.

Con 1: Talk too fast, brings↑ solid evidence could improve cross examination.

Pro 2: Excellent arguments and delivery. To the point makes his case during cross examination

Con 2: Good delivery, solid arguments, could be more expressive during cross exam. and focus

TEAM CODE #: __11__ on the __PRO__ wins this debate.
KHAN - FOX   (PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

WINNING TEAM presented more convincing arguments backed by solid evidence and intimidated (in a positive way) the opposite during cross examination

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: __NANCY CHEMALY__

Judge's School Affiliation: __MONTE VISTA HS__

JAMES LOGAN HS {

	PRO: 9		CON: 4	
Team Code #:	9	Team Code #:	4	
Pro Speaker #1	IZADI pts 27	Con Speaker #1	BALI pts 27	} DVHS
Pro Speaker #2	Mohammad pts 28	Con Speaker #2	QIN 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: Spoke very fast, did not enunciate properly. Good evidence, well constructed did better job at cross examination

Pro 2: Was not ready. Spoke clearly and slowly very composed. Very good job in cross examination

Con 1: Talk very fast. very agressive. enunciation problem Solid arguments. Confused the term RACISM & racial discrimination.

Con 2: OVER AGRESSIVE the whole time. Would benefit from slowing down and varying his tone.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Stronger cross examination and rebuttal ↑ Better overall delivery. was looking at opponents (not judge) while addressing them.   from winning team

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _Veronica Rogers_

Judge's School Affiliation: _James Logan_

PRO:	CON:
Team Code #: __11__	Team Code #: __4__

Pro Speaker #1 _CHOW_ pts _29_   Con Speaker #1 _Rajkumar_ pts _27_

Pro Speaker #2 _Ansel_ pts _29_   Con Speaker #2 _Kapyrabooyna_ 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: great analysis/DICTION/EYE CONTACT
VERY STRONG research
STRONG CROSS X

Con 1: great RESEARCH/ENUNCIATION
WORK ON EYE CONTACT.
GOOD RESEARCH.
SPEAK UP ON CROSS X. CONFIDENCE IS KEY.

Pro 2:
great DICTION & ENUNCIATION
great eye contact and flow.
RESEARCH/FACTS strong.
WATCH OUT FOR UMMS/AHHH's

Con 2:
great research/FACTS
WORK ON ENUNCIATION & VOL.
SPEED WAS HARD TO FOLLOW

TEAM CODE #: __11__ on the __PRO__ wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:
STRONG contentions overall good job during CROSS X.
great FLOW OF IDEAS.

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: ___Bernie Kamps___

Judge's School Affiliation: ___Albany___

PRO:
Team Code #: ___11___

CON:
Team Code #: ___5___

Pro Speaker #1 _Dylan Wallerstein_ pts _28_   Con Speaker #1 _Rishik Manthana_ pts _27_

Pro Speaker #2 _Alex Wang_ pts _28_   Con Speaker #2 _Vignesh Siva_ 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:
Clear analysis
Simplification of reasoning
effective but not
well supported by evidence

Con 1: Reasoning unclear
Not effective in rebuttal

Pro 2:
Effective rebuttal
Excellent job of identifying
key difference regarding
teacher role.

Con 2: Complaints about interruptions
excessive

Financial argument not
persuasive

TEAM CODE #: ___11___ on the ___PRO___ wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Use of probable cause does not mean that anonymous
tips will be prohibited. Warrant for searches not required
for probable cause for teachers. Trust improves overall safety, reduces

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _Bernie Kamps_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Albany_

	PRO:		CON:
Team Code #:	15	Team Code #:	9

Pro Speaker #1 _Anik Sen_ pts ~~26~~ 25   Con Speaker #1 _Anwesh Mohanty_ pts ~~23~~ (28)

Pro Speaker #2 _Keya Vijapure_ pts 28   Con Speaker #2 _Sean Rook_ 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: Confused important point regarding SROs. Appeared to be unable to assert argument.

Pro 2: After correction in Summary, clarity improved.
Very compelling in argument, regarding distrust. Good speaking volume. Passionate. Difficult to present evidence with untried proposal.

Con 1: Clear presentation. Reasoning simple and well constructed. Clear articulation.

Con 2: Articulation could have been clearer. Reasoning not strong.

TEAM CODE #: _9_ on the _CON_ wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Reasonable suspicion discovers more weapons and therefore improves safety. SROs separate teachers from safety enforcement role which they are not trained to provide.

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: __Veronica Rogers__

Judge's School Affiliation: __James Logan__

PRO:	CON:
Team Code #: __12__	Team Code #: __4__

Pro Speaker #1 __Matley__ pts __28__   Con Speaker #1 __Jamal__ pts __28__

Pro Speaker #2 __Hwang__ pts __28__   Con Speaker #2 __~~Sar~~ Sankineni__ 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 VOLUME/EUNUNCIATION
GREAT FLOW/ORGANIZATION
STRENGTHEN CROSS·X
STRONG CLOSING

Con 1: CLEAR POINTS & EUNUNCIATION
GREAT RESEARCH/FACTS
VOLUME WAS A LITTLE LOUD.
CROSS·X: good job keeping AFF ON DEFE
WORK ON STATS ~~ON~~ # TO SUPPORT INCREASED
GOOD WORK!   SRO'S

Pro 2:
GOOD VOLUME & EUNUNCIATION
CLEAR THOUGHTS & IDEAS.
WORK ON generalization...
SRO'S = RACIST

Con 2:
GOOD DICTION/EUNUNCIATION
WORK on ~~to~~ CONSISTANT
GREAT CROSS·X!
WORK ON BACK UP FOR CLAIMS + SRO'S etc.

TEAM CODE #: __4__ on the ~~NEG~~ CON wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: ~~Neg~~ CON won based on strong speeches & strong
CROSS·X. HELD POINTS THROUGHOUT ~~&RU~~ overall
better control/DOMINANCE OF debate

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _Suma Kachinthaya_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Dublin High School._

PRO:
Team Code #: _9_

CON:
Team Code #: _3_

Pro Speaker #1 _Uppal_   pts _28_   Con Speaker #1 _Durney_   pts _27.5_

Pro Speaker #2 _Sekar_   pts _29_   Con Speaker #2 _Liu_   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: Laid the evidence well with facts. Can improve on clarity of delivery of speech.

Con 1: Speaks clearly. Can improve on confidence and delivery style.

Pro 2: Confident delivery. Effectively countered the arguments

Con 2: Answers to questions were on point and clear.

TEAM CODE #: _~~8~~ 9_   on the _PRO_ wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Even though both the teams did very well, team 9 did better in cross examination and delivery.

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _Suma Kachinthaya_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Dublin_

PRO:	CON:
Team Code #: _4_	Team Code #: _15_

Pro Speaker #1 _Rapolu_ pts _28_   Con Speaker #1 _Narasimhan_ pts _28_

Pro Speaker #2 _Mishra_ pts _28_   Con Speaker #2 _Walji_ 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 communication style and clarity.

Con 1: Can be more confident in body language

Pro 2: Very confident. Can improve on cross examination skills.

Con 2: Can improve on clarity.

TEAM CODE #: _4_ on the _PRO_ wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Both the teams did extremely well. Because CON team did not clearly refute PRO team and because PRO team scored more points on delivery.

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Richard Fehr

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

	PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #:	12	Team Code #:	11	

Pro Speaker #1 __Park__ pts 27   Con Speaker #1 __Zheng__ pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 __Chan__ pts 26   Con Speaker #2 __Miskelly__ 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: well organized / good presentation
excellent crossfire questions
very good / respectful cont

Con 1: good presentation & arguments
a bit slow in providing cards
tiny bit too casual (frustration / comment)

Pro 2: good arguments
a little hard to understand at times
might be better not to say "Trump"
good crossfire question

Con 2: probably better not to change hair at podium
good direct response to opposition points
very good at keeping perspective on debate

TEAM CODE #: __11__   on the __Con__ wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _Rick Fehr_

Judge's School Affiliation: _13_

PRO: 4
Team Code #: _4_

CON: 9
Team Code #: _9_

Pro Speaker #1 _Shahi_ pts _28_ Con Speaker #1 _Noriega_ pts _28_

Pro Speaker #2 _Jang_ pts _28_ Con Speaker #2 _Yi_ 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: well organized / good delivery
good quality of life reform

Con 1: good arguments / well presented
good point regarding relevance of cost

Pro 2: very effective delivery
interesting point of morality/fairness

Con 2: good overview & reference
good reminder of standard

TEAM CODE #: _9_ on the _Con_ wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _Lori Patel_

Judge's School Affiliation: _CPS_

PRO:

Team Code #: _12_

CON:

Team Code #: _9_

Pro Speaker #1 _Majewski_ pts _26_ Con Speaker #1 _Autenreith_ pts _26_

Pro Speaker #2 _Weng_ pts _26_ Con Speaker #2 _Wu_ 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: For ~~many~~ me, too many definitions at the outset— distracted from clear layout of the argument.

Con 1: Appreciated the clear layout of where you were headed. Could project more confidence.

Pro 2: ~~Sometimes~~ Take a bit more time to make sure you're saying what you mean. Sometimes said the opposite. Plenty of confidence & projection, but not always targeted.

Con 2: Good eye contact, appreciated summing up main points.

TEAM CODE #: _9_ on the _CON_ wins this debate.

(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: Pro did convince me that prob. cause would reduce problems like racial profiling but did not convince me that this was the only way to achieve such results. The negative side, by introducing the Tinker standard, offered an alternative that could

produce results w/o the warrant-level
standards of prob. cause.
    Interesting that timely response was such a
small issue here. It was huge in the
        previous debate.

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: ___LORI PATEL___

Judge's School Affiliation: ___CPS___

PRO: 4

Team Code #: ___4___

CON: 11

Team Code #: ___11___

Pro Speaker #1 _Adusumilli_ pts _26_   Con Speaker #1 ___Ruiz___ pts _27_

Pro Speaker #2 _Bhargava_ pts ~~27~~ (26)   Con Speaker #2 ___Stephen___ 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:

Thanks for great courtesy.

Pro 1: Would appreciate more eye contact. Too much reading straight off screen.

"corroborated" Pro 2: Very courteous but stumbling some to get words out. Repeating. Your arguments are solid so have confidence in your delivery.

Con 1: Good eye contact, little less certain than your partner heading into your speech (kind of a winding up for the pitch).

Con 2: Excellent poise, eye contact, confidence. Appreciated your telegraphing where you would be headed.

TEAM CODE #: ___11___ on the ___CON___ wins this debate.
                                    (PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:
   Bottom line seemed to be whether schools could act to deter crime. Although the pro side argued exigent circumstances rule would allow schools to act promptly, the con side raised doubts as to whether this rule would allow schools to act in time (can't wait until there is a gun on campus). Colorado tip line evidence was persuasive ... pro side

raising doubts about bad tips did not outweigh this value.

Well done on both sides & much appreciate the debaters' kindness in helping me through my first judging.

Both sides astute in listening to each other & adapting to emerging direction of the argument.

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _David Fox_

Judge's School Affiliation: _MHS_

	PRO:	CON:
Team Code #:	4	15

Pro Speaker #1 _Pillarisetti_ pts _28_   Con Speaker #1 _Sen_ pts _28.5_

Pro Speaker #2 _Kiran_ pts _28_   Con Speaker #2 _Abbott_ 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:
- Strong argument using Magistrates
- Good case outlining key evidence

Con 1:
- Liked "school to prison pipeline" analogy
- Good use of evidence supports each key point

Pro 2:
- Very strong close "probable cause" impact (short/long term) us. reasonable suspicion
- Be careful interrupting

Con 2:
- Strong use of evidence/studies
- very strong cross
- Be careful interrupting

TEAM CODE #: _15_ on the _Con_ wins this debate.

(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: A very close and spirited debate. Ultimately I felt the evidence and reasoning + cross fire were handled better by the Con side.

Pro

1st Aff ＊strong use of evidence
　　　　　　＊strong speaker
1. Mistrust
a. – violates rights
　　 – no checks Salaries
　　 – too much latitude
　　 – racial bias
b. Probable cause　　(notre dame)
　　 – 2008 / 80%
　　 – Supreme Court 4th Amd (Magistrates)

2. Unfair sharing
　　 – Law circumvented by police (2005 Howard)
　　 – probable cause
　　 => lack of trust = educ. impact
　　 => Dangerous lesson = undeserving of public

Cross I　1st speakers

1Q why does probable cause decrease?
2A (Loophole) SRO not adhering / violating
　　 Status quo (through teachers "reasonable
　　　 suspicion").
Q media discourse?

2nd – OK speaker　　= Racist searches –
Standard over[struck] – not enough facts = more safety, more rights
– harsh punitive policies – punishing students
　 for petty crime (especially minorities)
– searches not supported by evidence.
– "probable cause" will ~~better~~ make situation better
– with Magistrates involved better outcome
Media (suppose) – probable cause fixes and the
public perception of school safety improves

Q why are students being affected by harsh... –

A.

Grad　　　　　 – Reasonable suspicion = excessive
　　　　　　　　　　　　　 search
Strong close
1. Criminalization – freed immediately
　　 zero tolerance being abused
2. probable cause = right person being punished

Con

1st Neg　＊＊strong evidence / strong speaker
– Force detention w jails; zero tolerance
– 95% sent to juvie not criminals
– 38 states implemented
– Safe environment (95% school admin)
– decrease in tough discipline – ↑
– Authoritarian measures

2nd Media sensationalism
– reverse trend to draconian
– Cleveland St. 500% ↑ w zero tolerance
– school to prison pipeline
– Brown – 23% ↑ ＃
– Social Connections; jobs off

Cross I　1st speakers
1A. Less searches = rise ~~risk~~ in arrest
2A. wider access to info?
　　 ~~If~~ arrests go down whats the problem?
A. change search standard = public backlash
　　　 = change in policy

2nd　Strong evidence / strong speaker　(Brown)
value – sending kids to school
　　　 – going to prison unjustly
– 95% of searches are counted to
– punishment more important than search
– 80% of teachers understood policy (school)
– Good Faith principle... very subjective (Howard)
– 87% feel safe in school　　　 (northeast)

A. Zero tolerance +
Q. How long reasonable suspicion? Have rights
　　 been violated?

Grad　　　　　 – 95% admin love reasonable
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　 searches
weaker close　 – searches = safety
　　　　　　　 – arrests increase 500%
– more likely go back to criminal
　 system
– punishment is what most matters

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _David Fox_

Judge's School Affiliation: _MHS_

	PRO:	CON:
Team Code #:	3	2

Pro Speaker #1 _Luo_ pts 28   Con Speaker #1 _Mossbridge_ pts 27

Pro Speaker #2 _Malhotra_ pts 28   Con Speaker #2 _Poten_ 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:
- Nice outline of case, with supporting evidence
- Good use of reasoning based on evidence
- Be careful reading off computer

Pro 2:
- Reasoning of juvenile development not a factor very strong.
- Good arguments/tone
- Maybe work on hand gestures, "1st... 2nd..." to strengthen points

Con 1:
- Nice outline of your key points
- Good use of facts to support your case
- Be careful negative body language. Confidence.

Con 2:
- Strong argument and negation of Pro to set up your case.
- Discrimination happens either way
- Good eye contact

TEAM CODE #: ___3___ on the __PRO__ wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION: Both sides did a great job outlining their case with strong evidence and crosses. I felt the Pro team ultimately had stronger points and a cross. Juvenile argument was weak for Con

Pro	Con
1st Aff * Read off comp	**1st neg**
1. Feeding pipeline - Good use of evidence (Silomon)	1. Current standard "RS" is better than "PC"
53% increase in police	- based on security
- increase in minor crimes (400%)	- protects administ/school safety
→ not justified (minor)	Apply for warrant takes time
1. precedent (	2. Decrease in safety — ↓ school efficiency
2. lost education / less likely to graduate	- unsafe students = ↓ scores; ↑ absentee
3. job opps	3. Kids brains not developed
4. Long term family impacts	provided stats that support better approach
2. Criminals	via RS than PC
- SRO schools = 29% ↑ in sus	
3. Discrimination	**Cross X**
- minorities - vicious cycle	=A. RS better since teen brain less developed
	Q. 50% ↑ —
Cross X	
Q. Explain teenagers need to be treated	**2nd**
differently than adults +	- no proof SRO ↑ w/ PC. No solvency
A. Reduces SRO's, not increases. + (Jacobs)	provided by Aff side
	- Future opps = no direct links by Aff
2nd "Safety for everyone" framework	- Discrimination happens w/ PC or RS
- officers still have opp to protect w/o	no proof ↑ or ↓
warrant (can still later)	+ children should be held to different standard
Hogan - 20% carried a weapon	+ drug rate ↓ after standard tightened
Maclin - 66% ↑ in suspension. More	
punitive not safer	A. Revisited law +-
- rate of mass shootings ↑	Q. What searches (mass)?
only 2%? teachers feel threatened	
Bennett Random less harmful than discretionary	1. evidence provided
= Safest environment for education	
- Blew up this argument & supporting	
evidence *Very very strong	
Q Tiller's qualities? +-	
Q Teachers are not trained. Need SRO +	
A.	
1. Dropped framework (neg)	
2. SRO	
3. Impacts (x4)	
4. Discrimination - PC different standard than RS	