

Bernie Kamps (*1)

Round 2A 11:00am D209

Pro: 4 Zhang - Jeong

Con: 12 Chan - Park

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Lisa Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

PRO:

CON:

Team Code #:

Team Code #:

Pro Speaker #1

Zhang 4 pts 27

Con Speaker #1

Chan 12 pts 27

Pro Speaker #2

Jeong 4 pts 27

Con Speaker #2

Park 12 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 difficult to follow

Con 1:

Very difficult to follow

Pro 2:

Con 2:

TEAM CODE #:

4

on the

Pro

wins this debate.

(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Was able to answer questions logically than other team.

Boliang Deng (*4)

Round 2A 11:00am D211

Pro: 19 Page - Crosby

Con: 12 Weng - Majewski

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM DebateJudge's Name: Boliang DengJudge's School Affiliation: DUHS

PRO:

CON:

Team Code #: 19Team Code #: ~~12~~ 12Pro Speaker #1 Emma Page pts 28 Con Speaker #1 Majewski pts 28Pro Speaker #2 Conner Crosby pts 27 Con Speaker #2 Weng 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:

*little bit fast, very organized,
well ~~prepared~~ prepared,
provided evidences related the
topic.*

Pro 2:

*the questions were not
on point sometimes and very
~~strong~~ strong*

Con 1:

*very organized, easy to
follow and understand.*

*provided reasonable evidence
to support the conclusions.
the answers were on point.*

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

*The evidences provided by pro speakers were
not very strong and the communicative style for
con speakers is better.*

Boliang Deng (*4)

Round 2B 11:00am D211

Pro: 9 Rook - Mohanty

Con: 3 Magid - Levi

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM DebateJudge's Name: Boliang DengJudge's School Affiliation: DVHSPRO: 9
Team Code #: _____CON: 3
Team Code #: _____Pro Speaker #1 Mohanty pts 28 Con Speaker #1 Magid pts 29Pro Speaker #2 Rook pts 27 Con Speaker #2 Levi 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: easy organized and easy to follow, provided evidences ~~not~~ related the topic.Pro 2: provided more evidences support the arguments. the questions were relevant and brief.Con 1: well organized and understandable, well explained the issues in the topic, explained clear, and answered the questions concise. ~~the~~ standCon 2: provides evidences to support arguments, well organized and got the points to support the argument. stayed on the focus. ~~points~~ need to provideTEAM CODE #: 3 on the Con wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)**REASON FOR DECISION:**it was very hard to say which team is better. Both teams did very good jobs. Con speakers stayed more focus and delivered the message.

Kaustubh Vijapure (*15)

Round 2A 11:00am D207

Pro: 9 Wu - Autenreith

Con: 11 Wang - Wallerstein

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM DebateJudge's Name: Kaustubh VijapureJudge's School Affiliation: The Quarry Lane SchoolPRO: 9
Team Code #: _____CON: 11
Team Code #: _____Pro Speaker #1 Autenreith pts 27Con Speaker #1 Wallerstein pts 28Pro Speaker #2 Wu pts 28Con Speaker #2 Wang 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:

Spoke well initially and put forward good points. Appeared nervous during summary.

Pro 2:

Spoke well, seemed to respond/disagree with team mate during the round which demoralized the team mate.

Con 1: Spoke clearly & confidently, despite making a mistake appeared calm & confident. During cross fire asked pertinent questions & responded very well.

Con 2:

Spoke clearly & confidently, mostly impromptu. Knew the topic & his case well & able to put forth points clearly.

TEAM CODE #: 11 on the Con wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)**REASON FOR DECISION:**

The con team put forward their case more clearly and confidently; during the cross fire asked and responded to questions better.

Bernie Kamps (*1)

Round 2B 11:00am D209

Pro: 2 Mossbridge - Poter

Con: 9 Meda - Doshi

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name:

Lisa Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation:

Sonoma Academy

PRO:

CON:

Team Code #: _____

Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 2 pts 27Con Speaker #1 9 pts 27Pro Speaker #2 2 pts 27Con Speaker #2 9 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:

Both were very prepared and had a strong analysis, evidence and reasoning.

Con 1:

Strong as well in analysis, evidence, and reasoning.

Pro 2:

Con 2:

Very professional. Excellent in cross fire.

TEAM CODE #:

9

on the

con

wins this debate.

(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Safety was the big issue. Teachers giving detention over an assault charge. Trust of teacher vs. law and drug issues.

Debbie Crosby (*19)

Round 2A 11:00am D213

Pro: 5 Siva - Manthana

Con: 4 Kiran - Pillariseti

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Crosby

Judge's School Affiliation: SVHS

PRO:

Team Code #: 5

CON:

Team Code #: 4

Pro Speaker #1 Manthana pts 28 Con Speaker #1 Pillarsetti pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 Siva pts 29 Con Speaker #2 Kiran 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: very clear + concise
clear questions + response
focused on bias

Pro 2: very clear speech
good analysis

Con 1:

clear answer
Great questions
good flow of reasoning in cross
+ analysis

Con 2: enthusiastic - perhaps too loud
good analysis of card for cross
good questions
asked for cot card

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Analysis more clear for Con with ev support

Reasoning thorough

Confident + clear (enthusiastic) delivery

Strong Rebuttals

Debbie Crosby (*19)

Round 2B 11:00am D213

Pro: 12 Roy - Ahluwalia

Con: 4 Jang - Shahi

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Crosby

Judge's School Affiliation: SVHS

PRO: Team Code #: 12 CON: Team Code #: 4

Pro Speaker #1 Ahluwalia pts 29 Con Speaker #1 Shahi pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 Roy pts 28 Con Speaker #2 Jang 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 - calm, clear & confident
clear presentation of points
nice reference to evidence

Pro 2: clear - good statements w/ evidence

Con 1: - loud & fast
so pts & evidence slurs together
- enthusiasm

Con 2: fast, speaking - difficult to follow
interrupted questions

Grand Cross
Please wait to
listen to question
& answer

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Good debate! - point of ↑ surveillance
metal detectors } ↓ privacy

- status quo includes PC & RS

Aff did not emphasize harassment of RS & imprisonments

Neg - broke down balance of security & privacy

Bodhi Nadler (*2)

Round 2A 11:00am Room 7

Pro: 3 Bhasin, Dovichi

Con: 4 Srinivas - Mundres

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM DebateJudge's Name: BODHI NADLERJudge's School Affiliation: ANALYTeam Code #: PRO: 3Team Code #: CON: 4Pro Speaker #1 Dovichi pts 29Con Speaker #1 Mundres pts 27Pro Speaker #2 Bhasin pts 28Con Speaker #2 Srinivas 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 tone & tenor,
excellent points, good cross
Rebuttal excellent

Pro 2:
slow down a little, but
overall, very well done.
excellent points, good cross
& analysis & evidence
TEAM CODE #: 3 on the

Con 1: speak slower, work on
body language & tone of voice (loud)
somewhat argumentative / confrontational
body language.

Con 2:
Good points, but spoke WAY
too fast & it was hard to follow sometimes
Saying the other team is not valid
is not good
PRO wins this debate.

(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PRO made their arguments w/ better communication & were
more convincing w/ their evidence. Also, they were easier
to understand because they spoke slower & had better body language

Pro

reasonable suspicion v probable cause
- racially biased
- min. discr.

fast speaker!

Crossfire

85-2000 -

Seems more certain - good
answers for cross

~~Witness~~
~~Reasoning~~

interrupted a bit

Tons of evidence
good rebuttals !!
very detailed

good x for O and

Con

but E and - can't understand if you are too fast.
public disclosure
- fear

Body language - leaning forward, no eye
contact

coersion -

Criminalization

- lost points on cross
- Pro revalidate some args.

Written - 4

TOO TOO FAST

Kept interrupting

Delivery - WAY too fast!

Courtesy -

Tons of evidence

Wke standard thru counts
- not by choice

Bodhi Nadler (*2)

Round 2B 11:00am Room 7

Pro: 12 Kim - Chou

Con: 4 Huang - Sun

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM DebateJudge's Name: BODHI NADLERJudge's School Affiliation: ANALYTeam Code #: PRO: 12Team Code #: CON: 4Pro Speaker #1 Kim pts 28Con Speaker #1 SUN pts 28Pro Speaker #2 CHOU pts 30Con Speaker #2 HUANG 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: Spoke clearly, great questions, cross x, good understanding of topic. Excellent evidence. Slightly fidgety.

Pro 2: Great delivery, great cross x, demonstrated great understanding of topic & provided excellent evidence.

Con 1: Good points, good delivery, spoke a little fast tho. good cross x & understood topic pretty well. Confusion about warrants vs reason for search.

Con 2: good points, great delivery, good job on cross x, rebuttal.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Better job of delivering points, cross x & a more thorough understanding of topic (seemingly)

lots of him PRO

fidgets?

1 probable cause - ref evidence
most useful effects

RS - more discriminatory
- school rule violators → ~~then~~
racial disparity

higher quality samples
- is this true?

quality better

Cross

good question

2 good points to counter con
no causation

spoke a good speed & excellent
delivery w/ eye contact

really good crossp. answers

- seemed to have a better

understanding of PC v RS &

how it relates to warrants

SROs in Canada? not relevant

Con

Loon

1

decrease in school crime

RS - keeps safe

well being of student,
over arresting of students

good response

2 # @/Ben.

good rebuttal of 1 point

RS works because #s are down

Do you understand PC ~~v~~ ~~s~~
for warrant?

PC → racism?

Gx

will it decrease crime?

NOT

Pinole Judge 4 (*14)

Round 2A 11:00am D212
Pro: 11 Kapoor - Weiner
Con: 9 Uppal - Sekar
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _____

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

PRO:

CON:

Team Code #: _____

Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Kapoor pts 27

Con Speaker #1 Uppal pts 27

Pro Speaker #2 Weiner pts 29

Con Speaker #2 Sekar 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 research + arguments
Good eye contact + body language
Speak more fluently

Con 1: passionate & clear + knowledgeable
Strong responses in crossfire
Unclear abt. SRV argument

Pro 2: passionate + knowledgeable
Clear argument re. problem of
unwarranted searches
challenged well their
arguments

Con 2: very knowledgeable + passionate
Good argument about teachers not
arresting students, as police would
good to distinguish between school +
broader society

TEAM CODE #: 11 on the

Pro wins this debate.
(PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prob cause will result in fewer unwarranted checks - allowing
teachers to relate well to student because trust
won't be jeopardized

Pinole Judge 4 (*14)

Round 2B 11:00am D212

Pro: 15 Walji - Narasimhan

Con: 12 Hwang - Matley

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM DebateJudge's Name: Kathy CurranJudge's School Affiliation: Sacred Heart

PRO:

CON:

Team Code #: _____

Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Narasimhan pts 26 Con Speaker #1 Matley pts 28Pro Speaker #2 Walji pts 27 Con Speaker #2 Hwang 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: excellent organization -
research
good pt. status quo not working
now
need stronger evidence 3rd opinion
will & bias

Pro 2:
Clear & understandable
good point that airports aren't
schools
great ability to go straight to
core issue

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

Con 1: knew material well
great crossfire presence
quick on his feet
good point re. health

Con 2: strong public speaker
good point that we don't want to get to
point of exigent circumstances
excellent rebuttals

REASON FOR DECISION:

Time is of the essence - the 95% stat reflects a need for
reform in the criminal justice system, not the schools

Jennifer Buchanan (*3)

Round 2A 11:00am D204

Pro: 9 Noriega - Yi

Con: 11 Fox - Khan

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM DebateJudge's Name: Jennifer BuchananJudge's School Affiliation: College PrepPRO: 9
Team Code #: _____CON: 11
Team Code #: _____Pro Speaker #1 Noriega pts 28Con Speaker #1 30 Khan pts 30Pro Speaker #2 Yi pts 29Con Speaker #2 30 Fox pts 30

Wow

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: Excellent delivery - great courtesy
Your evidence didn't prove your point
that probable cause will create less
suspicion and criminalization - I understand
that those will valuable but not that
probable cause would help.

Pro 2: ~~excellent~~ delivery very good
gaps in evidence and logic,
evidence that reasonable suspicion
will lead to prison for students not
well laid out.

Con 1: excellent delivery great courtesy
evidence quality was very good,
analysis and reasoning were well laid
out and supported

Con 2: questions at xfire were excellent -
point and concise, rebuttals were
on-point and supported by evidence.
excellent delivery
great courtesy, good civil discourse

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

evidence presented by Con team was stronger and very well presented. Pro team
didn't really give data to show harm of reasonable suspicion, and data given
was not as valid (Washington Post). I personally agree more with the Pro team,
but Con team's presentation was much stronger.

1A K-12 probable cause for SSS
good evidence
delivery

IN excellent evidence support

x fire
N-asked the right Q
A

2A good evidence

2N

cross fire

probable cause? xllmt c

evidence not supporting Sch → prison

1AS

x fire (2AFF good on
2NFF

courtroom,

Key point

does probable cause
change raised
profiling

probable cause =
not / create
prison / an suspicion
atmosphere

does
everyone B suspect =
criminalization

Jennifer Buchanan (*3)

Round 2B 11:00am D204

Pro: 11 Zheng Miskelley

Con: 9 Mohammed Izadi

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM DebateJudge's Name: Jennifer BuchananJudge's School Affiliation: College PrepPRO: 11
Team Code #: _____CON: 9
Team Code #: _____Pro Speaker #1 Zheng pts 28Con Speaker #1 Izadi pts 27Pro Speaker #2 Miskelley pts 28Con Speaker #2 Mohammed 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: your delivery was very good
good arguments for reasonable suspicion
diminishing trust.

Pro 2: you delivered your points
concisely, repeating for emphasis
evidence and logic chain were
good

Con 1: your analysis didn't lay out the
important issues in your argument in a way
that I could follow through the debate
rebuttals went.

courtroom, civil x fire was good

Con 2: a little disorganized, rebuttals were good not
great. logic chain analysis not clear
your questions were good. appreciated
your courtroom, civil style

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

1 A
instinct trust

1 N
comfort/safety

x fire
radi - not organized

2 A - evidence, logic chain good

2 N
analysis - logic chain
disorganized

x fire

2 N - di

probably cause
no into the
van cap.

Reg - to stay
same

- counter plan
not OK

1 AS -

1 NS - delivery poor

grand x fire

A1 =

good argument the provide power

if rias soup

2 AFF - effect of police

2 XFF

Con 2 -

no cogent argument
to keep reas. susp.

I don't understand.
your best argument of safety

Jim Hwang (*12)

Round 2A 11:00am D205

Pro: 11 Stephen - Ruiz

Con: 15 Vijapure - Sen

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Jim Hwang

Judge's School Affiliation: MUHS

PRO: 11
Team Code #: _____

CON: 15
Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Ruiz pts 29 Con Speaker #1 SEN pts 27

Pro Speaker #2 Stephen pts 30 Con Speaker #2 Vijapure 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:

Pro 2:

VERY GOOD SPEAKER. NICE PACE AND PUNCTUATION

Con 1:

TAKE A FEW SECONDS TO UNDERSTAND QUESTION BEFORE ANSWERING TO CONSTRUCT A THOUGHTFUL ANSWER.

Con 2:

DON'T INTERRUPT WHEN OTHER SIDE IS SPEAKING ALLOW OTHER PERSON TO FINISH POINT BEFORE COUNTERING.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

BETTER EVIDENCE & ARGUMENT.
NEG LACKED EVIDENCE

Jim Hwang (*12)
Round 2B 11:00am D205
Pro: 4 Jamal - Sankineni
Con: 1 Xu - Li
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Jim Hwang

Judge's School Affiliation: MUHS

PRO: 4 Team Code #: _____ CON: _____ Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 JAMAL pts 29 Con Speaker #1 4 pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 SANKINENI pts 29 Con Speaker #2 XU 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 A BIT FAST. POINTS WEREN'T WELL SEPARATED w/ PUNCTUATION.

Con 1:

Pro 2:

GOOD REASONING

Con 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

BETTER EVIDENCE AND REASONING

Selena Wong (*5)
Round 2B 11:00am Room 5
Pro: 4 Nachuri - Lee
Con: 12 Hart - Nakahara
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Selena Wong

Judge's School Affiliation: Dublin HS

Team Code #: PRO: 4

Team Code #: CON: 12

Pro Speaker #1 Nachuri pts 28 Con Speaker #1 Nakahara pts 29

Pro Speaker #2 Lee pts 29 Con Speaker #2 Hart 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:
Interrupted during crossfire -
Spoke over opponent -

Con 1:
Spoke too fast during format -
Good organization -

Pro 2:
Very well reasoned rebuttal
Delivered points clearly -
Spoke fast but clear
Brought up new argument in
New focus

Con 2:
Good at pointing out flaws
in argument -
Slightly aggressive

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Better evidence presented for CON side - better
organized and well better able to counter
opponent's arguments

Nachuri

Probable cause - creative, safe, learning env. - safety before equality - impacts
① better attitude - strict security measures - better outlook - can / more
destroy trust - unity - 2nd class rt. 2nd class citizen - clear crime
attributed few end - alienate - decrease safety - DPS - SKO - decrease crime
see + out of them - way - more engaged in - trust - 2nd class
SKO - 70% - prob. cause - pos. div. real ativ. rel. - turn to SKO - clear crime
saber - perception of crime - 92% - positive - produce # of students
perception safety - 100% of students - 100% of students - 100% of students

Nakamura

too fast - less safe - shouldn't have wait to collect evidence - 2nd class
NKE William - burden - SKO - which leg should - support - 2nd class
Spial - on the spot - leaving to - 1st class - 2nd class
School - 24 tips - Colorado - 1st class - 2nd class
tips do not cal. prob. cause evidence - to not
productivity 28 state - shootings - 100% - student wrong at
safety CDC - sleep studies - violence - 100%
in 5 - used digital label - every 10 go in 100%
reasonable suspicion is only - details - student - 100%
likely - urgent - 90% of reasonable - 100%
safely - 100% of reasonable - 100%

Nachuri / Nakamura

Probable cause - addressed under probable cause - 100%
Safety - reasonable - anonymous tips - 100%
direct safety - anonymous tips - 100%
do investigation - 100%
Nachuri - kept attempting - 100%
time / less search - 100%
evidence SKOs - 100%

Lee

evidence in 2B - ask for methodology - 100%
evidence in 2B - ask for methodology - 100%
evidence in 2B - ask for methodology - 100%
evidence in 2B - ask for methodology - 100%
evidence in 2B - ask for methodology - 100%

Hart

① Hestate / wait - 100%
debated att / 100%
tips unreliable - 100%
where is case? - 100%
evidence - 100%
- space but fast - 100%
threat - 100%
60% do not come - 100%
4th amendment - 100%
SKOs - 100%
1st SKO / 100%
Lee / Hart - 100%

Selena Wong (*5)

Round 2A 11:00am Room 5

Pro: 3 Clark - Wornow

Con: 9 Ganesh - Donthi

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Selena Wong

Judge's School Affiliation: Dublin HS

PRO: 3
Team Code #: _____

CON: 9
Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Wornow pts 28

Con Speaker #1 Ganesh pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 Clark pts 26

Con Speaker #2 Donthi 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 presentation of facts with supporting evidence and point

Pro 2:

Closing argument needed to be better reasoned & counter other sides arguments

Con 1:

Kept interrupting opponent during crossfire - answers on crossfire were not brief
Bit aggressive

Con 2:

Kept interrupting opponent during crossfire - answers on crossfire were not brief
Bit aggressive

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Case~~ CON side presented better arguments on crossfire were able to present better case

Woman

① More than reasonable suspicion - 4th ② Ought moral obligation - safe privacy - education -
unreasonable susp/dry testing - adv. of low standard - school by dry test -
WA Post - dry testing increased dry use - destroy student success -
15% less likely reasonable suspicion - fall & short - privacy - school -
interest - ability cell phone search ③ arbitrary - action - criminalize -
misbehavior by blacks - harm students in life - mental health -
good citations support arguments - 260K one goal - 45% increase in revenue -
233 - health - very a bit overtime - term 8 days - 400 plan 600 bill - 1st amendment -
dressed but casually - term 8 days - 400 plan 600 bill - 1st amendment -

Canesh

① School safety - dep on comfort & safety - anonymous tips - prohibit under probable cause -
cause - most effective law enforcement - 2,000 - 400 plan 600 bill - 1st amendment -
probab ② criminalization - aren't experts - wouldn't have probable cause -
SLO school resource officers - have SLO - increase rate of arrest - minor/unusual -
prison-like facilities - no evidence prevent - probable cause victimize -
③ Tinker v. Des Moines - judged 4th amendment - judicial certainty -
primary 1st amendment - six and of defense - 1st amendment -
deliberated agree - not - very a bit overtime -
break anything - not - very a bit overtime -

Woman/Canesh

Reasonable suspicion - 4th - Tinker standard - natural & disruption -
let schools adapt - Tinker standard - used in all school -
hurdle - 4th amendment - job created in network -
disrupts - low rate of disruption - job created in network -
witness - favorable view - in role for - job - 2 pass / in -
voluntary - anonymous tips - SLOs - 2 pass / in -
problematic under probable cause - most effective - HS -
Circuit 8 - very difficult - specific -
local bias - Tinker - very difficult - subs. -

Challe

Safety - probable cause allows safety / privacy - anonymous tips - no -
1.5% anonymous are anonymous - SLOs were - probable cause -
teacher can hear - alleged - will not be - SLOs - reasonable suspicion -
alleged bias - reasonable - teacher - can allow them to move -
tried - probable cause - teacher really want to real person -
less disruption - economy - more people in - arrested -
disrupt - good - more job opportunity - not - no actual -
safety & privacy - no guarantee will be - Tinker - probable cause -
evidence - school - no guarantee will be - Tinker - probable cause -
more require -

Dorothy went for fast

education - abhorrent / safety - pre-requisite to due - dry test -
rate - trust - weigh safety - pre-requisite to due - dry test -
67% drop in dry use 41% drop - not -
not racial - reasonable suspicion not - probable cause -
idiv - suspicion (rights) - NW law review - narrow - probable -
force to act - happen - alleviate - criminalize - reasonable -
Tinker standard - material - probable cause - need -
suspicion - implemented in all schools - need -
job - HS school - student - was able to get job - not watched -
Tinker, correlation - causal - minority student - privacy -
safety - danger - vote - resolution - Dorothy school -
Chalk/Dorothy - not - Tinker - statute -

Reasonable suspicion - status quo - better support standard -
Probable cause - teacher - peer need standard -
Education - teacher like time - exact same standard -
use Tinker standard - 1969 - exact same standard -
modified 4th - not absolute - majority of -
applied to - not absolute - teachers / police -
schools - well established - well held up - teachers / police -
teachers allow search - when do teachers / police -
everyone has probable cause - will be fair -
Dorothy - not - led one description - already -
not -

Kaustubh Vijapure (*15)

Round 2B 11:00am D207

Pro: 3 Durney - Liu

Con: 11 Chow - Ansel

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM DebateJudge's Name: Kaustubh VijapureJudge's School Affiliation: The Quarry Lane SchoolTeam Code #: PRO: 3Team Code #: CON: 11Pro Speaker #1 Durney pts 28Con Speaker #1 Chow pts 29.5Pro Speaker #2 Liu pts 28Con Speaker #2 Ansel 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:

Speaks clearly and confidently, during cross-x responded to questions well.

Pro 2:

Put forward very clear and simplistic reasons; during x-fire was not intimidated by opponent.

Con 1:

Spoke very well, was a very confident speaker and asked good questions & responded very clearly. Impressive confidence!

Con 2:

Tried to be intimidating to both, opponents and judge. Could not clearly understand points he was trying to make as he confused the judge by being quoting rules.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: The Pro team put forward simplistic and relevant points; the Con team spoke well but were not able to convince the Judge of their case as they kept putting up tournament rules, rather than focus on what they had to say.

Dilip Sharma (*9)

Round 2A 11:00am D206

Pro: 3 Zhang - Cohen

Con: 11 Lee - Steinberg

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM DebateJudge's Name: Dilip SharmaJudge's School Affiliation: James Logan High School.

PRO:

CON:

Team Code #: _____

Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Zhang pts 27Con Speaker #1 Lee pts 27Pro Speaker #2 Cohen pts 28Con Speaker #2 Steinberg 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: initial presentation
was too fast & little hard to follow
needed to slow down, but later was
more composed & not reading as initially

Pro 2: had good eye contact,
was very confident while delivering
the speech

Con 1: was reading too fast with no
eye contact initially, but subsequently
did show more confidence &
eye contact improved. will be good
to maintain from beginning.

Con 2: good eye contact, provided good
evidence & supported argument
was clear & concise in
refuting PRO's arguments

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

con provided evidence of 24,000 lives being
saved & reduction of ~35% violent crime by having metal
detectors but arg was not able to refute or prove their
side will either improve or help in this matter

Pro
Zhany

school by powerphoton
C1: Probable cause decreases
1995 → SBCB, increased
causes - not justified
(murder misbehavior)
→ best employment
harm

C2: Increased crime
→ act like criminals
SBCB 20% & crime
→ Probable cause
* Discrimination
→ Race/ethnicity
Probable cause

Too fast,
Reading, eye contact
musing
Good evidence

con/mug
Lee

family looking decreases
negative use
40,000 deaths &
12% decrease
Wholes doing nothing

→ use of metal detectors
35% decrease
→ detectors applied
C2: leads to even comparison
→ bring more
→ media coverage
"Probable cause" declining
wholes safety
→ "School to poison
pipeline"

→ * Supply
→ trust is higher
→ ~~Trust~~ lives & decrease
20% 35% victim
→ media over coverage

good eye contact
"Reading too fast"
→ confidence

Pro Probable cause

when
safety / mental health / physical

R1: decreases copying
→ trust * Review, open
doubts
→ Over compensation
more comfortable & safe
wholes? every caught
→ media

→ decrease related to
poison pipeline
→ decrease in SBC
dies chokes more
independence, less
account

trust & evidence based
Leads blanket test

Good argument,
eye contact

con/mug
Seiberberg (speeches)

making safe → no
comfortable & quiet
→ school to poison
200 - 6000
policy → suspended
→ Probable cause
increased poison
pipeline
→ metal detectors
→ 35% crime

* Discrimination
→ argue for
every one to be
searched
→ 2 min per each
in contact

* Probable cause" → targets
"reasonable Susp" does not
total
good eye contact
good argument

Dilip Sharma (*9)

Round 2B 11:00am D206

Pro: 4 Rajkumar - Kapyraboyna

Con: 15 Shvakeel - Dhatchi

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: _____

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

PRO:

CON:

Team Code #: _____

Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Rajkumar pts 27

Con Speaker #1 Dhatchi pts 27

Pro Speaker #2 Kapyraboyna pts 27

Con Speaker #2 Shvakeel 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:

→ Initially reading too fast, so hard to follow, but improved later. Initial presentation needs to be clear & concise, overall good job.

Pro 2:

→ need to slow down
→ Read less, which got better later, please, maintain this from beginning, so will help.

Con 1:

→ please slow down
→ need to improve eye contact

Con 2:

→ good eye contact
→ was clear & concise

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

the CON side brought up reasonable doubt that training teachers to be SLO's as PRO mentioned in C1 will be complex interpretation of law & unenforceable

Bejuma (Pos)

"4th amendment/Privacy"

C1: Racial bias / not consent

↳ SDO's

↳ within 3x more than others in drug sales

C2: cycle of disorder

↳ negative evidence

↳ drug selling & metal detectors

↳ physiological issues

due to metal detectors

Administrative searches

won decrease

↳ SDO's are not typical

Reading the first no eye contact was confident

Datche (Neg)

C1: SDO is imp

C2: Teachers cannot

provide laws

C1: Student teacher relationship

↳ better relationship

students do better

↳ self-regulation

↳ more trust = less crime

C2: cyber bullying

↳ by content monitoring

by reasonable suspicion

↳ 71% decrease in

↳ 33.8m lives saved

↳ lower grades/injury

↳ teachers cannot be trained to be SDO's

↳ bullies carried guns

provided evidence

need to show down & not read

Kopy (no) Journal

E1: still be existing

E2:

E3: cyber bullying is on the rise due to reasonable suspicion

the rise due to

reasonable suspicion

E1: SDO can help mostly with search warrant

* requires consent

* judges are friends

C2: drug taking is

competitive & students

reluctant

↳ should have lower GPA

↳ rights over safety

↳ SDO's → 3x more racist

Reading the first

Shubel (neg)

E1: more trust has

Alone

* safety is imp &

B1: forget memories

due to longed evidence

↳ pre computing the odds

→ teachers will not be able to learn

E2: not unique it

into today

E1:

C2: 7% decrease

"social contact theory"

good by contact, was not reading

Carol Lloyd (*13)

Round 2A 11:00am D210

Pro: 5 Menon - Anderson

Con: 4 Bhargava - Adusumilli

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: JODI CANN

Judge's School Affiliation: ALBANY HIGH

PRO: 5
Team Code #: _____

CON: 4
Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Anderson pts 27

Con Speaker #1 Adusumilli pts ~~27~~ 29

Pro Speaker #2 Menon pts 27

Con Speaker #2 Bhargava 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: Anderson

*Nice
Manner
Heartfelt*
Suggestion: You must slow down during 1st constructive argument. I could barely understand

Pro 2: Menon

- great manner
- Strong when you stay logical + progress the argument

Con 1: Adusumilli

*clear,
Logical*

Con 2: Bhargava

well-argued.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

CON team argued both laid out and defended their arguments with greater clarity.

Carol Lloyd (*13)

Round 2B 11:00am D210

Pro: 4 Bhakhat - Kuang

Con: 9 Srivastava - Wong

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Jodi Cahn

Judge's School Affiliation: ALBANY HIGH

PRO: 4
Team Code #: _____

CON: 9
Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Bhakhat pts 29

Con Speaker #1 Srivastava pts 29

Pro Speaker #2 Kuang pts 28

Con Speaker #2 Wong 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: Bhakhat

Con 1: Srivastava

Pro 2: Kuang

Con 2: Wong

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Ability to respond during rebuttal.

Deborah Weiner (*11)

Round 2A 11:00am D208

Pro: 4 Bali - Qin

Con: 3 Luo - Malhotra

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM DebateJudge's Name: Deborah Cahn-WeinerJudge's School Affiliation: MiramontePRO: 4
Team Code #: _____CON: 3
Team Code #: _____Pro Speaker #1 Bali pts 27 Con Speaker #1 Luo pts 28Pro Speaker #2 Qin pts 26 Con Speaker #2 malhotra 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: Gave a well organized introduction with evidence supported arguments But did not effectively respond to questions or arguments posed by the other team.

Pro 2: Made good points with supported arguments But overall speaking style and presentation limited impact.

Con 1: Very well structured arguments and facility with data and evidence. Arguments and questions were strong and effective.

Con 2: Excellent speaking style, clear facility with data. Answers were on points with good evidence to back up.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Con won because of well organized and evidence-supported argument. Pro failed to adequately respond to challenges posed by Con and overall speaking/communication style limited effectiveness.

Pro Bali
Quin

Analysts 1 2

Evidence: 4th Amendment
 2nd class citizens
 Negative use of school
 schools are authoritarian

Self fulfilling
 Prophecy

Recovery: rights
 are prevalent.

Rebut: Weak

Fact based
 reasonable
 suspicion

Cross: can SRO's
 be Biked?

where does \$
 come from
 metal detectors

Delivery: well
organized

well organized & evidence
 supported
 argument.

1 2

Trusts
 don't
 Reduce
 use

Race
 &
 Ethnic
 Disparities

Give rights
 Back

metal
 detectors
 \$ &
 machine?

privacy
 safety
 &
 civil rights

only
 contention
 is
 safety?
 what about
 rights?

draw
 answer

unsubstantiated

can't
 understand
 slowdown

Con
Mellhotra

1 2

Maslow:
 1) Prioritize
 student
 Safety
 2) Better education
 quality

Marijuana
 use

School
 legally
 allowed
 to search
 lockers

Metal
 Detectors
 Credit
 Benefits
 good data
 shows

who probable
 cause?
 good
 examples

where
 sit
 handbags?
 Addition

Very good
 organization

there's
 is
 safety

Sub
 schools
 have
 better
 retention

TH vs. NJ

reducing
 marijuana

op or
 rebut
 well
 organized

Who's
 Harvard
 card?

No
 author

Education
 vrd.com

good summary
 -> on good points
 other fairness

excellent
 speaker

gateways
 not
 get away

Con failed to respond to a adequately
 questions or arguments
 effectively a speaking style
 limited

Deborah Weiner (*11)

Round 2B 11:00am D208

Pro: 12 Kabra - Satoor

Con: 4 Mishra - Rapolu

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM DebateJudge's Name: Deborah WeinerJudge's School Affiliation: MiramonteTeam Code #: PRO: 12 Team Code #: CON: 4Pro Speaker #1 Kabra pts 29 Con Speaker #1 Rapolu pts 27Pro Speaker #2 Satoor pts 29 Con Speaker #2 Mishra 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: Excellent organization and good questions. Very facile with data.

Con 1: Very smooth delivery and organization. Some points need more hard data to back up.

Pro 2: Introduction did great job outlining points and all supported by true data. Outstanding communication style.

Con 2: Nice speaking style but it became repetitions and did not adequately respond to the questions posed.

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

This was a very close debate with all speakers being excellent! However, in the end I felt that PRO did a better job supporting their points with evidence and that CON did not always adequately respond to questions & challenges by PRO.

Pro Aff
1

Neg Con
1

2

2

Analysis

gave definitions
up front - great
outlines law
what is a reasonable
search
violates dignity &
rights

Addressed
each point
- teachers
cannot enforce
SRO's search
unless QOL
- Elton not
passer priority

- 1) teachers cannot expect teachers to do both
- 2) potential pressure
- 3) human rights
→ need to police
examples of
bad outcomes

agree w/
definition
SRO → demands
Privacy:
1) security
privacy
schools
unsafe → ↓
trust

Evidence

Data on
grad rates

Balance Between
Security &
Rights
Point by
point
arguments

Legality
4th Am. rights
different in schools
4) students
need medical
health
counselors

Reasoning

Searches
vs.
arrests
same a
balance

Framework
can't expect teachers
to be officers
nonviolent
behavior →
jail?

Rebuttal

? judicial
system
good questions

had to ask
? 3x's
& responded
succinctly

school to
prison
pipeline

if really
responding to
?

overemphasizing
need to
counselors

Cross

800

good
questions

Delivery

Ⓜ

smooth
fascinating
w/
data

great

great
delivery

most arguments
are hypothetical
not enough
data
failed to show
factual links

Sanjeev Chawla (*8)

Round 2B 11:00am Room 8
 Pro: 13 Hopcraft - Reicher
 Con: 3 Dyke - Jung
 Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Sanjeev Chawla

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington

PRO: Team Code #: 13 CON: Team Code #: 3

Pro Speaker #1 Reicher. pts 29 Con Speaker #1 Dyke pts 28
 Pro Speaker #2 Hopcraft. pts 29 Con Speaker #2 Jung 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 Clear & assertive
 + Evidence
 Need improvement in Cross Exam.

Pro 2: + Strong rebuttal,
 + very clear delivery,
 + Active Cross Exam.
 with Evidence

Con 1: + Strong Rebuttal.
 + ~~SE~~ Need some focus in
 Delivery of the
 ++ Strong Cross Examination

Con 2: + Strong Rebuttal.
 + Need more active
 participation in cross fire.

TEAM CODE #: 13 on the Pro, wins this debate.
 (PRO or CON)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Reicher

- 1) Violate Privacy Right
 - NO Warrants
 - Random
- 2) Bad Relationship between students + School
 - Lack of Trust
 - increase crime.
- 3) Fast track from student from school to jail

Student once safe in school
outsiders participate in crime

Cross Exam

Dyke

- 1) Violence
- 2) 135 ~~hundreds~~ guns
1 / School year
10% -

1) Too hard to enforce.

2) Lower search standard - that saves life

3) Metal Detectors.

4) Drug Testing
↳ less likely to use drugs

5) Substance Abuse
→ drop out

+++

→ Better punishment

→ Contraband

Example / Evidence
→ based Rhetoric

Wopcraft

1) Mass shooting more outside school than inside school.

Schools far more safe than other

2) American Union
Student get negative impact &

3) Pol. officer
20% increase juvenile crime.

4) Laws in place to report crime

5) ~~STJ~~

Tag

1) Safety more important than right

2) Officers do not need

3) Increase of search

4) American 100K Searches.

5) Most likely to be ~~interested~~ arrested

Probable Cause

→ Safety (Crime)
↓

→ TLO Look for
↓

then own search Contraband

↓ Students Immunized

TLO

Sanjeev Chawla (*8)

Round 2A 11:00am Room 8

Pro: 15 Abbott - Sen

Con: 3 Oh - Thomas

Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Sanjeev Chawla

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School

Team Code #: PRO: 15

Team Code #: CON: 3

Pro Speaker #1 Sen pts 27.5 Con Speaker #1 Thomas pts 27

Pro Speaker #2 Abbott pts 27.5 Con Speaker #2 Oh 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 thinking
Strong Evidence
+ Cross Exam.
+ Good delivery

Pro 2: + Strong Reasoning
+ Active participation in
Cross Exam & Rebuttal
+ Little less aggressive and
make it more helpful.

Con 1: Overall very good delivery
just a bit of hesitation
+ focus on Rebuttal
with evidence.

Con 2: Active participation in Cross Exam
Missed Rebuttal of a
few arguments of Aff,

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Sten (3-58)	Thomas	Abott	Oh
SE	Reasonable. <u>Weapons</u> 135 incidents (1	0.7% <u>Cases</u> 39% judges D district 2) RCA	→ Search in PS worse, → student Report can happen.
Improve Search.	Reasonable Suspicion 10% (2009-2011)	Search not intrusive	→ Random
Legal	Reasonable Suspicion. Metal detector.	6x =	→ <u>Arrest</u> ↓ <u>Made</u>
Recruit	Drug usage higher	Kids reporting Crime when Trusted	→ More Searches lead to more Students in
80% - 20%	Reasonable Suspicion. Evidence. Substance Abuse	Probably 1 in 2 M.	+ Evidence in
Discrimination Discrimination.	5/	Searches in guns brought to school Drug Test.	
23%			
New Interview tech.			
→ Evidence → Continuation. + Cross Exam	+ style + Gro Exam. Strong Exam.	(4:15) <u>SRO</u> ↳	<u>Reasonable</u> Weapons ↓ discipline
→ 2M. Study → Increase Trust.	→ 95% now violate → 12% growth → Better Ser Decrease arrests by 48%.	++ Circ.	Increase Trust With Weapons <u>Search</u>