Reasonable suspicion vs. probable cause

Abbey

Joseph

Gail Kernes (*1)
Round 3A 2:00pm D207
Pro: 15 Walji - Narasimhan
Con: 2 Mossbridge - Poten
Varsity Public Forum

RAGHJD
ALY

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: GAIL KERNES GK 10/8/16

Judge's School Affiliation: ALBANY

PRO: Team Code #: 15 (ESA)

CON: Team Code #: 2

Pro Speaker #1 WALJI pts 27 Con Speaker #1 MOSSBRIDGE pts 26

Pro Speaker #2 NARASIMHAN pts 26 Con Speaker #2 POTEN 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:

WAJII

Pro 1:
+ Begins w/evidence
+ clear communicator w/ valid reasoning
+ questions on point

Pro 2: NARASIMHAN
+ argument + issue of Racism assoc. ation
± indicates correlation without proof to search
– No specific evidence provided
– DIDNT ask if Ready.
+ Crossfire indicates this

mossbridge
forgot time starts now.

Con 1: + Good eye contact
– not responded to challenge of Brain development is better addressed w/ reasonable suspicion.

Con 2: POTEN + Rebuttal to 95% argument that there isn't evidence reasonable suspicion standards = examine search
+ pointed out limited argument
→ CON does a good job to suggest this is not the cause only addressing part of declining crime in schools to reasonable

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Better REBUTTAL

95% to JBII for nonviolent but not clear. this argues against Reason suspicion. implies only violent crime should be cause for search.

Rose Macias (*9)
Round 3B 2:00pm D210
Pro: 4 Nachuri - Lee
Con: 5 Menon - Anderson
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Rose Macias

Judge's School Affiliation: LOGAN

PRO:	CON:
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Pro Speaker #1 NACHURI pts 28	Con Speaker #1 ANDERSON pts 28
Pro Speaker #2 LEE pts 27	Con Speaker #2 MENON 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:

WELL SPOKEN, PRESENTS INFO CLEARLY. SHOULD ALLOW OPPONENT TO ANSWER BEFORE MOVING ON TO NEXT ISSUE.

Pro 2:

SPEAKS LOUDLY, BORDERLINE SHOUTING AT TIMES

Presented information well

Con 1:

SPEAKS VERY QUICKLY but clear
Organized info & evidence

Con 2:

GREAT SPEAKING PACE (Quick & clear)
Arguments easy to follow

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The CON TEAM PRESENTED THEMSELVES WELL AND WERE VERY COURTEOUS. THE AFFIRMATIVE TEAM WAS WELL PREPARED BUT I FELT AS THOUGH THEY STRUGGLED SLIGHLY MORE AND TENDED TOWARDS AGGRESSIVE TONES WHEN PRESENTING THEIR ARGUMENTS

Rose Macias (*9)
Round 3A 2:00pm D210
Pro: 12 Chan - Park
Con: 3 Zhang - Cohen
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Rose Macias

Judge's School Affiliation: LOGAN

PRO:	CON:
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Pro Speaker #1 PARK pts 27	Con Speaker #1 COHEN pts 28
Pro Speaker #2 CHAN pts 28	Con Speaker #2 ZHANG 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:
Speaks rapidly, hard to catch every word
organized info
Good volume
A little aggressive during crossfire

Pro 2:
Good use of facts

Con 1:
Clear presentation
organized info

Con 2:
Maintained composure during aggressive crossfire
spoke with confidence

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Overall it was a messy argumentative debate. Both sides were passionate but the Pro team tended towards intimidation during crossfire. I awarded the win to the Con team because they remained confident in their argument under duress.

~~Carol Lloyd (*13)~~
Round 3A 2:00pm D211
Pro: 3 Dyke - Jung
Con: 12 Roy - Ahluwalia
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Rick Fehr

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 12	
Pro Speaker #1 Dyke	pts 26	Con Speaker #1 Ahluwalia	pts 26
Pro Speaker #2 Jung	pts 27	Con Speaker #2 Roy	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 increased income and taxes seemed a little off point

Pro 2: great delivery & eye contact good cross-ex ~~the connection between community & negative impact could have been stronger~~ convincing arguments

Con 1: good delivery/eye contact the connection between community & negative impact could have been stronger

Con 2: good point that community and lack of punishment lead to lower respect excellent conclusion

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

More convincing presentation

~~Carol Lloyd (*13)~~
Round 3B 2:00pm D211
Pro: 11 Kapoor - Weiner
Con: 12 Kabra - Satoor
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Rick Fehr

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #: 11		Team Code #: 12	
Pro Speaker #1 Kapoor	pts 27	Con Speaker #1 Kabra	pts 28
Pro Speaker #2 Weiner	pts 27	Con Speaker #2 Satoor	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 insight to recognize positive impact of honesty
good point about the negative impact of unwarranted search

Pro 2:
excellent cross-ex questions
great point about negative impact of unwarranted search

Con 1:
very clear presentation and conclusion
strong safety arguments

Con 2:
consistently good response to cross-ex
very good to cite bias as being in people - not systems

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

More convincing presentation

Tobi Thomas (*14)
Round 3B 2:00pm D209
Pro: 3 Luo - Malhotra
Con: 15 Abbott - Sen
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Mary Rock

Judge's School Affiliation: Logan

Team Code #: PRO: 3 Team Code #: CON: 15

Pro Speaker #1 Luo pts 26 Con Speaker #1 Sen pts 28

Pro Speaker #2 Malhotra pts 27 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: ✓ Good speech but partner hard to hear. Using technical debate terms not always understood by judge

Pro 2: Strong delivery. Passionate.

Con 1: Strong delivery & XF careful to not cut-off partner in XT.

Con 2: Very passionate delivery Don't assume judges understand links & other jargon

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both sides had strong arguments, but CON was able to refute more contentions and PRO dropped key points

Aff

#1

Good delivery ✓ ✓

Privacy/Trust

Second Speaker

Safety

Security & privacy

~~Cost~~

more criminal

Delivery: OIC

Too much focus on racism

Probably change NOW

Damage more students

Abuse of change

Why change statistics

Cross

recreational use

Stop & Frisk examples

Unconstitutional

Neg

Safety

Cross fire ✓

Goal or Reason for change

Second

Safety or rights ???

Minors

evidence to reduce?

System create racism both

more control

Cross

Issue criminal justice system

PLEASE IGNORE

Kaustubh Vijapure (*15)
Round 3B 2:00pm D208
Pro: 12 Kim - Chou
Con: 3 Oh - Thomas
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: ~~The Quarry Lane~~ Kaustubh Vijapure

Judge's School Affiliation: The Quarry Lane School

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #:	12	Team Code #:	3
Pro Speaker #1	Kim pts 28	Con Speaker #1	Thomas pts 29
Pro Speaker #2	Chou pts 28	Con Speaker #2	Oh 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:
Case put forward with valid and pertinent points. Q/A session - could have fared better

Pro 2:
Listed points of opponents case and rebutted with effective evidence. Was not able to provide evidence for one rebuttal.

Con 1:
Spoke very well - put forward case with well laid out points & supporting evidence. Very ~~well~~ good responses during cross-fire.

Con 2:
Spoke well, listed opponents case with compelling rebuttals. During cross fire, posed some good questions and responses were very good.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams debated well with some very good case points and supporting evidence. However, during both cross-fire sessions the Con team's performance was better.

Kaustubh Vijapure (*15)
Round 3A 2:00pm D208
Pro: 19 Page - Crosby
Con: 1 Xu - Li
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Kaustubh Vijapure

Judge's School Affiliation: Quarry Lane School

PRO: 19

Team Code #: _____

Pro Speaker #1 Page pts 27.5

Pro Speaker #2 Crosby pts 28

CON: 1

Team Code #: _____

Con Speaker #1 Li pts 28.5

Con Speaker #2 Xu 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 though a bit fast at times; put forward several quotes & references - could have connected better to the case being presented.

Pro 2: Responded very well to questions post presentation during cross fire was very impressive.

Con 1: Spoke well, clearly putting forward the points of the case. Well articulated & laid out speech.

Con 2: Listed points of the case clearly. Spoke confidently and responded well during X fire.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

The debate was very closely contested, with both teams putting up good cases & doing well during Crossfire. However, the con team edged forward in the final focus during summarizing the cases.

~~Tobi Thomas (*14)~~
Round 3A 2:00pm D209
Pro: 3 Magid - Levi
Con: 12 Hwang - Matley
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Mary Rook

Judge's School Affiliation: Logan

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 12	
Pro Speaker #1 Levi	pts 28	Con Speaker #1 Matley	pts 29
Pro Speaker #2 Magid	pts 25	Con Speaker #2 Hwang	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: 1st speech delivered well
Good job responding in XF
Nice passion in your speeches

Con 1: Strong 1st speech - well delivered
Very firm in XF
Strong reasoning

Pro 2: Speech very scattered.
Hard to follow. At one point sounded like you were drawing MEG.
Confused in XF
2nd speech better. Organized

Con 2: Excellent rebuttal. Called Aff on critical pts. Easy to follow points and arguments
Very good in XF - clear & quick

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Con's case stands on most points. Clearly negated majority of Aff contentions.

Ruby Kaur (*9)
Round 3A 2:00pm D205
Pro: 4 Bhakhat - Kuang
Con: 11 Wang - Wallerstein
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Ruby

Judge's School Affiliation: Logan

PRO:	CON:
Team Code #:	Team Code #:
Pro Speaker #1 Bhakhat pts 27	Con Speaker #1 Wallerstein pts 28
Pro Speaker #2 Kuang pts 27	Con Speaker #2 Wang 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, but need to slow, too fast

Con 1: Good, confident but need to slow down.

Pro 2: speak clear Good, confident, improve pronunciation

Con 2: Good, Need to work on pronunciation more

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

REASON FOR DECISION: They are good, confident have evidence, facts

Deborah Weiner (*11)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 8
Pro: 9 Uppal - Sekar
Con: 4 Kiran - Pillarisetti
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Deborah Weiner

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PRO:
Team Code #: 9

CON:
Team Code #: 4

Pro Speaker #1 Uppal pts 28 Con Speaker #1 Pillarisetti pts 25

Pro Speaker #2 Sekar pts 27 Con Speaker #2 Kiran 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: Provided a good introduction and strong points on rebuttal. Very clear speaking style.

Pro 2: Good use of statistics and strong response to rebuttals.

Con 1: Overall well organized but I found the attitude to be slightly disrespectful.

Con 2: Good examples of SRO's and harms but presentation style limited impact

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
This was a close debate but in the end PRO did a more effective job at arguing their points and rebutting. Stylistically, PRO was more sophisticated. CON needs to work on being respectful to other team and not yelling.

1 PRO	2	1 CON	2
Analysis special needs doctrine Demonstration of school "What is reasonable"	special Needs Doctrine Bozedon Supreme Ct. - news made differ from P.C → SRO's "Impact is mitigated" Cost & prob. not relevant really to minee justice system 80% effective vs. 12% effective good response to 1st	Decriminalization 1) parents 2) Would graduate 3) lack of training 4) Coersion 5) Funds → ↓ $ for ↓ 6) Politicall pressure 3 ways why SRO's ↑	Different standards for teachers & SRO Police at fault Argue probable cause definition teachers more dependent on SRO's Argue good reasons & ↑ SRO's
Evidence good data for weapons arrests → drop outs More searches of racial groups		All Bad Argue to prove case standard	
Reasoning they dropped on impact good argument against why they didn't prove case	Scalia Card probable cause is flexible - case to case explained 2-prong well rise response ↓ they consent refute		Argue w/ Definition, But turn need warranty; Rights & Safety only Brought up at end
Rebut/Cross asking about harm & reasonable suspicion lack of probable cause → SRO		prevention; really intention just to go.	explain 2 prong process
Delivery good organization & style		well organized disrespectful	stop yelling

In US K-12 schools, the probable cause standard ought to apply to searches of students

Deborah Weiner (*11)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 8
Pro: 15 Vijapure - Sen
Con: 3 Clark - Wornow
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Deborah Cahn Weiner

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte

PRO: Team Code #: 15

CON: Team Code #: 3

Pro Speaker #1 Sen pts 27 Con Speaker #1 Wornow pts 26

Pro Speaker #2 Vijapure pts 27 Con Speaker #2 Clark 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: Excellent introduction and outline made it clear where argument was going. Nice use of stats + data. Stylistically could slow down a bit.

Pro 2: Very good summary, succint and organized. Very effective responses to questions + rebuttals. Great speaking style – sophisticated

Con 1: Did a nice job with overview of case but did not effectively handle the questions posed and misinterpreted some of opponents points.

Con 2: Overall good organization but presentation style was slightly slow + unsure. Need to show more confidence in your statements

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Overall, PRO did a stronger job at presentation and rebuttals.

PRO

1

Analysis

good intro of problem - Rqmt standard
1) ↑ discrim w/ data
2) Trust Betw. teachers & students

Evidence

good definition racial diser.
④ students → more offenses

Reasoning

SRO's create mistrust

Rebut/Cross

why do SRO in crime?

never saw teachers Bias

need hard evidence

how do SRO cause mistrust

Delivery

rushed.
too much eye -

2

correlation ≠ Causation
Don't know # of searches
↓
addressed time issue well

NOT cost efficient to get SRO's
⑤ Don't define non-serious crime
Attained each point well

SRO's create mistrust → Cost-Benefit Analysis
Boils down to one point - SRO's

impacts are not unique
no response to Discrimination
They did not respond to issues asked about

SRO's can act under RS?
Actual to claim argument

good summary

CON

1

Framework
- Safety most imp.

warrant is time consuming
2) ↑ SRO lead to communication
3) SRO → crime
good data points

~~RQ~~ Q of those cannot do not graduate

Did not respond effectively to questions re: Grand

Response crime → prime so asserted

How does PL eliminate racial discrim.

→ Bc asserted unfairly.

clear speedy style

2

- Safety should be priority could do well if not safe

SRO's: under PL or RS?

PL increased racial Bias

SRO's create more mistrust - But Data?

Links to SRO's exonerate

3 points
1) Still catchy crimes under RS
2) SRO's are educated in legal system
3) teacher Bias? I Don't remember that

racial Bias impact
from SRO → Jail dehumanizing from

crime is a crime? need a second chance

seem unsure of self.

Jim Hwang (*12)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 5
Pro: 9 Ganesh - Donthi
Con: 11 Fox - Khan
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Jim HWANG

Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS

PRO:
Team Code #: 9

CON:
Team Code #: 11

Pro Speaker #1 GANESH pts 29
Pro Speaker #2 DONTHI pts 29

Con Speaker #1 KHAN pts 28
Con Speaker #2 FOX 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 SPOKEN. GOOD POINTS

Pro 2: GOOD PACE.

Con 1: WELL SPOKEN. GOOD POINTS

Con 2: GOOD PACE BUT HARD TO FOLLOW TRAIN OF THOUGHT.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

BETTER AND MORE COHESIVE ARGUMENTS
NEG DID NOT REFUTE ~~EFFECTIVELY~~ CONVINCINGLY

Hao Li (*11)
Round 3B 2:00pm D204
Pro: 4 Jang - Shahi
Con: 9 Wu - Autenreith
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Hao Li

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte High

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	9
Pro Speaker #1	Shahi pts 25	Con Speaker #1	Autenreith pts 25
Pro Speaker #2	Jang pts 28	Con Speaker #2	Wu 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:
- speak too fast, tend to read from scripts, minimum eye contact.
- Not very adaptive,
- strong rebuttal.

Con 1:
- Good composure. nice gesture/eye contact
- Structured arguments
- A bit weak in rebuttal.

Pro 2:
- very tailored & esposes
- good gesture/eye contacts
- solid data with strong delivery. Strong rebuttal with exaple

Con 2:
- good eye contact/delivery style
- Tailored to the ~~situat~~ situation
- ~~st~~

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Hao Li (*11)
Round 3A 2:00pm D204
Pro: 4 Bali - Qin
Con: 9 Srivastava - Wong
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Hao Li

Judge's School Affiliation: Miramonte High

PRO:

Team Code #: 4 28

Pro Speaker #1 Bali " pts

Pro Speaker #2 Qin pts 25

CON:

Team Code #: 9

Con Speaker #1 Srivastava pts 26

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: - good eye contact, tends to speak a bit too fast, needs to slow down.
- great gesturing.
- strong cross fire.

Pro 2:
- speak too fast / nice gesture but lack of eyecontacts.
- has gesture but lack variations.

Con 1: - well structured arguments. could have more eye contacts / gestures
- solid data / evidence

Con 2: - good presentation style: eye contacts / gesture.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Two players consistently delivered better than the other team.

Jim Hwang (*12)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 5
Pro: 9 Rook - Mohanty
Con: 4 Mishra - Rapolu
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Jim Hwang

Judge's School Affiliation: MVHS

PRO:
Team Code #: 9

CON:
Team Code #: 4

Pro Speaker #1 MOHANTY pts 28 Con Speaker #1 RAPOLU pts 29

Pro Speaker #2 ROOK pts 27 Con Speaker #2 MISHRA 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: DID NOT MAKE GOOD USE OF CROSS EX TO EMPHASIZE POSITION

Con 1:

Pro 2: DELIVERY COULD BE MORE SMOOTH.

Con 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PRO DID NOT STAND UP UNDER CROSS EX
NEG WAS BETTER AT DELIVERY AND REFUTING

Pranav Shahi (*4)
Round 3A 2:00pm D206
Pro: 12 Weng - Majewski
Con: 3 Bhasin - Dovichi
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: PRANAV SHAH1

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #: WENG- MAJEWSKI		Team Code #: BHASIN - DOVICHI	
Pro Speaker #1 MAJEWSKI	pts 28	Con Speaker #1 DOVICHI	pts 30
Pro Speaker #2 WENG	pts 29	Con Speaker #2 BHASIN	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:	Con 1:
Pro 2:	Con 2:

3

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
It is all around reasoning for two key debate items:
(1) benefits of searches
(2) criminalization focus - arrests vs. jail

Pranav Shahi (*4)
Round 3B 2:00pm D206
Pro: 12 Hart - Nakahara
Con: 11 Lee - Steinberg
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: PRANAV SHAH

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #: HART-NAKAHARA		Team Code #: LEE-STEINBERG	
Pro Speaker #1 NAKAHARA	pts 28	Con Speaker #1 LEE	pts 28
Pro Speaker #2 HART	pts 29	Con Speaker #2 STEINBERG	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:	Con 1:
Pro 2:	Con 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Reasoning and great last rebuttal. In the last rebuttal it is clearly highlighted that PRO team was in alignment with 3 key factors of this debate - blanket searches, Racism, zero tolerance policies

Suma Kachinthaya (*5)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 7
Pro: 13 Hopcraft - Reicher
Con: 4 Jamal - Sankineni
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Suma Kachinthaya

Judge's School Affiliation: Dublin

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #: 13		Team Code #: 4	
Pro Speaker #1 Reicher	pts 29	Con Speaker #1 Jamal	pts 28
Pro Speaker #2 Hopcraft	pts 27	Con Speaker #2 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: Effective Speaker. Crisp and clear

Pro 2: Can improve on confidence level

Con 1: Passionate speaker. Can slow down while speaking so its easier to grasp the info.

Con 2: Effective speaker.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
This team effectively countered the arguments of the opponents and were convincing.

Suma Kachinthaya (*5)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 7
Pro: 9 Noriega - Yi
Con: 4 Huang - Sun
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Sirena Kachinthaya

Judge's School Affiliation: Dublin

PRO:	CON:
Team Code #: 9	Team Code #: 4
Pro Speaker #1 Noriega pts 27	Con Speaker #1 Sun pts 27
Pro Speaker #2 Yi pts 29	Con 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: Can improve on speaking style. Has good confidence.

Con 1: Can improve speaking technique.

Pro 2: Very effective speaker. Has very good clarity in communicating

Con 2: Can improve on emphasis.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
CON team presented their rebuttal effectively. PRO team was not convincing.

Sepideh Ataei (*12)
Round 3B 2:00pm D212
Pro: 5 Siva - Manthana
Con: 4 Rajkumar - Kapyraboyna
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Sepideh (Sepi) Ataei

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista HS

PRO: 5

Team Code #: 5

Pro Speaker #1 Manthana pts 29

Pro Speaker #2 Siva pts 28

CON: 4

Team Code #: 4

Con Speaker #1 Rajkumar pts 28

Con Speaker #2 Kapyraboyna 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:

Manthana Pro 1: + very well prepared with Facts & evidance
great cross exam
Organized speech
strong reasoning

Siva Pro 2: + great delivery
+ very logical argumnt
natural speaker

Con 1: Rajkumar -needs to make sure the speech doesn't ~~pass~~ go over time.
stay in time-frame.
+ lots of facts.
-needs to deliver in more natural & understandable speech.

Con 2: Kapyraboynd
needs to improve body language.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
well prepared with facts & evidance. Very natural & organized speech professional presentation.

Sepideh Ataei (*12)
Round 3A 2:00pm D212
Pro: 9 Mohammad - Izadi
Con: 4 Srinivas - Mundres
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Sepideh (sepi) Ataei

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista HS

PRO:	CON:
Team Code #: 9	Team Code #: 4
Pro Speaker #1 Izadi pts 30	Con Speaker #1 Mundres (26) pts ~~26~~ 26
Pro Speaker #2 Mohammad pts 29	Con Speaker #2 Sirnivas (28) pts ~~28~~ 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:

Izadi Pro 1: well ~~fact~~ fact based speech. well prepared. very professional presentation. ~~clear~~ clear and easily understandable speech

Mohammad Pro 2: organized delivery great cross exam +good use of evidance. ~~good~~ logical Argument

Mundres Con 1: needs more preparation questions on cross exam were not clear and overlapping. needs to work on improve body language needs ~~different~~ to use different tone and emphesize on certain words not use more natural tone. All of them.

Con 2: Sirnivas + great presentation +very logical argument needs to work on Cross exam. " " " Conclusions.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very professional & prepared speechs with facts and evidence. Civilized & well mannered debate.

Neeraj Chadha (*4)
Round 3B 2:00pm D213
Pro: 9 Meda - Doshi
Con: 11 Stephen - Ruiz
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Neeraj Chadha

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #:	9	Team Code #:	11
Pro Speaker #1	Meda pts 29	Con Speaker #1	Ruiz pts 29
Pro Speaker #2	Doshi pts 30	Con Speaker #2	Stephan. 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:
→ Very clear ~~essay~~ reasoning with evidence
→ Good at analysis & forming convincing arguments
→ good @ crossexam & rebuttal.

Pro 2:
→ Strong & concise arguments with evidence
→ very strong analysis
→ spontaneous & sharp

Con 1:
- Great reasoning with evidence
- consp & clear delivery
- Good with analysis
- Pls work on cross-exam/ rebuttal.

Con 2:
→ Great delivery & clear with arguments
→ Need more depth with analysis

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
- Very clear & depth in analysis
- Strong evidence in support of their arguments.

Neeraj Chadha (*4)
Round 3A 2:00pm D213
Pro: 15 Shvakel - Dhatchi
Con: 3 Durney - Liu
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: Neeraj Chadha

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #:	15	Team Code #:	3
Pro Speaker #1	Dhatchi pts 28	Con Speaker #1	Durney pts 29
Pro Speaker #2	Shvakel 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: Overall fine with analysis
- but lack in providing key evidence.
- Need to work on getting crisp during cross-exam
- Delivery can be better

Pro 2:
- Great delivery & cross examination skills.
- Not very conclusive with evidence.
- Analysis is great.

Con 1:
- Great Analysis with credible evidence
- Great delivery & cross-exam
- Wonderful in connecting dots bet evidence & reasoning.

Con 2:
- Very clear & crisp reasoning
- Great delivery.
- lot of good evidence.
-

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

provided much better evidence & reasoning for their arguments.

PROBABLE CAUSE VS. REASONABLE SUSPICION

Gail Kernes (*1)
Round 3B 2:00pm D207
Pro: 4 Bhargava - Adusumilli
Con: 11 Chow - Ansel
Varsity Public Forum

PUBLIC FORUM Debate

Judge's Name: GAIL KERNES GK 10/18/16

Judge's School Affiliation: ALBANY

PRO:		CON:	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	11
Pro Speaker #1	BHARGAVA pts 28	Con Speaker #1	CHOW pts 29
Pro Speaker #2	ADUSUMILLI pts 28	Con Speaker #2	ANSEL 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: BHARGAVA + CLEAR pronunciation and effective voice level + evidence based. + evidence correlation trust & grade. + evidence based 3 contentions.

Pro 2: ADUSUMILLI, sleeve + pattern of computer ~~evidencing~~ brings attention to team. ~~Text~~ NOT PROVEN that it is + increase SRO and then Benefits of SRO's + SRO benefit supported.

Con 1: CHOW, + proof of ↑ SRO's & with evidence + evidence based contentions. - support/correlation of criminal records & Lack of graduation w/time. to probable cause. + strongly persuasive re. trust higher w/ RS.

Con 2: ANSEL confident and CON 2 ANSEL + Didn't ask if ready. SRO's RACIST w/o evidence confident, practiced speakers. - ASSERTIVE to the point of overtalking CONS held up w/2015 EVIDENCE + ARGUMENT wins on TRUST higher.

Better Reasoning Probable Cause

- notable to LINK warrant to probable cause

Other team

~~Con 1~~ Inter Upts

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

REASON FOR DECISION: BETTER REBUTAL + SROs ↑ safety & TRUST. + evidence against SRO Refuted. + well prepared, excellent style. + won on ↓ RACISM w/ probable cause