

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose HZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Rebecca Hong	28	3
1	Alyssa Zhao	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Evergreen VS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Deepshika Vellaboyina	28	2
2	Navina Senthil	28	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Mission San Jose HZ
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: ☒

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff wins the sexual harassment contention
Neg wins ECG, young children needing to socialize
Aff wins on cognitive development, learning better
Aff's third contention (test scores, 4 year colleges) goes unrefuted
Both teams need to more directly make the distinction between classrooms
and schools, and to address the implications of Title IX.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Mountain View LS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Laura Liu	27	27(4)
2	Jonathan Shi	27	27(3)

NEGATIVE

POS	Evergreen KK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Harika Kalluri	28	28(2)
2	Meghna Kolli	29	29(1)

The better debating was done by the NEG from Evergreen KK
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- argued opponent's contentions better
- had more evidence than opponents
- try to wrap up better w/ own framework at end

2

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Homestead AR	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Andrew Allen	27	27 (3)
2	Vaibhav Ramamoorthy	28	28 (1)

NEGATIVE

POS	Foothill FH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Bryce Fan	29	29 (1)
1	Arthur Hwang	29	29 (2)

The better debating was done by the NEG from FOOTHILL FH
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- PRO dropped 3rd contention
- NEG wrapped up better
- more evidence
- argued better, didn't just use logic

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Milpitas XX	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Amal Mulaomerovic	28.5	1
1	Grace Shau	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose SC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Shiv Salwan	27.8	3
2	Andrew Choi	27.5	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from MILPITAS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Christine Salah

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted for the affirmative because I feel that the aff side showed more data in support of higher academic benefits. Yes, it was only 2 schools, but it was real data. The neg side had an excellent point about costs, that is a huge issue. But they could not defend the fact that their data was about single gender schools not single gender classrooms. If the neg could prove that single gender classrooms were more expensive that would be really helpful.

Grace
(1st)
Very good crossfire about transgender

Amal
• excellent eye contact
• very good delivery and emphasis

Shiv
• great eye contact
• very clear enunciation
* great staying professional about the time issue

Andrew
• loved road map
• Very good
(2nd) crossfire about transgender-bullying happens more ~~there~~ worse in single gender environ.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Milpitas KG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ruby Khan	27	3
2	Armaan Ghedia	26	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Homestead WB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Samantha Wu	28	2
1	Swagata Biswas	28.5	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from Homestead
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Christine Salah

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted for the negative because their data seemed more solid. They made a lot of good points about ^{fact that} the real world is co-ed, so kids need to learn to work in that environment. (whether in the classroom or on the playground, etc) They also cited that stereotyping is perpetuated in single gender environments but the data backing that up wasn't very clear. Finally the gender-questioning/gender-diverse students would suffer in having to decide about which classroom makes sense but there ~~was~~ not a lot of data (it is mostly speculation)

The affirmative side stated the longitudinal study about how single gender environments increase outcomes. This was a good point, but the rest of their evidence was limited to a story about one person (Cynthia Delgado) who had ^{an} improved outcome. That is weak evidence.

Ruby good points, but
- Don't simply read fast to me
- Show me a roadmap in the beginning of what you will argue.

Armaan
- you seemed to rely on limited data
- give me a sense of what you will argue

Swagata
- very positive energy/attitude
- very good eye contact, Great enunciation

Samantha
- good road map/good eye contact
- good citing evidence

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Quarry Lane CG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2A	Tanishka Chellani	27.4	3
1A	Ron Gupta	27.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose MA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2B	Nihal Maunder	27.4	2
1B	Kunal Agarwal	27.1	4

The better debating was done by the Neg from Mission San Jose MA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: yes

Signed: Single gender classroom would improve the quality of Education in American Public Schools

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1A Nice speaking style. Clear concise presentation of the material. Good awareness of what is going on. Knows when to pull back. Good offense.
- 1B Good speaker, Good refuter, try to stay calm and make your point. Identify when to let conceder point & harp on ~~their~~ opps points.
- 2A Good speaker, sometimes little monotone, try to argue more during crossfire
- 2B Good speaker, Good debater, Careful though can come across as a ~~overpowering~~ reader. Let other good hammering on stab to hide your weakness
- Overall the debate went on more on statistics than the substance. In the heat of argument pro did not refute the negs point very well (several hammered, leaving to co exist). Just for this reason the debate goes to neg as the pro did not get time to refute all points substantively. Neg did not refute the extracurricular point

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks KS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2A	Devesh Kodnani	27.3	1
1A	Sukhman Singh	27.4	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose SA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2B	Nikit Shingari	27.1	4
2A	Vineet Advani	27.3	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from Brooks KS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Single gender classroom would improve the quality of education in American public schools.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1A Good Speaker. Good presence of mind. Nice refutes. Be sure to bring the evidence.
- 2A Good Speaker. Nice concise presentation of the points. Nice presence of mind. Mindful of not wasting the time in gathering the evidence.
- 1B Good Speaker. Forceful refutes. Good presentation of the material. Try to stay within the rules of the debate.
- 2B Good Speaker. Concise presentation of the material. Nice presence of mind. Focus on logical refutes and try to find what in the case rather than state evidence.
- Debate for pro side focused on the deficit of the topic & hypothetical question. Nicely integrated studies with point single gender classrooms. The con could not refute the case although lack of evidence on hypothetical question which was made very clear by pro. Hence ~~debat~~ Con could not refute the case effectively. Debate goes to Aff.