

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Quarry Lane CG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Tanishka Chellani	29	3
1	Ron Gupta	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks KS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Devesh Kodhani	29.5	1
1	Sukhman Singh	27	5

The better debating was done by the Aff from Quarry Lane
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams were WAY too reliant on evidence.

EVIDENCE IS MEANT TO SUPPORT YOUR ARGUMENTS,
 NOT MAKE THEM

Both sides need warrants for evidence. Aff needs to remember res says, "Significantly" meaning a small improvement in test scores DOES NOT meet. Res needs to extend contention-level clash. U-pillar is a strategy to increase Aff burden but you didn't hold them to it! You need to clash. Test scores is schools ↓. Tell me how you outweigh! Alternate route does not work in a topic that says nothing about implementation.

Winner: ~~Aff~~ ~~Aff's too statistical things~~
 Aff. Barely meet given burden

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	MISSION	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Mission San Jose HZ		
	Rebecca Hong		1
	Alyssa Zhao		1

NEGATIVE

POS	MISSION	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Milpitas KG		
	Ruby Khan	No Show	
	Armaan Ghedia	No Show	

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

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

Signed: [Signature] Notre Dame.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Mountain View LS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Laura Liu	29	1
	Jonathan Shi	28	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose SC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Shiv Salwan	28	2
	Andrew Choi	28	3

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

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

Signed: A.C.R. Jander Notre Dame

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

LS focused on quality of education based on SAT
Test results and supporting information
SC focused on economics which secondary for this
topic. Also the are AFFIRMATIVE claims.

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Evergreen KK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Harika Kalluri	26.5	(3)
2	Meghna Kolli	27.2	(2)

NEGATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose MA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Nihal Maunder	27.9	(1)
1	Kunal Agarwal	25.5	(4)

The better debating was done by the NEG from MISSION SAN JOSE
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: S. S. Malitharan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Single gender class room?
 1A they put the burden of proof on neg.
 Args for diff between males & females.
 2) increases participation.
 3) Prof is better.

2N Transgender. Single gender should not be in &
 sex harassment - SSE promote boys groups?!

2A. Poked hole @ gender arg.
 By putting boys & girls in a single class room.
 good examples.

2N Quality of education is more than test scores.
 Poked strong arg against diff between boys & girls.
 Single gender only support stereotypes -
 Poked strong holes @ South Carolina & North Carolina.
 No benefit for single gender education.

CROSS
 Good cross exam -
 All team won. Poked hole about gender.

Nihal: Very engaging, forceful and convincing - Strong rational arguments, good performance

Kunal: Bit nervous. Need to engage audience more -
 Need to ~~understand~~ repeat the core of his args more. Was very good in 2nd round.

Very strong arguments

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Foothill FH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Bryce Fan	29	1
1	Arthur Hwang	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Evergreen VS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Deepshika Vellaboyina	27	3
2	Navina Senthil	26	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Foothill
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 set up a strong initial case, Need to link more to own Paradigm of equal education. How does harassment link to education? Too reliant on evidence at times, close to doing the debating for you. If you're going to do that, you need more warrants. They dropped your initial case, hit that! Excellent crossfire

Neg needs to understand importance of meeting own paradigm, it's how you will be judged. Don't drop initial case. Fix crossfire, you spend way too much time on defense. Factor in common sense: not everyone goes to church! Against a heavily technical team, engaging them on that front is more useful than focusing solely in superficial analysis. They lacked warrants, tell me that!

Winner: Deeper analysis, Aff

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Homestead WB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Samantha Wu	27	44
3	Swagata Biswas	27.5	33

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas XX	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Amal Mulaomerovic	28	41
2	Grace Shau	27.6	34

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

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

Signed: M. A. [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff:

Contention 1: Men + women have different learning cultures
 Males have detrimental effect on women's education
 Gender-inclusiveness seems to be teaching

Contention 2: Eliminate gender stereotypes

Swagata Biswas: reality from prepared text

Contention 3: Encourage cooperation

Crossfire: Relevance of 3rd contention?

Differences in framework - small.

Single sex classes overcome stereotypes + greater self-esteem.

→ Samantha Wu: evidence that teachers work better in single-gender classrooms.

More money spent on single-classes, not spent on improving economic situation.

Crossfire:

Are we talking about single-sex classrooms in mixed schools?

Re-iteration of contentions: single-sex teaching will give greater confidence. Samantha Wu: Study is controlled for funding - proves that teachers in prep better classes.

interesting attack on relevance of non-US research

Neg:

Contention 1: Inconclusive research + stereotype
 Contention 2: Unnecessary, does not ignore based on analysis

Contention 3: Unnecessary cost

Grace Shau: Clear speaking quality of teachers bigger factor

Crossfire: Evidence from non-US schools. Relevance of UK research?

Amal Mulaomerovic - very direct, clear

Agreed framework as utilitarianism, more educational research in UK relevant?

Segregation means gender-stereotypes

Crossfire: Does not separate how their introduction to general society.

Grace Shau: isolate factor that ignores education. What an alternative to single sex education?

Single sex schools fail.

Preparation for society?

Amal Mulaomerovic:

SCU PHILAETHIC
 Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose SA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Nikit Shingari	28.2	3
2	Vineet Advani	28.3	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Homestead AR	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Andrew Allen	28.2	4
1	Vaibhav Ramamoorthy	28.5	1

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

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

Signed: mta Gilchrist

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Nikit: clear, somewhat aggressive?

Contention 1:

Contention 2: Single sex girls benefits are more

Contention 3: Students improve in single-sex classes

Contention 4: Participation: Phys Ed improves

Contention 5: Behavioral benefits: harassment + bullying decline

Crossfire: Real world experience

Vineet: School does not have to be microcosm of real world.

Not all classes have to be single sex.

Mixed sex classes re-inforce genders.

Crossfire:

Nikit: Minorities benefit from single-sex classrooms.

Single sex classrooms enable choice of STEM.

Pinetown study: mixed classes encourage behavior to gender stereotypes.

Vineet:

Enjoyed utilizing to challenge statistical basis of studies, + causation.

Andrew:

Contention 1: Non real-world environment

Contention 2: Reinforce gender stereotypes
 Study says single sex schools do not do any better.

Stereotyping in classroom can be discriminatory.

Good prep in response to questions
 Challenge statistical basis of Aff contention 2.

Vaibhav: flawed research because does not use random assignment, good students choose single sex classes.

Preparation for real-world under pressure
 Establishing connection between single sex classrooms + outcome.

Crossfire: What is purpose of education? College or working classroom.

Andrew: Need to show causation
 Brief filed by ACLU.