

# SCU PHILAETHIC

## Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

### AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Evergreen VS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Deepshika Vellaboyina	27	2
2	Navina Senthil	28	1

### NEGATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose SC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Shiv Salwan	26	3
2	Andrew Choi	25	4

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

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

Signed: *Mark*

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

"Single-gender classrooms would improve the quality of education in American Public Schools"

Affirmative

Affirmative via sociology and psychology  
 Stereotype threat  
 Differences in learning  
 Test-scores provide evidence  
 Single-gender classrooms as an option/Alternative  
 not as a primary means of education

Negative

- Defines quality of education using UN definition  
focuses on an economic scale
- Discrimination: inter-grouping bias

Test results are not conclusive enough to confirm single-gender classrooms as a better alternative

All four students were heavily repetitive: causing contradiction and straying from topic

All sources used and cited were from school studies

# 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	25	3
2	Meghna Kolli	24	4

### NEGATIVE

POS	Quarry Lane CG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Tanishka Chellani	26	2
1	Ron Gupta	27	1

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

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

Signed: Mark

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

"Single-gender classrooms would improve the quality of education in American Public Schools"

Affirmative

- Definition of single gender classrooms
- Argument (hopes) to examine prompt through benefits of cost
- Focuses on psychology and sociology

Negative

- Definition of single gender
- Controlled experiment test results will be construed
- Single-gender classrooms does not provide "beneficial preparation for the real world"

Questionable sources cited by both sides: i.e. LA Times, Huffington Post

Many holes on both sides of arguments and speeches.

Began to stray from topic and debate by way of making it personal.

**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	28.5	1
1	Arthur Hwang	27.5	3

**NEGATIVE**

POS	Brooks KS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Devesh Kodhani	28	2
1	Sukhman Singh	27	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: Mitch

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

2nd aff speaker -  
 1) do a better job labeling your arguments. Make sure you know the difference between offense and defense. ~~Make sure you know the difference between offense and defense. Make sure you know the difference between offense and defense. Make sure you know the difference between offense and defense.~~  
 If their impacts happen in both worlds, that's just a reason why they can't flourish, not why yours is any better — thus, it's not a win. Don't confuse yourself into thinking you can win off of no-solving arguments.  
 2) good on-the-fly rebuttal. (appreciate your use of analytic arguments despite using no prep time)

2nd neg speaker -  
 1) you need to have better coverage of his responses to your case. He has 4 arguments against each of your points and you only respond to the first ones.  
 2) don't repeat yourself. If you make an argument that can apply to more than one of his arguments, explain that when you first make the argument. You waste valuable time saying their same explanation multiple times — you do this ~~over and over~~ when you say their arguments aren't specific to single policy claims but are talking about complete resolutions. ~~Make sure you know the difference between offense and defense. Make sure you know the difference between offense and defense. Make sure you know the difference between offense and defense.~~  
 3) I think you have pretty high quality responses to the aff's arguments

1st aff & neg  
 don't go for too much in your final speeches. You only have 2 minutes, if you try to go for all the points, framework, interpretative content, you won't be able to sufficiently develop any of them.  
 RFD: aff says no implementation, all neg has left is defense.

Flight A

**SCU PHILAETHIC**  
 Santa Clara University  
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POS	Homestead WB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Samantha Wu	27.5	2
1	Swagata Biswas	28	1

**NEGATIVE**

POS	Milpitas KG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ruby Khan	27.0	3
2	Armaan Ghedia	26	4

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

IA Effective, graceful, good speaking skills. Contributions put forward were evidence based. Quoted several studies to form the basis of their arguments.

IN: Good speaking skills. I would have liked to hear more evidence based contributions. It would have helped, if their first contention, about quality of education & USDE was elaborated.

IIA: Eloquent speaker. Made better arguments than the opponent in the cross examination.

IN: did a fair job with final focus. However, wasn't well prepared & didn't convince me about the argument on hindrance to male learning. Single sex classroom.

I give my vote to AFF since they had more evidence based arguments and convinced me that by encouraging competitiveness, addressing different/unique learning style of each gender, it would ~~be a better~~ improve quality of education.

# SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose MA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Nihal Maunder	30	1
1	Kunal Agarwal	29	2

## NEGATIVE

POS	Homestead AR	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Andrew Allen	27	4
2	Vaibhav Ramamoorthy	28	3

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

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

Signed: Di Allen

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff 1 (Kunal): Excellent <sup>opening argument</sup> ~~opening argument~~ - Well structured and lots of excellent data/evidence, but unable to ~~take~~ challenge to relevancy of some evidence.

Aff 2 (Nihal) Excellent clash with opponents' evidence, outstanding arguments, very persuasive and logical. Excellent clash on all arguments from opponents, ~~take~~

NEG 1 (Andrew) Outstanding speaking skills, excellent structure and good evidence, but possibly too much reliance on evidence based on single people vs statistical data from larger studies. ~~Dropped opportunity to respond to some of opponents~~

NEG 2 (Vaibhav) Excellent speaking skills but some rebuttals lacked tangible evidence and were therefore less persuasive. Dropped response to some of opponents' points. Very elegant speaking style.

# SCU PHILALETHIC

## Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

### AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose SA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Nikit Shingari	29	3
1	Vineet Advani	30	1

### NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas XX	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Amal Mulaomerovic	29	2
1	Grace Shau	29	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from MISSION  
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:

Aff 1 (Vineet): Outstanding opening argument and excellent responses/clash with opponents arguments.

Aff 2 (Nikit): Outstanding speech and clash. ~~Wrote response to certain points but~~ response to all points made by opponents.

Neg 1 (Grace): Excellent opening argument, great evidential support, drafted response to bullying point.

Neg 2 (Amal): Excellent clash and rebuttal of opponents' evidence, very precise arguments well backed up with data. Could not answer critical question about key evidence after challenge

# SCU PHILAETHIC

## 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	2
1	Alyssa Zhao	27.5	3

### NEGATIVE

POS	Mountain View LS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Laura Liu	28.5	1
2	Jonathan Shi	27	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: [Signature]

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted for Aff because the team was able to show that single gender classrooms would be beneficial with the help of better studies with names of authors and methodology explained. Neg could have done a better job of refuting the other team during cross. They failed to do so convincingly.