

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Harker FS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Lauren Fu	27.5	4
	Nikki Solanki	28.0	3

NEGATIVE

POS	CandT Youth Technolog CW	POINTS 30	RANKS
	Evans Chen	28.0	2
	Bill Wu	28.5	1

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

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

Signed: Nalpalapati

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Good arguments and counter arguments to the point
- Present proof of evidence

Room: ^{AKS} Kennedy C
Flight A: Start 10am
Public Forum March Novice

1

BD Bala, NS

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks BB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Roanak Baviskar	28.5	3
	Akhil Bhamidipati	28.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Valey Christian KS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ishani Karmarkar	27.5	4
	Deepal Sanghrajka	29	1

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

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

Signed: _____

Akhil Bhamidipati

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Contentions with examples and shades were good
- Evidence to the arguments

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Quarry Lane TM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Tara Tran	28	1
1	Yuvi Mahadeshwar	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose VA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Nishat Vemuri	27	4
2	Abhinav Aeruva	27	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from QUARRY LANE TM.
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 had better contentions than NEG.
AFF ~~had~~ pushback rose above to the point
and NEG couldn't answer questions effectively.
NEG contentions were not strong enough, not
convincing.
NEG didn't offer good evidences.
AFF was very good in challenging NEG contentions.
AFF's evidences were stronger and they were well
prepared to defend them.
AFF won debate by margins.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks LS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Ryan Le	26	3
1	Dinesh Sen	25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Quarry Lane DK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Nehal Desai	27	1
2	Aneesha Kalur	27	2

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG had better contentions.
AFF was weak in presenting their case.
AFF contentions were not convincing and couldn't back up with evidence.
AFF was not able to answer questions from NEG.
Although, NEG case was not as strong they won by the fact the AFF team case was weak.
NEG won crossfire as well.
AFF was not convincing.

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Cabin John Middle XX		
	Rohit Harapanhalli		
	Adlee Heshmat		

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Brooks DG		
	Neeti Dhomse		1
	Aarushi Gupta		1

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

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

Signed: _____

(JANJAY KAMBOJ)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFFIRMATIVE TEAM DIDN'T TURN UP
SO NEG TEAM GIVEN WALKOVER.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks GM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Arunav Gupta	29.5	1
	Ishan Maunder	29.0	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Homestead ZW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jennifer Zhou	26.5	3
	Cynthia Wang	26.0	4

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

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

Signed: _____

(SANJAY KAMBUS)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF 1st - Too fast.

Lack of Articulation.

Good Evidence (Better)

NEG 1st - Very Good Arguments & Reasoning
Good Evidence.
Good Articulation

- NEG Presented Arguments better

Crossfire - AFF team did much better here & NEG didn't answer well with evidence.

2nd → Good Arguments.
Slightly Neg 1st

2nd. Good Arguments.
Slightly Aff 1st → Neutral.

Crossfire - Better Evidence.

Affirmative team won this round.

Summary - AFF scored much better with great evidence.

RFD → AFFIRMATIVE WON MOST ROUNDS ON BETTER CROSSFIRE Qs & SOLID EVIDENCES & NEG TEAM COULDN'T HANDLE THEIR ARGUMENTS WITH CREDIBLE EVIDENCES, though their argument seems good.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	CandT Youth Technolog LY	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ethan Liu	26	3/2 4/3
2	Jeffrey Yin	27	1/4 2/3

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks GJ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Rhea Guliani	24	4/3 2/4
2	Keya Jonnalagadda	27	2/3 1/4

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

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

Signed: Tram Dang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- argued better.
- stuck to resolution better
- argued under both arguments
- shouldn't have brought up evidence until final four

Arts
Room: Kennedy F
Flight A: Start 10am
Public Forum March Novice

1

BK Dang, Tram

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	CandT Youth Technolog	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Erkai (Patrick) Zhang	27	3
1	Manxuan (Michelle) Gao	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Quarry Lane IW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Musab Imran	28	2
2	Inaara Walji	28	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Quarry Lane IW
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 did not address full resolution
- brought up good points, fully addressed resolution

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	CandT Youth Technolog H2	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Oliver Hu	28.5	2
3	Tiger Zhang	28.7	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas MS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Ashutosh Madhu	26	4
2	Brandon Schletzbaum	28.2	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from CandT Youth Technolog H2
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 won by providing good compelling evidence on major issues. The ~~AFF~~ team is well prepared with research studies. Neg provide good contention that Aff did not refute well.

- Speaker 1 - good research & speech
- 2 - good presenter, confident & persuasive
- 3 - very good speaker.
- 4 - Need ~~to be~~ more confidence & preparation

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks MM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	2 Rishabh Mandayam 4	28.5	1
1	1 Jedd Miguel 4	27.5	243

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga BY	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	1 Balakumaran Balasubraman 4	28.5	32
2	1 Siavash Yaghoobi 4	28.5	4

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

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

Signed: Dante

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG won by providing clear compelling
contention that were not well refuted
by the AFF.

Room: Kennedy B
Flight B: Start
Public Forum March Novice

1

CD Chellani, Var

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

BYE - No Show

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Brooks XX		
	Michelle Ng		
	Yukti Vijay		

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	CandT Youth Technolog LP		
1	Vincent Li		
2	Sheng Po (Frank) Yang		

The better debating was done by the Neg from CandT Youth Tech
AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

BYE

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Milpitas LC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Nicholas Luc	25	4
1	Divyesh Chotai	25	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks GT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Savvy Gupta	28	2
2	Sahith Tummala	28	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from Brooks GT
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg wins on Trans Discrimination and homophobia. This is never refuted by Aff, who instead says that it doesn't impact education, in spite of the fact that Aff's first contention deals with social outcomes.

School functioning and implementation debate won by neither.

Aff's misrepresentation of a copyright warning to mean that somehow the study isn't ready for publication is reason enough for them to drop the round.

Neg successfully turns Aff's Test Scores—South Korea/Florida with their neurological arguments, which Aff in turn never addresses.

~~As the subject is not for a formal debate, the Neg must to use~~

Arts
Room: Kennedy E
Flight A: Start 10am
Public Forum March Novice

1

~~AU Kamboj, Sanja~~

Jin, Shu

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	SURLI RV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Arian Raje	27	1
1	Roshan Verma	26	2

NEGATIVE

POS	CandT Youth Technolog WS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Joseph Wobus	26	3
1	Kevin Su	26	4

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

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

Signed: Shu Jin

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF team won this round of ~~the~~ debate by delivering convincing arguments in an organized and confident way.

NEG team needs to prepare better in advance and during the debate managed the time better to cover all the key arguments. Basic skills to improve: eye contact, and no sign of nervousness.

A1 needs to end his speech in conclusive statements.

Both teams need to go after the opponent's weak arguments.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	CandT Youth Technology CY	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Grace Chen	26.5	3
2	Paxon Yu	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Homestead CC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Gloria Cheng	27	2
2	Benji Chia	26.5	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from CandT Youth Technology CY
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- The AFF team won the debate for the following reasons
- Cited a number of studies about single-gender schools improving academic scores and getting the NEG team to concede that academic scores were a part of ~~the~~ measuring overall quality of education
 - The AFF team brought in the notion of choice - allow some public schools to do this, even if it results in some benefits. The NEG team was not effective in countering this with the argument ~~of~~ that it was not worth the energy and money.
 - Both teams debated well and made a number of other good points - well done!

Room: Kennedy G
Flight A: Start 10am
Public Forum March Novice

1

CD Mahadeshwar

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Single Gender classroom
would improve the quality
of education in American
public schools

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Evergreen VK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sravya Voleti		
	Samya Konda		

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks GS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Rohit Ghoshal		
2	Aarushi Sahejpal		

The better debating was done by the NEG from Brooks GS
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 team was a no-show

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Homestead ZW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Jennifer Zhou	25	3
2	Cynthia Wang	25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker FS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Lauren Fu	28	1
1	Nikki Solanki	27	2

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted con for the following reasons:

- ① The con team spent their rebuttal speech effectively addressing pro's contentions and covering both sides of the flow
- ② I do not believe that it is necessary for boys and girls to be separated because they learn best at different room temperatures, and Lauren did an outstanding job ~~convincing me~~ convincing me that there are no real learning differences.
- ③ The pro team brought up new evidence in Final Focus which isn't allowed and the con team pointed it out.
- ④ PRO only had one example of Hilary Clinton coming from an all girls school and doing well socially.
- ⑤ The con team extended and impacted all the necessary arguments in Final Focus

Jennifer & Cynthia: project more and be more confident about your claims!
NIKKI & Lauren: great job & good civility 😊

Room: Kennedy A
Flight A: Start ASAP
Public Forum March Novice

2

CD Kalur, Sai

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose VA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Nishat Vemuri		
3	Abhinay Aeruva		

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks XX	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Michelle Ng		
	Yukti Vijay		

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:

Opponent no show (after 1 hour wait)

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks GJ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Rhea Guliani	26	4
3	Keya Jonnalagadda	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	CandT Youth Technolog HZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Oliver Hu	28	2
4	Tiger Zhang	29	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from C&T
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:

This was a close debate. Everyone did very well. The neg team won on the strength of their persuasion.

Rhea: Spoke well. Can improve by paying ^{more} attention to the opposing team's speech. ~~He~~ Gave the ^{first} X-fire question to the opponents every time.

Keya: Good cross-fire. Acknowledging that the evidence of the aff vs that of neg did undermine the case. But well done overall.

Oliver: Very persuasive speaker. Well done in the X-fire.

Tiger: Awesome job! Very quick, deliberative and strong debate.

Room: Kennedy H
Flight A: Start ASAP
Public Forum March Novice

2 BK Mulaomerovic,
Schleferbaum, Jammie

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks DG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Neeti Dhomse	26	3
2	Aarushi Gupta	27	1

NEGATIVE

POS	CandT Youth Technolog	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Erkai (Patrick) Zhang	27	2
1	Manxuan (Michelle) Gao	26	4

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

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

Signed: Jammie Schleferbaum

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: (Debaters: Look at judge during Cross fire)

Michelle - 23 seconds left in Speech (4 min Speech)

Neeti 21 seconds left in Speech (4 min Speech)

Patrick - 28 seconds left in 4 min Speech.

Aarushi - Good job covering neg case. Ran out of time at the end. You can finish your sentence after time but there is no "grace period"

Aff: Do not just repeat your case in Summary. Narrow it down to what is important in debate.

RFD: Neg talked a lot about social interaction but did not give tangible impacts of lack of social interaction. Aff had statistics proving test scores improve with single gender schools.

Room: Kennedy H
Flight B: Start
Public Forum March Novice

2

~~BK Mulaomerovic,~~
Schletchaum, Jammie

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Quarry Lane IW		
1	Musab Imran		
2	Inaara Walji		

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Cabin John Middle XX		
	Rohit Harapanhalli		
	Adlee Heshmat		

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

no show

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Valey Christian KS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Ishani Karmarkar	29.5	1
1	Deepal Sanghrajka	27.0	3

NEGATIVE

POS	CandT Youth Technolog LY	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ethan Liu	29.0	2
2	Jeffrey Yin	26.5	4

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

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

Signed: Michael Conlin

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- AFF Team was more convincing overall. Provided good reference data/studies to support single gender benefits. Also addressed all Neg contentions well, even cost if single gender improves the quality of Education. AFF Team also won grand crossfire addressing Neg contentions well.
- AFF Speaker 1 a little weak on crossfire #1, Also did not use all her time during second speech.
- AFF Speaker 2, strong & confident & clear. Excellent final wrap up.
- Neg Team focus was on transgender, challenging data, and cost only, brought up again after AFF team addressed transgender choices (co-ed forex) and studies of improvement. Neg team only strong on addressing cost issue.
- Neg Speaker 1 strong, good frame work, well organized with 5 contentions, very good crossfire responses. (2nd crossfire)
- Neg Speaker 2 stumbled at times, flow could be better. Appears computer slowed him down, hence he ran out of time. Final wrap up weak.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Brooks GT		
	Savvy Gupta		
	Sahith Tummala		

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Evergreen VK		
	Sravya Voleti		
	Samya Konda		

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

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

Signed: Michael Conklin

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NO
SHOW

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Quarry Lane DK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Nehal Desai	26	2
	Aneesha Kalur	25	3

NEGATIVE

POS	CandT Youth Technolog CY	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Grace Chen	25	4
	Paxon Yu	29	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from CandT Youth Tech.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~For~~ To: the 1st speaker of CandT. Your speech was over time, by about 40 seconds.. Please pay attention to the time next time.
Other than that. The CandT. team made a stronger argument on cost of education & benefit.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks GS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Rohit Ghoshal	26	2
	Aarushi Sahejpal	27	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Quarry Lane TM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Tara Tran 2nd	26	3
	Yuvi Mahadeshwar 1st	26	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Brooks
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:

The evidence Neg. team provided is not very clear. Also the Facebook argument is weak. A social network should not determine how the school defines its classes.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	CandT Youth Technolog CW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Evans Chen 2A	28	1
	Bill Wu 1A no pacing no emphasis	25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks MM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Rishabh Mandayam 3N	27.5	2
	Jedd Miguel 1N	27	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from CandT Youth Tech.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Cassie Chen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A: Single classroom

C1: single gender classrooms more efficiency

C2: segregation provides more in-depth learning.
teacher address individual concern.

C3: coed less.

2A

2A: rebut AC1: only making single sex class
for only family life class.

rebut AC2: single gender family life class

C1: single gender family life class overall
improve education.

go through puberty help

CF: Broader framework

Aff's interpretation is narrow. But why

1N: Affr has burden of proof must prove
segregation promotes better education.
Bully more in single sex classroom.
poor communication b/c genders.
oneside curriculum.
not economic feasible. \$4500/school/yr

2N: single gender classroom → all school, not
only one classroom
only family life irrelevant to topic.
not prepare for real world.
boys/girls have diff curriculum.

it's wrong? Neg. failed to defend.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Homestead CC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Gloria Cheng	26	#2
	Benji Chia	25	#3

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks GM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Arunav Gupta	23	#4
	Ishan Maunder	27	#1

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

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

Signed: KLan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Calorra → The sent as bad too
fast. - slow down:

Negative → Social skill as important as
screaming to be learned from social.

Positive → Very little evidence though
the arguments are good.

-ve → Done thorough research.
→ The arguments are compelling.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Milpitas MS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ashutosh Madhu	24	2
	Brandon Schletzbaum	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks LS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ryan Le	25	3
	Dinesh Sen	26	2

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

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

Signed: K. Chellani

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Posite → Quality of education.
→ Gender / team arguments →
→ providing a choice is good.

Neg → Good definition of quality of education

Posite → Good point and valid evidence.

→ Some teams have very less evidence.
However team with high quality evidence can be debated
with compelling reasons.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	CandT Youth Technolog LP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Vincent Li	28.6	3
1	Sheng Po (Frank) Yang	28.5	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks BB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Roanak Baviskar	28.8	1
1	Akhil Bhamidipati	28.7	2

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

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

Signed: Akhil Bhamidipati

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both AFF & NEG presented their arguments passionately.
However NEG team convinced me with setting up a
framework and arguing to support their framework with
examples and studies.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	CandT Youth Technolog	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Joseph Wobus <i>very clear w/ emphasis</i>	26	4
	Kevin Su	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas LC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Nicholas Luc <i>too fast</i>	27	3
	Divyesh Chotai <i>clear, good pace</i>	29	2

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: Cassie Chen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A: sexual health: single gender class
C1.
C2. more indepth learning
C3. Coed promote stereotype

as long as show
1N: Single gender class proves no diff.
↓
has no burden of proof
C2: economic cost.
C3: segregation promotes stereotype.
Schools being suit. have to drop segreg.
costly to defend law suit.

CF Affirm: legal issue w/ only single gender school, not single gender program.
no child specifcally allows single gender program left behind act

1N: entire school would lose funding if lost Resolution ~~they~~ *doesn't* say have to focus on sex

2A:
CF Neg 2N persuasive argument: Framework is broader & include Affirm's framework.

2N: Aff. failed to show impact of SG. educ. to student future.

1A: research shows seg. gender class → ~~less~~ lower dropout,
~~no legal~~ Neg. has abusive framework.
no way to prove effect of all seg. x x classroom

2N: talks about overall education
opponent: cherry pick on sex education.
Title 9 doesn't matter.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks NV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	MICHELLE NG (Vinayak Nadig)	28.0	4
	YUKTI VISHAY (Sahith Vaddi)	28.3	3

NEGATIVE

POS	SURLI RV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Arian Raje	28.5	1
1	Roshan Verma	28.4	2

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

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

Signed: Alex Palapati

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Neg team presented framework and arguments to support their framework in a better way.
- Both teams presented thoughtful contentions but aff team was able to defend ~~and~~ the contentions in a better way presenting some studies.