



Room: SHAH 403  
Flight 1 Start: 9:00 AM  
Public Forum

1

Balasubramanian,  
Suresh

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT Communication

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Harker Suryadevara & Khatri	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Ananya Suryadevara	23
1	Anoushka Khatri	24

Spkr	Milpitas Stanley & Bilaskar	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Amy Stanley	25
1	Nikita Bilaskar	22

Winner: Milpitas School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? YES

Signature: [Signature] School: Communication Academy

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Harker

Milpitas

- Needs to slow down - (NB)
- (AS) speaks much better, more understandable.

- ~~hesitant~~
- well articulated points

(AK) had some good facts supporting her argument.

- Resources for refugees get

fresh.

- Crossfire was very light. → only 1 question.

- Both teams not prepared with enough crossfire questions.

Both teams need to be better prepared with facts, more at their finger tips!

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT Communication

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Harker Song & Jia	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Yejin Song	27
1	Angela Jia	26

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Golden State Maharana & Huang	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Lakshay Maharana	28
2	Howard Huang	26

Winner: Golden State School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: Comm Academy

GS had a better well constructed set of arguments with evidence!

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- ① govt should support their citizens
- ① Resources (Resource Contention)
  - Resource contention
  - Jobs competition
  - team should have addressed the national interest contention.
- ② Xenophobia
  - ~~ban~~
- ③ Economic Backlash
- Economic impact counter was a good one.
- it would help the team to have more evidence ready and don't hesitate to interrupt!

- (LM) uses good evidence to support
- ① - National interest. his claim. [smuggling]
  - Moral. →
  - Economic.
    - well prepared with facts.
    - Economic impact shown as <sup>the</sup> good evidence
    - Moral obligation.
  - Economic evidence is very strong
  - Good example of tying Economic impact to evidence. xenophobia.
  - Much better with specific numbers
  - I like the connection between Economic impact → welfare/homeless

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

TEAM A

TEAM B.

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Golden State Liu & Dixit	POINTS (20 - 30)
② B	Jacob Liu	28.5
① A	Arnav Dixit	29

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Sharma...	POINTS (20 - 30)
② B	Garima Sharma	28.5
① A	Priyanka Janjanam	28.5

Winner: GOLDEN STATE LIU/DIXIT School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: HARKER

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Very Close Debate, good powerful and passionate speakers,
- Con team won on the basis of arguments on population concerns, xenophobia, and better citation of sources.
- More notes on reverse.

⑩

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

2nd

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Milpitas Garg & Karkare	POINTS (20 - 30)
①	Mehak Garg	28.5
②	Saili Karkare	29

Spkr	Brooks Shah & Vasani	POINTS (20 - 30)
①	Sajiv Shah	29
②	Arya Vasani	28.5

Winner: Milpitas Garg / Karkare debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: HARKER.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Extremely close debate
- Speakers were well prepared and showed good elocution skills
- CON won because they were able to discredit the "good for economy" argument
- More notes on reversal.



# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Zheng...	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Shannon Zheng	29
	Sanjana Raganathan	25

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Terman Middle Balakrishnan & K...	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Ishan Balakrishnan	28
	Ezra Kohrman	28

Winner: Terman Middle & debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team Kohrman and Balakrishnan

Signature: Chanda School: Harker

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro: Ezra and Ishan had strong logic. They need to develop themselves to be more forceful speakers. They stayed course and were less perturbed by their opponent's rudeness and personal attacks.

Cons: Shannon and Sanjana are great speakers and presented their case forcefully. They did not present enough logic and could not evolve from their original stand and were constantly repeating the same points. They need to work on their logic. In addition, throughout the debate the con side ~~is~~ would not let pro speak, was constantly interrupting and was disrespectful. It looked unhealthy. ~~It~~ It appeared they did not want to debate and just wanted to hear their own voices.

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

**PRO** CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	TCA Hiremath & Ranjan	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Adarsh Hiremath	29
	Rishabh Ranjan	28

Spkr	Milpitas Alam & Virmani	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Novel Alam	25
	Rohan Virmani	25

Winner: TCA Hiremath & Ranjan debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Chanda School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro: Presented good logic, very thorough and thoughtful. Was able to adapt to opponent's claims and evolve their logic and presentation

Cons: You presented your case well. With some additional prep you will be able to provide more examples to make your case stronger. Good luck!

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

**PRO** CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Garg &...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Anika Garg	28
1	Puja Oak	20

Spkr	Milpitas Huang & Ho	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Daniel Huang	<del>21</del> 26
2	Chin-Hsing Ho	<del>20</del> 25

Winner: Dougherty valley School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win?

Signature: Jean Chung School: Atiiva

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro =

2 - human right, economic, help out other country, clear.  
crossfire - Successful  
Summary -

2 - more personal opinion  
crossfire -

Summary - have wrong time, didn't finish it

Con =

1 - reading her essay, no eye contacts, not confident

crossfire -

Summary -

2 - doesn't have strong supporting points

crossfire -

Summary -

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Golden State Nethi & Karwa	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Pranav Nethi	28
4	Saniya Karwa	28

Spkr	Gurukulam Enrichment Center N...	POINTS (20 - 30)
3	Vishnu Naroth	27
1	Ayan Patel	27

Winner: Golden State NK School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*refugee topic Con*

→ disasters displace 27m ppl from ~~developed~~  
 → climate change environmental

Current crisis  
 hum. need - designed to protect lives  
 → benefits outweigh the harms

C1 Developing countries  
 86% - majority, econ burden, strains

C2 brain drain  
 → will never be able to rebuild, deprives country

C3 govt should prioritize own citizens  
 → First prioritize own citizens, not int over hum

→ 1st speaker successfully won cross-fire; should support own case as well

→ does not define brain drain clearly - I understand but other judges might not

→ refugees harm economy - rise in housing price

→ Syrian crisis - main crisis

→ needs empirics! weigh across round

→ Won based off of C3, I did not buy C2.

→ good structure for final focus

*Pro*

C1  
 → CO<sub>2</sub>, greenhouse gas emissions  
 → developed nations - high C footprint

→ long-term solvency  
 → climate migration  
 → donor teams

C2 - benefits econ directly  
 → take blue-card job that citizens will not take, wage ↑  
 → can still help refugees, not necessarily *provene*

→ more offense in cross-fire needed  
 → should fill up rebuttal time; rebuttal needs structure - # your arguments!  
 → arguments should have concrete impacts; did not buy 1C  
 → great 2nd contention - should emphasize more  
 → helps CON according to resolution  
 → 2nd speaker should be more active in grand cross

- both sides need to weigh their arguments!



# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One) 2nd

1st (Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Young Genius Christainsen & Pan	POINTS (20 - 30)
4	Philip Christainsen	27.2
1	Anthony Pan	28

Spkr	Redwood Middle Nair & Sarathy	POINTS (20 - 30)
3	Dhruva Nair	<del>26.9</del> 27
2	Kavya Sarathy	27.8 28

Winner: Young Genius Christainsen & Pan School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Con** Refugee Topic

- refugees dangerous
- ↳ someone fleeing
- C1 refugees dangerous
- Islamic fighters sneaking in - terrorism
- group fighters slipping into Europe
- Hungary, Slovakia - reject quotas, mass muslim migration bad
- express-uk.com - 4000 ISIS into two nations
- C2 Refugees threaten stability
- social, econ stress
- infra. strain, \$4 bill deficit + \$2 bill
- C3 Cannot absorb refugees
- can't provide basic needs, 19 mill. currently refugees, host countries like Lebanon can't absorb, camps are flooded

**Pro**

- current crisis → Syrian rebels
- hum. needs → basic necessities
- national interests → what everyone wants
- nat interest < hum. needs
- A1 Refugees can help
- less likely to commit crimes
- helps economy;
- displaced, 1.5 want refuge
- Syrians in danger - life/death, face persecution
- A2
- need food, water, safety, medicine
- home country is a war zone
- Syrian kurdi: people dying

**RFD**

- Rebuttals need more offense & less defense
- All up speech times
- Dropped the argument that terrorists can be smuggled into European countries
- CON won based off of rebuttal & immunity - successfully attacked Pro's case.

- fill up speech times
- did not refute the Con's argument that refugees strain infrastructure, food & water, etc.
- Great job in crossfire

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Terman Middle Zhang & Naddell	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Max Zhang	29
1	Leo Naddell	26

Spkr	Nova 42 Kyle & Agarwal	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Daniel Kyle	29
1	Priya Agarwal	25

Winner: Terman Middle School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision: Terman won by a hair. Nova 42 won the security argument but Terman had more hard evidence on other topics v.s. obnoxious on the other side. Very close though.

**CON**

**PRO**

Leo

- National Security
- <sup>Terror</sup> Gain access
- Cost & Economic difficulties
- Lose jobs

Which countries agreed?

Max

- International Law } refugees
- Lebanon

+1  
+1

Raising wages?

Priya

- Legal & Moral
- Call for help from others
- Obligations are to all people not just citizens
- Refugees benefit residents
  - help economy
  - raise wages
- Neglecting refugees harms gov
  - has security risks

+1 (who refugees)  
+1

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

**PRO** CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Milpitas Pallapati & Sandhu	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Hannah Pallapati	28
1	Esha Sandhu	20

Spkr	BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Clab Choi	25
2	Ian Zhang	27

Winner: Basis Independent School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Anurag Kahol School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision: Hannah made very good arguments but were not backed up by Esha. Basis was more consistent.

- ① Greatest good for the greatest # of people
- 30% global warming due to wood burning
  - Refugees cause health risks
    - malaria, cholera
    - diseases will travel to other countries
    - overcrowding

Cross Saving resources? X +1, +1, +1

② waste of money?

- ① National Economic
- Waste money for better
  - Focus more on our people
  - Germany sagging

Cross where are the camps - evidence produced

- ②
- Don't make camps
  - Health not an issue
  - Disease caused on ships

+1 eth How does clean water help?  
 +1 Not enough money  
 +1

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Gale Ranch Middle Huang & Sun	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Jennifer Huang	28
1	Lauria Sun	27

Spkr	Harker Saksena & Hoskote	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Riva Saksena	26
2	Adi Hoskote	25

Winner: Gale Ranch Middle Huang & Sun debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Aavani School: Milpitas

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Lauria Sun

↳ polite, but forceful  
↳ good cross-ex questions

Jennifer Huang

↳ very confident

Riva Saksena:

↳ soft spoken (doesn't seem very confident)

Adi Hoskote

↳ stuttering, not really confident

Gale Ranch Middle HS

- strong points and effective counter
- consistent attack on Aff.
- emphasis on framework
- clear evidence and presentation of evidence

Harker Saksena & Hoskote

- consistent advocating of their own points- building and supporting.
- Clear emphasis and denial of the Neg accusations.

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

**PRO** CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Harker Awais & Wang Belle	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Zain Awais	28
1	Bryan Wang Anna Belle	29

Spkr	Golden State Sundaram & Niu	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Aditya Sundaram	27
2	Alex Niu	26

Winner: Harker Awais & Belle debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team

Signature: K. Ramesh Kumar School: Redwood Middle School

Comments & Reason for Decision: Team successfully refuted opponents contentions with Evidence.

Anna - contentions and good Evidence.

Zain - Nicely Refuted opponents contentions with supporting Evidence.

Aditya - clear contentions and good Evidence.

Alex - Good clarity in communications. suggest structure your thoughts and ask questions clearly.

Use preparation time between rounds to organize questions.

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

**PRO** CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Challenger School SY Karim & K...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Isha Karim	28
2	Nithya Koneru	27

Spkr	Harker Reddy & Sajoi	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Anshul Reddy	29
1	Dhruv Sajoi	28

Winner: Harker Reddy & Sajoi debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team

Signature: Ramesh Kumar School: Redwood Middle School

Comments & Reason for Decision: Good Questioning, Quantitative Evidence,

C1 ✓ Blue collar jobs - Labor market  
 ✓ Economic Growth Source  
 C2 ✓ Conflict re - refugees are not responsible.  
 C3) Foreign govt responsible.  
 - Organize your thoughts prior to cross fire rounds.  
 - Better coordination between you both is required.

C1 Good Evidence and supporting data  
~~Source~~  
Anshul - good Refute questions.  
~~Good~~  
 Dhruv - use your full time allotted, speed up your speech.

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO  CON (Circle One)

(Circle One)  PRO  CON

Spkr	Harker Su & Sun	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Alisa Su	28
2	April Sun	27

Spkr	Communication Dogra & Kuo	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Aaina Dogra	28
2	Grace Kuo	29

Winner: Communication Dogra & Kuo debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team

Signature:  School: MHS

Con: Stronger argument and evidence, an error on speech  
Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro: evidence was not strong enough  
a few of their points were too close to make them separate points  
speech for Alisa is nice

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015


PRO  CON (Circle One)

(Circle One)  PRO  CON

Spkr	Gurukulam Enrichment Center R...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Aryak Rekhi	27
1	Ashwath Bhupatiraju	28

Spkr	Harker Jeyendran & Xu	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Vidya Jeyendran	28
2	Sidra Xu	29

Winner: Harker Jeyendran & Xu debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team

Signature:  School: MHS

Comments & Reason for Decision: Con: strong debate and great evidence  
good analogy that was relatable  
great speech

Pro: good & reasonable arguments  
however, not enough reasons that were strong



# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

**PRO** CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Brooks Gattapally & Kurapati	POINTS (20-30)
4	Shruti Gattapally ✓	25
2	Varshita Kurapati ✓	26

Spkr	Golden State Yan & Gong	POINTS (20-30)
3	Daphne Yan ✓	26
1	Caroline Gong ✓	27

Winner: GOLDEN STATE School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: TERMAN

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFFIRMATIVE CASE IS AN ASSUMPTION THAT REASONS TO HELP SYRIAN REFUGEES IS "PURE", WITH IMPLICIT REASONS OF COMPASSION, MORALITY, ETC → BUT THEY DO NOT ARTICULATE MORE THAN EVIDENCE FOR REFUGEE SUFFERING. THIS IS NOT A FRAMEWORK BY WHICH WE CAN WEIGH REASONS TO HELP REFUGEES VS. NATIONAL INTEREST. EXPLORED THE LEGAL, MORAL, POLITICAL RAMIFICATIONS → DON'T JUST SAY THAT IT IS OBVIOUS.

THEN THE DEBATE CENTERS AROUND HOW MUCH + TO WHAT EXTENT NATIONAL INTEREST IS AFFECTED BY REFUGEES. BOTH SIDES REPETITIVELY WOULD BRING TO THE SAME ARGUMENTS + EVIDENCE (TOO MUCH ON THE CONSIDERED EVIDENCE !!) RELEVANCE

THE FACT WAS A WITH, WITHOUT COMPASSION ARGUMENTS TO BRING GOVT DESTABILIZATION, ECONOMIC BENEFIT, TRANSPARENCY.

ULTIMATELY, AFFIRMATIVE LOST BECAUSE OF A LACK OF COHERENT FRAMEWORK WHICH EXPLAINS WHY HUMANITARIANISM OUTWEIGHS NATIONAL INTEREST.



# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...	POINTS (20 - 30)
4	Cathy Chang ✓	25
1	Helen Hu ✓	27

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Ha & H...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Rebecca Ha ✓	26
3	Mahika Hazra ✓	26

Winner: DOUGHERTY VALLEY School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: TERMAN

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A CHALLENGING DECISION BECAUSE BOTH TEAMS COULD DO BETTER TO MAKE DIRECTLY  
 ADDRESS EACH OTHER'S ARGUMENTS, BUT MORE IMPORTANTLY, SHOULD TRY TO PRIORITYZE  
 ARGUMENTS FOR THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE RESOLUTION AND TO SYNTHESIZE THOSE  
 ARGUMENTS FOR THE JUDGE. TOO MUCH TIME ON BOTH SIDES DEBATING  
 DEFINITIONS + POINTS WHICH HAD NO RELEVANCE (eg. DEFINITION OF "CRISIS")  
 + ECONOMIC MEASURES vs. RESOLUTIONS

AFFIRMATIVE MADE CASE FOR HIGHER ORDER ("MORE OBVIOUS", "JUST GOVERNMENT")  
 NATIONAL INTEREST, BUT ALSO MADE ARGUMENTS THAT  
 NATIONAL INTEREST WOULD BE SERVED. NEGATIVE FOCUSED ON TELETONIAN IMPACTS  
 ON NATIONAL INTEREST BUT DID LITTLE TO EXPLAIN ~~HOW~~ HOW THESE POTENTIAL  
 IMPACTS SHOULD OBTAIN THE HIGHER ORDER ARGUMENTS PROVIDED BY THE AFFIRMATIVE.

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

Spkr	Gurukulam Enrichment Center A...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Indu Abhilash	28
2	Nazhah Mir	27

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Harker Tian & Tian	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Nicole Tian	28
2	Betsy Tian	28

Winner: Harker School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: Milpitas

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The economic benefit for GDP and fiscal policy seemed to outweigh other points. While both sides were fantastic, the pro side gets the win.

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO  CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO  CON

Spkr	Harker Liou & Ding	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Kenneth Liou	30
1	Jeremy Ding	29

Spkr	Brooks Bugata & Srivastav	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Mira Bugata Rohan Chakravarthi	27
1	Alaina Srivastav	27

Winner: Harker School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Nicolas Martinez School: Milpitas

Comments & Reason for Decision:

All points made outweighed the con side's argument.

6

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Nova 42 Wilson & Park	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Cara Wilson	29
1	Felicity Park	28

Spkr	Gale Ranch Middle Kuang & Zho...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1?	Vivian Kuang	28
2?	Ada Zhong	26

\* the first speaker received 28 pts

Winner: Nova 42 School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? low

Signature: Meghna Nanda School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision:

\* Overall very good debate  
◦ both sides addressed their respect points very well

CON:

\* ample evidence was to your advantage  
\* if you have conflicting evidence then explain why yours is better  
↳ this happened when you said "well my evidence says this..."

PRO

\* CON found loopholes through your case by asking for evidence you could not provide as much  
\* if the CON side puts your framework under theirs then say why your framework doesn't do so and why it's better  
\* analogies were good but not as comparable to the refugee condition → concrete evidence is better

Overall:

• bit more eyecontact but very well-presented  
• good organization



# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Team - B  
 MILPITAS

TEAM A  
 REDWOOD (Circle One)

PRO

CON

(Circle One)

PRO

CON

Spkr	Milpitas Kumar & Shritroya	POINTS (20-30)
2	Devika Kumar	29
1	Saniya Shritroya	27.5

56.5

Spkr	Redwood Middle Jain & Kaza	POINTS (20-30)
1	Rishi Jain	28
2	Siddharth Kaza	27.5

55.5

Winner: MILPITAS School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: HARKER

Comments & Reason for Decision: Was very close, both teams presented and defended well, Devika both rounds was very prepared, delivered and refuted well.

Q1: Well being  
Citizens  
 C: Impact on economy  
 → Crime  
Social Problems  
Security  
 → Ecology  
Pub Services - Health, education  
Refugee - Iraq, Pakistan  
 → Big impact on economy  
 - Damaging  
 → Interest on  
 Q: Case Sources -  
Case relates to humanitarian needs?  
 C2: Moral obligation

Q1: SAUNIYA  
 ⊕ More lives saved  
 - Syria  
 - Europe  
 - Bombing, ISIL  
 - Germany, Africa  
 - Needs help, 12%  
 ⊕ Moral obligation  
 - UN refugee - moral crisis  
 - Lebanon  
 ⊕ Help country and economy  
 - Language, Profession  
 - Self sufficiency  
 Q1: -  
 C2 → water, house is contaminated  
 C1 → How it impacts economy

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr		POINTS (20 - 30)
	<b>BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...</b>	
	Albert Chu	
	Andy Lu	

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr		POINTS (20 - 30)
	<del>Communication Lin &amp; Mohideen</del>	
	<del>Brendon Lin</del>	
	<del>Anees Mohideen</del>	

Winner: BASIS Independent School/Team debating on the \_\_\_\_\_ Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: HARKER

Comments & Reason for Decision:

We waited for over 20 minutes until 10:30 AM. The other team did not show up.



# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr		POINTS (20 30)
	<b>Brooks Dhillon &amp; Sudharsan</b>	
	Harneet Dhillon	
	Roshni Sudharsan	

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr		POINTS (20 - 30)
	<del><b>BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...</b></del>	
	<del>Cindy Li</del>	
	<del>Amulya Aditham</del>	

Winner: Brooks debating on the \_\_\_\_\_ Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Harker  
Basis no show

Comments & Reason for Decision: \_\_\_\_\_

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

**PRO** CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Terman Middle Goel & Naddell	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Swati Goel	30
1	Elise Naddell	25

Spkr	Atiiva Garg & Patra	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Manasi Garg	27
2	Aindri Patra	28

Winner: Atiiva Garg & Patra debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision: Excellent team work, stated their points very clear. Great grand crossline responses.

Elise Naddell: Speaks very fast, difficult to follow. Asked irrelevant Q? Read the entire presentation (long) from the script and never finished. Did not participate in the cross fires.

Manasi Garg: Great presentation, was not fully read at a script. Strong response to questions. Did not provide evidence when asked for. Excellent in Grand crossline arguments, clear answers.

Swati Goel: Strong and to the point arguments, addressed all the issues & contentions. Excellent figure at speech. Excellent in grand crossline arguments, answers. Excellent closing statement.

Aindri Patra: Confident, firm, Barely referred to notes. Addressed all the issues in other team's arguments. Excellent closing statement.

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Harker Mantripragada & Pakravan	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Ishaan Mantripragada <i>Shyl Lamban</i>	25
2	Sascha Pakravan	23

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Ahuja &...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Ishita Ahuja	28
1	Shaurya Nyamgoudar	26

Winner: Doughtery Valley Ahuja debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? 2  
School/Team

Signature: Cathy Peng School: Terman

Comments & Reason for Decision: Con team did not come up clear argument for their position.

Shaurya: confident, good gesture, speaking loud  
Lack of eye contact, on the paper all the time, time went over a little.

Shyl: clearly state his arguments, confident,  
Good eye contact, time management good  
Questions are too long, Not given opponent enough time.

Ishita: Great confidence with good eye contact  
Good examples to argue, clear points

Sascha: confident, clearly defend the position  
little too emotional.

Accol prob example is not relevant  
pro team concluded clearly their positions.  
con team did not come up sensible arguments.



# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Harker Dani & Gupta	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Arnav Dani	23
1	Pranav Gupta	25

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Kapara...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Rahul Kaparaboyna	26
1	Jeevan Rajkumar	26

Winner: Dougherty Kapara debating on the pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? 4

Signature: Cathy S School: Terman

Comments & Reason for Decision: Pro team clearly stated their arguments

Con team addressed the polar warning over the referee, but fail to provide evidence. Not able to clearly define their position.

Pro team is well prepared. clearly stated their points. Ask right questions and answer to the point.

All are confident, great team spirit.



# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Golden State Noru & Mogli	POINTS (20-30)
1	Sahana Noru	27
2	Riya Mogli	27

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Manku...	POINTS (20-30)
1	Akash Mankude	26.5
2	Rohit Srinivas	29

Winner: Dougherty Valley Bridge School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: Tom Penick School: Milpitas

Pro ~~side~~ explained the argument of terrorism/

Comments & Reason for Decision:

refugees / Germany very well. The rebutted this argument and refuted.

Sahana 1  
 • adequate speed  
 • clear voice  
 • needs to enunciate more  
 • summary speech was very choppy

Akash 1  
 • not announcing  
 • speaking to fast and slurring words  
 • don't agree to their questions!  
 • practice speaking

Riya 2  
 • do not repeat your arguments to waste time.  
 • do not explain your intentions in your fourth!

Rohit 2  
 • very nice speaking voice  
 • nice pace  
 • nice analytical arguments  
 • very good to use 5 main points

• Aff case was better organized  
 • don't read the card in crossfire. you should know it if it is in your case.  
 • ~~Needs~~ needs to use a variation of arguments  
 • ~~the~~ Aff in rebuttal has logical arguments. ↓  
 • brought the security/terrorism, Germany arguments (Aff)  
 • brought the aff standard

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Chandr...	POINTS (20-30)
2	Romir Chandra	28.5
1	Suchit Bandaram	26.5

Spkr	TCA Pai & Ramakrishna	POINTS (20-30)
1	Ronak Pai	26
2	Ashwin Ramakrishna .	27.5

Winner: Dougherty valley School/Team Bridge debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Marc Pomke School: Milpitas

Comments & Reason for Decision: bought their terrorism/standard/America non unique arguments

~~Romir 2~~  
 Suchit 1  
 very unclear speech  
 very choppy. its hard to follow on your thought process

Romir 2  
 very nice explanations for rebuttes  
 strong point in crossfire

Ronak 1  
 • stutters too much  
 • ~~too~~ standard doesn't have to come from resolution

Ashwin 2  
 • nice pace  
 • arguments were not logical

• bought off argument on standard weighing and prioritizing it right now (US)  
 • bought the terrorism argument from off (non unique)

not WWII camps? not current. (con)  
con evidence is too old. 2005?

• conditions in EU are better than in Syria (pro)



# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

Spkr	Gurukulam Enrichment Center V...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2N	Akash Vemulapalli	29
1N	Pranav Palleti	29

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Milpitas Or & Nair	POINTS (20 - 30)
2A	Maggie Or	27.5
1A	Swetha Nair	28

Winner: Gurukulam Enrichment Center debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team

Signature: Nikita Ramoji School: The Harker School

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Comments given during round.

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

**PRO** CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Atiiva Gupta & Lee	POINTS (20 - 30)
1A	Shama Gupta	28
2A	Audrey Lee	27

Spkr	Young Genius Gupta & Chamarchy	POINTS (20 - 30)
2N	Ajay Gupta	29
1N	Agustya Chamarchy	27

Winner: Young Genius Gupta & Chamarchy School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Nikita Ramoji School: The Harker School

Comments & Reason for Decision:

General Notes:

- look at judge when doing crossfire
- you aren't directly addressing each other's arguments - you both are not explaining why each other's points are wrong, you just say they are wrong.

• other comments were given during round. Ultimately, decision was based on team that best explained arguments and that supported the resolution (focused on most important arguments, not the minutiae of the debate)

65 sec  
Aff prep: ~~42 sec~~ 2:00  
Neg prep: 60s 2:00





# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015


PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Gade &...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Sruti Gade	27.5
2	Riya Bindlish	28

Spkr	Brooks Peruvemba & Ramesh	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Aditya Peruvemba	27
2	Vignav Ramesh	27.5

Winner: Dougherty Valley Bridge AB debating on the con Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature:  School: Milpitas High

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- NEG had a strong case that the AFF did not really attack much during XC
- AFF should try to stay more offensive than defensive
- NEG FW and definitions were really emphasized
- AFF: speak a little clearer and have confidence in your voice
- NEG: good debating, work on organization of speeches a bit

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Golden State Koppurapu & Cho...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Rithvik Koppurapu	28
1	Rishabh Chowhan	27.6

Spkr	BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Amun Asnani	27.8
1	Shrayes Upadhyayula	28

Winner: BASIS AV School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature:  School: Milpitas High

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- NEG emphasis on examples. AFF's main example was Germany
- NEG provides economic harms, security harms, and backlash for harms
- AFF shows reduction of ISIS taking in refugees (reducing terrorism) and economic benefits
- NEG has shown more harms than benefits
- AFF: good debating skills, focus on opponen't case during speeches
- NEG: good debating skills, again, attack rather than defending too much

Room: SHAH 401  
Flight 2 Start: 9:00 AM  
Public Forum

1

✓  
Truong, Alvin  
Milpitas

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

**PRO** **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Harker Wang & Yuan	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Aimee Wang	26
1	Alina Yuan	28

Spkr	Terman Middle Naddell & Lee	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Bruno Naddell	25
1	Peyton Lee	26

Winner: Terman middle debating on the con Low point win? yes  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Milpitas High

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Harker only focused on why another should take in, no evidence for other areas of the world.

14



# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

**PRO** CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Harker Raghiv & Yang	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Reja Raghiv	28
2	Russell Yang	27

Spkr	Challenger School SY Yalamanc...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Tanvi Yalamanchili	25
2	Arnav Garg	<del>24</del> 25

Winner: Harker School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? no

Signature: [Signature] School: Milpitas, high school

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Harker won other team had lack of evidence & were unable to defend some of their points



# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

**PRO** CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Communication Xu & Balasubra...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Jacqueline Xu	28
2	Aeshon Balasubramanian	27

Spkr	Gurukulam Enrichment Center A...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Aadit Agrahara	28
2	Rishi Pasumarthi	26

Winner: Jacqueline Aeshon School/Team \_\_\_\_\_ debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

R-1-Jacqueline: very good arguments and logic, good examples, give definitions to each point  
 To improve: not to read/rehearse, but keep learning to express very good!

Rishi  
Aeshon: very good number/facts argument, more convincing and show good prep!  
 very good flow with logic and facts!

To improve: not to read all the time, eye contact and be more expressive,  
 be confident, Asked good <sup>learn to do</sup> questions during rebuttle.

R-2. good eye contact after partner's reminder, very good speaking tempo  
 To improve: ~~strong~~ need strong ending to summarize and concluding.  
Aeshon:

Aadit: Very good expression and ~~strong~~ convincing, good posture, good facts!  
 To improve: eye contact, look at opponents & judge

Cross- Aeshon: asked excellent question by finding conflict in arguments!  
 Aadit: Answer with logic and strong argument

R-3 Jacqueline: very good posture and eye contact, argument & questions relatively weak

Rishi: good defense argument  
 no eye contact, please be confident and at ease

Aadit/Rishi: good at cross fire, give example to answer questions

Jacqueline/Aeshon: good at using logic to find fault at opponents argument



# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Gurukulam Enrichment Center A...	POINTS (20-30)
1	Nikhita Arun	28
2	Nandini Bangalore	27

Spkr	Challenger School SY Arora & Jilla	POINTS (20-30)
1	Saanvi Arora	27
2	Sanjana Jilla	29

Winner: ~~Nikhita Nandini~~ Nikhita Nandini debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- R-1. Saanvi: very good tempo, <sup>& expression</sup> eye contact, good definition to start arguments with facts & example  
 To improve: May add more contents into presentation, ~~you~~ may prepare questions
- Nikhita: very good argument and facts/numbers to ~~rebuttle~~ lay out, good at ask sharp questions  
 To improve: more eye contact, more tempo.
- R2. ~~Nikhita~~ Sanjana: very very good rebuttle, ~~and~~ give factual example, ~~to~~ good answer.  
 To improve: can be a little relaxed
- Nandini: good eye contact & expression,  
 To improve: may add number of each argument.
- R3. Saanvi: arguments are a little weak, may prep before hand.  
 Nikhita: can be brief and focus on key arguments
- Cross fire { Nandini → can ask questions on wider topics to show breadth of thoughts  
 ↳ good prep of data  
 ↳ Sanjana: able to ask very sharp questions.
- R4. Sanjana: good at start to summarize... good summary of opponents weakness.  
 ↳ improve: brief to keep in time.  
 ↳ Nandini: good rebuttle, better use numbers

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

**PRO** CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Gurukulam Enrichment Center T...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Sathvik Tammineedi	28
2	Sanjit Shirol	27.5

Spkr	Terman Middle Agarwal & Chen	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Anshika Agarwal	28.5
1	Charlsley Chen	28

Winner: Terman School/Team debating on the con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Alice Xu School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision:

pro  
sanjit  
sathvik  
- confident and constructive cases  
- good preparations on evidence

sanjit  
- clear presentation

con  
Charlsley  
- great presentation of contentions  
- convincing summary

Anshika  
- strong rebuttal  
- fluent speaking with well prepared evidence

con team won the round because they have more convincing cases and evidences, and they did better in rebuttal and final focus.

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Tanya Beri	28
2	Anya Raju	27.5

Spkr	Milpitas Schletzbaum & Madnawat	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Brandon Schletzbaum	28.5
1	Rahul Madnawat	28

Winner: Milpitas School/Team debating on the pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Alice Xu School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision:

con

Tanya

- clear and confident presentation of contentions during constructive
- speaks right to the point to emphasize own point while aiming at weakening pro team's contention

Anya

- effective to point out weakness of other team's evidence

pro

Brandon

- well organised evidence
- speaks logically on short and long term impact of economy and humanity
- strong argument in final fours


Rahul

- confident and fluent speaker, excellent volume
- very spontaneous in crossfire

Both teams did a great job presenting the framework and evidence.

Con team has great contentions, pro team is stronger in rebuttal and final focus. <sup>but</sup> It's a close call. <sup>overall over,</sup> pro team did slightly better.





# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Terman Middle Qu & Shaotran	POINTS (20-30)
1	Daniel Qu	29
2	Ethan Shaotran	28

Spkr	Nova 42 Crawford & Choi	POINTS (20-30)
1	Harlan Crawford	29
2	Young Choi	30

Winner: Nova 42 Crawford & Choi debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
 School/Team

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision: strong arguments, presentation & advancement on points

Daniel:  
 1. Yes Refuse.  
 less people killed.  
 iPhone.  
 → genocide: not defined. X  
 can't defend.

Ethan:  
 Life > money  
 Refuse ≠ terrorism  
 iPhone: helped economy ✓

Ethan:

Daniel:

Ethan:  
 Daniel →

Crawford: (No) refuse  
 1. Political Problem  
 2. Economy \$56 cost  
 3. Terrorism

Exchanged Ref.  
 C2: genocide.  
 C3: national law

Young/Choi:

Civil war ≠ refuse  
 Harm > benefit  
 Lebanon ✓ unemployment

Young/Choi: cost / Lebanon  
 Rebuttal: contentio #1: no refuse (mentioned)

Crawford:  
 cannot risk taxing Refuse

Choi: steal jobs / Tax → refuse  
 → old examples.

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

**PRO** CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Gale Ranch Middle Kurella & Mu...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	<del>Litesh</del> Litesh Kurella	29
1	Sarim Mundres	29

Spkr	Young Genius Chatterji & Qi	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Oishani Chatterji	29
1	William Qi	28

Winner: Gale Ranch: Kurella, Mundres. debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision: Pro side has strong argument / rebuttal.

Mundres: Human Need / Contribution

Qi: Financial / Terrorism / protest own / security / social contract / upairs. / weeks / Lost 3 billion \$/s.

Kurella: life / money  
 may have long term Financial Benefits  
 enhance work force / workforce  
 Paris / citizen: social contract / economy

Chatterji: political instability  
 wrong refugee

Mundres: life > money.  
 ? EU citizen → Paris.  
 • contract → theory:

Qi: need money for life  
 ✓ priority → importance

Room: MAIN 17  
Flight 1 Start: 9:00 AM  
Public Forum

1



Zhang, Xinyu  
Terman Middle

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO  CON (Circle One)

(Circle One)  PRO CON

Spkr	Gurukulam Enrichment Center P...	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Jash Parekh	29
	Yivaswat Suresh	28

Spkr	Harker Sankar & Weirch	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Pramiti Sankar	30
	Anna Weirch	25

Winner: Gurukulam Enrichment Center debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Winner was on arguments preparation and team balance.

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Golden State Mandayam & Kothari	POINTS (20 - 30)
(2)	Rishabh Mandayam	30 <del>27</del>
(1)	Krish Kothari	30 <del>27</del>

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Harker Hansen & Raina	POINTS (20 - 30)
(1)	Madeleine Hansen	26 <del>28</del>
(2)	Anishka Raina	26 <del>28</del>

Winner: Golden State Mandayam debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Winner wins on interactive clash.

# HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Harker Cheung & Aggarwal	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Amanda Cheung	29
2	Ghandan Aggarwal Jason Pan	<del>25</del> 27

Spkr	Gale Ranch Middle Chakraborty...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Risha Chakraborty	<del>25</del> 27
2	Leah John	<del>25</del> 26

Winner: Amanda & Jason debating on the con Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Janithy School: ~~Atiiva~~ Atiiva

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO:  
 speaker 1 - give ~~me~~ reasons for her debate. less eye contacts.  
 Summary - I think she need more evident to support her idea  
 speaker 2 = talking with confident, but catch wrong argument.  
 Summary:

CON =  
 speaker 1 = more firm what she said.  
 Summary:  
 speaker 2 = seems more clam express what he said  
 Summary =

They all speak so fast.