

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Young Genius Chatterji & Qi	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Oishani Chatterji	27
1	William Qi	26

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Ha & H...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Rebecca Ha	27
2	Mahika Hazra	28

Winner: Dougherty Valley Bridge School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: K. Ramesh Kumar School: Redwood Middle School

Comments & Reason for Decision: Strong meeting in troxtire suppressing opponent's position

William

- Good Presentation on case
- Need to prepare well to answer questions.

Rebecca

- good case presentation
- Good team work

Oishani:

- Be crisp in answering ~~the~~ questions
- you brought up excellent arguments refuting opponenent's statements. Keep it up.
- Agreed with opponenent's argument that accepting refugees is moral obligation.
- ✓ Both need to Team up and discuss.

Mahika

- Good Refute arguments and evidence.
- Good team work.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Harker Song & Jia	POINTS (20 - 30)
<input checked="" type="radio"/> 2	Yejin Song	28
<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1	Angela Jia	28

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Ahuja &...	POINTS (20 - 30)
<input checked="" type="radio"/> 2	Ishita Ahuja	28
<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1	Shaurya Nyamgoudar	28

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

Signature: _____ School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both team did great job in construction and team blame. Winner team did better job in evidence picking

Room: MAIN 17
Flight 1 Start: 5:00 PM
Public Forum

4

Hems, Ravi
DV Bridge

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Harker Reddy & Sajoi	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Anshul Reddy 2	25
	Dhruv Sajoi 1	22

Spkr	BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Amun Asnani 2	27
	Shrayes Upadhyayula 1	26

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

Signature: Hemantlis mancha School: DV Bridge

Comments & Reason for Decision: Strong contention points.

Room: MAIN 10
Flight 2 Start: 5:00 PM
Public Forum

4

SONNIA DOGRA
COMMUNICATION ACADEMY

~~Kaza, Ramesh~~
~~Redwood~~

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	25
2	Riya Mogli	28

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Albert Chu	25
2	Andy Lu	28

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

Signature: Sonia Doga School: Communication

Comments & Reason for Decision: Good persuasion, good eye contact, good questioning

Room: MAIN 10
Flight 1 Start: 5:00 PM
Public Forum

4

SONNIA DOGRA
COMMUNICATION ACADEMY
Kaza, Ramesh
Redwood

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Harker JN	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Arnav Jain	28
1	Arvin Nidadavolu	28

Spkr	Gurukulam Enrichment Center A...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Nikhita Arun	27
2	Nandini Bangalore	26

Winner: HARKER JN debating on the PRO Low point win? _____
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Sonia Dogra School: Comm. Academy.

Comments & Reason for Decision: Good command over the content, good emphasis and connecting to the judges!

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	30

Spkr	Gale Ranch Middle Kurella & Mu...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Litesh Kurella	30
1	Sarim Mundres	30

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

Signature: Devesh Kodnani School: Golden State

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro	Con
:56	1:10
:24	:26

util & timeframe don't interact
 -explained in oral critique

voted pro on timeframe fw
 & contention 1, as well as
 economic benefits

Explained in oral RFD
 → great round by both teams
 any other questions or concerns:
 email me at devesh.kodnani@gmail.com

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)
1	Jash Parekh	27
2	Vivaswat Suresh	27

Spkr	Gale Ranch Middle Huang & Sun	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Jennifer Huang	28.5
1	Lauria Sun	29

Winner: GALE RANCH HS School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Devesh Kodnani School: Golden State

Comments & Reason for Decision:

prep	pro	con
	:46	1:20
1:00		

ORAL RFD

— email me if
you have any
more questions
at devesh.kodnani@gmail.com

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Team A

Team B

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Milpitas Pallapati & Sandhu	POINTS (20-30)
1	Hannah Pallapati	25
2	Esha Sandhu	22

Spkr	Terman Middle Goel & Naddell	POINTS (20-30)
2	Swati Goel	30
1	Elise Naddell	27

Winner: Terman Middle School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature] School: Harker.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Team A has weak points and argumentation lacked substance. Interactive clash was one sided with team B gaining. Team balance was great for team B. They really complemented each other well.

30+ ~~80~~

Hannah

- ✓ - illiteracy ✓
- ✓ - deforestation ✓
- 30% greenhouse
- environmentally sensitive area
- ① - Minimize env. damage

② Violence & disease

③ Resolution solves. 1 2

(B-)

not sure if question is on cross check
 (-ve) on cross check

10+ 20+

Elise

- II - moral hazard - action because - war, religion + their society
- I - humanitarian need. - combat needs to provide for - 3.7 = BP in and - not doing anything for prep. Jordan

(A) - Main allegiance is to main people.

They are not war disph

III Could bring danger → terrorist

Pain last night

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

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

Spkr	Harker CP	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Amanda Cheung	28.5
2	Jason Pan	29

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Kapara...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Rahul Kaparaboyna	27.0
1	Jeevan Rajkumar	27.5

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

Signature:  School: Milpitas High

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- AFF explains why their FW stands, NEG doesn't really further explain
- AFF speeches were a lot more organized, easy to follow Jason's rebuttal speech
- one evidence really stood out was "If every country in EU took in 2.6% of refugee pop. it would end crisis" NEG did not exactly refute that point
- AFF: organized, concise, easy to follow
- NEG: good job, work on organization of speeches, it was hard to follow because their rebuttals didn't follow any order

Room: MAIN 11
Flight 1 Start: 5:00 PM
Public Forum

4

Balakrishnan, Mahesh
Terman

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

Spkr	Brooks Peruvemba & Ramesh	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Aditya Peruvemba	24
	Vignav Ramesh	28

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Milpitas Or & Nair	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Maggie Or	24
	Swetha Nair	29

Winner: MILPITAS / OR & NAIR debating on the PRO Low point win? _____
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: B. Mahesh School: TERMAN

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Milpitas stated their arguments very clearly & kept coming back to them through the course of the debate.

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	30

Spkr	Gurukulam Enrichment Center R...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Aryak Rekhi	24
1	Ashwath Bhupatiraju	25

Winner: HARKER / RAGHIV & YANG debating on the CON Low point win? _____
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: *B. Mahesh* School: TERMAN

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Harker stated ~~that~~ their arguments very well and they were also very direct in rebutting their opponents positions

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Atiiva Garg & Patra	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Manasi Garg	29
2	Aindri Patra	28

Spkr	Golden State Koppurapu & Cho...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Rithvik Koppurapu	26
1	Rishabh Chowhan	27

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

Signature: K. Rameesh Kaval School: Redwood Middle school

Comments & Reason for Decision: Evidence, successfully refuting opponen in content

Manasi
✓ Nice Job in Presenting the case
✓ good Questioning

Rishabh
✓ Good Job in case presentation.

Aindri
✓ Be more assertive in questioning.

Rithvik
✓ Need to work on clarity in communication
Response
✓ did not answer opponenets question on if all the money gets misused or only part of it.

✓ ~~_____~~

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT Communication

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

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

(Circle One) PRO CON

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

Winner: TCA School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) *very close debate.*
 Signature: [Signature] School: COMM ACADEMY

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Moral / strong team, well prepared / Good arguments

① Humanitarian need
 - Boost Economy
 Govt spending → boost economy
 good evidence pts for this contention
 - funds → refugees → spend.
 - GDP / 0.25%
 Good counter on the (2) pt

② Moral obligation
 - will get worse over time
 - displaced people
 - Good pts / impact
 Birth rate argument.

③ Terrorism
 - Refugees → terrorist
 - Paris bombings
 Govt / Strong Rebuttal.

Economy → National Interest
Strong team, well prepared / Societal Welfare
N / National Interest = Societal welfare!
Refugee humanitarian aid.
 Good counter to the foreign aid question
 Money results in corruption → Good pts to support their case.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Team A

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Team B

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Golden State Nethi & Karwa	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Pranav Nethi	24
2	Saniya Karwa	28

Spkr	Young Genius Gupta & Chamarth	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Ajay Gupta	29
1	Agustya Chamarth	26

Winner: Young Genius School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature] School: Harker.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Team A had weaker argumentation and did not elaborate on few key aspects of humanitarian needs. During interactive clash team B defended their claims very well. Team A had some difficulty. Both teams had a little issue with team balance. Team 'A' showed more consistency in all ideas advancement.

45+30+15.

Pranav 30+90

- I - Humanitarian needs
- II - decreasing population (demography)
 - Young people scamp job
- III - Address sexual / assault / violence
 - make conditions better

Agustya (Good data oriented)

- take care of their own issues.
 - Jordan / Lebanon / ... /
 - ↳ bad economy / take care of that
 - do not have enough resource
 - Syria an example.
 - ↳ basic need.
 - Social economic taking a toll.
 - huge risk of terrorism
 - security / not Comp. assign.
- Prep: 30sec.

(Balanced)

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	27
2	Anyaraju	27.5

Spkr	Brooks Gattapally & Kurapati	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Shruti Gattapally	27
1	Varshita Kurapati	27

Winner: BASIS independent silicon valley debating on the con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature:  School: Milpitas High

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Under NEG's FW on net benefits, they clearly show the harms overweighing the benefits (economic harm, harms to countries including backlash)
 - one problem with both sides was too much restating of evidence rather than analysis
 - AFF: focus on offensive rather than defensive
 - NEG: focus on offensive rather than defensive
- don't restate evidence, only restate and emphasize it the opponent does not restate it spend time advancing your case

P.S. "a government" is just government.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Harker Mantripragada & Pakravan	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Ishaan Mantripragada SHYL LAMBA	28
	Sascha Pakravan	26

Spkr	Gurukulam Enrichment Center A...	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Aadit Agrahara	24
	Rishi Pasumarthi	20

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

Signature: Hemantli manehe School: DV Bridge

Comments & Reason for Decision: Good contention points and good rebuttal. focus more on points than the other such as links or credibility.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

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

Spkr	Golden State Maharana & Huang	POINTS (20-30)
2	Lakshay Maharana	28
4	Howard Huang	27

Spkr	Gale Ranch Middle Kuang & Zho...	POINTS (20-30)
3	Vivian Kuang	30
1	Ada Zhong	30

Winner: Gale Ranch (K+Z) debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win?

Signature: [Signature] School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CON (Gale Ranch)

Ada: Great delivery timing, and pace. Excellent use of rules and time.
Work on: clearer observation definition at start.

Vivian: Excellent crosses - great offense. kept other team on defense throughout. I would rely less on 'framework' and keep hammering contentions.
Very well-constructed case. Great job of clarifying observation throughout. Great offense during crosses and final focus.

Team:

PRO (Golden State)

Lakshay: Great opening. Good pace and emotion
Work on: responding quicker to attacks

Howard: Good defense of Neg observation but needed more evidence for moral obligation.

Team: Good arguments and well-organized case.
Needed more refutations and quicker response to Neg. observation

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Young Genius Christainsen & Pan	POINTS (20 - 30)
4	Philip Christainsen	26
2	Anthony Pan	27

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Chandr...	POINTS (20 - 30)
3	Romir Chandra	27.5
1	Suchit Bandaram	28.5

Winner: Dougherty Valley debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win?

Signature: [Signature] School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO (Dougherty Valley)

Suchit: Good pace and emotion. Good offense and defense during crosses.
Work on:

Romir: Great opening and emotion. Great offense during crosses.
work on: Clearer statements/take on fewer things
Good, well-constructed case. Good legality contention.

Team: work on: Clearer contention 1, Not talking over each other.

CON (Young Genius)

Anthony: Good opening. Good pace and contentions.
work on: Responding quicker to refutations

Philip: Good case, good evidence, good delivery
Work on: Using all your time, attacking opponents

Team: work on: Refuting opponents arguments, more active during crosses

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

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

Spkr	Golden State Sundaram & Niu	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Aditya Sundaram	27
2	Alex Niu	25

Spkr	Milpitas Alam & Virmani	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Novel Alam	24
1	Rohan Virmani	26.5

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

Signature: [Signature] School: TCA

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The pro team successfully refuted the "con" contentions and a few of theirs were still standing. Additionally, there was a 'global stability' argument that was very well made and convincing for net economic benefits.

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	25
2	April Sun	24

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Zheng...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Shannon Zheng	28
2	Sanjana Raganathan	27.5

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

Signature: [Signature] School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

In the end, the pro side did an effective job proving the economic side of the argument that refugees help economic and therefore should be prioritized by governments.

The neg was unable to defend with evidence their argument on Xenophobia, and ultimately, the fact that "increased" competition was a bad thing.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

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

Spkr	Redwood Middle Jain & Kaza	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Rishi Jain	28
2	Siddharth Kaza	27

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

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

Winner: Terman middle/Agarwal & Chen debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 School/Team

Signature: _____ School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision: Better Presentation & advancement of arguments!

No Refused
 Kisha: ① social impact/security
 ② ~~security~~ ecology/INF.
 ③ negative economy.
 Q1: # of country sign the law has to follow law?
 Q3: or content #1.

Charlsey: Refuse
 ① human >
 ② Law: 1951. Responsibility
 Survival > law.
 Q1:

Kaza: Jews is weak, unbounded!
 ③ Paris:

Anshika: security issue
 Ref: #1: not unique
 #2: not unique: disease
 #3: _____

Rishi: no proof for unique.

Charlsey: Paris: one not all

Kaza:

Anshika:

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One) 1

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Gade &...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Sruti Gade	30
2	Riya Bindlish	29

2 (Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Gale Ranch Middle Chakraborty...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Risha Chakraborty	30
2	Leah John	30

Winner: Gale Ranch Middle School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____ School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision: Strong and emotional arguments & refute

Gade: **NO Refugee**
 → fluent presentation
 → financial impact
 → security
 Q1: priority: importance

Risha: **Yes Refugee**
 - no harm
 - positive refugee effect
 - international obligation

Riya: Paris
 → financial
 →

Leah: Life > anything
long term benefit!
 Paris: 7/8 citizens
 Q1:

Gade:

Risha:

Riya:

Leah:

Room: SHAH 406
 Flight 2 Start: 5:00 PM
 Public Forum

4

Tian, Bing
~~Wang, Cindy~~
 Harker

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	27
2	Ethan Shaotran	28

Spkr	Nova 42 Kyle & Agarwal	POINTS (20-30)
2	Daniel Kyle	30
1	Priya Agarwal	27

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

Signature: Jim Bing School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision:

pro1 practise crossfire.
 Also, ~~number~~ ~~you~~ write down
 or mark your contentions
 clearly so you don't lose track

con1 practise crossfire.
 summary speech should go over
 both teams contentions. not just
 one refutation.

pro2 clear logic, refuted all con's
 contentions. good.
 very good at crossfire, and
 final focus.

con2 practise final focus.
 Also, stick to your own framework.

I voted for ~~A~~ Pro because they ~~not only~~ proved their
 resolution wins even using con's framework. Also ~~the~~ Pro's
 framework was not refuted.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Milpitas Kumar & Shritroya	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Devika Kumar	28
1	Saniya Shritroya	28

Spkr	Terman Middle Naddell & Lee	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Bruno Naddell	29
1	Peyton Lee	28

Winner: Terman Middle Naddell & Lee debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: Harker

Comments & Reason for Decision:

pro1
 Good speech. ~~should~~
 should re-consider the
 genius argument.

con1
 clear speech.
 cost of ~~refugees~~ refugees in Jordan
 v.s. ~~economy~~ economy impact doesn't
~~prove~~ prove harm.

pro2
 Should ~~be~~ ^{question} more ~~clear~~ on
 contention 3 from con.

con2
 Should refute all pro's contentions.
 I do appreciate the calm manner
 Devika had during crossfire.

I voted for Pro because their contention 2, 3 are not
 refuted. Also, con's contention 3 is ~~rather~~ confusing.
 What's the harm with the economy of Lebanon and Jordan?

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Brooks Dhillon & Sudharsan	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Harneet Dhillon	27
1	Roshni Sudharsan	27

Spkr	Milpitas Huang & Ho	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Daniel Huang	28
2	Chin-Hsing Ho	28

Winner: Milpitas Huang & Ho School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? 2

Signature: Cathy Peng School: Terman

Comments & Reason for Decision: Con team stated clearly the points against the pro.

The con side rebutted every single point pros made. clear and to the point. the pro side did state the reasons, but without more solid facts.

Both sides stuck on the jobs in U.S market, not address more areas of impact.

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	26
2	Sanjit Shirol	26

Spkr	Young Genius Ganti & Reddy	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Manasi Ganti	28
2	Aditya Reddy	27

Winner: Young Genius Ganti debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win?

Signature: Cathy Peng School: Terman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro team Sathvik was not able to answer the questions.

Con team addressd many times on the Paris Attack to defend their position.

Both sides could do better job with more solid research and facts to support their positions.

Room: MAIN CONF ROOM
Flight 1 Start: 5:00 PM
Public Forum

4

Prasad, Aman
Golden State

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

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

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

Spkr	Terman Middle Balakrishnan & K...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Ishan Balakrishnan	28
2	Ezra Kohrman	26

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

Signature: Aman Prasad School: Golden State Academy

Comments & Reason for Decision:

ORAL

Room: MAIN CONF ROOM
Flight 2 Start: 5:00 PM
Public Forum

4

Prasad, Aman
Golden State

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	27
1	Leo Naddell	30

Spkr	Milpitas Garg & Karkare	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Mehak Garg	28
2	Saili Karkare	28

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

Signature: Aman Prasad School: Golden State Academy

Comments & Reason for Decision:

ORAL

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Redwood Middle Nair & Sarathy	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Dhruva Nair	27
1	Kavya Sarathy	30

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Brooks Shah & Vasani	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Sajiv Shah	30
2	Arya Vasani	28

Winner: Brooks Shah & Vasani debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 Signature: [Signature] School: Milpitas

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very good speakers
 good arguments
 make sure you have all your evidence in order
 killed 132 people
 Paris, it's not 11 or 21
 Dhruva was very very mmh
 look at judges during CX

Very good speaking
 good arguments
 Thank you for refereeing conventions
 Japaned disease was topic of...
 look at Judges when CX
 you both teams need to get serious and stop messing around

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

Spkr	Harker Saksena & Hoskote	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Riva Saksena	29
1	Adi Hoskote	20

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Gurukulam Enrichment Center A...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Indu Abhilash	29
2	Nazhah Mir	29

Winner: Gurukulam Enrichment School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 Signature: [Signature] School: Milpitas

Comments & Reason for Decision:

20111 replies ^{revalued} ^{curious}
 Jordan 62602000
 economic harm ^{100 thousand} ^{refuse}
 100k yearsh ^{at the} ^{refuse}
 glad you referenced each
 contented
 100k would per ^{refuse}
 high jobs \neq high employment
 refuse indicate \rightarrow point that
 your highlight say that he
 chose at a person ^{structure}
 increase w/ ^{refuse}
 make
 look at times
 dw. 30X
 address ^{RA}
 simple ^{or}
 example
 won't do

good across fire questions
 glad you referenced each
 contented
 good to respond question
 economic stimulus can be tough
 purchase it to shift
 don't hide behind your
 paper
 - replies help economy
 need to address low interest economy
 low birth rate so not enough to
 fill jobs
 sound example was good
 look at judges during CX
 they asked you clarified but not every
 get
 steld out

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT Communication

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Nova 42 Crawford & Choi	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Harlan Crawford	28
2	Young Choi	29

Spkr	BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Cathy Chang	26
1	Helen Hu	27

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

Signature: [Signature] School: COMM ACADEMY

Comments & Reason for Decision:

① Moral obligation
 (law states that)

② Economic cost.

③ terrorism angle.

Framework

Good counter
 with data
 Cost of
 refugee
 (#6.5B)

Immigrant vs Refugee.

There is a lot of confusion
 between these two terms

- Arguments are strong. The ① was
 stated with strong comp

- Very articulate in their cross.

① Migration Strain / Resource?
 - Terrorism angle.
 Standard (good evidence pts)

② Racism Backlash
 (Xenophobia)

③ Economic Cost / Impact.
 (low skill migrants)

- Summary section was not
 very strong

- Team was not able to
 counter effectively.
 Counter

- Final focus was not very
 strong.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Brooks SC	POINTS (20 - 30)
B	Alaina Srivastav	28.5
A	Rohan Chakravarthi	28

Spkr	Challenger School SY Yalamanc...	POINTS (20 - 30)
B	Tanvi Yalamanchili	29
A	Arnav Garg	28

Winner: Challenger School SY debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No.

Signature: [Signature] School: Gale Ranch

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Brooks SC
- Supportive ~~document~~ evidences should have been stronger.
Great speech by both the team members.

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

Winner: Nova 42 ~~Wilson & Park~~ debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: DVHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Con side brings good argument points that proves to be difficult for pro side to counter.
- Cara Wilson
 - excellent communication & delivery.
 - very proactive during the crossfire.
 - Be more affirmative but not aggressive :->
- Felicity Park
 - very good delivery.
 - May ~~needs~~ needs to bring up more relevant & convincing evidence. i.e. Economic benefits for Jordan may be supporting facts for the pro side.
- Rahul
 - excellent communication & delivery. - smart to use opponents' proof to counter.
 - May needs to provide more ~~conv~~ convincing proof to emphasize ~~the~~ environmental impact.
- Brandon
 - Being excellent to bring up facts & data as proof.
 - Needs to improve on delivery & communication.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Harker AJ	POINTS (20 - 30)
Z	Zain Awais	27
A	A. Ju	28

Spkr	Golden State Mandayam & Kothari	POINTS (20 - 30)
Z	Rishabh Mandayam	29
K	Krish Kothari	28

Winner: Gold state School/Team debating on the pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature] School: PVHS Bridges

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A. Ju: - very good delivery with strong evidence.
 - good communication.
 - Needs to improve on crossfire

Zain Awais - provide enough & strong evidences to ~~create~~ counter opponents' points
 - needs to improve on delivery, to be ~~engaged~~ more engaged during the crossfire.

Con side needs more collaboration during the crossfire.

krish - very good communication & delivery. economic data.
 - ~~pro~~ brings up good evidence on ~~it~~ ~~them~~
 But Evidence would have been stronger.

Rishabh - excellent communication & delivery
 - very proactive during the crossfire.

Room: Patil 56 Economics
Flight 2 Start: 5:00 PM
Public Forum

~~4~~

Kurella, Mrs.
Gale Ranch

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr		POINTS (20 - 30)
	Harker Hansen & Raina	
	Madeleine Hansen	
	Anishka Raina	

(Circle One) PRO CON

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

Winner: Harker Hansen & Raina debating on the _____ Low point win? _____
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: J Vinatha School: Gale Ranch

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The other party was not on.
(Gurukulam)
waited till 6:30 pm.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Communication Dogra & Kuo	POINTS (20-30)
1	Aaina Dogra	28.4
2	Grace Kuo	28.9

Spkr	Golden State Liu & Dixit	POINTS (20-30)
2	Jacob Liu	27.6
1	Arnav Dixit	27.4

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

Signature: Ashlyn Timmerman School: None-UC Berkeley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Arnav: good definitions, gives good framework; respect in international community, potential employees; good statistics, refugees income increased compared to others but what about @ home country, gather thoughts before speaking, reciting old claims w/o new info; need to keep face

Aaina: knew info well + good paced; refugees attempting to take advantage; point about poor countries confusing, airplane metaphor relates well, when giving counter arguments try to expand more so than originally

Jacob: increase in pledging money for refugees from countries, good use of sources - space out within argument more, good argument with "win-win"; need a clearer foundation for what reputation is + why it is important, too repetitive of point "prioritizing" w/o explaining what is meant beyond definition; confusing clarifications in end, why does their relations help, try + give examples + expand beyond pure quotes

Grace: Point out economies not increasing, but may still give; recruitment source good, integrating into society, very good refuting points; point about coming in good, but could be a bit further developed; need face

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Harker Sankar & Weirch	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Pramiti Sankar	26.1
1	Anna Weirch	25.8

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Manku...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Akash Mankude	29.2
2	Rohit Srinivas	27.9

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

Signature: Ashlyn Timmerman School: None- UC Berkeley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AKASH: Good use of statistics strain on economy, risk of terrorism, public safety
 - concise points, good questions + explanations of points
 - stuttering + some confusion of points, said a lot without many distinct points being made
 - refugees don't help poor countries which hurts more
 - "quantifiable"

Anna: some stuttering of words (lengthy one), heavy use of statistics + quotes to back up info, struggled to answer questions + not very clear on what she was saying
 - said contentions + framework still stood but didn't say why

Rohit: Very good clarification as to morality vs obligations, backed up evidence in a really good manner; root cause; twist on econ. argument; helping, but not prioritizing, questioned points very well + gave well formatted thoughts
 attacking root cause very good point

Pramiti: speaking stuttered, good refuting point w/ law for refugees, attempts to refute economy point, had good starting point, but didn't complete thought
 - became overly defensive + made argument too personal
 - had good point, but didn't clarify it well/almost negated it

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)
2	Clab Choi	27
1	Ian Zhang	27

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Garg &...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Anika Garg	29
1	Puja Oak	30

Winner: Dougherty Valley Bridge Garg debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team Oak

Signature: Aavani School: Milpitas

Comments & Reason for Decision:

BASIS Independent Silicon Valley Choi & Zhang

↳ weak arguments and weak supporting of evidence.
 team seems a little lost sometimes

Dougherty Valley Bridge Garg & Oak

• strong arguments and effective counterarguments
 • meaningful and strong cross-ex questioning.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

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

Spkr	Dougherty Valley Bridge Sharma...	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Garima Sharma	28
1	Priyanka Janjanam	29

Spkr	TCA Pai & Ramakrishna	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Ronak Pai	28
2	Ashwin Ramakrishna	29

Winner: TCA Pai & Ramakrishna debating on the Con Low point win? _____
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Aavani School: Milpitas

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Dougherty Valley Bridge Sharma and Janjanam

- ↳ strong points... but apart from those few, not revealing any other strong evidence.
- ↳ not asking any strong questions on cross ex, only defending their own over and over again due to a lack of questioning.

TCA Pai & Ramakrishna

- ↳ well thought out responses.
- clear refutations and strong evidence
- ↳ strong cross ex questions with meaningful evidence

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Harker Suryadevara & Khatri	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Ananya Suryadevara	26.5
1	Anoushka Khatri	27

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Challenger School SY Arora & Jilla	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Saanvi Arora	26
2	Sanjana Jilla	28

Winner: Challenger School debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? 190

Signature: [Signature] School: Nova 42

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD
 All dropped Con 1 b/c unable to link to reso. All dropped Perbity b/c unable to link to reso. Con 3 beautiful Neg b/c admitting & believes became a national interest, negating the need to prioritize. Therefore,

Neg's Win

Ananya
 • Bring all your evidence and source material!!!!
 • Organize your speeches by contention; you need organization
 Use voting points on FF; don't contradict your position

Saanvi
 • I like your pace, but you need to finish your case. Work on timing.
 • Summary should include rebuttal and organization.

Anoushka
 Stay Constructive; work on your summary speech; organize it using your and your opponents' contentions
 Bring all your evidence and source material!!!!
 Don't just repeat points; extend them and show me why they are important.

Sanjana
 • No new evidence in FF
 • Voting points in FF, not summary
 • You're a strong speaker; now focus on content
 • Be more respect to your opponents

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Harker Wang & Yuan	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Aimee Wang	26.5
1	Alina Yuan	25.5

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Communication Xu & Balasubra...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Jacqueline Xu	28
2	Aeshon Balasubramanian	26

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Nova 42

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD

Con dropped impacts on death of ethnic purity. Gridlock on Lebanon & Jordan, and Con could not discredit Cleveland evidence. Con provided no FW, so All's was used.

All's win

Aimee

- Work on volume & diction
- Con 1 impact was good; carry it over thru the flow
- Work on time
- If something seems off, don't be afraid to point it out

Alina

- Your 2 speeches can't be the same; work on combining your speech and your partner's.
- Work on time
- Be more aggressive in cross ex

Jacqueline

- You don't have an issue w/ them, so work on creating more contentions
- Expand on your evidence; tell me why it's important, not just what it is
- Work on organization in 2nd speech; use your all their contentions to structure your summary

Aeshon

- Work on time and ?s on cross
- Establish why points in FF
- Start relating from your first speech to help your partner

Room: DOBBINS 203
Flight 1 Start: 5:00 PM
Public Forum

SUBRAMANIA PENUVENDA

~~Kurupati, Sunil~~
Brooks

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)
①	Shama Gupta	27
②	Audrey Lee	26

Spkr	Milpitas Stanley & Bilaskar	POINTS (20 - 30)
②	Amy Stanley	25
①	Nikita Bilaskar	26

Winner: ATIIVA & LEE School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature] School: Brooks

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Debate performance of both teams similar, but
Atiiva & Lee was slightly better.
Atiiva & Lee really did good in cross*

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

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

Spkr	Golden State Yan & Gong	POINTS (20 - 30)
①	Daphne Yan	26
②	Caroline Gong	27

Spkr	Gurukulam Enrichment Center V...	POINTS (20 - 30)
②	Akash Vemulapalli	27
①	Pranav Palleti	27

Winner: Gurukulam Enrichment School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature] School: Brook

Comments & Reason for Decision:

both teams spoke well. Golden State did not fully state how pro would benefit or not cause Gurukulam cross was better and more pointed questions.

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	26
1	Pranav Gupta	27

Spkr	Challenger School SY Karim & K...	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Isha Karim	29
2	Nithya Koneru	27

Winner: Challenger School debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____ School: Terman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

lost team ~~in~~ introduced evidence which is irrelevant to argument. also team balance was not consistent. Winning team was able to focus on this issue and pointed invalid evidence.