

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eagan FS	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Scott Franklin	27
	Amrit Sanal	28

CON

Spkr	Eastview DP	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Tharun Dulla	28
	Elijah Peterson	28

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

Signature: School: Edina

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Summary for Con was more articulate
- Both sides should work on learning cards (early in the year)
- Answer question → what can a teacher do w/ an anonymous tip
 - Answer - then explain
- Pro give up on Safety - why does RS ↑ safety?

Room: 118
Start: 8:45 AM
Varsity Public Forum

1

Seggerman, Katharine

~~Parra, Maggie~~

Edina

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eastview AU	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Ross Abram	29
2	Michelle Uchenik	29

CON

Spkr	Eagan NC	POINTS (20 - 30)
 	Vy Nguyen	
3	Jeffrey Chen	26

not present

Winner: Eastview AU debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? no

Signature: [Signature] School: Edina

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ross Abram - good eye contact + calm mannerism. Good use of summaries to review + resituate arguments. great prep.

Michelle - excellent cross-examination pts. great preparation and organization.

Jeffrey Chen - more preparation for cross-exams would yield more supporting evidence and claims; ~~the~~ ~~good~~ wouldn't have to rely on 2nd contention repetition. good use of current events to challenge lack of racism in probable cause situations.

1:00
1:33

1:20
1:35

Room: 010
Start: 8:45 AM
Varsity Public Forum

1

Lutz, David

Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Blake AJ	POINTS (20-30)
2A	Anish Aggarwal	28
1A	Joel Jude	27

CON

Spkr	Eastview AD	POINTS (20-30)
1N	Yasmin Afifi	27
2N	Katie Dewitt	27

Winner: Blake debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 School/Team: Wash. N. High School: Eagan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Forework. Neg suggests forework is safety. Aff doesn't disagree, so I accept that forework. The parties disagree about who promotes safety. I adopt safety as forework operates who is safety. Trust. Aff argues Prof Law ("PC") = ↑ Trust. Aff shows ↑ Trust = ↓ violence and drug use. Neg cites Fowon that difficult to link particular outcomes to particular search/seizure policy. I find that Aff has shown that PC = ↑ Trust as a general matter, altho Fowon shows it is not as easy to quantify statistically. Nonetheless, Aff showed ↑ Trust as various good outcomes that are quantifiable.

Cell Phones. Aff argues cell phones require higher standard of importance of privacy. Neg argues that students don't have as high a reasonable expectation of privacy. Aff argues Neg dropped cell phone argument. I disagree, since Reas. Expect of privacy relates to cell phone. I also reject Aff's argument that Reas. Supp. std. prevents kids from exercising 1st Am. rights as adults since they do now. Neg argues this is outside resolution, but I reject, since Resolution puts in play reasons supporting each std. (I am persuaded that cell phones are a particularly sensitive privacy right warranting ↑ protection). Probable Cause. I agree w/ Neg that PC still takes over this PC of warrant, but Aff is correct that exigent circumstances allow school to diffuse the most immediate need. Neg shows that some investigations will take more time after emergency defused, but no evidence that the additional time after emergency defused is bad. Neg argues that PC is more complicated to apply than common sense but not clear why they care hear it.

Status Quo. Neg shows violence ↓ over recent years, but Aff argues that this tells us nothing re what will happen if adopt PC. I agree. The fact that schools are safer now doesn't help me decide whether PC better than Reas. Supp. what courts think. Neg argues PC std. not suited to schools under TLO, but Aff. cites Reddy case re strip search. This argument is reversal.

"Contradiction". ~~Case~~ CDC came out in 2008. Not sure I can consider the evidence that came out on 2008 only, but Aff. is right that there is some contradiction b/w violence is ↓ yet not kids still fear a weapon at school. Neg says it's misperception, but I'm not convinced. This was an example of great debate by both sides, but the current status of fear & violence under Reas. Supp. doesn't help me decide if PC better.
 GREAT DEBATE, ALL

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Blake KO	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Fatiya Kedir	27.5
1	Sinan Onder	28

CON

Spkr	Eastview FM	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Dante Fornizy	28.5
2	Osman Mansur	28

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

Signature: Ceil McDonald School: Eagan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Great debate, all! Very enjoyable. I must say, though, that ~~the~~ Fatiya's constructive was very, very impressive.

OK Safety vs Privacy - more philosophical than anything but Aff does build a good case for me that real safety depends on building trust in the community and though I agree with Con to a certain extent that schools do have a role in loco parentis, it is not complete.

Pro convinces me w/ their argumentation & evidence that ① overtime the trust that can come from using a higher ev. standard will lead to a more safe environment ② that has backed up by something will keep kids safe ③ exigent circumstances still rule in emergencies. I also find Pro attack on Trelex ev pretty devastating. Pro did not articulate as well as Con is correct that Pro does not solve for racism and I think Pro could have articulated more clearly after the 1st construct that more "warranted" searches and fewer "less warranted" ones would result in fewer punitive measures taken at least result in \downarrow punishments, but overall Pro

Room: 203
 Start: 8:45 AM
 Varsity Public Forum

1

LaMoore, Lindsay (CF)
~~Walker, Molly~~
 Edina

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Eagan FP	POINTS (20-30)
1	Quinn Foerster	26
2	Reece Peters	26

CON		
Spkr	Eastview RK	POINTS (20-30)
2	Suhail Rizvi	28
1	Tenzin Kunchok	28

Winner: Eastview RK debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Signature] School: CF

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Quinn In grand CX, try to find a way to get out of talking in circles → Even if that means dropping the argument.

Tenzin Good point to make in Grand about how debate isn't referencing zero tolerance policy punishment

Reece Your first speech had no evidence brought up. Good point to bring up context of the oppnt's card in CX of but you lost a little steam on driving home your point.

Suhail Great evidence to bring up in 1st speech, be careful not to extrapolate.

Reece & Suhail: neither of you participated in grand CX. Regardless of how well your partner may be arguing your case/points, find a way to contributing to the CX. Otherwise, it can really damage the way your teams are presenting.

Decision: Ultimately, Pro failed in appropriately refuting Con's case or rebuttle. Pro weighed the debate on "circumventing the law matters bc of the psychological impact of perpetuating the cycle," yet never refuted Con's evidence that a 32% decrease was seen in the pipeline. Essentially, Con's last speech was 100% my reasoning.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Cannon Falls CJ	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Ella Coyle	28
	Hannah Johnson 1st	27

CON

Spkr	Edina KI	POINTS (20 - 30)
	James Kuznecoff	29
	Khalid Ishani 1st	29

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

Signature: Cindy Lutz School: Eagan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1st aff - nice clear delivery

1st neg - good questions in crossfire (strip searches, students' knowledge projects)

2nd aff - good explanations of your points but please provide dates for your sources - helps provide context,

2nd neg - good explanation of strip search issue

Framework - accepted by both sides

Aff - the strip search issue flows negative in my opinion pretty early on in the debate. Aff. does not provide statistics or any way to weigh impact of this argument. I think it would have been a stronger strategy to spend more time on safety issues.

Neg - nice organization and explanation of the key issues.

RFA ① strip search issue goes con. ② I also understand and accept the Con's analysis/argument that

Schools will look for security measures outside of the probable cause standard and that overall

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Edina PM	POINTS (20-30)
1	Owen Pheneretton	27
2	Jenny Ma	29

CON

Spkr	Lakeville OR	POINTS (20-30)
2	Drake Olson	28
1	Tyler Rebeschke	28

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Eastview

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Honestly my biggest problem in this round is how to judge it. I don't get any framework at all until CON summary, but honestly at that point so late into the round its hard for me to really use it. ~~The closest~~
RFD] ultimately the safety/tips argument ends up in a wash, I'd probably lean CON on it, but it doesn't factor into my decision. For me the biggest impact in the round comes from the SRO/Pipeline arguments, and I simply have more clear logic from CON on that issue. I never really get much of a response from PRO on why SROs will either stay the same or go down, so since the impacts of PRO CII and CON CIII are up for grabs here, I negate.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eagan KW	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Nibraas Khan	29
2	Hunter Weber	29

CON

Spkr	Lakeville CM	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Maddie Cook	28
2	Karen McCoy	28

Winner: Eagan KW debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 Signature: [Signature] School: Eastview

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Nibraas Good Q's in CF, but ask follow ups when your opponent doesn't fully answer!
 Really good pace + organization for summary. Excellent job extending cards and getting to 2nd line analysis. You + Hunter work really well as a team! You sound like you're on the same page all round.

Hunter Very good rebuttal. Thorough + direct. However, when your cases directly clash (ex: criminalization) try to go further than saying "our case disagrees" → give me reasons why your side is correct DESPITE con's arguments

Maddie Slow down during your opening speech! You have a lot of sources that come quickly at the judge - if you want me to get all of that down you've gotta go a little slower, please! Good pace in summary, glad you brought up your SRD arguments.

Karen During your rebuttal, I'm not hearing you move your arguments beyond the arguments the pro made in rebuttal - if your opponent challenges your argument you need to rebuild it before using it to refute your opponent's case! Good job in 2nd CF trying to rebuild.

RFD There was a lot of clash in this round which made it fun to watch + judge! Both teams did a really nice job. We agree to a FW of safety + education, which means both need to be considered, but PRO wins the argument about anonymous tips/ex. circ. so imminent threats to safety aren't a concern. Con does prove that SRDs will ↑ in schools w/ PC, but PRO then proves that the harms (↑ criminaliz. and ↑ racial bias) actually will still ↓ w/ a PC standard. I vote

1:05
1:22

Room: 126
Start: 8:45 AM
Varsity Public Forum

1

Vair, James

Eastview

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eagan SV	POINTS (20-30)
1	Maria Sanchez	27
2	Roselin Victor	20

CON

Spkr	Apple Valley SK	POINTS (20-30)
1	Julia Scovil	28
2	Carson Kowalski	27

Winner: Apple Valley SK debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Eastview

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Roselin For first speech, a "point preview" before launching into your first contention would be helpful. In first point, two main points are good but the way speech was set up the point at first seemed random. A little more context would have helped. In your second ^{point} great strategic "law of the land" before you started. Good analysis of current legislation.

Carson - thank you for addressing element in your first speech. Very good. - solid analysis in your first speech. I appreciate your multi-faceted research to support your points. Speech was a little short Ce 3:10. Great analysis to cross & identifying ways in which the opp's sources were troublesome. Excellent second speech with strong your opponent's framework.

Maria - thank you for addressing our arguments of your opponents in your speech! Perhaps a quick "point preview" before you start? That would help me better follow where you're going. very good second speech and strong delivery. via point of extrajudicial circumstances. - great extemporaneous delivery. via final speech, wanting to tie everything back together and reinforcing your team's position.

Julia great speech intro. Thanks for "road mapping" before you start. solid critique of your opponents' sources excellent analysis. Excellent extemporaneous delivery. thank you for addressing feedback from your opponents in your speech. told follow up w/ extrajudicial circumstances. - excellent extemporaneous speaking delivery. solid analysis of the opp and supporting your points in your final full.

over
→

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Nova Classical CC	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Harold Carlson	28
1	Casey Connell	27

CON

Spkr	Edina TN	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Theo Teske	29
1	Matthew Nissen	28

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Edina

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Casey - slow down - as the season progresses make eye contact. What is TLO? Never defined. Defining terms in Xfire - Define your terms upfront - give me your framework.

Harold - good voice/projection. Great eye contact - you spent 1 minute defining of searches, hit and run! Make that 1:40 spent on definition, waste of your time.

Matthew - you sway side to side - distracting. good projection of voice, pace. When you cite a source validate it - ~~the~~ IG who is Brad Celcius and why should I give him credit? Left 25 seconds, Security Cameras = harm? Signal the context more overtly

Theo - good volume, articulate well - great pace and did a good job reestablishing your case

RFD - I side with Con from Edina -> There was no real clash between sides. Con said this is a big picture debate. Pro was focused on a definition. I agree with Con, this is big picture. Theo did an excellent job with analysis of the points. The cell phone argument and rebuttal was weak. I was wondering about cell phones and privacy as this case is K-12 - How and what are privacy expectations of a 1st grader? Something to consider, this debate applies K-12 (=big picture) Pro, on the rebuttal with 1 minute left you had the first hint of a clash and it was bias with Reasonable Searches. Yes - please continue - that is what Patrick cause puts a pause to, right? I wanted more of this and less about the definition of a search.

Good Luck

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	School/Team	POINTS (20-30)
1/3	Apple Valley HS MAY	28
	Zach Hayes	
	India Smith	

CON

Spkr	School/Team	POINTS (20-30)
4	Edina VB	28
	Sujit Varadhan z	
2	Samantha Bevers	27

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

Signature: Mollie Clark School: Eagan HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

APPLE VALLEY

- Great question asking the neg to show specific evidence especially when they can't.
- Strong rebuttal especially for going maverick. Some things to work on:
 - 1) speech/vocal pases "uh" "like"
 - 2) draw on more warrants, especially ones that clash with the neg.
 - 3) Attack their link stories
- In summary, try to more evenly cover voters. You only spend 25 seconds on school to prison pipeline which I think is where you have a little more argumentative leverage.
- FF is purely defensive. I'd like to see WAY more offense

EDINA

- During the first cross X there's a little bit of a confusion about which students can be drug tested. One good thing to work on would be running CX drills so you can get more familiar with your evidence and advocacy.
- Strong rebuttal, I like your energy. A couple things:
 - 1) Good use of evidence in rebutting their case
 - 2) Claiming more your PC definition. I think your link bit PC → warrant → Arrest needs a little more explanation
 - 3) Your responses on the Aff C2 are not super responsive.
- I'd like to see more warrant extension in your summary, good coverage of major voters. I also think it's important to explain the PC → warrant → arrest chain more clearly.
- Prop biggest offense: Anon tips
- Votes in summary → votes in FF, they have to follow each other

RFD

School to Prison Pipeline

- Aff: there might not be an increase of police officers
- Neg: arrest for drugs

Strict Security

- Dropped by neg in sum @ extend to FF

Anon tips

- Rebutted by aff
- Dropped by neg in FF

↑
 Voting occurs here where I'm not shown the definition of drug searches leading to arrests.

Room: 121
Start: 8:45 AM
Varsity Public Forum

1

Minsker, Max

Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

Not pushing male who's a mistake

PRO		
Spkr		POINTS (20-30)
2	Edina MZ	29
1	David Ma	29
1	Richard Zhu	29

CON		
Spkr		POINTS (20-30)
2	Apple Valley AD	26.5
1	Rahma Abass	26
1	Kathy Dinh	26

FF a little
Kiss of death
didn't lose
47% skew

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Eagan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1 - good job in CX, couldn't push harder on first question

pair zone with McAttee at the top of C2 to ~~set up~~ establish PC/RS distinction before you ~~argue~~ argue that racism when subjectivity w/ HLR ev.

2 - good opening question in CX → continue done more on hot race 9 good prep allocation

1 - too much time on con case in summary
don't lose step and risk arg ^{do more on your case since they don't respond well}

RFD The pro is clearly far more prepared and craves to victory in this round. Pro easily proves trust/race impacts and mitigates all con impacts

with exigency and the fact that the con team doesn't really understand the pros comparative analysis,

1 - no need to define terms
more eye contact
- fill speech time

CX - just concede a point if he's just trying to state your argument
can't concede exigent circumstances

2 - I think you misinterpreted Tiller a little bit.

2 - sign post better, interact w/ opponents evidence
you don't seem to understand this question (RS v PL)
keep track of your own prep

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Eastview DM	POINTS (20 - 30)
3	David Dobkin	28
1	Joe Matijasevich	28.5

CON		
Spkr	Apple Valley BS	POINTS (20 - 30)
4	Abby Brachio	26.5
2	Brandon Schellhaass	27

Winner: Eastview DM debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 Signature: [Signature] School: Edina HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- 1) What is the impact of the self-killing problem?
- 2) Good answers to the excluding etc.
- 3) Don't telegraph your extensions in crossfire.
- 4) Why would you argue to the same amount of searches.
- 5) Solid Summary 3oc. Nice work.
- 6) Don't say acronyms.

Both: Neither case was very narrow.

- 1) ILP was scaled back by both Tinker vs Des Moines? TLO
- 2) Random DT isn't part of the RS vs PC debate - Just had what amount searches, which isn't subject to our warrant requirement.
- 3) I'm not sure your reasoning to the Lasky case or the increased barrier arguments -> the argument isn't thought out
- 4) Where was their card in rebuttal.
- 5) The rights argument was not in the summary.
- 6) You're justifying incorporating neighbors?

PFV
 I think this round is pretty clear.

The Pro is clearly extending their case offense and the Con keeps asserting the benefits of safety but they don't address the warrant for criminalization and the impact of Katie Sang. Even if the number of searches shows the same, the clear evidence of a higher barrier. The Con card went in summary is too late for me.