

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Lakeville RK	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Brandon Rierson	27.5
1	Aashish Komaragiri	27

CON		
Spkr	Edina MC	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Chloe Maynor	28
1	Kendrew Chen	27.5

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

Signature: Elizabeth Rhodes School: Eagan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aashish - when asking a question then saying "I have a card" sounds like a threat, watch your tone.

Kendrew - Nice point for rehab. & student healthy lives. Nice point that principles might go to blanket searches.

Brandon - you are still flustered easily & stumble. Talk your issues out & practice & fire. This was your weakest area, both offensively & defensively.

Chloe - Spot on revealing that \$3000 was per possible no threat. Nice, clear picture of both of schools. Great & fire thinking. Great point of searches. Could your searches data be more than just drug focused?

Even though Con never addressed pro's point of interpersonal trust, they still won due to how they refuted, defended, and addressed their points of view and those of their opponents.

Room: 223
 Start: 8:45 AM
 Junior Varsity Public Forum

1

Landon,

Deborah

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Edina

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Lakeville NR	POINTS (20-30)
2	Sheridan Norcia	27
1	Maddie Rowe	27

CON		
Spkr	Eagan PS	POINTS (20-30)
1	Ayush Patel	29
2	Jason Scheller	29

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

Signature: [Signature] School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Team B (CON)

good structure
 clear to follow
 good use of
 statistics/
 evidence

good eye contact

eloquent

hand gestures
 facial expressions

Speaker 2
 said
 "thing"
 a few
 times

provided
 evidence to
 refute
 other teams
 claims

Team A (PRO)

good eye contact

wish that you addressed
 non qualitative/emotional
 aspects

would have been stronger
 w/ more statistics

eg. occurrence of stuff
 statistics (frequency)

develop a bit more
 confidence
 in speaking

struggled a bit w/
 ideas/pauses
 in presentation

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Eagan GS	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Nirupa Ganesan	27
2	Anusha Sharma	27

CON		
Spkr	Eastview NS	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Akshay Naik	29
1	Ari Schlegel	27

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

Signature: Claire Dodds School: Lakeville

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro spkr 1:

- Constructive only 3:30, maybe add more?
- Don't make all your arguments in CF
- In your summary you need to do some form of roadmapping, you're all over both sides of the flow!
- Be careful with "trust" arguments

Con Spkr 1:

- you'd save a lot of time if you didn't say "end quote" after every card, it's already implied
- Don't let Pro control CF
- Good comeback in CF with asking about punishment and searches link
- a little loud during prep
- THANK YOU for picking the 2 main points in round during prep

Pro spkr 2:

- You keep stating "pro solves this" but never say why
- You had a full minute left to use in rebuttal! Use that time!
- Misunderstood Con (C1), which made your arg against it invalid
- Don't ask "would you agree?" in CF if the obvious answer is no

Con spkr 2

- Good Job pointing out your opponents misunderstanding your (C1)
- Good offense and defense in rebuttal
- have evidence saying Anon Tips will be used less with PC.

RFD: Con did a better job of responding to both sides, debating the key issues, and had more offense

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eastview AP	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Daniel Agbator	27
	Daniel Portnov	27

CON

Spkr	Lourdes EB	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Peter Erickson	25
	Alisha Bhagia	25

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

Signature: [Signature] School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision: Eastview had more substance in their claims.

Argument: Policy of racial discrimination

- S.O.!: Subjectivism
- : White privilege.
- B: School to prison pipeline.
- C:

How long it takes to get a warrant

- Alternative
- + Alternative solution
- kicked out of the classroom?

Objective:
 solution:

Comments:

- Missing hard data (Push)
- Found ambiguity in opponents claims (Praise)

Argument: student crime & violence.

- A: Gun violence
- B: Back log of warrants.
- C:

what is a "silly bandage"

where's the hard data

Comments:

- How do "Silly Bands" lead to gun violence? Plausible cause for search warrants? (Push)
- Points & claims were clear (Praise)

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Eagan JK	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Bjorn Jonas	27
1	Sourish Kundu	28

CON		
Spkr	Edina CO	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Jay Chochreck	29
2	Oscar O'Brien	29

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

Signature: Adit Gupta School: Eastview

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Bjorn & Sourish

Jay & Oscar

- Sourish practice speaking your case more so your voice is clearer
- Bjorn use a little more evidence or logical arguments to refute, otherwise it was good good job with cross referencing to refute points
- good job with pointing out the 412 attack prevented case
- make sure to bring evidence about court case

- ^{50%} good job speaking the case, make a little more eye contact if possible
- Oscar good job in bringing evidence and logical points to refute
- excellent summary

Decision:

Both teams did very well. Both teams could work on practicing more to achieve clarity and being able to convey your points more efficiently. The Pro team could have done a better job at refuting the Con's points. Both teams did well in establishing their positions. The debate was very close, but ~~the~~ the Con won because they did a better job at refuting, holding their position and speaking. Pro did a good job by questioning the "412 attacks prevented" card, so Con make sure to read more on it so it can be clarified for future debates

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eagan CU	POINTS (20-30)
1	Britney Chino	27.5
2	Ijeoma Ugboajah	28

CON

Spkr	Eastview NT	POINTS (20-30)
1	Jagath Naithani	27.5
2	Ethan Ta	28.5

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Britney - Have concrete examples of SROs that have violated student rights; Ben Fields, Joshua Kelly.
 - In summary, try and mention evidence previously read by mentioning author & date.
Ijeoma - Great point that most CON ev indicates the SQ. Make sure you go back to your own original case to argue that racism harms students ability to learn & feel safe.

Jagath - Good speaking style. WRT in loc parentis, make sure to question/counter the assertion "it's not used anymore." You kind of ignore this arg by PRO in summary & just repeat your original arg.

Ethan - Good job clashing & responding to PRO args. You clash the most in the round. However, there is not much discussion of framework or clash here.

RFD FRAMEWORK - There is little round clash here. Which is more important, education or safety. PRO arg that RS is SQ and kids feel unsafe now. They need to be bringing up original construct ev on this but lacking much CON ev/clash here. PRO says in exigent circumstances, PC d/r apply, CON d/r answer much other than to ask definitions of term in crossfire. Education seems more important as framework.

CON arg that students feel unsafe is essentially indictment of SQ and PRO args this. They do essentially not argue that SROs are not cause of school to prison pipeline, but, that zero-tolerance policies are and it's unrefuted. There's some question if it's harder to find drugs on kids (PRO you need better responses here), but this d/r have an in-round impact compared to PRO impact & framework \Rightarrow PRO IS A LOT

GREAT ROUND ALL!