

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Lakeville CM	POINTS (20-30)
1	Maddie Cook	27
3	Karen McCoy	27

CON

Spkr	Apple Valley HS	POINTS (20-30)
2 <sup>nd</sup>	Zach Hayes	28
	India Smith	28

1:15

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

Signature: Nikhil N. Kale School: Blake

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Zach - I think you should re-structure your case to be 1 contention potentially. C2 is just how the SA solves the harms of C1, they're not really separate arguments. I think the trouble w/ it is also evident in rebuttal when you make between impacts + solency across contentions. When you address GW on edu you're close to giving a justification but just tag on a because statement. Like = you prefer this b/c X. I think the lack of searchest and also hampers your argument unless you clarify that the standard is what creates deterrence not searching medicine - If he's just asking for the link to the resolution assuming w/ impacts isn't responsive. Cool it w/ the side coaching in cross  
 & this term need unspecified extensions than just generic "we improve x". Cite the same authors you used in case. Try to put in a question or so in GCP. Ideally you do most of the work in GCP so your partner can prep.  
 Karen - you should explain why edu is the most important impact. Doesn't new conflict w/ RS out  
 Solving violence? - yeah he pointed it out. Exigent is like ex-ij-ent. I think you're contradicting yourself in defending that crime is just going down b/c time and then saying he's not sharing  
 Solency if schools are still unsafe  
Zach - You probably need a better answer to their trust impact than just claiming the link is absurd.

RFP: Issues Aff wants me to vote on  
 - Minorities - Reject b/c minorities are still treated disproportionately bad in the real world under PK  
 - Trust - Aff is probably winning that trust increases but specific impacts of trust aren't really extended.

Issues NEG wants me to vote on  
 - safety - NEG wins this b/c deterrence prevents crime i.e. of the evidence Aff read from newton saying crime is down in the SA. overall This outweighs because NEG wants that safety is needed to access educational benefits.

NEG on safety.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eastview FM	POINTS (20-30)
1	Dante Fornizy	28.5
3	Osman Mansur	29

CON

Spkr	Edina PM	POINTS (20-30)
2	Owen Pheneretton	28
4	Jenny Ma	29

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

Signature: Leena Philip School: Blake

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO has done a better job of carrying the main voting points thru the round. Some of the CON arguments like tips being valid under PC is reverting to RS didn't make sense. Even under PC, tips can lead to investigation or even searches depending on severity of the situation.  
good point on correlation leading to high risk student being more likely to be in criminal justice later, but what is your evidence?  
Pro good turns on 30% not trusting + drug test leading to harder drugs.  
also good turn on anonymous<sup>tip</sup> searches due to flimsy reasons

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Lakeville OR	POINTS (20 - 30)
2 <del>1</del>	Drake Olson	28
1 <del>2</del>	Tyler Rebischke	29

CON		
Spkr	Eagan FP	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Quinn Foerster	27
1	Reece Peters	28

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Eastview

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Tyler - good voice (projected) - fast - slow down a bit. You are swaying side to side. Good case - good structure.  
 Drake - you took 15 seconds stating what you are going to talk about. Good projection and eye contact. Work more on impacting. You get general/vague

Reece - Set your framework/context upfront - don't start with your first words "Contention One". Good volume - slow down - you say "Um" a lot! I'm struggling with your case, cheating and bullying. You need a clear argument  
 Quinn - passionate! Breath - your face is turning red trying to read fast. "Cheating and bullying is the root of all problems in schools." - you said that, really? - Don't use absolute words like always, all. In limits you. I.e hunger, poverty are issues that inhibit learning at schools too. you are being called out in Grand Cross - now - if you are printed

RFD - I side with Pro (Lakeville OR). They had better mechanics, better arguments and keep the debate on point with Clash. Con didn't attack the Pro vulnerabilities adequately (IE - why should Kindergartners be treated as adults for PC searches?)  
 Pro - I feel you could have put it away by writing your points. They are there but fragments to the argument. (IE Say/acknowledge that cheating and cyber-bullying will exist with PC or RS environments by you C1 and C2 are prefer because... treated with disrespect etc). You have all those parts out there but sum it up and embrace your opponents points and extend (Goes to Con too)

Con - in Ford - say Framework is safety so how does cheating fit in your

Good Luck

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Apple Valley BS	POINTS (20-30)
2	Abby Brachio	29
1	Brandon Schellhaass	29

CON

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

Winner: Eagan KW debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature: [Signature] School: EV

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The biggest problem PRO has in this round is that a lot of their attacks on the CON case rely on the idea that warrants are easy to get. Unfortunately, I don't ever get any evidence to substantiate this, meaning almost all of the CON case still stands at the end of the round, while PRO loses most of their impacts on CIP by never providing me with a direct link to RS/PC searches, and showing me how affirming actually helps to address these issues. I negate.

#27

:26 Room: 121  
Start: 10:00 AM  
Varsity Public Forum

2

Vair, James

Eastview

# ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

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

CON

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

Winner: EDINA MZ debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: EASTVIEW

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Jeff - Great first speech. Very interesting analysis with your reason of how reasonable suspicion leads to Fourth Amendment encroachment. Good delivery, however was towards a more extemporaneous style so that you don't just read to us. Great critique of the con during cross. Great second speech. You did a very nice job of thoroughly analyzing and taking apart of the con's argument, which supported your case. Did not have any questions during second cross, leading you to look unprepared.

Richard - Excellent extemporaneous delivery. In your first speech a quick intro/point preview would have been helpful. Intriguing analysis of how strict scrutiny measures are multi-faceted in their negative impact on the school. Great cross, defending your case and critiquing your opponent. Solid understanding of probable cause vs. reasonable suspicion. Great summary speech. ~~Very exceptional topic. Excellent analysis in grand cross.~~

David - Wow, solid analysis in your first speech. Excellent extemporaneous delivery and solid analysis. Additionally your critique of the opposition clearly supports your position through clear and logical presentation of your case. Excellent job during cross, you are clearly prepared and are well-versed in your case/the resolution. Excellent final four speech.

over →

# ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Apple Valley AD	POINTS (20-30)
2	Rahma Abass	27
1	Kathy Dinh	27

CON

Spkr	Eastview DM	POINTS (20-30)
2	David Dobkin	29
1	Joe Matijasevich	29

Winner: Eastview DM debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: John Fogarty School: CF

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro - you have pushed the racial issues, but there were no questions about that in Crossfire. Pro 2 - you have spent too much time in rebuttal defending your case, not attacking theirs. Con - yes, zero tolerance doesn't really have any relation to searches. Pro has indicated that P.C. doesn't always need a warrant. That may be important here, but they did not follow up in Summary. Crossfire shows that Pro doesn't understand zero tolerance and Con does. In this final focus, Pro has to show more about how P.C. actually can make change in the school... Not just that R.S. is bad

R.F.D. - Con has shown that Pro hasn't really proven that P.C. changes all the problems they show in R.S. and they needed to. Con does show that there is a better chance of safety due to anon. tips.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

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

CON

Spkr	Eagan SV	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Maria Sanchez	27 <del>28</del>
1	Roselin Victor	<del>27</del> 26

Winner: Edina TN debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: Blake

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro - need to get a stand, hunching over your computer makes it hard to understand what you're saying

Eagan - need to read more evidence on the cyberbullying contention

Edina - great rebuttal speech, lots of common sense responses and cross application of your case

Eagan - need to ask a question, Edina is dominating crossfire

Edina - good final focus, you're extending the right args

Eagan - MUST answer the arg that violence / drugs in schools means reasonable suspicion doesn't work now

RFD - Pro is winning substantial defense on con case, also winning that fairness is a pre-req to con impacts / solvency

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eastview DP	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Tharun Dulla	28
	Elijah Peterson	23

CON

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

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

Signature: [Signature] School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- (Both) - Confident, eloquent speech  
 ↳ eye contact w/o losing place in argument
- (Both) - Evenly balanced stats ; storytelling
- (Eastview DP) - Issue with non-relevant leading questions during crossfire  
 ↳ e.g. "would you agree..." [insert basic gesture question that doesn't actually pertain to the issue.]  
 ↳ like, "Would you agree that students should be safe in schools?"  
 ↳ which is kind of about the topic but doesn't technically focus on the points in the opponents argument.
- (Both) - Equally strong skills on both sides  
 ↳ Multiple mentions on both sides about, "And that's what this debate is about."  
(Nova Classical reads)
- Solid end speeches by both



# ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Edina VB	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Sujit Varadhan	29
1	Samantha Bevers	27.5

CON

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

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

Signature: Dhiemann School: Lakerette

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Trust in the law

- I think you could do a better job explaining your evidence.

- I would have liked you to push the con on the idea that everyone's racist. You can easily turn that.

- cost benefit analysis

- Nice job turning the 40% card. The aff didn't give enough info for me to leave it on their flow.

- You talk a lot about circumstances but do not link

good luck ☺

RFD- In the end the Pro provided the biggest impact of increased civic engagement, linking to cons framework.

1 affirm

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eastview RK	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Suhail Rizvi	27
1	Tenzin Kunchok	27

CON

Spkr	Blake KO	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Fatiya Kedir	28
1	Sinan Onder	27

Winner: Blake KO debating on the Con Low point win?

Signature: [Signature] School: Rosemount

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2AC (Suhail) - You made a lot of claims w/o providing the reasons why they were true. "We've shown..." and rattling off uncontested citations doesn't contend the opposition.

1NR (Sinan) - When you announced the Cost-Benefit framework; it actually ignores the conceded "safety" standard established by Pro and ~~agreed~~ conceded by your partner.

RFD This is a story of drops. Ultimately Con ~~wins~~ has a compelling warrant on the PIC → SRO → prison link + impact chain. Out of the pro I'm not seeing a compelling advantage. Con!

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Apple Valley SK	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Julia Scovil	30
1	Carson Kowalski	29

CON

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

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

Signature: Bonnie Horgos School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- PRO CONSTRUCT:** Defines probable cause. Reads clearly. Looks up & acknowledges judge. Strong body language. Cites evidence to support argument. Very well written, but sounds like he's speaking in an engaging manner, not simply reading.
- CON CONSTRUCT:** Starts w/ strongly written anecdote—extremely engaging. Speaks clearly and expressively. Strong body language (posture, eye contact, ~~the~~ hand gestures). Uses evidence to back up claim.
- CROSSFIRE:** Carson asks validity of a source. Michelle says they provide more solid evidence. Carson relies on a couple colloquial expressions, uses "like" a couple times. Carson points out the weakness in the argument that teachers replace students @ school.
- REBUTTAL:** 40 seconds used to prep by PRO. Speaks strongly & clearly. Crouches down a bit to read notes; a bit distracting at times, but better than holding papers in front of face. States that minority students often targeted. Cites evidence to support argument. Asserts that schools aren't as dangerous as people claim; bullying is a greater worry. ~~stronger than the other~~
- REBUTTAL:** Makes really strong eye contact, strong body language. Agrees that criminalization is bad, but uses statistics to rebut opponent's statement. ~~stronger than the other~~ Uses strong statistics to address racial issues. Claims that bullying is terrible, but not relevant to today's debate.
- CROSSFIRE:** Julia addresses 32% drop in juvenile crime, says that it doesn't relate to schools → Ross states it's assumed though it's school. Julia asks Ross to validate source that violence has been reduced in schools; Ross states it's from NPA. Julia asks if students feel unsafe because of safety or because of violence.
- PRO SUMMARY:** 40 seconds used to prep by PRO. Addresses that teachers will violate students' rights, uses evidence to support claim. Says it doesn't threaten America's

OVER →

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Edina KI	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	James Kuznecoff	28
1	Khalid Ishani	29

CON

Spkr	Blake AJ	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Anish Aggarwal	29.5
1	Joel Jude	29.5

Winner: Blake AJ debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature: G Thomas School: Eastview

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Khalid Really clear, strong case!  
 slow down during delivery if you want me to write all of the details. As always - great job in CF.  
 You did a great job doing damage control in summary but your position got reduced to a positive step down from all of the offense you had

Joel Really interesting case, I haven't seen an argument like your CI - I'm really interested to see how it plays out.  
 - Summary was so thorough and played a key role in extending discrimination argument

James You're making good points but you HAVE to slow down in rebuttal. You can make all of those arguments without the speed reading.  
 FF was strong, but those arguments are coming too late in the round, try to make them earlier.

Anish Really good job defending your CI in reb. and CF. Reb. was a little fast - try to slow down just a bit.  
 FF was strong + you carried the arguments of your reb + partner's summary through really clearly

RFD I vote ~~pro~~<sup>con</sup> in this round, but I really do want to stress that both teams did a great job. ~~Pro~~<sup>con</sup> won their discrimination argument, which allowed them access to a lot of pro's points impacts about the WS and that was the biggest voter for me. Anish - debate!

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

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

CON

Spkr	Eagan FS	POINTS (20-30)
2	Scott Franklin	28
1	Amrit Sanal	29

Winner: Eagan FS debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: EDINA

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO CON makes two main args in case: 1) Cyberbullying is b/c harder to prosecute under Probable Cause (PC) standard & 2) PC would lead to increased generalized searches (GS). CON agrees with PRO framework, no adjudication necessary, still, it might be beneficial to CON to run own framework. This is just nitpicking.

I would have voted CON on both args. CON kind of abandons cyberbullying wholesale after first speech and focuses on general bullying, but the scenario is very specific about "The Cyber" as our GOP nominee calls it. PRO kind of ignores the actual scenario, but CON follows the new generalized bullying line and this arg ends up washing out.

GENERALIZED SEARCHES - CON argues a very specific scenario in which PC would lead to a lack of searches, which would cause a media outcry, which would lead to teachers feeling powerless, which would lead to the need for things like generalized searches. PRO misunderstands this arg and essentially drops it. CON points this out in every subsequent speech and CON addresses in final speech. Too late. This scenario has like four to five internal links which seem weak, but absent PRO args, I have to accept. This effectively turns case. => CON Ballot

Well done all!