

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Nova Classical CM	POINTS (20-30)
2	Martha Connaire	26
1	Valerie Mao	28

CON

Spkr	Bloomington MM	POINTS (20-30)
2	Katelyn Maguire	27
1	Hodo Mohamed	29

Winner: Bloomington MM debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: John Marshall

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Valerie - preponderance of evidence (only 3 examples!) doesn't work unless clearly

Martha - They were asking for an assertion, not an opinion. Make a claim! The whole argument should have been made if you're right, not CF. If you organize better, you'll be more confident =)

Hodo - Enunciate on constructive & especially taglines! Ask judges about speed. Good defense of metal detectors

Katelyn - No need to apologize for hesitation. You actually don't stutter or pause very much - you are a good speaker.

~~REFD~~

Because the debate's focus shifted away from the resolution and onto metal detectors, I have to vote on whether or not I feel like they are a good idea or not. Because pro did not continue its constructive narrative and did not completely discredit metal detectors, I have to vote CON.

Gene
ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr		POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Edina KT	25
1	Tenzin Kunga	25
1	Karma Tseringtso	25

CON		
Spkr	Eagan RS	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Kira Rostance	26
2	Jordan Sandvig	29

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

Signature: _____ School: Nova

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- RFD I went back and forth about this a lot. Pro started out very strong they didn't use jargon and spoke clearly and in words I could understand but they lost in crossfire and Final Focus
- Pro 1 Good Diction; not too fast Good!
 Good explanation to RS = Terry Stop = Stop Frisk standard
 Avoid too much language like "Contention 1 ..."
- Con 1 ~~As~~ Don't sway on your heels; it's distracting
 Good Argument that RS is a deterrent to bad behavior making schools safer
 Good that you explained connection between RS and ~~any~~ anonymous tips
 (other debaters muddled this issue)
 you lost me on the bullying argument
 In crossfire "It's obvious" is not a good answer to Poole's question
- Pro 2 "Pursuant"; "contrast"; "anonymous tips." (Practice pronouncing these words; otherwise it's distracting)
 you were doing well then abruptly stopped at 90 seconds
 you could have used more time
- Con 2 Good conversational tone.
 Good argument re SRO's
 Good argument that FC standard won't eliminate racism. you could have elaborated
 "Minors don't have some 4th amendment rights as adults"
 Can you give examples?
 Can you talk about how school administrators ≠ cops

Room: 317
Start: 10:00 AM
Novice Public Forum

2

Landon,

Deborah

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Edina

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr		POINTS (20 - 30)
	Lourdes BB	
	Charlie Boggust	27
	Sarah Bower <i>Paula</i>	27

CON

Spkr		POINTS (20 - 30)
	Blake RV	
	Sophia Rohlfen	28
	Joshua Vorbrich	28

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

Signature: *A. Jamal* School: Parent Judge

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO

good job asking for specific evidence/demonstrations in support of their claims

- I liked the specific examples to illuminate your point

Paula good job in ground cross & reasoning for specific examples!

- missed opportunity in final focus to restate evidence in support of your argument

- Chelsea could speak a little louder, ~~with an~~ body language more confident but good job presenting your evidence

use all of your time to build your case or refute their evidence!

CON

well structured

I liked the use of statistics

you did a good job of balancing ~~other teams~~ your con evidence ~~pro~~ w/ refuting/challenging other teams' evidence

in cross & anal in final focus

Room: 303
 Start: 10:00 AM
 Novice Public Forum

2

P/C
 +1.33
 142

Appelget,

Steven

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Bloomington

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr		POINTS (20-30)
	Eagan PG	
	Shailja Panchal	28
1/2	Srilekha Garishakurti	

CON		
Spkr		POINTS (20-30)
	Edina JW	
2	Evan Jiang	28
1	Isaac Wu	28

Winner: Edina JW debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 Signature: [Signature] School: B J

Comments & Reason for Decision:

EVERY BODY! - BUG YOUR COACHES TO TELL YOU WHAT A TERRA
 STOA IS !!

I'd like to hear people challenge the evidence being read, it's not very good and I think those arguments would be kind fun to hear,

RFP

Aff never gives a solid response to Neg's contention that PC wld require more police officers in schools and that is fact. This evidence is DREADEFUL, but conceded.

Aff has good analytic responses to Neg Contention that I see lips and this is - students w/ use anon tips as just another bullying tool

Aff Cont I - No ev Neg ↓ reaches and thupfr at that

Aff Cont II - drops

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr		POINTS (20 - 30)
②	Eagan BW Dhruv Balasubramanian	25
①	Carter Weber	26

CON		
Spkr		POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Edina PS Julia Pan	24
2	Laryn Scribner	25

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

Signature: Amanda Connaire School: Nova Classical Academy

Comments & Reason for Decision:

① Excellent use of examples.
 Timing of speed very good. Gave audience time to process info.
 Highlight with your pens when listening.
 You are passionate in presentation. Audience wants to listen.
 Eyecontact: good job - Keep developing this skill.
 You have an ease in your presence. Keep going - sit taller and command.

② Very mannerly with entire group.
 If you are having issues finding things or moving papers, fake the appearance of being in control.
 Know what you want opponent to clarify. You want to be specific and use correct terms.
 "who said that" → my "what's your source, their credentials"
 Harvard Law is not the end all. Try not to seem like a dog with a bone when sticking to a point (Harvard Law).
 Thank you.

① Started out much too fast and motoric. I honestly could not keep up with your points, so you lost audience attention. Less is more if it means getting your point across. More eye contact please.

Excellent reflective listening during Crossfire!

② Speech speed is very good. Try a little more volume. Own it!
 more questions for opponent. Make them defend by having a question. If they miss, THEY lose points.

"like" or "uh" → Don't use them. → take a breath instead.

Discriminatory v. Discriminate

Excellent job

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Blake BH	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Daniel Barra	28
1	Rishab Halder	27

CON

Spkr	Nova Classical AB	POINTS (20 - 30)
①	Mya Aryal	26.5
②	Dania Barrera	27

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

Signature: Elizabeth Rhodes School: Eagan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Rishab - Great ~~sta~~ opening statement. Well articulated. Your cross fire was unclear. Please don't use the phrase "that's why we're winning" Try "this is why we feel the PRO deserves a vote"

Daniel - You did not use all your time - work on that. Nice point that con side didn't address your points. ~~Wed~~ Well stated. Calm down!!

Mya - You seem to be hesitant. Work on voice volume & be more sure of yourself and your points. Your crossfire seemed unsure. For you and Dania - tighten up wording - state it once - don't say it over and over. That wastes time.

Dania - nice point on teacher bias - but not strong enough. You agreed bias exists - but existing & acting on bias is not a given. You were warned twice by the pro team that you failed to respond to them - listen next time.

While con presented their points clearly and with great support, they failed to respond and address pro's points. Because of this ~~the~~ the win goes to pro.

Room: N22
Start: 10:00 AM
Novice Public Forum

2

Landseidel,

Derek

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Bloomington

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Lakeville GG	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Justin Geertsema	27
2	Gus Gerlach	26

CON

Spkr	Edina RR	POINTS (20 - 30)
X1	Luke Rubin	26
X2	Aditya Rewalliwar	26

Winner: Lakeville debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 Signature: [Signature] School: Bloomington

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Overall: The Pro developed a strong opening argument with evidence that was not rebutted much by the con side. I felt the school retaliations argument was fairly untouched by the con team, as well as the notion that students should learn without fearing punishment for suspicious causes. The Pro side also did a good job refuting the anonymous tips issue. Great debate overall. It was close!

Derek.

Pro: I appreciated a clear framework provided. Nice work during the rebuttals and cross X!

Con: ~~was~~ there was a time I was unclear of what side you were arguing at the end. But I did appreciate the depth of evidence for your case. Nice work!

For both teams: I thought you got lost in small details during the cross X but still did a good job of respecting each other + still attacking the opposing arguments

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eagan HK	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Andrea Hagape	28
1	Sanjana Krishnamurthy	28

CON

Spkr	John Marshall NF	POINTS (20 - 30)
3	Lap Nguyen	28
4	Daniel Fleury	27

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Lap - don't talk to partner while opponent is speaking or while partner is speaking
- Both sides - Don't ask compound question:
 - One topic -
- Court decision is not as persuasive as reasoning behind decision - understand why the court ruled as it did
- Observe formalities of process
 - Is opponent ready?
 - Is judge ready?
- Con needs to address racism issue
- Pro - Con stated "Evidence that P.C. would drastically increase violence." But No evidence offered - Challenge!
- Don't pack up before debate is over

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Edina AP	POINTS (20-30)
1	Camilla Atalla	25
3	Marnie Pardo	25

CON		
Spkr	Eastview HO	POINTS (20-30)
4	Jordan Homstad	27
2	Bitsy Oberle	27

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

Signature: Mollie Clark School: Eagan HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

EDINA

- an extra 1:30 left in construction: make sure that you're utilizing all of your time.
- In CX make sure you can point out your specific evidence when your opponent asks where you prove certain ideas. ☺
- Also Jason Nance's credibility is that he's one of the leading scholars of privacy issues in schools.
- Signpost in Rebuttal and go down their flow, answering each contention.
- Don't talk to your partner during CX
- 1:00 left in summary Try to organize important issues into VOTERS to better organize.
- In GCX be careful not to get talked over

COMMENTS FOR ALL

- everyone needs more organization
- work on using evidence to crash against your opponent's case.
- Try to use all of your time.

EASTVIEW

- During ICX, face the judge when you're asking and answering questions.
- Make sure to sign post your responses in rebuttal.
- Don't talk to your partner during CX
- Try to organize summary into voting issues to make your arguments clearer. Try to use all of your time as well?
- In GCX be careful not to talk over your opponents (Jordan, you especially struggle with this) when you ask questions. Let them answer.
- Don't laugh while your opponents are speaking

RFD

- I end up voting for the negative team, they better extend evidence and make an emotional appeal to protect minority students.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Bloomington MS	POINTS (20-30)
	Luke Modeo-Price	30
	Darwin Scherf Lane	

CON

Spkr	Nova Classical CG	POINTS (20-30)
	Ian Crawshaw	30
	Aseem Gidwani	30

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

Signature: Teresa Felmlee School: JMHS

Comments & Reason for Decision: Luke: You had strong arguments; keep repeating evidence / Ian: Strong arguments w/ evidence / Aseem: Strong arguments w/ evidence

- #1 - low std of R.S.
 ✓ evidence (2013)(2014)
 ↑ expulsion for minor action
 ↑ minority charged
 - Better learning environment
 ↑ R.S. searched = ↑ mistrust
 ✓ evidence
 ↓ respect for law/authority
 ✓ evidence
 make schools unsafe = mistrust
 PC

- #2 PC; search; ought
 - swift discipline can't be done using P.C.
 ✓ evidence
 ↓ learning environment
 - unsafe environment (weapons & drugs)
 ✓ evidence (2013)

X fire
 2: minor infractions?
 1: ↓ trust
 2: unsafe schools? so don't get to school
 1: ?

X fire!
 Pro: will not get P.C. based on racial bias.
 Con: will ignore evidence? to be bias

Did not address racial issues

#3 - PC std must be met (no warrant needed)

#4 - Trust:
 Police won't be able to do job if PC must be met.
 - PC = warrant which = more time
 ↳ doesn't stop crime

Summary

- ↓ search = environment is safer
- ↑ RS & respect for law
- Racial bias exists

Summary
 - SRO's can ↑ trust by being able to do job
 - sm. infractions are not searched
 - race brought up

Final: ↑ std for search = ↑ trust between teacher - student

Final:
 Trust: ↑ crime w/ PC
 Bias: believe PC will not ↓ racial bias
 Warrant: time to get one will allow crime to

Room: Main Hall Conference
Start: 10:00 AM
Novice Public Forum

2

Parra, Maggie
Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr		POINTS (20 - 30)
	Edina Sa	
	Zach Paradis	
	Michael Santoni	

CON

Spkr		POINTS (20 - 30)
	Lakeville NM	
	Abigail Nachreiner	
	Ruby Martinez	

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

Signature: Maggie Parra School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

No show

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Bloomington Ph	POINTS (20-30)
	Charles Maki	27
	Vivian Pham 1st	27

CON

Spkr	Edina FD	POINTS (20-30)
	Nicholas Fu 1st	28
	Michael Dalsin	27

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

Signature: Cindy Lutz School: Eagan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1st aff - delivery was a little too fast and sometimes difficult to understand. This early in your career and the season I think it would have been better to have fewer contentions and subpoints with more clear delivery.

1st neg - nice clear delivery and explanation of issue.

2nd aff - good point about anonymous tips still useful under probable cause standard

2nd neg - good organization in 1st speech. Could've used remaining prep time to get ready for summary.

Both - please face the judge during crossfire.

RFD: This was a close round, but I think the Con overall did a little better job of explaining the issues and their arguments. The Pro didn't convince me that the school environment would be better or safer using the probable cause standard.

Anonymous tips: this issue became kind of a wash for both sides.

Over

1:23
1:40

Room: 308
Start: 10:00 AM
Novice Public Forum

2

Lutz, David
Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Edina MZ	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Arjun Maheshwari	27
1	Ryan Zhu	27

CON		
Spkr	John Marshall HM	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Ali Hezeil	27
1	Keerthi Manikonda	28

Winner: JM debating on the Neg Side (Pro/Con) Low point win? _____
 Signature: David N. Lutz School: Eagan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

General comments. Nice job, everyone! Cross should be used to make points, like WA asking 1A of 4th Andro app to students. Too much "Can you restate your argument?" questions after 1A + 2A. Distorting is distracting. i please argue to MR, not to Aff's, ~~and~~ perhaps scale back aggression as to just a bit. Just a little aggression. Low this comment has NOTHING to do with gender. Everyone after 1A ad 1N, it would help me if you tell the M. clearly where you are on the flow. Neg, why would you use your prep time before Aff turn? 2A, you cannot decline answer a question on cross. 2N, nice job of weaving in the cross in 2NR.

In Loco Parentis. The concept is that schools can act in parental role. Aff says TLO abolished the doctrine, but no support. Neg argues a court case can't abolish a doctrine, but I don't buy that either. As a lawyer, I don't see why a court case can't abolish a doctrine, such as economic loss doctrine, work product doctrine. 1 NR actually reads from the case survey, which reads it for Neg.

Discriminatory. Aff argues that discipline is inherently discriminatory. Neg responds only that more probable cause ("PC") will not ↓ discrim. I agree, but it will ↓ opportunities to apply tech. that will be applied discriminatorily. ~~I think Aff's argument is~~

Criminalization. Aff argues that Reasonable Suspicion ("RS") standard → criminalization, which essentially becomes self-fulfilling. Neg has no response except that it will still occur under PC. Problem: there are fewer opportunities to exercise power that tends to be used in a manner that causes alienation.

4th Andro. Aff is right that PC better preserve 4th Andro Rights. Neg argues Minors don't have 4th Andro rights. Aff's cite to 14th Andro doesn't show that 4th Andro applies. Minors. Neg analogy re 3rd Andro is well reasoned, altho it doesn't show that 4th Andro doesn't apply. Neg shows Minors don't have same rights.

Safety. Neg shows there is a lot of violence. Aff points out that this occurs under RS standard, but I have little evidence re whether PC will ↑ or ↓ violence, except that I have an example of a gun found in PA under RS that would not have been found under PC. This road could have been won by either side if either side had responded more fully. In the end with little refutations by either side, I go w/ side that refuted better, which was Neg.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Cannon Falls JF	POINTS (20-30)
1	Laura Johnson	28
2	Bryson Felton	28

CON

Spkr	Bloomington BS	POINTS (20-30)
2	Sophie Bierlein	23
1	Bree Smokovich	24

Winner: Cannon Falls JF debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____ School: _____

Details of case were explicit & consistent throughout debate.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Public K-12
 Probably Cause → 4th Amendment
 + Creates harm
 • Breaks trust
 Inhibits learning.
 Expenses & treats students like criminals, eg a student.

Repetitive searches.
 Tax \$ → education

Safety & agreement of Framework
 End doesn't justify the means.

Comments:
 Praise: Stayed consistent throughout debate.
 Push: Claims @ the start should be more sound.

Metal detectors. (Need of)
 Not based on probable cause
 • Reduces guns & knives in school
 • Uses hard data & the elimination of searches & biases.
 #2 "To keep students safe."
 Reduces expenses.
 85% of drug sniffing dogs are wrong ✓

Comments:
 Praise: Claims were strong in the beginning
 Push: Could be more prepared. Claims could be more clear.