

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Apple Valley SK	POINTS (20-30)
3	Julia Scovil	26
1	Carson Kowalski	28.5

CON

Spkr	Eastview DP	POINTS (20-30)
2	Tharun Dulla	29
4	Elijah Peterson	29.5

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

Signature: Alekh N. Kale School: Blake

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Julia: "Columbus School of Law says" is an incorrect citation.  
 I'm not entirely sure what your first answer to anon tips was. Students have a face to their disclosure so they can be followed up with. TIPS don't provide an ID to corroborate info with.

Tharun - "Columbia University says" is an incorrect citation. Authors ~~write~~ write studies not universities.

Carson: I think TIPS does have a pretty clear line to deterrence. Either way, you should probably refute the warrant as well. If they just provided ↓ standard = ↑ deterrence as an analytic I'd still be evaluating it.

RFD: FW - safety matters more than anything.

Issues PRO wants me to vote on

- Criminalization - ~~anonymization~~ PRO wins some points but not really directly since discipline and searching are different.

- Issues CON wants me to vote on
- Deterrence - I think the link is won pretty clearly that a higher standard decreases deterrence
- Anon TIPS - CON is winning the Colorado line pretty clearly
- CON is winning that arrests take "bad" kids out of school

CON on deterrence/safety

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Edina VB	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Sujit Varadhan	29
1	Samantha Bevers	28

CON		
Spkr	Blake KO	POINTS (20-30)
2	Fatiya Kedir	30
1	Sinan Onder	29

Winner: Blake KO debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO  
 Signature: [Signature] School: Eastview

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Samantha - good pace, good inflection  
 You speed up from time to time - Good  
 Constructions of Cases. Over the season loose  
 the papers or look up at the judge more, No  
 impacts in your opening.

Sujit - Slow down, pickup your tablet and  
 read rather than duck down. SRO - Can someone  
 tell me what that is? Good to  
 re-establish your team's position

Samantha - join the grand cross - haven't  
 heard you and 1 minute left. This is team  
 work here - Never heard from you


Sinan - great volume, look up, don't just read,  
 & you are looking up more with last minute.  
 What are SRO? Never defined. I find your  
 contentions defensive (against PC - rather than offense)  
 Cross X is your strength.  
 Fatiya - you know the material! Fantastic - slow  
 down - sometimes a pause to a point will give  
 it even more impact. If their study consisted of  
 white <sup>students</sup> only (cause - let that sink) - not  
 a hit and run statement.  
 SRO are racist? (Sinan - you are confusing me - are  
 you pro now)

RFD - I side with Con from Blake KO. Better mechanics, they  
 impacted, Con brought in the ~~extra~~ content and effected us them to  
 say why the Con position is better. They know the evidence better, they  
 know the opponents evidence better. Con had better analysis, though I  
 struggle with the cost benefit framework.

Good Luck

Room: 218  
 Start: 11:00 AM  
 Varsity Public Forum

3



Appelget,

Steven

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Bloomington

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eagan SV	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Maria Sanchez	25
2	Roselin Victor	26

CON

Spkr	Apple Valley BS	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Abby Brachio	28
	Brandon Schellhaass	28

Winner: Apple Valley BS debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature: [Signature] School: BS  
 (Ed. Wm. Mitchell, L.R.)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Folks, Law Review articles are NOT PEER REVIEWED - we just checked ~~with~~ citations & grammar/spelling. Peer review is a specific process which does not apply to Law Reviews.

RFD-

~~on pro side, there is no harm from cost & is not relevant.~~

No ev or argument that either PC is a standard ~~or~~ causes harm or that PC as a standard gains advantages. Contrariwise, ~~implementing~~ implementing PC means more dogs -

Room: 121  
 Start: 11:00 AM  
 Varsity Public Forum

3

Averbeck,  
 Elizabeth

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Lourdes

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Eastview AU	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Ross Abram	29
1	Michelle Uchenik	28

CON		
Spkr	Edina MZ	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	David Ma	29
1	Richard Zhu	28

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

Signature: Elizabeth Averbeck School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Michelle / Very professional w/ strong skills. Intriguing sociological study. Good turn on probable cause + # criminalized. Good job using clarification.

Richard / Good delivery w/ a lot of evidence.

Ross / Great organization & use of logic. Look at judge during crossfire.

David / A lot of evidence! (in rebuttal) Good knowledge of evidence.

REF / Great debate! All speakers did a fantastic job. This was not an easy case to decide. Both sides had a lot of evidence which made for great clashes & debates. The win goes to PRO for following reasons:

① Criminalization: Both sides claim their world will ↓ crim, but I'm sure by Pros point that cameras, etc. would be less invasive & don't disc. while con says they're disp. used in minority schools, they didn't prove it to me.

② Standards: while con use Johnson v. US to show vague nature. PC def - it's not any less vague than RS & when combined w/ other args to clarify, con's attempts do point out media's strong sensationalism, & dash in there & therefore its impact falls out.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

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

CON		
Spkr	Apple Valley HS	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Zach Hayes	24
	<del>India Smith</del>	

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

Signature: Claire Dodds School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro spkr 1: <sup>Dante</sup> Great speaking style, very clear  
 • Great impacts in case  
 • Powerful CF, gained major offense  
 • Good Summary, picked main 2 issues in the round  
 • Love the clarification of mitigation, not solving

Pro spkr 2: <sup>osman</sup>  
 • Also great speaking style, clear & well paced  
 • Rebuttal was thorough w/ evidence on every argument made  
 • Good call with racism still happening with Rs despite con's definition  
 • Great framework debate & key voters

Con  
 • On average you say the word "like" about 15 times in every question you answer/argument you make  
 • No sources used in rebuttal.  
 • You cant extend a contention w/o addressing the args made against it  
 • None of your arguments against their contentions had any link/evidence  
 • Your use of "like" is distracting

RFD:  
 - Pro pretty much had the most offense during the entire round, and actually used evidence.

Seriously, best speaking skills I've seen in debate in a long time, keep it up! :)

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Eastview RK	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Suhail Rizvi	30
1	Tenzin Kunchok	29

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

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

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

Very Close! Case became stronger over crossfire. Case was firm & well dis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1: Healthiest Environment  
 Brain & psychology  
 DOE California  
 Great Resources

42% odds  
 Facts acknowledged. Backed-up

climate of schools

Increasing standard probable cause.

2: what would build a better environment.

A) Accountability of warrants

Are labels meant to be true?

Zero Tolerance Policy.

1: Schools are always at risk.  
 school administration  
 Negatively

2: Zero tolerance society.  
 Media displays that school violence is out of control

Tried  
 Probable Cause -  
 Personal search

Praise

\* Key language is called out! \*

Push: Bring up comparing socio-economic status up

Praise: Made Pro very difficult to find substance in case.

Push: Bring up comparing socio-economic status up more frequently

Room: 008  
Start: 11:00 AM  
Varsity Public Forum

3

Pendergast,

Devon

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Apple Valley

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Edina PM	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Owen Phenertton	27
3	Jenny Ma	29

CON

Spkr	Eagan NC	POINTS (20 - 30)
	<del>Vy Nguyen</del> Mauerreck	
2+4	Jeffrey Chen	28

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Apple Valley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- All:
- Both teams should avoid asking if your opponent has any more questions, keep the pressure up! Aff doesn't have to take first question either.
  - Both first speakers need more eye contact in constructives.

Owen: Your summary was almost restating Jenny's rebuttal without extending. The job of the summary is to narrow the focus for the judge to a couple issues that you would be winning.

Jenny: Love your speed/confidence in rebuttal, keep up the intensity. Your first speech needed to have a little more warrant to the arguments against Jeffrey's second contention, but overall good job. Low signposting needs to be better. Good job on de-linking cont 3, and responding at the same time but you and Owen didn't respond to the negative repairs.

Jeffrey: Great job on going max. Balanced eye contact and good time management. You didn't respond to their Minorities contention but they drop it too and fail to capitulate.

**RFD:** This was a muddy round because no one gave reasons to vote for your side, only against your opponents. Con wins framework and thus I'll vote of security impacts. Tips flow con due to lack of response of ~~the~~ Jeffrey's argument on exogen circumstance being rare. I also buy "corroboration of evidence needed with tips!" Minority students would have won Aff the round if brought up before FF but Neg carries Tips, Bullying and framework on safety. I vote Neg.

P.S. because of the ~~violence prevention~~ ~~and evidence~~ ~~argument~~ ~~flowed~~ Neg's argument.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

→ 28 if .5 is not allowed  
 1.35  
 .25

2:00  
 1:10  
 :55

PRO		
Spkr		POINTS (20 - 30)
	Blake AJ	
2	Anish Aggarwal	27.5
1	Joel Jude	27

CON		
Spkr		POINTS (20 - 30)
	Eastview DM	
2	David Dobkin	27
1	Joe Matijasevich	27

Winner: Blake AJ debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win?   
 Signature: [Signature] School: Rosemount

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2NC You need to try to go point-by-point when ~~the~~ your opponent does so.  
IAR / INR Y'all grouped tons of arguments and didn't address each other past reiterating claims from previous speeches, ignoring all of the more refined responses.  
Con - maybe flow your opponents last speech.

RFD Simply, the Pro is able to clearly extend ~~was~~ a ~~st~~ story of how they increase trust and answer ~~with~~ with ~~us~~ / warn sorta shallow claim bashing by the con.



Room: 203  
 Start: 11:00 AM  
 Varsity Public Forum

3

LaMoore,

Lindsay

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Cannon Falls

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eagan KW	POINTS (20-30)
1	Nibraas Khan	28
2	Hunter Weber	27

CON

Spkr	Lakeville OR	POINTS (20-30)
2	Drake Olson	27
1	Tyler Rebeschke	27

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature] School: Cannon Falls

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Nibraas Be careful to not ask Pro Con for solvency if you've said ~~that~~ solvency doesn't exist in either world (mitigation focus).

Drake

Tyler Summary speeches don't need to address all contentions, hence summary speech, which is where you want to summarize arguments that arose from constructive speeches.

Hunter

Pro's main argument was that reasonable suspicion allows for more subjective searches, ~~which is not the case regarding Ex. Circumstances~~ which creates avenues for biased searches, i.e. racism, whereas probable cause requires more before action is taken and therefore the standard itself acts as a filter for subjectivity.

Con responded by saying that racism is inherent in society and thus probable cause would lead to (essentially) racial profiling. However, this isn't well supported and Pro's argument that the standard would solve for this stands. Con's rebuttle that warrants take longer time-wise was never truly refuted by Pro, yet it didn't carry the weight of the ~~and~~ given that Ex. Circumstances could be employed if necessary, which is a situation-specific instance, ~~and~~ and can't entirely be refuted by it's an interpretation of law when it's enacted.

I don't buy Con's argument that teachers couldn't be taught P.C. = ↑ SROs = ↑ racism and criminalization because this is the same rhetoric used by Con to refute the Page 8 of 11 Pro argument on "racism is inherent to society."

Room: 122  
Start: 11:00 AM  
Varsity Public Forum

3

Rebischke, Mike

Lakeville

### ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

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

CON

Spkr	Eagan FP	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Quinn Foerster	29
1	Reece Peters	28

Winner: Nova Classical CC debating on the Pro side. Low point win? Yes  
Signature: Mike Rebischke School: Lakeville

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~Both sides presented well, very good interaction & eye contact~~  
Both sides presented well, very good interaction & eye contact  
Pro did not address all contentions of con (Cheating)  
Need more support & depth around zero tolerance

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Apple Valley AD	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Rahma Abass	28
3	Kathy Dinh	28.5

CON

Spkr	Lakeville CM	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Maddie Cook	27
2	Karen McCoy	27.5

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

Signature: Ma-June School: BLAKE

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Lakeville - it seems like your contentions may conflict with one another "don't criminalize students... but teach them all for drugs and weapons at any time"

RFD: Pro wins on scope - racial discrimination affects more students than the very small number of students who are killed in schools. Con needs to do a better job of framing their impacts.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

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

CON

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

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Apple Valley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF!  
 Amrit: You're kinda loud take it down lower. But great impact!

Scott: Good rebuttal. But try and spend more time on their case instead of your own. Don't cut people off during cross.

CON:  
 Ella: 3:45 → have time for more stuff in case.  
 → Don't let him define what your 3rd contentions means its a trap!!!

Hannah: Don't cut people off during cross, don't let him talk about his points during cross.

RFD: So Eagan has a better "Exert most of their impact" than Cannon Falls. Higher standard will decrease gear lines. Racism: effective return on everyone bias. Higher standard will decrease gear lines. Buses on bias criminalization → wash. A no homus tips → no useful essent requiring explicit numbers for impact based on probability, garbage + not convincing. Warrant is not convinced you need a warrant for searches based on probable cause. It's higher standard not so meaning based on warrant. 2. No impact. 3. special circumstances will result in action under probable cause so prol.

there was no firm definition of R.S. and P.C. this would be very helpful

Room: 010  
 Start: 11:00 AM  
 Varsity Public Forum

3

Connaire,

Amanda

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Nova Classical

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eastview AD	POINTS (20 - 30)
①	Yasmin Afifi	27
②	Katie Dewitt	26

CON

Spkr	Edina KI	POINTS (20 - 30)
②	James Kuznecoff	27
①	Khalid Ishani	28

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

Signature: Amanda Connaire School: Nova Classical Academy

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CON:  
 "You're just bringing that up now" → audience questions how important it is.  
 Clear, Concise "Struct Security: poverty, mental det, target minorities. Then back to review the points. Good." PRO.

PRO:  
 "Climate of trust" - good term. Draws a picture for audience  
 1997-98 school year example. This is such an antiquated example. Try to find a newer study - sounds more plausible

Cross: Security measure - search or walk through (YAS) which is more intrusive? PRO won

Prob. cause v. suspicion: PRO won (YAS)

Question re: CON use of study from U Mass CON upheld broadcast PRO won (K)

Presentation → CON was excellent

Crossfire: PRO was respectfully vicious ↓ down class