

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Edina RR	POINTS (20-30)
2	Luke Rubin	26.5
1	Aditya Rewalliwar	28.5

CON

Spkr	Bloomington BS	POINTS (20-30)
2	Sophie Bierlein	26
1	Bree Smokovich	26

Winner: Edina debating on the Alt Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature: [Signatures] School: Eagan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1 - speak slower  
 your shirt is wrinkled  
 dont communicate w/ partner  
 during cross

1 - you sway when you speak

both: probably should dress more formally

Both: look at 2 - go down their case in rebuttal

me during CX

Both: prepare closing question

1 good summary overye

RFU I dont think either side does a good job handling the arguments in this debate, but at least Edina carries more arguments while Bloomington doesnt respond to any of pros arguments. Bloomingtons rebuttal, summary and FF combined lasted about 7:00 or less so it would be hard to vote for them.

Thurs, I affirm

You guys should flip speaker positions immediately

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eastview HO	POINTS (20 - 30)
②	Jordan Homstad	27
①	Bitsy Oberle	27

CON

Spkr	Edina KT	POINTS (20 - 30)
①	Tenzin Kunga	26
②	Karma Tseringtso	25.5

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

Signature: Elizabeth Rhodes School: Eagan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Bitsy Clear intro -  
 nice pace & volume.  
 Great lay out of your  
 points of view.  
 Nice cross fire -  
 work on using time well.

Tenzin - Nice opening -  
 but you and your  
 partner never addressed  
 or countered your  
 opponents points of view.

Jordan  
 You also have a nice  
 speaking voice you made  
 some great points in  
 cross fire. While you  
 had nice data to support  
 your position - work on  
 some more depth to  
~~your~~ issues you glossed  
 over some points.

Karma - you had some great  
 moments. You got frustrated  
 and lost. Keep trying  
 and work with your coach  
 and partner to stay focused  
 along w/ being organized.

Due to the lack of preparation and ability  
 to defend their point of view <sup>by con</sup> the win goes to  
 pro.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eagan PG	POINTS (20-30)
	Shailja Panchal	27
	Sritekha Garishakurti	

NOT PRESENT.

CON

Spkr	John Marshall HM	POINTS (20-30)
	Ali Hezeil	28
	Keerthi Manikonda	30

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

Signature: [Signature] School: EDINA

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO

CON

\* TRUST B/W STUDENTS AND TEACHERS IS KEY TO A HEALTHY ENVIRON. WHICH IS NECESSARY.

\* IN LOCO PARENTS EXPEND = MINORS  
 DARRY POLICE EXAMPLE  
 \* VERY STRONG ILLUSTR. OF POINT.

\* REBUTTAL A LITTLE HARD TO FOLLOW. MAKES GOOD POINTS BUT SPOKE TOO QUICKLY AND FRANTICALLY AT CERTAIN POINTS.

\* RIGHTS OF 4TH AMEND. DONT APPLY TO MINORS  
 \* RESPONDS DIRECTLY TO OPPONENTS POINTS AND PRESENTS CLEAR COUNTER ARGUMENTS.

\* COULD POSSIBLY DEFINE ARGUMENTS IN CROSSFIRE A LITTLE MORE.

\* APPROVED ALL OR NONE VIEW ON RIGHTS

\* "SECOND CLASS CITIZEN?"

\* GOOD ARGUMENT ABOUT THE "TRUST FACTOR"!

SUMMARY: GOOD ARG. ABOUT SEARCH BY PARENT → SEARCH BY TEACHERS

\* GOOD ARG. IN SUMMARY

THAT BY "IN LOCO PARENTS" SHOULD HAVE STUDENTS SHOULD TRUST AS PARENTS

\* GOOD PT. THAT PRO SIDE LACKED EXAMPLES.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

154ser

prep time: 43 <sup>45sec</sup>

PRO

Spkr	Eagan BW	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Dhruv Balasubramanian	26
1	Carter Weber	27

CON

Spkr	Edina AP	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Camilla Atalla	30
1	Marnie Pardo	29.5

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

Signature: [Signature] School: John Marshall

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Carter - less reliance on cards could benefit you; spend more time trying to make arguments in speech not ex. You had empty time in your rebuttal.  
 Dhruv - Use whole time! You've all been competing (only 30 sec) make arguments in speech not ex. You had empty time in your rebuttal.  
 Marnie - slow your mind down - this will help with clarity and stutters/stutter-ousses  
 Camilla - "we have several reasons" is a nice part of your style, but WPE might not have enough time. Good job understanding and defending your points.

RFD

PRO  
 1 - Dropped/countered (come up with) ~~1 - [scribble]~~  
 2 - good point but ~~we~~ wear emphasis  
 CON  
 1 - ~~[scribble]~~ stand still - mild advantage  
 2 - This won the round - still standing and impactful

Based on the round, CON had a better understanding of their points and impacts.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Edina SA	POINTS (20-30)
2	Zach Paradis	28.5
1	Michael Santoni	28.5

CON

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

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Eastview

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Michael Good pace of delivery. You have 30 seconds left in your case - you can probably add more info into your case. Good job in CF. Try to use all time in your summary! Very nice job in GCF working as a team.

Laura - if you add some <sup>delivery!</sup> transitions into your case, it will be a little easier to flow. I think you might be a little confused about the language limitation arg. - ~~try~~ try to be really clear ~~about~~ with your questions. Try to use all of the time in your summary!

Zach please sign post your rebuttal. let me know where you are so I can write it all down! Good arguments, but you have a minute left, keep making arguments! Good job in CF! Careful not to make new arguments in FF, but otherwise good job!

Bryson please sign post for me in your rebuttal so that I know where you are and can get your arguments down. Also, you had about 45 seconds left in your rebuttal, you can use that time to rebuild your case. Good Q's in CF! In FF I'm hearing a lot about deterrence factors which I haven't heard about since rebuttal, ~~the~~ make sure you're on the same page as your partner!

RFD - Good job everyone. Both teams

brought up good arguments, and the major voter that I heard about in the last four speeches was student rights. Pro wins this argument. Con complicates that in the last FF with deterrence factors, but it's not been consistently carried through the round, so I give rights more weight in the debate.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

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

CON

Spkr	Lourdes BB	POINTS (20-30)
	Charlie Boggust	27
	Sarah Bower	27

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

Signature:  School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- *(Katie)* - Articulate, well paced, solid sources
- *(Lourdes)* → Argument would be better if speaker used more inflection, however this doesn't negate the overall tone: research that went into the ~~my~~ speech.
- *Crossfire* → polite, well thought out.  
 by *(Nova Classical)* clearly winning this round. They had detailed questions against the other team.
- *(Lourdes)* though the anecdote about devices was well thought out, it lacked facts/statistics to back up the claim
- *2nd crossfire*: lots of paper shuffling; searching for the facts  
*(Lourdes)* → this took up the majority of the time. once they found the facts, it was relevant but it limited their ability to make it pro sound.
- Summary: clear instructions on both sides of the opponent's view  
 → *(Nova Classical)*
- *Large crossfire*: Lourdes has found their stride! Doing very well in this round. Nova Classical is holding their own.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Edina JW	POINTS (20 - 30)
3	Evan Jiang	27.5
1	Isaac Wu	26.5

CON

Spkr	Bloomington MM	POINTS (20 - 30)
4	Katelyn Maguire	25
2	Hodo Mohamed	26

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

Signature: Maggie Parra School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Isaac - don't rely on Evan so much in CX

Evan - don't whisper to Isaac after every question during his CX - let him handle it. Impressive use of evidence in rebuttal. Work on sign posting & explaining how your arguments interact/refute the con case. You had over 1:30 left in rebuttal

Isaac in summary, summarize your evidence too, not just the arguments. Your research is strong

Hodo - I really like your dress! your speed reading wasn't necessarily bad, but you had 34 seconds left in constructive speech & ~~was~~ your speaking could be more clear if you slowed down & paced yourself within the 4 min. time.

Katie I like your confident speaking style. Keep working on this topic, and with time you will be able to fill the full 4 min. for rebuttal!

RFD: I wish Evan/Isaac didn't drop all the evidence spoken in rebuttal, my decision would be much easier...

I still grant off some offense off discrimination/profiling w/ searches (but I agree w/ the con case that metal detectors do not profile) as less searches happen overall. I also grant off offense off losing trust and ↑ in delinquent behavior long term.

Room: N21  
Start: 11:00 AM  
Novice Public Forum

3

Landseidel,

Derek

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Bloomington

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Edina PS	POINTS (20-30)
1	Julia Pan	26
2	Laryn Scribner	27

CON

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

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

Signature: Derek Landseidel School: Bloomington

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Overall: Nice work to all debaters.  
I think Con delivered a strong opening argument (pro as well!) ~~and~~ but the Pro did not rebutt the swift action argument, Tiller, enough. It seemed that there is too long of a process in times of an emergency or immediate threat.  
The ~~for~~ Con also did an effective job refuting the argument of oversearches by saying that PC <sup>could</sup> lead to more police interactions w/ students instead of teachers intervening, or admin.  
Both sides did a great job. Nice work!

Pro: I think your rebuttals were well organized. I would say that your job during crossfire is to answer a question if you have the time.

Con: One piece of improvement would be to organize your rebuttal so that it's clear what contention you are attacking but your evidence ~~was~~ to oppose arguments was still effective! Great crossfire, also!



ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	John Marshall HR	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Tara Hussey	27
	Janet Nguyen	27

CON

Spkr	Edina MZ	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Arjun Maheshwari	29
	Ryan Zhu	28

Winner: Edina debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No  
 Signature: Cindy Lutz School: Eagan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both : Everyone had a nice delivery for novices this early in the season.

Con : please be careful about whispering / talking during the pro speeches. It was distracting.

Pro : with experience I think you will learn to utilize prep time. <sup>Had a lot left.</sup>

RFD : The Con did a better job of organizing and explaining the main issues and carrying their main points through to the summaries.

4th am rights : I agree with the ~~pro~~ Con that the status quo is consistent with the application of other rights in the school setting.

UN convention : Not a voting issue. This got so bogged down in ~~an~~ int'l law vs. ~~scotus~~ <sup>scotus</sup> that the substantive point was lost. 1  
5  
3  
0

Anonymous tips : I agree with Pro's argument

that the cyberbullying issue isn't necessarily linked to search and seizure (although it could be) but con lead a rather point that anonymous tips are more useful

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Nova Classical CG	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Ian Crawshaw	28
1	Aseem Gidwani	29

CON

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

Winner: Nova School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No  
Signature: Dale Foerster School: Eagan HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ian: Nice Summary, covered points of con didn't drop support citations, would help judges.

Aseem: Great intro, excellent cross skills

Daniel: Excellent cross and summary

Rishab: Good intro clear slides. Avoid passive arguments  
Suchas "Could lead."

Note - Expand past cell phones into Digital devices.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Blake RV ✓	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Sophia Rohlfesen	24
1	Joshua Vorbrich	25

CON

Spkr	Eagan HK ✓	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Andrea Hagape	25
1	Sanjana Krishnamurthy	24

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

Signature: Erica Baumann School: Rosemount

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Josh - good diction, but you could enunciate more - work on that

Sophia - ~~good~~ good job, but be sure to check the Pauses and "Um"s  
said - they detract from the evidence.

Sanjana - good fluidity, however I would work on your crossfire  
questions and answers, I found it very confusing

Andrea - very good job - smooth and distinct speaking style.

RFD: I felt the Blake team did a better job explaining the  
evidence and was less confusing over all.

You all did a very nice job!



1:53  
1:20

1:22

Room: Main Hall Conference  
Start: 11:00 AM  
Novice Public Forum

3

Lutz, David

Eagan

# ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Edina FD	POINTS (20-30)
1	Nicholas Fu	28
2	Michael Dalsin	29

CON		
Spkr	Lakeville GG	POINTS (20-30)
1	Justin Geertsema	28
2	Gus Gerlach	27

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

Signature: David N. Lutz School: Eagan

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

General. Great job everyone! ~~But~~ Neg in cross you asked Aff. to explain their case twice. But Aff says they ↑ safety. Framework: Neg has safety, Aff doesn't refute, so safety is is. Bias. Aff argues about Reasonable Suspicion ("RS") of other analogous investigations are biased. Neg argues that racism is inherent, which essentially says I cannot solve racism. I agree, but Aff says that Probable Cause ("PC") reduces the opportunities for racism by adding procedural hoops and Neg has no response. This goes Aff. The fact that 51% of whites think Blacks are lazy helps prove Aff's point.

Constitutional Rights. Aff argues that RS violates 4<sup>th</sup> Amend. Neg only arg is that people don't have absolute rights (airports) of students don't have complete rights (2<sup>nd</sup> Amend + 1<sup>st</sup> Amend), argued for first time in 2NR). Aff wins this.

In Loco Parentis. The principal that the school stands in the shoes of the parent is logical, but even if still valid, it doesn't help me resolve the debate. Cross brings out that it predated RS and that it was overruled in ~~the~~ TLO in '85 and that's what prompted RS to start. Aff doesn't prove it, Neg doesn't refute it, so I go with my own understanding, which is that it is no longer the standard.

RS = Expedient Search = ↑ Educational Value. Neg persuades that we have exterior problems in schools, but Aff correct that all this occurred under RS. 2N temporarily overruled, in cross, but realizes he can't. Neg has no response to Aff that exigent circumstances exist always preventing root serious problems. Neg has no response to arg that ↑ security measures = ↑ delinquency (do we have a chicken/egg issue? No one tells me). Most persuasive, Neg has no response to Aff arg that most ev'd gathered under PC is helpful as root end under RS is not. Therefore, PC will eliminate fruitless searches but not the most important ones.

Analysis of TIPS. Neg correct re importance of TIPS. A strong TIPS can still be used under PC citing Supr. Court. Neg has no response other than not topical. I don't see how it's not relevant to the resolution.

-:22 1:10

i think you guys ended up switching speech order in the round.

Room: 106A  
Start: 11:00 AM  
Novice Public Forum

3



St. Germain,

Matt

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Edina

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Bloomington Ph	POINTS (20-30)
2	Charles Maki	<del>28.5</del> 29
1	Vivian Pham	28.5

CON

Spkr	John Marshall NF	POINTS (20-30)
1	Lap Nguyen	29.5
2	Daniel Fleury	29

Winner: John Marshall NF debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: EDINA

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Vivian - Make sure to open your mouth more when speaking, you actually have good speed for policy debate, just work on clarity. Try to reference evidence from 1st speech in 2nd speech.
- Lap - Why is the "schools less safe than they used to be" read on the CON side? This assumes a Reasonable Suspicion (RS) status Quo (SQ). Very nice speaking style.
- Charles - EXCELLENT point about CON ev that says things have gotten worse under RS. Need to cross apply your ev and not just make analytics for whole speech.
- Daniel - Face judge during speech, not other team. You do an excellent job as a novice clashing with the other teams args. Keep that up.

RFD PRO. makes good args supporting their case and extending original args. They even begin to analyze CON ev. to take it out. The lack of clash or competing, independent arguments makes sorting out what happened difficult. While I understand and fundamentally agree with many PRO args, CON args that PC environment would make stopping not just drugs, but violent crimes including school shootings - much more difficult. PRO goes back to original args, but doesn't really explain this away. RS seems like a better standard for keeping students safe, even if it leads to student distrust. PRO also must address CON evidence that PC not suitable for school environment. Original constructive args address some of this, but more is needed to counter, esp. when PRO

Kind of drops this.  $\Rightarrow$  CON Ballot.  
 AMAZING job all! This is some tough stuff and everyone did great!

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eagan RS	POINTS (20-30)
1	Kira Rostance	28
2	Jordan Sandvig	28

CON

Spkr	Bloomington MS	POINTS (20-30)
1	Luke Modeo-Price	28
	Darwin Scheferlane	

Winner: Eagan School/Team \_\_\_\_\_ debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature: [Signature] School: Parent judge

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Sp 1 - good IC - easy to follow logic  
 good speed and volume. ~~latter~~  
~~the~~ ~~over~~ ~~had~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~a~~ ~~little~~ ~~more~~ ~~inflection~~  
 Try not to simply read.

Both - an example of <sup>current</sup> racial bias  
 would have supported claim.  
~~Sp 1/2~~

Sp 2 - excellent eye contact  
 engaged body language <sup>good</sup> <sup>poise</sup>  
 good speed, sometimes tone was  
 a little ~~accusatory~~ <sup>prepar</sup> <sup>objective</sup> <sup>tone</sup>  
 but good energy.  
~~Sp 1/2~~  
~~Sp 1/2~~  
~~Sp 1/2~~  
 - ineffective detectors (bags/purses)  
 ≠ they don't reduce crime  
 argument logic didn't work for me.

Sp 1/2 - good speed/elocution in  
~~fast~~ ~~speed~~ IC.

I liked using metal detector as  
 example ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> broad use of scanner not only  
 in schools, but society - could have used  
 one or 2 more points on con side.  
 project more confidence → good speaker!  
 more prep effort ~~was~~ → more confidence  
 : take notes, use prep time  
 don't concede so easily when challenged.  
 could have ~~been~~ <sup>used</sup> time to <sup>(i.e. school in Texas</sup>  
 not <sup>representative</sup> <sup>of other</sup> <sup>schools)</sup>  
 question their arguments  
 don't just defend your own  
 → you didn't refute their evidence  
 or claims - if you take notes, it  
 will be easier to do that in the round.

PRO: focused too much on refuting value of metal detectors vs.  
 supporting prob cause. Issue more broadly

CON: bring in other evidence rather than resting case on 1 benefit of not  
 requiring prob cause.