

Room: 223
 Start: 12:45 PM
 Junior Varsity Public Forum

4

LaMoore,

Lindsay

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Cannon Falls

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eastview NS	POINTS (20-30)
2	Akshay Naik	27
1	Ari Schlegel	28

CON

Spkr	Edina MC	POINTS (20-30)
2	Chloe Maynor	29
1	Kendrew Chen	27

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Cannon Falls

Ar:	Comments & Reason for Decision:
Kendrew	I don't recall if you said anything during grand CX → make sure you get your voice involved.
Akshay	Be careful w/ what you mean by brain development; you're referring to better understanding rights ≠ biological development. Good point about how it's not the fault of the standard, but of the officers in CX
Chloe	

The debate hinged on two points, which were both evaluated in learning environment, a framework that both teams acknowledged. 1. "Drugs" and 2. The potential for bias treatment of minority students during searches.

I think both teams ran into some confusion regarding the first: the crux of this point is regarding the legal consequences of what is uncovered during a search i.e. whether or not a student will be convicted of crime ~~or if the~~ (as is what occurs under the Probable cause standard) or will be brought to counseling/treatment or rehabilitation (as with reasonable suspicion) → "drugs" was an example that distracted from the point on both.

Given this clarification, Con's argument that reasonable suspicion is better for learning enviro went unrefuted; ~~Pro~~ did not have adequate evidence to support rebuttle. Logistically.

Secondly, Con's point that ~~judges~~ warrants are generally easy to obtain also went unrefuted. The TSA argument wasn't well supported with evidence and was mostly conjecture. Overall, Con proved that the general student welfare would be at risk if Probable cause standard was implemented.

Room: 224
Start: 12:45 PM
Junior Varsity Public Forum

4

Seggerman,
Catherine

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Edina

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Team	POINTS (20-30)
1	Daniel Agbator	27
2	Daniel Portnov	27

CON		
Spkr	Team	POINTS (20-30)
1	Britney Chino	28
2	Ijeoma Ugboajah	28

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Edina

Comments & Reason for Decision:

OVERALL - Tensions were high on this one! Everyone remember to take the higher ground when possible. Despite some behavioral problems and mumbling, Eastview had the clearer, better delineated argument PRO probable cause. Very tough topic. This was the best group I saw all day. Great prep

individual - DANIEL A excellent construction outline, although some pts were lost in enunciation. Condense talking pts so you can go slower, which would help me understand scope. Prepare "stingers" so they have even bigger impact.

DANIEL P very good passion and adaptability. I took points off for shouting, which ironically made this classroom feel like an unsafe environment, much like bullying in school.

BRITNEY CHINO very professional demeanor, although some sarcasm detracted from that. Good pt that school has - and should have. different rules than outside society. good job finding 2010 SRO case

IJEOMA UGBOJAH Good job keeping cool + using time to organize for hist rebuttal. Eagan possibly misunderstood Eastview pt about ~~parents~~ parents being allowed to search belongings b/c different

legal grounds. Also great job w/ legal terminology, lends credibility.

Room: 225
 Start: 12:45 PM
 Junior Varsity Public Forum

4

Piotrowski,

Bryce

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Lakeville

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

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

CON		
Spkr		POINTS (20 - 30)
	Eagan JK	
4	Bjorn Jonas	25
2	Sourish Kundu	25

Winner: Eagan JK debating on the con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? no
 Signature: [Signature] School: Lakeville

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Alisha: clear case presentation was nice
 good signposting in summary, I followed where you were clearly, extend offensive reasons to vote for you.
say something in grand!

Sourish: your case delivery was a little choppy, try to work on that.
 organization & coverage is good, but I need more clear extensions of offense

Peter: good rebuttal organization, work on having more evidence to support the organization.
 FW was agreed upon in every speech, no need to spend a ton of time need more offensive reasons to vote for you.
Point arguments

Bjorn: very good organization, nice case defense. Work on having more ev. to back up your points.
 - your FF was all over the place structure it like your rebuttal.

After summary, there's very little offense left on the flow, which makes this debate difficult to judge. The framework agreed upon is safety and that's almost all I have to go off of. The aff team provides no solvency for any of their arguments, while the neg team gives me no offense upon which I can safely see substantive reductions in safety in an aff world. Neither team tells me how their arguments link to either safety or morality. Neither team gives offensive extensions for why to vote for them ^{or some morality}

At the end of the day I begrudgingly vote NEG off of the Tiller card in NI that is extended in summary but barely touched on in Final Focus because there is some risk of probable cause being less flexible which might lead to less ^{at least} safety. It's also easier to vote neg b/c pro never gives me offense derived from switching the standard to PC.

Room: 222
 Start: 12:45 PM
 Junior Varsity Public Forum

4

Connaire,

Amanda

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Nova Classical

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eagan PS	POINTS (20 - 30)
1.	Ayush Patel	24
	Jason Scheller	25

CON

Spkr	Edina CO	POINTS (20 - 30)
1.	Jay Chochreck	23
	Oscar O'Brien	23

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

Signature: Amanda Connaire School: Nova Classical Academy

Comments & Reason for Decision:

When performing Crossfire, PRO successfully won informed citizens & Probable Cause

Pro "get tough", "stop switching" excellent

Con
 Rubber stamp
 2 min. 48 sec example very good

A.P. hold notes a bit higher so audience can see your eyes, not lids ;)

O.B. a bit quieter - audience then listens harder can be compelled to listen better.

Seize opportunities such as bond wagon argument.
 Ex "Most people doing drugs"

Fewer → not Less, gentlemen

Excellent quiet discussions and note taking

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Lakeville NR	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Sheridan Norcia	29
1	Maddie Rowe	27

CON		
Spkr	Eagan GS	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Nirupa Ganesan	28
2	Anusha Sharma	29

Winner: Eagan GS debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 Signature: Adit Gupta School: Eastview

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Lakeville NR

rebuttal was very strong
 good job addressing everything
 Summary could be a little stronger. Make sure to address everything

Eagan GS

good cross eq
 rebuttal was excellent. You attacked opponents case, presented strong evidence, & defended your own case
 Summary was very good and strong

Decision

The debate was very close and it was very hard to pick a winner. Eagan GS won because they were able to coherently articulate their points, and arguments and brought up strong evidence. Both teams were excellent speakers

Room: 219
 Start: 12:45 PM
 Junior Varsity Public Forum

4

Averbeck,
 Elizabeth

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Lourdes

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Lakeville RK	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Brandon Rierson	28
1	Aashish Komaragiri	27

CON

Spkr	Eastview NT	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Jagath Naithani	28
2	Ethan Ta	29

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

Signature: Elizabeth Averbeck School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aashish / Slow down & enunciate. Hard to understand at times in constructive. Very professional. Signpost more clearly in your summary & know what to do in your summary.

Jagath / Very well spoken; clear & easy to follow. Good job structuring your summary in a way to refute their FW.

Brandon / Try not to say "um" so much. Good signposting. If you're asking to take the first question, have one ready. Good job pointing out arguments that have gotten dropped.

Ethan / Very logical rebuttal. Strong crossfire skills. Good deep understanding of the content & calling them on inference v. proof.

ZFD / Our first crossfire doesn't make sense. You guys are not answering one another's questions (equally). Safety is wanted by both, PRO or CON and is ~~something~~ something that can be discussed. Pro: your point about STD training is very vague & confusing; I would try to strengthen your understanding that. The win goes to CON because: ① can effectively argue that PC will not lessen or remove racial tensions as evidenced by a racially tense society w/ PC still ② can reject FW based solely on rights; PRO doesn't respond ③ PRO makes some weak links: inference about disabled searches/arrests claims that STDs miss school due to trust issues