

Room: 125
Start: 2:00 PM
Varsity Public Forum

5

Piotrowski,

Bryce

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Lakeville

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

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

CON

Spkr	Edina TN	POINTS (20-30)
4	Theo Teske	30
2	Matthew Nissen	30

Winner: Edina TM debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO
Signature: [Signature] School: Lakeville

Comments & Reason for Decision:

oral RFD given. 1 vote Neg on Mathis + Tiller
link chain C1 → impacted with Nance turn on Pro C1

Room: 218
 Start: 2:00 PM
 Varsity Public Forum

5

Connaire,

Amanda

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Nova Classical

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Cannon Falls CJ	POINTS (20-30)
	Ella Coyle	25
①	Hannah Johnson	26

CON

Spkr	Lakeville CM	POINTS (20-30)
①	Maddie Cook	26
	Karen McCoy	27

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

Signature: Amanda Connaire School: Nova Classical Academy

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro: Be careful interrupting too much during cross.
 E.C. Some is good for passion and point. too much is not mannerly. Good hand movement for points

Pro: When thinking, be comfortable with a moment of silence instead of saying "um". Your brain will process your thoughts, and opponent will be thinking about why you're silent (1-2 sec) instead of plotting to threaten your argument.
 H.J.

Con: If you could slow down a bit, the audience could digest your points and buy into your argument.
 M.C.

Con: Knuckle Cracking... just once, but still silly to do in this forum.
 K.M.

Speaker 2 Final point was very concise well delivered

1978 } Either find ways to
 1969 } get back up these
 find current proof as
 find dates with more gusto or

Very good job

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

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

CON

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Kathy - good voiced/pace - make more eye contact. I would like to hear more impactful. What does this mean? what does this yield? 20 seconds left

Rahma - well spoken. You say "Um" a lot. Good reestablishing your case/position. You ran out of steam attacking Con contentions so advance yours - would be better use of last minute

Owen -
 C1 - anonymous tips
 C2 - prevent drug rehabilitation - drug testing.
 your structure is good but like the pro - more impactful
 It is a clear presentation
 - your cross & answers conflict with respect to drugs.
 Jenny - great eye contact. You say "Um" a lot. Great offense. Excellent logic - easy to follow. Fully qualify all your sources - left 20 seconds - extend your case a bit.

RFD - While there was no strong clash, I feel that the Con provided better analysis and attacked the points better. An example of the clash I was hoping for -> Pro C2 = Prison Pipeline Con C2 - drugs - These are linked are they not? Help me weigh it. IE - Reasonable suspicion = more of a catch (more likely to be caught) so they more or less won't take the chance and that's Prison Pipeline - clashes like that. Rahma you momentarily mentioned K-12 - yes - I wanted more of this rather than a simple acknowledgement. Con got Pro to agree with the anonymous tips too.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eagan SV	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Maria Sanchez	28
1	Roselin Victor	27

CON

Spkr	Nova Classical CC	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Harold Carlson	28
1	Casey Connell	26

Winner: Eagan SV debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? no
Signature: Claire Dodds School: Lakeville

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro Spkr 1:

- work on clarity
- dont let con control in CF
- good job re-explaining the case in your example
- good use of evidence in sum.

Con Spkr 1:

- learn your case, you mis-pronounce a lot of it
- "I dont understand" during CF 3 times after pro kept re-explaining was crazy, she clarified it perfectly
- no extensions or cards in arguments on pro
- "Pro has to show PC is best ^{possible} option" → very abusive, they just have to show its better than RS

Pro Spkr 2:

- it's "exigent", you're saying "extrajgent"
- good job addressing every arg. on con side
- good job clarifying life threatening
- when con uses such an abusive burden you need to argue it and ask what their burden is
- THANK YOU for pointing out the fault in the status quo!!!

Con Spkr 2:

- "pro needs to show many examples", no they showed a good example that stood through the round, when there are 4 mins in the constructive 7 you cant ask for a "multitude" of examples
- keep track of time during your speech, dont go over
- spend more time learning about exigent circumstances, you dont seem to understand their argument

RFD: not much to go off of, but aff wins with more offense and better standing args at the end of the round

Room: 121
Start: 2:00 PM
Varsity Public Forum

5

St. Germain,

Matt

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Edina

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eagan KW	POINTS (20-30)
1	Nibraas Khan	28.5
2	Hunter Weber	28.5

CON

Spkr	Blake AJ	POINTS (20-30)
2	Anish Aggarwal	29.5
1	Joel Jude	29

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

Signature: [Signature] School: EDINA

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO Case argues that it is the small violations that diminish or harm students in long run. I can grant them this but CON argues that PRO won't solve this b/c Probable Cause (PC) requires a warrant, and this pulls kids into criminal justice system. Further, there is some debate about whether PC in schools requires a warrant, PRO needs to be lock-down on this story & CON highlights that they aren't & casts doubt over plan action. CON further argues that both judges & police are biased and this continues post FIAT and can be solved by PRO, and PRO has very little response to this. CON argues that status quo (SQ) is moving towards Restorative Justice (RJ) and that FIAT kills this movement. It's a very sneaky strategy to which they pull off effectively, or PRO uniquely kills RJ b/c all minor infractions (wrong or right) require judicial intervention, thus pulling kids into criminal justice system & thus triggering case-side harms. Framework can really get argued, but PRO would be well served by finding a framework that places solving racism above all, as PRO does solve for preventing kids from unreasonable searches (CON grants this out effectively), it's just that they successfully argue that there are huge drawbacks to this
⇒ CON BALLOT

WELL DONE ALL !!!

Room: 010
 Start: 2:00 PM
 Varsity Public Forum

5

LaMoore,

Lindsay

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Cannon Falls

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

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

CON

Spkr	Eagan NC	POINTS (20-30)
X	Vy Nguyen	X
1 1/2	Jeffrey Chen	27

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Cannon Falls

Khalid Comments & Reason for Decision:
 Your summary was exactly what you needed to say & thank you for asking in Grand CX about Ex. Circumstances requiring Prob. cause → I was wondering that myself.

James You spoke well despite acoustics in the room.
 Rebuttle was well done.

Jeffrey Had a ~~slow~~ slow start to ~~constructive~~ ^{rebuttle} don't worry so much about telling me how you'll respond (i.e. their flow, etc), just go ahead and start.

P.S. I'm sorry your final focus was interrupted by art teacher → I think you handled that well. (Rude of art teacher)

First off, I see why Pro spent time on the point about media sensationalization, but, frankly, Con's point is correct; the media has increasingly become an ~~entire~~ agent of entertainment, not journalism and does seek to sensationalize as it leads to ↑ viewership. But I don't think this was a very strong point to begin with based on the original rhetoric in the constructive.

Secondly, I was not entirely convinced of Pro's argument that a decrease in the total amount of searches necessarily equates a decrease in unjustified searches. However, this wasn't a point I weighed the debate on in these specific terms.

Con's response to Pro's point mentioned above was simply that percentages don't translate to numbers of incidents being prevented/ there's no evidence supplied by Pro. I do not think this argument could hold that much weight against Pro. Con argued that reasonable suspicion requires less evidence to enact on more "things"; yet this logic doesn't account for enacting effectively, which Pro repeatedly carried that there is an increase in effectiveness during searches conducted under probable cause.

Room: 126
Start: 2:00 PM
Varsity Public Forum

5

Pendergast,

Devon

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Apple Valley

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

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

CON

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

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Apple Valley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Amrit: Overall speaking critiques: slow is smooth and smooth is fast. Only spread when you can clearly enunciate and your mind can keep up. Strong questioning, make sure you are extending impacts and not just evidence.

Scott: Be louder, more confident. You have good pace and cadence, so use it to your advantage. If you want to call out your opponents on Foreman, say that, tell your judge to pull the evidence. Capitalize on their evidentiary doubts.

Tenzin: Awesome tone set reading your case. You had command of the room. I appreciate the time taken to explain impacts in your own words. You need to "escalate" and extend your points further against your opponents. You could have won cyber to the summary.

Suhail: Great Rebuttal and ability to link the FF and summaries. Extend your 995 evidence on random and general searches.

RFD Con fails to win generalized argument and cyberbullying becomes muddled and washed out. The cross apply of foreman to turn Nance to the Aff along with the issue of trust flowing with James (It is still topical). Aff wins security and framework.

P.S. If you want to throw out James, you have to provide a standard (like "fair debate" or "definitions") and where your opponents violated it in _____

email: pende056@unm.edu

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

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

CON

Spkr	Lakeville OR	POINTS (20-30)
4	Drake Olson	428
2	Tyler Rebischke	228

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

Signature: Mollie Clark School: Eagan HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

EASTVIEW AU

- 20 seconds left in constructive. You could have more content if you cut down the conclusion.
- Beautiful speaking in rebuttal.
- Spend 1:30 on SROs but otherwise good extensions in summary.
- make sure you have entire PDFs saved this is NSDA rule.
- Beautiful FF love how you frame the round

LAKEVILLE OR

- ~~You could have~~ solid coverage in constructive, I like the link story told in your warrants.
- Read more new evidence in rebuttal
- Need way more org. in summary
- ~~women~~ argo in FF (SROs racist)

RFD

The aff tells a consistent narrative w/ well extended warrants. Their advocacy is clever and ties directly into the framework

← Vote analysis

Subjectivizing

- dropped by opponent
- Racism nonunique but something that we need to fight (Boston/Johnson/HLR)

Solm

- SROs ⁵² ↓ arrst ~~30~~
- students overall
- Exigent circumstances solm
- SROs ↑ incar (not impacted to FW)
- Fast responses good

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Apple Valley HS	POINTS (20-30)
MAV	Zach Hayes	29
	India Smith	X

CON

Spkr	Eagan FP	POINTS (20-30)
2	Quinn Foerster	27.5
1	Reece Peters	27.5

Winner: Apple Valley HS debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win?
 Signature: [Signature] School: Eastview

Comments & Reason for Decision:

ZACH Good Q's in CF!
 I'm wondering why you're arguing that PC can FIX STPP rather than arguing for an improvement?

Reece You don't link very clearly in your case - make it more explicit! I like that your case ID's the everyday use of RS, but talk to me more about the impacts & make sure to weigh them!

Quinn Please sign post when you are in your rebuttal otherwise I have to jump around to figure out where you are.
 Also, you have to respond to opponents case!

RFD Pro's biggest problem with con's case is that it's non-unique, but that attack is never responded to. Also, pro's CI is not refuted, and CI is rebuilt when pro explains how STPP is reduced by PC standard.

Pro weighs safety against cheating + cyberbullying effectively.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Eastview DP	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Tharun Dulla	28
2	Elijah Peterson	27

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

Winner: EASTVIEW DP debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 Signature: Bonnie Horgos School: EDINA

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. PRO CONSTRUCT: Speaks at a nice pace w/ clearness. Cites valid sources. Effective body language (posture, eye contact, gestures, etc.). Nice use of quotes.
2. CON CONSTRUCT: Speaks quickly but clearly. "Symbolic form of criminalization." Cites effective stats. Says "UM" a couple times. Nice eye contact initially, but seems to lose it as he continues argument.
3. CROSSFIRE: Tharun makes great eye contact. Sinan starts a little too colloquially ("oh, so like...") & uses "like" Tharun trips up a bit but makes it; uses "like" a few times.
4. PRO REBUTAL: Uses 52 seconds. Elijah: good, relaxed body posture & tone. Effective sources. could work up & make eye contact while reading. Punishment isn't a part of the debate. Uses "like" a couple times as well as "UM." Right now, only people that have to abide by this at the end of standards are police. Loves train of thought for several seconds. Says wrong
5. CON REBUTAL: Speaks quickly but effectively. Reads too much to read from computer. Disfractly. Uses effective evidence to back up statement. When that body con, posture is relatively effective. Trips on words a few times, but flows ok.
6. CROSSFIRE: Elijah says "like" a few times, making speech less effective. Fatiya cuts Elijah off, he should have continued. Fatiya asks if Elijah has a position, but he doesn't; weakens his argument. Elijah keeps claiming per. Distractly.
7. PRO SUMMARY: Uses 20 seconds. Trips up speaking a few times, but flows ok. Great eye contact & hand gestures. Says "gonna" - distracting. Refers to evidence/sources effectively. "Anybody can apply to these warrants without probable cause."
8. CON SUMMARY: Uses time, has 124 seconds left. Sinan speaks quickly. Repeats a couple times, uses "gonna or UM." Effectively references opponent's arguments. claims

over →

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

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

CON

Spkr	Edina VB	POINTS (20-30)
4	Sujit Varadhan	28.5
2	Samantha Bevers	27

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

Signature: Maggie Parra School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision: Great round everyone ☺

I find that discrimination flows to the pro. I think they did a good job responding to the "rubber stamp" arg from con § I buy that PC creates more barriers for one person's bias § the con evidence doesn't prove that even though it moves quickly through the magistrates it isn't measurably unfair.

School to prison pipeline is a wash. I buy that searches ↓ and subjectivity ↓, and all pro evidence links to ↓ crime / delinquency to ↑ in the fairness or perception of justice. So even though arrests ↑ they're "more fair". Pro doesn't respond to con Bracey evidence § since I don't know how to weigh these two in this context it is a wash.

I don't think con gets any offense off anonymous tips or drug tests. Not enough defense in second half of round. I affirm

Room: 122
Start: 2:00 PM
Varsity Public Forum

5

Fink, Reka

Blake

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eastview AD	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Yasmin Afifi	28.5
2	Katie Dewitt	29

CON

Spkr	Apple Valley BS	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Abby Brachio	28
1	Brandon Schellhaass	27

Winner: Eastview AD debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
Signature: [Signature] RF School: BLAKE

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: Eastview (Pro) wins that the chance
of dying in school is 1 in 2 million.
Con has no response. Pro impacts outweigh

Room: 203
Start: 2:00 PM
Varsity Public Forum

5

Henry, Ryan

Eastview

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Apple Valley SK	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Julia Scovil	28
1	Carson Kowalski	28

CON

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

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

Signature: [Signature] School: EV

Comments & Reason for Decision:

while I don't personally really buy the media coverage providing nearly as much impact in schools as CON argues, PRO never really refutes the risk averse nature of schools being fueled by the media, meaning CON still has ~~some~~ access to their CI impacts. Ultimately, PRO really loses most of their offense early in the round, while not addressing a core link in the con case. I negate.