

Room: 303
Start: 2:00 PM
Novice Public Forum

5

Lutz, David

Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Bloomington MS	POINTS (20-30)
	Luke Modeo-Price	24
	Darwin Scheferlane	

CON

Spkr	Edina PS	POINTS (20-30)
1	Julia Pan	25
2	Laryn Scribner	26

Winner: Edina debating on the Neg Side (Prb or Con) Low point win? _____
 Signature: David Lutz School: Eagan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

General - The teams used half of their cross time. I encourage you to take all the cross you can get. If your opponent doesn't want cross, then you should use it.

Reasonable Suspicion ("RS") is a Low Standard. Aff argues that the RS stand, as adopted by TLO case is more relaxed than Probable Cause ("PC") standard. Neg misunderstands this argument and suggests that it is talking about PC. Aff. argument is clear to me. Aff. shows that suspicion are up, referrals to law enforcement are up and that it is racially disproportionate. Since Neg misunderstands the first premise and otherwise drops this, it all goes Aff.

Trust. Aff says Trust is Key and Neg agrees trust is important, but Safety Trumps Trust. Aff. shows that unnecessary searches = ↓ Trust and increase gang involvement and antisocial behavior. Neg argues that virtually all searches will still occur be based on Consent, Not RS, and will still occur under a PC standard. Neg also shows that just as there is racial bias in searches now, there still will be after PC because nearly all will still occur under consent. Thus, Neg negates almost all of this.

Racial Bias. Virtually all searches will still occur. See above. Neg cites Jacoby that the (almost all) searches that still occur will still be racist. This goes neg.

Safety of Anonymous Tips. Neg argues that a PC stand will ↓ safety, including thru decreasing anonymous tips. Aff. response is to say he has no response. This all goes Neg.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Team	POINTS (20-30)
	Lourdes BB	
1	Charlie Boggust	26
2	Sarah Bower Pavao Veldic	28

CON

Spkr	Team	POINTS (20-30)
	Nova Classical AB	
1	Mya Aryal	27
2	Dania Barrera	28

1:59
 Winner: Nova Classical School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO
 Signature: Dale Joent School: Eagan H.S.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Nice use of a small amount of facts. Both teams showed command of subject matter.

Charlie: Missed #2 on opening (doh!) Good opening, with a mix of facts to support contentions

Pavao: Strong cross skills, good close. Agreed to bias being your ~~only~~ only position. Rethink doing this in the future.

Mya: Good opening: Proper pace mixed with clear quantitative support

Dania: ~~Should~~ not bring up #2 contention until Grand Summary. "You failed to state it"

Dania: Strong cross, excellent response to drug contention

Debate won on Cons ability to support safe environment contention. With exception of drugs, facts on weapons & threats due to weapons, ~~was~~ held up through the debate.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Bloomington MM	POINTS (20-30)
	Katelyn Maguire 1st	27
	Hodo Mohamed	28

CON

Spkr	Lakeville GG	POINTS (20-30)
	Justin Geertsema 1st	29
	Gus Gerlach	29

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

Signature: Cindy Lutz School: Eagan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Framework: Safety as set forth by Con and not contested by Pro. Framework provides a basis of analysis.

Pro: you did a good job of setting forth your points, but did not respond to many of Con's points. Back and forth discussion on the arguments from both sides promotes more vigorous debate. You also asked some good questions in crossfire, but didn't always use the information you obtained in the subsequent argument (ex- bullying, con use of stats)

Con: generally a good job of organization, explaining your arguments and use of sources. Pro didn't call you out on this, but be careful of a generalization without a source. Such as "saying" racial bias will continue because "most judges are white males." Although probably true, there were no stats provided and your responses white male judges are inherently racially biased.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

25

PRO		
Spkr	Edina RR	POINTS (20-30)
2	Luke Rubin	26
1	Aditya Rewalliwari	28

20

CON		
Spkr	Nova Classical CG	POINTS (20-30)
1	Ian Crawshaw	27
2	Aseem Gidwani	30

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

Signature: [Signature] School: John Marshall

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aditya - You tend to shout out; (you) a bit more on specific contentions and sign post for me. Also, a little feeding of arguments to partner is OK, but only in small amounts. Let him talk!

Luke - You argued for prep time for swimming. Well, do a whole argument before starting up. Part of learning is that you're so much about messing up.

Fan - Questions are important; always have 2, even if they are dumb.

Aseem - Good knowledge of case and arguments. Good passage in rebuttal.

RFD

PRO standing, largely untouched.

CON - standing, but weakened. F by con is still slow, but card would have been nice!

(C2 - standing; I am convinced that the status quo is dangerous, and I do not want it to be more so.)

Yes to con (2, with con)

(3) not a lot of ink on actual case argument; I want to buy it, but can't quite.

(Turn over)

Room: 327
Start: 2:00 PM
Novice Public Forum

5

Landseidel,

Derek

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Bloomington

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Nova Classical CM	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Martha Connaire	27
1	Valerie Mao	26

CON

Spkr	Edina AP	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Camilla Atalla	27
1	Marnie Pardo	27

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Bloomington

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams did an excellent job. I went with the Con for the following reasons:

- The Con defended their point of increased police presence, thus ~~augmenting~~ augmenting the effects of the School-Prison Pipeline. The Pro side offered evidence ~~of~~ but it seemed to lack substance to negate the argument.

- The Con team argued against the introduction of PC ~~into~~ because officers are not trained to be in schools of varying levels.
(From K-12)

Both teams presented a good argument, Nice work to all!

Use all your time, especially in rebuttal

Room: 308
Start: 2:00 PM
Novice Public Forum

5

Rebischke, Mike

Lakeville

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Bloomington Ph	POINTS (20-30)
2	Charles Maki	28
1	Vivian Pham	28

CON

Spkr	Eagan PG	POINTS (20-30)
12	Shailja Panchal	29
—	Srilekha Garishakurti	—

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pros
Speaker 1 needs to address judge & not to opponent
Had good questions during cross; just need to articulate better
Had edge on bias contention and let it go (same w/ anonymous tips)
Nice tie in during summary w/ anonymous tips

Cons
Needs to let opponents finish questions
Remember time management
Well organized & presented well
Summary nailed home case ~~and~~

Room: 324
 Start: 2:00 PM
 Novice Public Forum

5

Averbeck,
 Elizabeth

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Lourdes

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eagan RS	POINTS (20-30)
1	Kira Rostance	27
2	Jordan Sandvig	28

CON

Spkr	Edina JW	POINTS (20-30)
2	Evan Jiang	29
1	Isaac Wu	28

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

Signature: Elizabeth Averbeck School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Kira Wear shoes next time, please. It keeps a level of professionalism. You have 30s left in constructive - use it. I would suggest saving your prep time & not using it before cross. Judge during cross. Know what you're supposed to do during your summary speech. Very polite. Good timings in summary.

Isaac Clear constructive speech; easy to follow. Look at judge during crossfire. Know what you're supposed to do & how to structure summary.

Jordan Let your opponent run her own crossfire. Look at judge during your rebuttal, not your opponents. I would actually have a definitions signpost in your rebuttal. Use all your rebuttal time. If you're going to ask a question - know what you're referring to. Stand straight & don't lean on desk. ^{strong} final focus.

Evan Let your partner conduct the crossfire, not you. Good signposting in rebuttal. Look at judge during your crossfire. And let him conduct his summary. Use all of your time in final focus.

RED This was a good novice debate; all speakers were polite & very nice. The con won this debate because their rebuttal ~~was~~ more adequately stopped the PROs; they also used their summary & final focus more efficiently & effectively.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

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

CON

Spkr	Eagan BW	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Dhruv Balasubramanian	27
	Carter Weber	28

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

Signature: Adit Gupta School: Eastview

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Edina MZ

don't use too many pieces of evidence on the same argument. The time can be allocated towards different aspects of the debate.

Eagan BW

Good cross eq
work on using all the time for speeches
Bring up evidence to refute opponents case

Decision

Con needs to work on using all the time given to speak during the speeches. Also use evidence to refute the pro's case. The Pro won because they were stronger. They refuted all points, used evidence, and articulated argument very well.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

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

CON

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

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

Signature: [Signature] School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Premise:

- 1) Bias in Searches.
 - Subjectivism from teachers/admin
 - Bias towards minorities.

current standard challenged.

Court case
 Reasonable suspicion

How is gun use increasing?
 Equal Rights to all students
 • Not the case

Negative

- 1) Schools ~~assume~~ do not
- 2) ~~Controlled by~~ 74% threatened.
- 3.) Do not have the same rights.

Nation wide issue

- Hard data
- Concrete examples
- Great organization

Punches holes in Resources

Minority discrimination contested.

Praise: Solid logical claim. Often sound arguments. Objectivity was clear.

Push: Hard data was challenged.

Praise: Great organization, Hard data concrete examples

Push: Logic is not an opinion, but contested by validity.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Edina KT	POINTS (20 - 30)
2	Tenzin Kunga	25
1	Karma Tseringtso	26

CON

Spkr	John Marshall HR	POINTS (20 - 30)
1	Tara Hussey	26
2	Janet Nguyen	27

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both - need more eye contact
enunciate
2 - make sure you have questions in cross fire
1 - refer back to your case in summary. Go over your own points
2 - try to go down your opponents case in rebuttal
1 - one example isn't enough to prove a trend
2 - I don't think the general will really work here

RFD Neither team uses enough of their speech time to evaluate arguments in this debate. Both teams drop all of their arguments except cons (3), so I guess I'll vote on that. Pro doesn't give a reason to change the status quo.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Blake BH	POINTS (20 - 30)
	Daniel Barra	23
	Rishab Halder	28

CON

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

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

Signature: [Signature] School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

(Both) Articulate, well sourced, well paced. Relevant stats
 [John Marshall] → did a good job articulating facts w/in their anecdote. Well written argument.

(Both) crossfire: well rounded questions, clearly listed intently to each other's argument.
 [Blake] → Askd specific questions about the opponents argument
 Did my well.
 [John Marshall] → Able to pepper in stats quickly & effectively

Rebuttle: [Blake] → Stats & emotional aspect of this argument. Doing well!
 [John Marshall] → Reference policies alongside statistics. Doing great!

Crossfire: Relevant, non-rhetorical questions. [Blake] Brought forward critical facts/examples quickly [John Marshall]
 [Blake] did a good job forcing the opponent to partially
 [John Marshall] acknowledge their point.

Blake Summary: Good! Could potentially be better rounded. Felt like it ran away from him in a way.

John Marshall Summary: Did a good job bringing stats back into the argument. Clearly well researched.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Edina Sa	POINTS (20-30)
2	Zach Paradis	28
1	Michael Santoni	27

CON		
Spkr	Eastview HO	POINTS (20-30)
2	Jordan Homstad	25
1	Bitsy Oberle	26

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Rosemount

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro

+ 60 sec
 + 50 sec.

Michael: eye contact
 + eye contact: make sure to not just look at your computer
 + good pace/ tone
 + self fulfilling prophecy: good
 + evidence was well used
 + well thought out argument: nice
 + good counter to 'whims'
 + be careful about wording - sometimes it was hard to understand your point.

* sorry about time - I ~~forgot~~ totally had a blank.

Zach:
 + if you need to slow down to not trip over your words, that's okay.
 + eye contact always helps.
 + limiting rights good point.

nice job keeping composure.

Con

Bitsy:
 + nice commanding tone/pace/volume
 + argument easy to follow, good flow
 + good explanation of why reasonable suspicion is okay.
 + well done
 + in cross X try to expand instead of re-say what you have already stated.
 + summary was hard to follow

probable cause does NOT mean warrants.

Jordan:

+ good eye contact/ tone
 + is 7.1 and 7.9 percent high enough to support point.
 + did they say it suppresses rights? I don't remember that.
 + remember not to continually cut off your opponent if they are getting to the point.
 + let him finish his point.
 + second ammendment is not being debated here.

Bitsy/Jordan - you guys are taking a really aggressive approach - it would behoove you to ~~take~~ keep composure in the future.

Overall, while both sides had some faulty arguments, the aggressive approach of the con side led to refuted arguments that did not ^{re} examined enough to refute.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Blake RV	POINTS (20-30)
	Sophia Rohlfen	26
	Joshua Vorbrich	27

CON

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

Winner: Cannon Falls JF debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
Signature: [Signature] School: Edina

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Stand up - or sit-up straight - ~~I~~
- When you run-on sentences + thoughts, it is difficult to follow points
- Anonymous tips - brought up but not clear why it supports Pro -
- Stated → Increased interaction w/ police causes delinquent behavior - What does this fact, even if true, do to support Pro or Con
- Is a warrant required for P.C.? Answer this one -
- If you die with trust ... is that better? Great
- Offensive language? Limiting of rights - weak
- Terrorists + cell phones - distracting
- Currently - are searches supported by P.C.?

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Bloomington BS	POINTS (20-30)
1	Sophie Bierlein	29
2	Bree Smokovich	29

CON		
Spkr	Eagan HK	POINTS (20-30)
2	Andrea Hagape	29
1	Sanjana Krishnamurthy	29

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Apple Valley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Sophie: ~~Pro~~ wear dress clothes its just a thing in debate.

Bree: dido face the judge during speeches; tell me what your addressing at the beginning of your speech; using prep for cross is not advisable

Sanjana:
 Evidence: make sure you cite evidence. ~~is not a~~ ~~is not a~~ ~~is not a~~ ~~is not a~~

the con was able to extend the first and third contention while the pro did not respond to the rebuttle in summary but rather restated their contentions, con prep and honorus tips but still outweighs