Room: 363
Start: ASAP
Novice PF

1

George Aileen

MARET INVITATIONAL
Washington DC
April 14

PRO

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Nysmith RR	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Pari Rana	22	2
1	Spencer Rothka	22	3

CON

NEGATIVE

POS	Richard Wright RC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Amaya Roberts	20	4
2	Amora Campbell	23	1

The better debating was done by the AFF (AFF or NEG) from Nysmith RR (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: Con did not directly defeat contentions 1 and 2 of Pro – stronger economy and job shortage.

Pari
- you used 1/2 of rebuttal to repeat arguments, you need to REBUTT
- good challenge in cross
- jump in to grand cross
- use final focus to tell me why pro should win, not just repeat arguments

Amaya
- write down your opponents' arguments as they are talking
- sign-post! Tell me which argument you are answering - use your time wisely
- be more assertive in cross, ask ?s

Spencer
- good logical flow to case
- don't spend too much of crossfire on 1 topic
- summary should be a highlight of main points of clash
- great responses in grand cross

Amora
- you need a case to read from
→ this will help you organize and provide evidence
- good delivery/presentation skills, good passion
- sign-post: your arguments are everywhere - tell me what it is in response to

Room: 364
Start: ASAP
JV PF

1

Thong, Andrew

MARET INVITATIONAL

Washington DC

April 14

NEG

~~AFFIRMATIVE~~

POS	Meridian MV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Emely Martinez	28	1
1	Milani Voltaire	26	4

Aff

~~NEGATIVE~~

POS	Holy Trinity BM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Margaret Blomstrom	27	3
1	Olivia Maguire	28	2

The better debating was done by the aff (AFF or NEG) from Holy Trinity BM (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Adam Thong

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff ~~Aff~~

Con: More eye contact
- Explain econ comp more with links
- Don't ask "don't you realize" questions, lead into more Q's
- Good answers

~~Don't restate contentions in rebuttal~~
- Be more organized/confident
- Warrant evidence more; 1 million jobs by 2020 exists in the neg world, prove it goes up in aff
- Good answers
- Spend more time on your own case
- Don't fight w/ your own partner
- Good organization, THANK YOU FOR WEIGHING!!

Neg ~~Neg~~ ~~Neg~~

Con: Be more confident, stop stuttering
- More eye contact
- Don't use one example of job shortages, use statistics

1CX
~~Don't ask~~ Don't ask "are you aware" questions, lead into Q's
- Good taking control of questions, but be more ~~question~~ confident
- Don't read off evidence

Reb
- Don't finish contentions your partner didn't finish, time your constructive
- Don't read overpopulation at the end with a) no warrant b) no evidence

2CX
- Don't give a response, ask a question
- Don't give questions

Sum
- Good, organized, hits most off points

GCX
- Good aggression

FF
- Good organization

Voted aff because neg didn't bring up their own case and dropped their contentions in sum

Room: 263
Start: ASAP
Novice PF

1

~~Hansford, Brent~~

MARET INVITATIONAL

Woodridge

Washington DC

April 14

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	BASIS DC DS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Noemie Durand	26	2
	Amelia Solomon	27	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Meridian KP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Kaliah Porter	25	3

The better debating was done by the AFF (AFF or NEG) from Basis (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Charlottesville ?

Be more specific in Rebuttal
Don't read so much, make eye contact
Be better prepared - know your contentions better
Be more specific with questions
60k ↓ from Americans for what
H1B1 visas make jobs?
Be more specific with visa types
Seemed to be arguing both pro/con side - Kaliah
Same question in 2 rebuttals.
Population size?

RFD Overall The Affirmative team had a better grasp of their arguements and presented it in a more logical manner. Negative team practice more w Time

Room: 362
Start: ASAP
Novice PF

1

Kuang, Kelvin

MARET INVITATIONAL

Washington DC

April 14

Neg.
~~AFFIRMATIVE~~

POS	Nysmith MM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Neeraj Madamalla		
1 2	Esha Madamalla	27	1

Aff.
~~NEGATIVE~~

POS	C and T Youth and Tec ZM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Kevin Wu	26	2
1	Luke Mei	24	3

The better debating was done by the Neg. (AFF or NEG) from Nysmith MM (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD Nysmith: Provided a more convincing argument than Affirm. Also overall, debated better than affirm.

Feedback:

Luke: Look up @ the judge more speak louder, and just have more confidence in what you're saying.

Kevin: Don't let the other team ~~dominate~~ dominate cross fires. Be more aggressive. Also look @ judge

Esha: Don't debate about sources, it makes for a bad debate.

Room: 261
Start: ASAP
Novice PF

1

Ding, Albert

MARET INVITATIONAL

Washington DC

April 14

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Nysmith BC 1st	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1st	Dishaa Bhat	27	2
2nd	Kinnari Chaubal	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	BASIS DC GH 2nd	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2nd	Wesley Greene	28	1
1st	Danika Howard	27	3

The better debating was done by the Aff (AFF or NEG) from Nysmith BC (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: ✓

Signed: Albert Ding

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff and Neg both extended all contentions throughout debate. Aff wons since neg case was built on the premise that foreign workers are taking US jobs. However, neg wasn't able to defend this point when the aff said that most companies hire HIB workers due to a skill gap and that there is a STEM shortage in the US. Due to this, 2/3 neg contentions don't stand. Neg did little defense on aff contentions with no response to Aff C1 of helps econ and Aff C2 of specialized workers.

Room: 361
Start: ASAP
Novice PF

1

Gabidoulline, Ai

MARET INVITATIONAL

Washington DC

April 14

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	BASIS DC HL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	James Hughes	28	1
	Naomi Linera	26	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Holy Trinity SM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Theo Schindler	25	~~2~~ 3
	Hugh McMahon	24	4

The better debating was done by the ~~NEG~~ AFF (AFF or NEG) from Basis DC HL (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Both teams were well prepared
- Basis team demonstrated better
  - use of questions
  - voice, eyes, and body language
  - mastery of material

Room: 262
Start: ASAP
Novice PF

1

Huang, Charles

MARET INVITATIONAL

Washington DC

April 14

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Nysmith WP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Amal Wooldridge	28.5	2
1	Emma Pan	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	University Pro DT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jaina Dotson	27.5	4
1	Mackenzie Trice	27.5	3

The better debating was done by the Aff (AFF or NEG) from Nysmith WP (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Charles Huang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Content

Aff second speaker Great content need more confidence
nice rebuttal very strong
line by line hit everything
innovation extra offense
- strong defense on second cross
- summary but most things could have extended
defense on abuses more clearly I like the ct 2 very unique

you dropped their second contention in rebuttal

abuses extended through into

Neg not extended but it didn't really matter

1st cross
Don't get caught up over ev in cross it wastes time

Rebuttal - don't read off your phone/ipad

nice cross question (1st cross)
Hayk HB moreskilled

wasn't extended on

rebuttal - spend more time on blocks/defense

Speaking

RFD: I voted off Aff ct 2 when was dropped in Neg rebuttal.

Room: 371
Start: ASAP
JV PF

1

Kuang, Hellen

MARET INVITATIONAL

Washington DC

April 14

AFFIRMATIVE PRO

POS	Nysmith SA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Eesha Somasundar	27	3
3	Ayana Ahuja	29	1

NEGATIVE CON

POS	North Fairfax Debate HN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Serena Hirani	27	4
4	Tara Nair	28	2

The better debating was done by the Aff (AFF or NEG) from Nysmith SA (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Hellen Kuang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Eesha:
Great confidence and clear first speech!
In your summary, try to use up all of your time, and remember to not drop any arguments.

Ayana:
Great rebuttal! All of your claims were supported with great evidence.

Serena:
· Your summary was very clear and concise.
· When your opponents answer questions, don't disregard their answers.

Tara:
· When asking questions, be sure to let your opponents have a chance to answer.
· Great rebuttal!

RFD: The con team based their entire argument on a counterplan. They did not sucessfully refute Pro's contentions with sufficient evidence. The PRO team did a better job at refutting the Con's claims, and supporting their own. The Con did not give me a reason to value American workers over foreign workers.

Room: 462
Start: ASAP
JV PF

1 **Armentrout, Anna**

MARET INVITATIONAL

Washington DC

April 14

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Holy Trinity BL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Biz Blee	27	3
1	Connell Leary	27.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Nysmith RL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Zain Rahman	27	4
2	Matthew Li	27.5	1

The better debating was done by the AFF (AFF or NEG) from Holy Trinity BL (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Prep Time Used
Pro 1 min
Con 45 sec

Great work, all debaters!

Strong first speeches from all debaters. Solid crossfire, too, but both teams need to allow the other side to ask questions.

Zain - Spend your summary being more specific. It's a good idea to outline the round, however, just saying "they didn't respond to our framework + 1st + 2nd contentions," doesn't help us make a decision about policy. Tell us specifically why this matters - what is the substance/impact of these arguments?

Connell/Biz - Respond to their framework. You claim the same benefit - econ. growth - but you should explicitly address this. You agree w/ the framework - you just are arguing that you uphold this framework best.

Overall, Pro wins that this helps the economy which is what I'm told to vote on in framework.

Room: 461
Start: ASAP
JV PF

1

Stevens Simon

MARET INVITATIONAL
Washington DC
April 14

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Episcopal SM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Harry Shi	29	1
1	Amy Ma	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	North Fairfax Debate KS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Manjula Khetan	22	4
1	Natasha Sanghvi	24	3

The better debating was done by the Aff (AFF or NEG) from Episcopal SM (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Simon Stevens

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams showed civility, confidence, and aptitude. However, the AFF was able to defend its stance and critique that of its opponents with a higher degree of detail and rationality.

When the AFF suggested that the US benefits when its focus is on the global community, it ~~flow~~ provided reason and evidence to support that claim. The NEG, though adamant, fell short in justifying its "America first" contention.

✓
Room: 372
Start: ASAP
JV PF

1

Mills-Rodgrigo,

MARET INVITATIONAL

Washington DC

April 14

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Emerson Prep NA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Paule Ndjiki-nya	29	1
2	Marley Anthony	29	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Landon DB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Nikola Dragacevac	29	2
1	Alexander Brown	29	4

The better debating was done by the neg (AFF or NEG) from Landon DB (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: ✓

Signed: [signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

H1-B hurts american employment rates + aff misexplained competitiveness

Room: 463
Start: ASAP
JV PF

1

Solomon, Isaiah

MARET INVITATIONAL

Washington DC

April 14

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Holy Trinity FE	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sarah Flanagan	23	3
	Colleen Ewald	24	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Nysmith JC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jack Carson	23	2

The better debating was done by the AFF (AFF or NEG) from Holy Sarah Flanagan / Collen Ewald (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed:

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

THE AFFIRMATIVE TEAM WAS ON POINT with the FACT AND DATA. MORE ON TOPIC, impressive focus under standable. HAD RESEARCH, Facts statistics, etc.

Room: 370
Start: ASAP
JV PF

1 Krishnan, Arjun

MARET INVITATIONAL

Washington DC

April 14

Pro + 1st

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Landon MK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Alec Mearns	29	2
2	Mark Kalavritinos	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Episcopal DZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Rob Deaton	28.5	4
1	Karen Zhang	28.5	3

The better debating was done by the AFF (AFF or NEG) from LANDON MK (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Arjun K

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted for the AFF because they convinced me raising the quota would benefit the U.S. economy; the CON did not introduce a compelling downside.

Room: 465
Start: ASAP
Open PF

1

Majors, Laretta

MARET INVITATIONAL

Washington DC

April 14

~~AFFIRMATIVE~~ Con

POS	Landon GM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Thomas Gao	28	1
1	Owen McCarthy	27	2

~~NEGATIVE~~ Affirm

POS	National Cathedral CS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Rania Chowdury	27	3
2	Arrieanna Solomon	26	4

The better debating was done by the NEG (AFF or NEG) from Landon GM (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Thomas Gao - great job! You represented your position thoroughly.

Owen McCarthy - great job!

Rania Chowdury - Great job! Build a better Disney arguements

Arrieanna Solomon - great job! Your question during the crossfire was a little confusing and when ask to clarify it became more confusing. Focus on your question and Remember the timing.

Room: 474
Start: ASAP
Open PF

1 **Christensen Phil**

MARET INVITATIONAL
Washington DC
April 14

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Nysmith MJ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
A	Swetha Madaraju	28	2
B	Emma Jing	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	National Cathedral BH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
A/B	Emily Hester	29	1

The better debating was done by the NEG (AFF or NEG) from Emily Hester - Natl. Cathedral (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Philip D Christensen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good JOB to all

The Aff team had a strong case in the constructives but did not provide analysis, evidence, or refutation to the Negatives claims. The main argument from the debate was whether HIB ultimately hurts the worker & the US. The Aff team did not address those critical arguments.

A few key points for the future:

① Aff - Don't read prepared blocks in Rebuttals. You will miss all the analysis & specific Refutation.

② Final Aff speech Read a Neg prepared block. In it, you said "You should cast an opposition ballot." This was the last speech. The Neg ~~debat~~ really should jump on that and simply say, "I agree, vote for me"

③ Neg - Please use all of your time in every speech.

Great JOB everyone!

Room: 476
Start: ASAP
Open PF

1

Katyal, Rem

MARET INVITATIONAL
Washington DC
April 14

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	National Cathedral LG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Emily Liu	26.5	4
2	Alice Gabidoulline	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Nysmith AH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Sarang Arun	29	1
1	Cami Hiek	28.5	2

The better debating was done by the Neg (AFF or NEG) from Nysmith AH (TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME)

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Rem Katyal

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

very good debate - lots of clash, but quite often arg were dropped. This debate really came down to whether the visa hurt U.S. workers [I didn't evaluate the econ debate too much since there was no impact to econ decline/strong econ] I felt that the Neg did a better job proving that an increase in H1B visas would hurt U.S. workers. One of the big arg here was the layoff arg, which the Aff didn't really do a good job responding to. Also Aff kind of dropped their arg about it overturning the Immigration and Nationality Act. I felt that Neg did a better job proving that U.S. workers would be laid off, as proved by the Disney example. I actually really liked the Aff arg that visa workers actually create more jobs. And although I didn't really like the Neg arg that the same thing would happen with U.S. workers, Aff never really responded to it. I also liked the increase innovation arg from Aff, but in the context of the Neg's framework, it didn't hold much weight. I also liked the Aff arg about the SNAP program, but it hasn't extended until the last speech, and it also didn't really have much to do with helping U.S. workers, or if it did I didn't hear that arg made. Also the Chain migration arg was unfortunately dropped by the Aff.