Policy Debate Varsity		Charlie Cavalier		
Round 1		B104		Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM

Speaker (circle) **Affirmative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle) **Negative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st (2nd) Annabelle Long	1	28.1	1st (2nd) Neel Lal	3	26.6
(1st) 2nd Elyse Pham	2	28	(1st) 2nd Chloe Lemay-Assh	4	26.5
F CK McClatchy			T Granite Bay High School		

The winner of this debate was

(Affirmative) Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _No_

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation: _Monterey Trail_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

There was a disconnect between the affirmative and the negative. I think the negative would benefit from competition on the national circuit and I recommend sending them to the Santa Clara University Tournament on April 1st. Additionally, I believe that the affirmative would benefit from a plan focused style of debate. I recommend researching specific bills and policies that eliminate biometric scanning. Both aff and neg would benefit from a deeper understanding of biopolitics and the integration of biometrics into the biopolitical regime we inhabit. The 2A would be very successful in any anthropology or political science program in the country.

The neg loses their utilitarianism argument so I evaluate the structural violence presented by the aff first. Even though the aff provides no statistics, I trust the peer reviewed journal articles presented in the 1AC. And I accept the affirmative's critique of statistical evidence as a byproduct of bad epistemology. And there real risked drug trafficking/terrorism in StatusQuo because of biometric spoofing, which compells

CX-V

Policy Debate Varsity				Steven Farias			
Round 1 12/10 1:45				B101 4:56		Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM	

Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
(1st) 2nd Lily Dearing		2	26	1st (2nd) Teddy Hill-Weld		1	29
1st (2nd) Serena Jones		4	25	(1st) 2nd Morgan Marguilles		3	26
L Rosemont High School				C Nevada Union High School			

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative (**Negative**)

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

INC NEEDS TO WORK ON ANNUNCIATION. CLARITY WAS AN ISSUE W/ THE SEXTON 10' CARD & GILBERT 09' CARD, ARGUABLY TWO MOST IMPORTANT CARDS IN THE INC.

2AC NEEDS MORE OFFENSE ON THE K & MORE WARRANTS ABOUT THE PERM IN THE CONTEXT OF THE DEBB. HOW DOES THE PERM RESOLVE THE K? THERE IS A LEVEL OF IMPLICATION, BUT 2AC SHOULD WORK TO MAKE MORE EXPLICIT.

THE NR'S SHOULD WORK MORE ON THE ABSURDITY ARGUMENTS. THEY ARE SOLID AND CRITICAL FRAMING AGAINST CASE.

RFD: I VOTE NEGATIVE ON THE (K). THE AFF HAS 3 OUTS BUT THOSE ARE SHORT-CIRCUITED. 1) I AM NOT SURE THE AFF (S) FOR NEOLIBERALIST CAUSES OF VIOLENCE & THE DURABILITY OF RIGHTS BEYOND PRISONS. THIS MEANS AFF (S) IS NOT AN OUT. 2) THE PERMS NEED MORE ARTICULATION TO WIN. 3) NO DISADS TO ACT.

CX-V

Policy Debate Varsity			Beya Pasha (*D)			
Round 1			**B110**		Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM	
Speaker (circle)	**Affirmative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	**Negative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)

Affirmative
- (1st) 2nd Kaylee Silber — Rank 3 — Points 28.5
- 1st 2nd J"cyn Crawley — Rank 4 — Points 28.
  L Rosemont High School

Negative
- 1st 2nd Eric Boettner — Rank 1 — Points 30
- 1st 2nd Nate Fleming — Rank 2 — Points 29
  Passes   F CK McClatchy

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **(Negative)**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Beya J. Pasha
Judge's Signature
Monterey Trail / educator
School / Affiliation / Occupation

FCC should have oversight of NSA to curtail

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Kaylee - excellent eye contact during. 1AC Strong voice. Arguments understood
1st Aff. Rebuttal: "The status quo fails"
    - terrorism
Solvency: Restate the plan and arguments

Nathan - excellent use of facts / sources.
1st Neg Rebuttal - very strong. You went through each argument of the aff. successfully.

Excellent team work.
    Timoe - did not complete ending.

J'Cyn - 2AC ~~scratched~~
It is apparent that you are prepared.
Excellent use of directly refuting the neg. arguments.
"It does prove that we solve for at least 1% and therefore..."
How does one disaggregate the data collected by the NSA?

Eric - ~~cross~~ cross was well spoken.
Your questions pertained directly
2NC - Great way to refute cited card of the aff. by pointing what it actually claims. Very strong! You were very organized.
Cross examine by aff. was won by you.

CX-V

Policy Debate Varsity			Tait White-Rasmussen			
Round 1			B102		Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM	

Speaker (circle) **Affirmative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle) **Negative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd Tony Hackett	1	29.3	1st 2nd Ashley Sonali Pandya	3	27.8
1st 2nd Molly Martin	2	29.1	1st 2nd Serena J Lee	4	27.1
F CK McClatchy ＼			Q James Logan High School		

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative   Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? __Ø__

Judge's Signature: Tait Hank Oren White-Rasmussen

School / Affiliation / Occupation: U C Davis — Sophist

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Aff ① ② all NEG Theory ∮ out weighed

CX-V

Policy Debate Varsity	Jack Gugino (*F)	
Round 1	B105	Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM

Speaker (circle) **Affirmative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle) **Negative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
(1st) 2nd Kelly Muir	3	'26	(1st) 2nd Kaitlin Raymond	2	27
1st (2nd) Devin Anderson		28	1st (2nd) Jayden Watts	4	26
C Nevada Union High School			L Rosemont High School		

The winner of this debate was

(**Affirmative**) Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision: end surveillance in indian land to find oil

Topicality: yes

Significance: No surveillance ≠ new deposit → less colonization/racialization/less exploit.

Inherency: yes

Solvency: yes

Disadvantages: yes

Side Comments for both teams: when arguing about def. of a whole set of people, try not to refer to that group of + grouping people as "them" ~~and not say "they"~~ like is arguing that choice of def is available

KM	DA	KR	JW
- Enunciation, slow down if you cannot pronounce the words if going that fast	- very clear, good cadence	- good speech. good change of pace.	- Debate on Indian classification
~~being called~~	- good job in rebutting critique of Native American and Indian discussion/ distinction	- too much discussion on the name "indian" Ask sources challenge, move-on.	~~Prefer term of Indian (4 #).~~
~~being called~~	- good rebuttal Jan 2'11	~~...~~ They have burden.	- good for asking for evidence for case — was looking for it
- During cross → wasted some time by saying "that's just what they want to be call." ~~say the~~ offer to source and move on and source in second Aff.	- using "like" as ≠ filler → stop	- good on cross - pushing on capitalism disc.	- ~~Gomez~~ very clear, addresses key points directly (clearest of four)
	- good point on who can sell land (BIA)	- is saying "they don't want to be called this" ∴ we can't call them this → defining parameters of what a people can call themselves? Otherwise, good first rebut.	- Circumvation is inevitable but ≠ capitalism. ~~BIA 2 reset label~~ - Argument became circular during cross.
- Great speed and			

PRICHARD, ROBERT

Sacramento NCFL

CX-V

Policy Debate Varsity				Robert Prichard (*T)			
Round 1				**B106**		Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM	
Speaker (circle) **Affirmative**		Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle) **Negative**		Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd Jocelin Rivera		___	___	1st 2nd Sophia DeBoer		___	___
1st 2nd Kiran Khalid		___	___	1st 2nd Emily Valerio		___	___
N Antelope HS				F CK McClatchy			

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** / Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____	Judge's Signature School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg Forfeit

CX-V

Policy Debate Varsity				gregory young (*R)			
Round 2		B101				Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM	
Speaker (circle) **Affirmative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)		Speaker (circle) **Negative**		Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd Eric Boettner	1	29		1st 2nd Kelly Muir		3	28.5
1st 2nd Nate Fleming	2	28.7		1st 2nd Devin Anderson		4	28.4
F CK McClatchy				C Nevada Union High School			

The winner of this debate was	
(**Affirmative**) Negative	Judge's Signature
(Circle Winner)	CSUS / Alumni / gout cler
Is this a low point win? _NO_	School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

-Vote Aff, not enough offense on nes, +
dropped counter - interp

Policy Debate Varsity				Debby Juarros (*N)			
Round 2 3:40 2:45				B102		Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st (2nd) Neel Lal		4	25	1st (2nd) Tony Hackett		1	28.5
(1st) 2nd Chloe Lemay-Assh		3	25	(1st) 2nd Molly Martin		2	28
	T Granite Bay High School				F CK McClatchy		

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative (**Negative**)

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **NO**

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEEL - YOU NEED TO LET YOUR PARTNER SPEAK DURING HER CX

↳ YOU ARE SPEAKING OVER ¿ FOR HER

MOLLY - IF YOU DO NOT HAVE MORE TO COVER, FEEL FREE TO SIT DOWN. IT STOPS MORE PREP TIME. FOR THE 1AR

TONY - MAYBE LEAVE THE (T) ¾ CASE FOR THE 1NR. ALLOWS FOR MORE FRAMING, WEIGHING, ¿ EXPLANATION OF CASE V. ALT METHOD. YOU ALSO DON'T NEED EVERYTHING IN 2NR.

CHLOE - YOU SHOULD WORK ON EXPLAINING THE CLAIMS YOU ARE MAKING ¿ MPXING THE ARGUMENTS YOU GO FOR IN THE 1AR.

RFD: THE OFFENSE OF THE (K) SHOWS THE AFF HARMS ARE

Policy Debate Varsity			August Wissmath (*D,F)			
Round 2			B106		Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM	

Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd	Kaitlin Raymond	1st	30	1st 2nd	Jocelin Rivera	4th	26
(1st) 2nd	Jayden Watts	2nd	29	1st 2nd	Kiran Khalid	3rd	28
	L Rosemont High School				N Antelope HS		

The winner of this debate was

(Affirmative) Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature: Seya J. Pasha

School / Affiliation / Occupation: Monterey Trail

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Jayden 1AC US gov't prohibit NSA ~~oversee~~ surveillance Kiran
Spreading easy to understand.
Pace is perfect. Organization easy
to follow. You answered all questions
during neg. CE.
Cross of neg ~~was~~ focused on "curtailing"
the NSA.

Kaitlin.
Excellent voice - Protecting consumers
from NSA monitoring
During cross examination, you
turned the questions back to the
negative. ~~You ask~~
Very strong cross exam.
Too often I questioned your
logic. Curtail the NSA OR
___ ____ __ the NSA?

1NC Very strong. Spreading done
flawlessly. "The NSA has not shown
it played a role..."
"The FCC should not regulate an
inefficient program." "Their plan
is harmful."
Cross exam - ½ aff is ¾ very strong
NSA NOT comparable to congress
The FCC
NSA can be eradicated thru the Supreme Court.

Jocelin
2NC - "They did not state HOW the
FCC would make the NSA better."
Definition of curtail given. "There
is no evidence how reinstating
Safe Harbor will be ..."
Oversee vs. Curtail
Used words of the aff. to refute them
very well.
Eradicate the NSA

CX-V

Policy Debate Varsity				Brandon Garcia (*W,F)			
Round 2			B105				Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM

Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd	Ashley Sonali Pandya	1	28.8	1st 2nd	Kaylee Silber	3 2	28.3
1st 2nd	Serena J Lee	2	28.6	1st 2nd	J''cyn Crawley	4 1	28.1
	Q James Logan High School				L Rosemont High School		

The winner of this debate was

(**Affirmative**) Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

T isn't impacted well and the ①D on ⑤ isn't extended well enough for me to pull the trigger on the stock issue voter. Aff wins that they meet their definition & that they ⑤ enough of case

CX-V

Policy Debate Varsity			Joshua Rayburn			
Round 2			**B104**		Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM	

Speaker (circle)	**Affirmative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	**Negative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd	Teddy Hill-Weld	1	29.3	1st 2nd	Annabelle Long	3	29.1
1st 2nd	Morgan Marguilles	4	28.9	1st 2nd	Elyse Pham	2	29.2
	C Nevada Union High School				F CK McClatchy		

The winner of this debate was	
Affirmative (**Negative**)	Tait Hawk Oren White-Rasmusson
(Circle Winner)	Judge's Signature
Is this a low point win? ∅	WCD Sophist
	School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Don't see Aff Aing of plan suggests. Reform Sev. ok, but then Aff(s) is ⊑ to the relation of the K to the 1AC & the epistemic Δ the 1Ac Advocates is lost to a contextual (s) of the K.

Policy Debate Varsity			Ben Menzies (*F,C)		
Round 3		B105			Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM

Speaker (circle) **Affirmative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle) **Negative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st (2nd) Kaitlin Raymond	1	28.6	1st (2nd) Neel Lal	3	28.
(1st) 2nd Jayden Watts	2	28.5	(1st) 2nd Chloe Lemay-Assh	4	27.5
L Rosemont High School			T Granite Bay High School		

The winner of this debate was

(**Affirmative**) Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

MCCLATCHY

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

ALL DISADS TO PERM ARE DISADS TO THE CP. NO ~~ADD~~ NET BENEFIT TO CP ALONE. AFF 100% CONCEDED.

AFF

- HAVE PURPOSE BEHIND PERMS/ARGS.
- YOU COULD BE A LITTLE NICER TO AN INEXPERIENCED TEAM.
- YOU SOMETIMES ASSERT THINGS W/O EV - POLITICAL CAPITAL IS FLUID AND NOT ONLY BY THE PRES.

NEG

- MORE WARRANTS
- NEED TO READ EV NOT JUST CITE IT
- NEED REASONS AFF IS BAD - ~~ADD~~ DISADVANTAGES.

Policy Debate Varsity			gregory young (*R)		
Round 3		B101			Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM

Speaker (circle) **Affirmative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle) **Negative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd Kelly Muir	4	25	1st 2nd Lily Dearing	3	26
1st 2nd Devin Anderson	1	27	1st 2nd Serena Jones	2	26
C Nevada Union High School			L Rosemont High School		

The winner of this debate was

(**Affirmative**)   Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?   ✗

Judge's Signature

JFK

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1st
AFF iF YOU ARE going TO SPEAK FAST PROJECT AND PRONOUNCE CLEARLY

1st
NEG ERRY TO UNDERSTAND

2nd AFF CLEAR

(Reading Long QUOTES is NOT debATiNg —
Logic + REASON Backed by EdU is)

iF You don't Look up FROM YOUR READING YOU
WONT SEE TIME SIGNALS

ARGUMENTS WERE DROPPED by boTH SIdes

AFF PROFIALED THE MOST

CX-V ✗

Policy Debate Varsity			Steven Farias		
Round 3 I:II		B106			Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM

Speaker (circle) **Affirmative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker 3:44 **Negative** (circle)	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
(1st)2nd Ashley Sonali Pandya	4	25	1st (2nd) Eric Boettner	1	28.5
1st (2nd) Serena J Lee Q James Logan High School	3	28	(1st)2nd Nate Fleming F CK McClatchy	2	28.5

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (**Negative**) (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? **No**	Judge's Signature School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: Alt Resolves Replication of the Affs Harms. So Vote Neg on the Ⓚ

Rhaw Umana, Victor

CX-V

Policy Debate Varsity	Charlie Cavalier	
Round 3	B104	Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM

Speaker (circle) **Affirmative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle) **Negative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd Annabelle Long	2 3	29 28	1st 2nd Jocelin Rivera	3	27
1st 2nd Elyse Pham	1 2	28 S	1st 2nd Kiran Khalid	4	27
F CK McClatchy		29.5	N Antelope HS		

The winner of this debate was

(**Affirmative**)   Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

MISSION SAN JOSE / JAMES LOGAN

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CX-V

Policy Debate Varsity	Tait White-Rasmussen	
Round 4	B105	Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM

Speaker (circle) **Affirmative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle) **Negative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd Jocelin Rivera	3	27.1	1st 2nd Kaylee Silber	1	27.4
1st 2nd Kiran Khalid N Antelope HS	4	27.0	1st 2nd J"cyn Crawley L Rosemont High School	2	27.8

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative (**Negative**)

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

TAIT HAWK OREN WHITE-RASMUSSIN

Judge's Signature

UC DAVIS   SOPHST

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CAP

CX-V

Policy Debate Varsity				Joshua Rayburn			
Round 4				B104		Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM	
Speaker (circle)	**Affirmative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	**Negative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
(1st) 2nd Tony Hackett		3	28	(1st) 2nd Kaitlin Raymond		1	27
1st (2nd) Molly Martin		2	27	1st (2nd) Jayden Watts		4	26
F CK McClatchy				L Rosemont High School			

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative   **Negative** (circled)

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Hired

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: It's a very interesting aff but also very heavy on theory that you run through very quickly, which is difficult to follow.

Neg: I get that you were caught off guard, but you need some better answers than just cap bad K

RFD| The round becomes very muddled and dificult to follow so I default to the easiest answer and that is I don't know the role of the ballot. To the point that the Aff tells me they don't call for the ballot and that surveillance is bad I don't know how to vote for the aff. Also, you say the 1AC isn't a narrative but is

CX-V

| Policy Debate Varsity			Ben Menzies (*F,C)			
Round 4			B102		Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM	

Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
(1st) 2nd	Lily Dearing	3	28.5	1st 2nd	Ashley Sonali Pandya (MAV)		
1st (2nd)	Serena Jones	2	28.6	(1st) 2nd	Serena J Lee	1	29
	L Rosemont High School				Q James Logan High School		

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative   Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ___X___

Judge's Signature

McClATCHY

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

T - LOW IMPACT TO VIOLATION,
DOMESTIC INCLUDES FOREIGNERS;
AFF BETTER THAN STATUS QUO

(ORAL)

Policy Debate Varsity			Robert Prichard (*T)			
Round 3			B102		Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM	

Speaker (circle)	**Affirmative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	**Negative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd	Teddy Hill-Weld	1	26	1st 2nd	Tony Hackett	2	25.5
1st 2nd	Morgan Marguilles	3	25	1st 2nd	Molly Martin	4	25
	C Nevada Union High School				F CK McClatchy		

The winner of this debate was

(**Affirmative**) Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

GBHS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Teddy: You have a condescending tone during CX

Tony: a little snippy in CX

Molly: Your stops + starts made it impossible to follow your "turns" on colonialism in your speech.

morgan: Your articulation skills are not good enough to speed read. Your argument should not rely on the judge "calling for the cards".

Molly: Don't apologize so much.

Tony: Slow down when you name your cards. I missed 4 citations.

morgan: I don't think it is appropriate to say, "act like dicks ..." in a debate round.

RFD: ON BACK ——→

Topicality fell to the wayside by the end of the debate, and I think the aff would agree with the neg that consequences matter. I didn't hear a response to the supremacy of being a benevolent hegemon other than the consequences of creating a power vacuum (nuclear war) would make the risk not worth it. This might be enough for me to vote neg except I didn't hear a response to the card that if anti-American rhetoric actually did reduce hegemony, it would have happened already. The poor communication display in this round may have interfered with this judge's ability to follow the whole debate.

YOUNG, GREGORY   Sacramento NCFL

Heilman

CX-V

Policy Debate Varsity		gregory young (*R)		

Round 4		B101		Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM

Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd	Eric Boettner	4	25	1st 2nd	Teddy Hill-Weld	1	28
1st 2nd	Nate Fleming	2	27	1st 2nd	Morgan Marguilles	3	26
	F CK McClatchy				C Nevada Union High School		

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **(Negative)**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

alisha Heil
Judge's Signature

Attorney
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

Eric

- I can't see you behind the desk
- slow down - I have no idea what you are ~~saying~~ saying
- you may have had some great points in there but your words just ran together and you were going so fast I could not process what you were saying
- your pace when asking what you affirm was understandable - use that throughout
- your pace when answering questions was great!
- good answers addressing the issues
- do not interrupt ~~or~~ the person you are asking questions to
- the pace at the start of your rebuttal was still a bit fast but better, towards the end you picked up your speed again and I couldn't follow you

Neg

Teddy

- avoid interrupting after you ask a question
- good pace
- 2014 - do you have a more current source?
- nice job addressing their attack on your side
- you know your args well which was clear in your answers to questions

Nate

- get rid of stand
- good job outlining your topics up front
- nice job addressing the opposing sides attack on your points
- should have to argue the plan is bad - good point ~~xxxxx~~
- good understanding of what you need to prove

Morgan

- I can't see you behind the stand
- slow down
- it does not matter how many points and how much information you have if I can not understand what you are saying
- I have no idea what even one of your points is
- ~~Follow your xxxxxxxx during xxx~~
- try to answer questions during cross
- let him finish answer before asking another question
- your pace during rebuttal in the beginning was much better
- but then you began to speed up again

Reason for Decision: ~~xxxxx~~ I was not able to follow the main initial points on either side because I could not understand the 1st speaker on either side. Decision for negative because affirmative has burden. and I am not sure if all issues were addressed

CX-V

	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)		Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
Round 4		B106				Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd	Kelly Muir	3	27	1st 2nd	Annabelle Long	2	28
1st 2nd	Devin Anderson	1	29	1st 2nd	Elyse Pham	4	26
	C Nevada Union High School				F CK McClatchy		

The winner of this debate was

(Affirmative) Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

G B H S

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Long: Topicality discussion in NR too similar to NC and only superficially adjusted to aff responses.

Pham: a little fast for me, but I got it

Muir: nice AC, your AR was a little all over the place, but I think I got it

Anderson: Great speaking style, clear!

Pham: you need to link to how getting rid of SPOT increases terrorism more clearly.

R F D   ON   Back →

CX-V

Policy Debate Varsity			Robert Prichard (*T)		
Round 4			B106		Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM

Speaker (circle) **Affirmative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle) **Negative**	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd Kelly Muir	3	27	1st 2nd Annabelle Long	2	28
1st 2nd Devin Anderson	1	29	1st 2nd Elyse Pham	4	26
C Nevada Union High School			F CK McClatchy		

The winner of this debate was

(**Affirmative**) Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Robert Prichard (Judge's Signature)

GBHS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Long: Topicality discussion in NR too similar to NC and only superficially adjusted to off responses.

Pham: a little fast for me, but I got it

Muir: nice AC, your AR was a little all over the place, but I think I got it

Anderson: Great speaking style, clear!

Pham: you need to link to how getting rid of SPOT increases terrorism more clearly.

RFD ON BACK ⟶