A. Taggart

US 221
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**	
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 221**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **A**	Judge: **Austin Taggart (U19)**	Affiliation/ Occupation: **Durham Academy** (U19)

Debaters: Marisa Sashti and Curran Mann (**Ravenwood High SM**) *vs.* Connor Jenkins and Caroline Brewton (**Pinecrest High JB**)

Resolution --

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: Ravenwood SM	Side: __ Pro ✓ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)	School: Pinecrest JB	Side: ✓ Pro __ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: Marisa Sashti		29	Speaker 2 Name: Connor Jenkins		28
Speaker 3 Name: Curran Mann			Speaker 4 Name: Caroline Brewton		

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: __ Pro X Con	Winning Team/Code: Ravenwood SM	Low point win?
	Judge's signature: Austin Taggart	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

orally given

Comments to debaters:

orally given

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

I voted neg b/c aff won that aid increases are effective but neg had better extension that overall increases in military spending, which is ~~made~~ conceded by the aff to be more likely with affirming, which linked better into generating armed conflict than aid increases are at preventing it.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*** The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**

R. Sharma

US 222
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**	
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 222**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **B**	Judge: **Rahul Sharma (U14)**	Affiliation/ Occupation: **Durham Academy** (U14)
Debaters: Jason Hallman and Aditya Surana (**Cary Academy SH**) *vs.* Justin Smith and Connor Fultz (**Charlotte Lati SF**)				
Resolution --				

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: CL SF	Side: __ Pro ✓ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)	School: CA SH	Side: ✓ Pro __ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: Justin S.		26	Speaker 2 Name: Jason H.		28
Speaker 3 Name: Connor F.			Speaker 4 Name: Aditya S.		

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: ✓ Pro ___ Con	Winning Team/Code: CA SH	Low point win? NO
	Judge's signature:	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

- Print your con, learn it. Hard to understand broken case.
- Stand on 2 feet during CX, look nervous (1st speaker)
- Don't look for cards during CX
- Very Scattered Rebuttal, few → Don't ask questions to opp & don't take prep
- Summary is unprepared & scattered, hard to follow

Comments to debaters:

- Good Case, well-Delivered
- If you are going to go back to your con, don't just extend, actually defend the attks on your case.
- "I can read a few cards if you like." - DON'T SAY IT

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

- Turn on Diplomacy for the Pro
- Turn on arms race for the Pro
- Naval Primacy ↓

- Don't Debate outside speeches & Cross-X
- If something isn't in summary DO NOT put it in FF.
- DO NOT bring new evidence into FF

↓

Pro wins on 3 points

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*** The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**

~~D. Carsewell~~ John Schaeffer

US 223
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**	
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 223**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **C**	Judge: ~~**Diana Carsewell (A1)**~~ KZ	Affiliation/ Occupation: ~~**The Potomac School**~~ (A1) Cary Academy

Debaters: Paul Snyder and Emma Smits (**Pinecrest High SS**) *vs.* Moaad Alwakil and Thomas Landsberg (**Research Trian AL**)

Resolution -- Int'l conflict US should sig. increase military spending

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: RESEARCH TRI AL	Side: __ Pro ✓ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)	School: PINECREST SS	Side: ✓ Pro __ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: Thomas Landsberg		28	Speaker 2 Name: Emma Smits		29
Speaker 3 Name: Moaad Alwakil			Speaker 4 Name: Paul Snyder		

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: ✓ Pro ___ Con	Winning Team/Code: PINECREST SS	Low point win?
	Judge's signature: John H. Schaeffer	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

- Great job outlining argument and responding to Aff's points
- While I can see value in double-checking opponent's stats, I found the repeated (3) requests to see evidence a bit distracting

Comments to debaters:

- Also great job framing argument and responding to Con's points
- Don't know if it was solely for this match but I noticed a tendency to hijack crossfire and continue your argument rather than attack opp's with questions.

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Very close round. Both sides were outstanding and should be commended. I belive the Affirmative is the more difficult argument with this Resolution and because of that belief and that the argument was so close, the Aff/Pro wins.

I found the Aff's arguments of drone technology and increased use, along with a military presence to stabilize a region for humanitarian aid to be persuasive. Aff also presented statistic to support need for increasing US spending that Con failed to attack as biased or flawed. Aff's response that Russia + China have become more belligerent in years of decreased spending muted Con's point of potential arms race.

Again, Con made sound, logical arguments, but I was more persuaded by Aff/Pro.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*** The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**

A. Petersen

US 224
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**	
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 224**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **D**	Judge: **Ann Petersen (G2)**	Affiliation/ Occupation: **Pinecrest High School** (G2)

Debaters: Sejal Patel and Zach Kingery (**Research Trian PK**) *vs.* Ambika Bhatt and Gargi Mahadeshwar (**William G. Enl BM**)

Resolution -- US should increase military spending

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: Research Δ	Side: __ Pro ✓ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)	School: Enloe	Side: ✓ Pro __ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: Sejal Patel		29	Speaker 2 Name: Gargi Mahadeshwar		28
Speaker 3 Name: Zach Kingery			Speaker 4 Name: Ambika Bhatt		

Rate each TEAM: <20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: __ Pro ✓ Con	Winning Team/Code: Research Δ PK	Low point win? no
	Judge's signature: Ann Petersen	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:
You complement each other nicely. / Zach, you said... "We are looking @ this through a lens of lenses, what?" But, good job bringing Xexam question back well done — Ask for source when you can still rebut it - They didn't offer again / Brink that / Not sure you made connection to your assertion — that raising military spending = lowering bureaucratic funds. ~~Both~~ Perhaps commonsense?

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):
To both of yr - US. Hedge argument not fleshed out well on either side —
Argument that cut waste + apply resources gained to ~~attack~~ addressing cyber attacks carries the day —
Win for Con - Well argued case — Close call —

Comments to debaters:
Ambika, watch your posture when you speak — Watching to see if cross legs — Very confident — final argument — That works. Gargi, your last argument very well organized but your spontaneous responses are lacking in confidence. Trust yourself.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* **The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**

K. Grover

US 225
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**	
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 225**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **E**	Judge: **Kurren Grover (U26)**	Affiliation/ Occupation: **Durham Academy** (U26)

Debaters: Aidan O'Connell and Aminah Jenkins (**C E Jordan Hig OJ**) *vs.* Hern Lim and Katrine Andersen (**Cary Academy AL**)

Resolution --

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: C E Jordan OJ	Side: __ Pro ✓ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)	School: Cary Academy AL	Side: ✓ Pro __ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: Aidan O'Connell		27.5	Speaker 2 Name: Hern Lim		28
Speaker 3 Name: Aminah Jenkins			Speaker 4 Name: Katrine Andersen		

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: ✓ Pro ___ Con	Winning Team/Code: Cary Academy AL	Low point win? No
	Judge's signature:	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Comments to debaters:

Katrine - when time goes up, try to end your sentence and stop, no need to continue on for too long.

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

I voted Aff almost solely on cyber-security. Neg never had a real response that was extended through ~~[illegible]~~ whereas I saw clean extensions from Aff.

I felt like the T in spending by China, Iran, and Russia was met w/ Neg's idea of an arms Race that was never refuted by Aff so that ultimately became a wash.

The other points that had clash were exclusively ~~offense~~ defense anyway.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*** The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**

Z. Becker

US 226
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**		
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 226**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **F**	Judge: **Zachary Becker (R4)**	Affiliation/ Occupation:	**Cumberland International Early College** (R4)

Debaters: Harish Korrapati and Callan Hazeldine (**Ardrey Kell Hi KH**) *vs.* William Lloyd and Gauruv Singh (**Charlotte Lati SL**)

Resolution --

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: Charlotte Lati SL	Side: __ Pro ✓ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)	School: Ardrey Kell	Side: ✓ Pro __ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: William Lloyd		25	Speaker 2 Name: Callan Hazeldine		26
Speaker 3 Name: Gauruv Singh			Speaker 4 Name: Harish Korrapati		

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: ✓ Pro __ Con	Winning Team/Code: Ardrey Kell Hi KH	Low point win? NO
	Judge's signature:	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Sp1: Excellent eye contact, tone, speed.

Sp3: Excellent job attacking your opponents case.

Comments to debaters:

Sp2: Your case was ~~was~~ easy to flow - Excellent use of sources. Watch your time.

Sp4: Excellent job furthering your contentions. Watch your time.

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Both sides! Please do not talk to your partner when your opponent is speaking. The Pro side was able to support their contentions throughout the rounds.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*** The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**

P. Shah

US 228
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**	
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 228**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **G**	Judge: **Parul Shah (K12)** [redacted]	Affiliation/ Occupation: **Cary Academy** (K12)

Debaters: William Montalvo and Kai Fenty (**Cumberland Int MF**) *vs.* Aayush Purohit and Sofia Sanchez (**NCSSM PS**)

Resolution --

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: Cumberland	Side: ☐ Pro ☑ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)	School: NCSSM	Side: ☑ Pro ☐ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: William Montalvo		29	Speaker 2 Name: Sofia Sanchez		29
Speaker 3 Name: Kai fenty			Speaker 4 Name: Aayush Purohit		

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: ☑ Pro ☐ Con	Winning Team/Code: NCSSM- Sofia Sanchez/Aayush Purohit	Low point win?
	Judge's signature:	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

William
Good citing of references
Make clearer distinctions b/w contentions
much better pace in Summary
Good eye contact & body language in Summary.

1 min prep.

Kai
Good speaking pace.
Great eye contact
Creative argument.
Try lowering your voice- it seemed like shouting at times

Both of you did a great job in summary without notes.

Comments to debaters:

Sofia
Good clear voice & eye contact
Good defense & assertivness. in X-fire.

1 min prep
1 min prep.

Aayush
Good points but difficult to understand distinction between your contentions due to lack of inflection.
Good defense in X fire
Good job taking control of x fire

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

The pro position is much more difficult to defend. Although the con side gave strong arguments, specifically re-allocation of funds and that much of budget goes unused, the pro side was overall more convincing in that the new world order (China, Russia) demand an increase in spending to update nuclear arsenal, create a stronger presence and defend weaker nations.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min. ✓
Speaker 2	4 min. ✓
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min. ✓
Speaker 3	4 min. ✓
Speaker 4	4 min. ✓
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min. ✓
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min. ✓
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min. ✓
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min. ✓
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min. ✓
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min. ✓

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*** The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**



A. Ardis

US 230
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**		
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 230**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **H**	Judge: **Abby Ardis (J1)**	Affiliation/ Occupation:	**C E Jordan High School** (J1)

Debaters: Mason Reece and Khushi Surana (**Cary Academy SR**) *vs.* Aleks Trivanovic and Christian Brown (**Ardrey Kell Hi TB**)

Resolution -- ↑ Military spending better respond to international conflict

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: Ardrey Kell TB	Side: __ Pro ✓ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)	School: Cary Academy SR	Side: ✓ Pro __ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: Aleks Trivanovic		26	Speaker 2 Name: Khushi Surana		28
Speaker 3 Name: Christian Brown			Speaker 4 Name: Mason Reece		

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: ✓ Pro __ Con	Winning Team/Code: Cary Academy (SR)	Low point win?
	Judge's signature: AA Ardis	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:
- #1 - slow down - need to catch all evidence
  ↳ good ? at start of X-fire
- #3 - Good rebuttals to points brought up pro
- #3 - try being more clear in question
- #3 - good use of evidence, but it was mostly speculation statistics
- frustration was shown causing composure lost to be
- # Good responses in defense

Comments to debaters:
- #2 - good evidence, clear pathway with ↳ great responses to crossfire
- #4 strong questions during crossfire
- good maintence of composure
- work on providing more concrete examples

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

I found the pro arguments on cyber security and protect trade interest to be particularly strong. Con had a initial strong point that funding during aid exacerbates conflict but data seemed speculative. Con also came back to the idea that ↑ spending with domestic issues would have domestic consequences by reallocating fund from welfare but again the data seem speculative. Overall, pro laid out clearer examples and logical arguments.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*** The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**

E. Lee

US 303
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**	
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 303**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **I**	Judge: **Emma Lee (U9)**	Affiliation/ Occupation: **Durham Academy** (U9)
Debaters: Ankit Jajoo and Avi Agrawal (**Ardrey Kell Hi JA**) *vs.* Aditi Gupta and Ananya Seelam (**William G. Enl GS**)				
Resolution --				

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: William G. Enlo	Side: __ Pro ✓ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)	School: Ardrey Kell	Side: ✓ Pro __ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: Aditi Gupta		26	Speaker 2 Name: Avi Agrawal		30
Speaker 3 Name: Ananya Seelam			Speaker 4 Name: Ankit Jajoo		

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: ✓ Pro ___ Con	Winning Team/Code: Ardrey Kell JA	Low point win? NO
	Judge's signature: Emma N. Lee	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Aditi - good job reading case. Be more prepared to answer Qs about your case in CX. Good job extending Gorney. Should have responded to overview

Ananya - Instead of reading a card in cross make it a short logical question & have your partner cite it and give analysis. explain cybersecurity triggering arms race - give evidence

Comments to debaters:

Avi - Fast but well spoken & good analysis ready in cross on terrorism & arms race args.

Ankit - thorough rebuttal. well done & overview @ top

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

I vote Pro on both Innovation & the drone strikes turn. The impact analysis is clear on the Pro side that civilian casualities decrease & terrorism decreases along with the 1.5% in GDP card. Good issue selection & well done condensing innovation arg. Neg drone strikes arg needed to be more developed & needed to come up earlier to weigh it in round. Ultimately ↓ in casualties & terrorism outweighs small amount of wasted spending & Pro did a good job proving that throughout the round

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*** The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**

B. Butt

US 402
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**		
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 402**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **J**	Judge: **Bilal Butt (L2)**	Affiliation/ Occupation:	**Ardrey Kell High School** (L2)

Debaters: Matthew Schaeffer and Arm Kassam (**Cary Academy SK**) *vs.* Subhag Kotrannavar and Kavin Govindarajan (**William G. Enl KG**)

Resolution --

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: Enloe KG	Side: X Pro __ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)	School: Cary Academy SK	Side: __ Pro X Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: Kavin Govindarajan		27	Speaker 2 Name: Arman Kassam		29
Speaker 3 Name: Subhag Kotrannavar			Speaker 4 Name: Matthew Schaeffer		

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: __ Pro X Con	Winning Team/Code: CARY Academy SK	Low point win? NO
	Judge's signature: Bilal Butt	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Govindarajan: Don't sway. Summary needed to address some of the responses made directly to your case/contentions Kotrannavar. Need to be more aggressive and more comfortable w/ the evidence you read.

Comments to debaters:

Schaeffer - be careful some of the staff you read seems to contradict your case in rebuttal

Kassam: great summary - good time allocation and frontlines.

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

CON effectively shows that Russia is a dying threat w/ their crippled economy. so they have less military capability. Next cyber security seems like it could be a reason to spend more but Pro never shows spending solves the cyber threat. In the end Pro shows that China isn't a threat currently but US power projecting in South China Sea will antagonize china. Pro fails to show how spending more is good for combatting terrorism. But CON effectively shows spending leads to aggression so terrorism gets worse

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*** The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**

M. Tyler

US 405
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**		
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 405**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **K**	Judge: **Matt Tyler (W2)**	Affiliation/ Occupation:	**Research Triangle High School** (W2)

Debaters: Caroline Blythe and Grace Smith (**Woods Charter BS**) *vs.* Isaac Fan and Tori Boriase (**Cary Academy BF**)

Resolution --

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: Woods	Side: ✓ Pro __ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)	School: Cary	Side: __ Pro ✓ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: Caroline Blythe		26	Speaker 2 Name: Tori Boriase		27
Speaker 3 Name: Grace Smith			Speaker 4 Name: Isaac Fan		

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: ___ Pro ✓ Con	Winning Team/Code: Cary Academy BF	Low point win?
	Judge's signature:	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

- Grace – watch "ums"
- Grace: good job w/ leading questions
- Caroline: good rhetorical point (entertainment)
- Caroline: good ratio – 134 cartels, 18 significant
- Caroline – use prep before cross; ran out of questions to ask

* Lots of unsubstantiated/speculative China team-mapping

Comments to debaters:

- Ask questions during cross! (esp. Isaac)
- Tori: good point about nuclear deterrence

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

- Con won on China – U.S. likely not to go to war with large funding partner
- Wish Grace had brought up Iraq power vacuum earlier — was brought up @ end
- Con's point that ↑ spending leads to more terrorist attacks not refuted
- No one defined significant increase
  Caroline's def was weak source: "likely to have noticeable effect" – Vague

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*** The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**

V. Shirshail

US 406
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**	
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 406**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **L**	Judge: **Vaibhav Shirshail (U15)**	Affiliation/ Occupation: **Durham Academy** (U15)
Debaters: Ava Autry and Caroline Spancake (**Cary Academy AS**) *vs.* Sahil Patel and Colin Wang (**William G. Enl PW**)				
Resolution --				

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			TEAM Points (out of 30)
School: Enloe PW	Side: ✓ Pro __ Con		27
Speaker 1 Name: Sahil Patel		28	
Speaker 3 Name: Colin Wang		27	

Second Team			TEAM Points (out of 30)
School: Cary Academy AS	Side: __ Pro ✓ Con		28
Speaker 2 Name: Ava Autry		27	
Speaker 4 Name: Caroline Spancate		28	

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: ___ Pro ✓ Con	Winning Team/Code: Cary Academy AS	Low point win? No
	Judge's signature: Vaibhav S.	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

S1: good, confident speaking

S3: smart use of cyber warfare point but didn't utilize it, focused too much on a losing point

Comments to debaters:

S2: in summary make sure to use evidence and utilize your partners rebuttal as part of your speech.

S4: good rebuttal, confidence is nice

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

China/Russia Conflict was the main topic of debate and I got no reason as to why military spending increase would actually give me solvency. The other arguments were too muddled to make sense out of.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*** The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**

C. Brady

US 407
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**		
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 407**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **M**	Judge: **Chase Brady (L6)**	Affiliation/ Occupation:	**Ardrey Kell High School** (L6)

Debaters: Darshan Raj and Jonathan Hayden (**Research Trian RH**) *vs.* Mitchell O'Connor and Mason Laney (**Woods Charter OL**)

Resolution --

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: Woods Charter OL	Side: ✓ Pro __ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)	School: Research Triangle RH	Side: __ Pro ✓ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: Mason Laney 27		28	Speaker 2 Name: Jonathan Hayden 27		27
Speaker 3 Name: Mitchell O'Connor 28			Speaker 4 Name: Darshan Raj 27		

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: ✓ Pro ___ Con	Winning Team/Code: Woods Charter OL	Low point win? NO
	Judge's signature: Chase Brady	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:
- Work on developing Contention 2
- Work on confidence in cross-x, Mason
- Give a framework to articulate where the money would go to

Comments to debaters:
- Russian history lesson doesn't help case
- Focus on offense in 2nr, no defense
- Like contention 3

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):
- Well prepared rebuttal

I affirm because
1. military spending aids deterrence & diplomacy
2. low capabilities now
3. military budget not sufficient to cause overstretch

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*** The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**

Mr. Clemens Chaucer
Mrs. Clemens Chaucer
Miss Clara Clemens
Miss Susy Clemens
Miss Jean Clemens
Miss Olivia Susan Clemens

H. Martin

US 501
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**		
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 501**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **N**	Judge: **Hunter Martin (U4)**	Affiliation/ Occupation:	**Durham Academy** (U4)

This is incorrect

Debaters: Riya Thomas and Alex Knott (**Cary Academy KT**) *vs.* Max Shenkman and Ramses Rubio (**The Potomac Sc SR**)

Resolution --

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: Cary KT	Side: X Pro __ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)	School: Potomac SR	Side: __ Pro X Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: Riya		29	Speaker 2 Name: Max		29
Speaker 3 Name: Alex			Speaker 4 Name: Ramses		

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: X Pro ___ Con	Winning Team/Code: Cary Academy KT	Low point win? NO
	Judge's signature: Hunter Martin	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Both teams fail to link their arguments back to responding to conflict making the round very hard to decide.

Comments to debaters:

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

I vote Pro after much deliberation. The argument I look to most is the conflict in the South China Sea. AFF proves that China has been agressive, and that we have an interest in maintaining control

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*** The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**

K. Jin

US 503
Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: **Jan. 14-15, 2017** *Time:* **4:00 PM**			*Tournament:* **Cavalier Invitational 2017**	
Rd. **4**	Room: **US 503**	Grouping: **PF** Section: **O**	Judge: **Kevin Jin (K4)**	Affiliation/ Occupation: **Cary Academy** (K4)

Debaters: Sam Thompson and Mubashshir Khan (**Cary High Scho TK**) *vs.* William Thompson and Quentin Levin (**The Potomac Sc TL**)

Resolution --

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.
AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: CH TK	Side: ✓ Pro __ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)	School: potomac	Side: __ Pro ✓ Con	**TEAM Points** (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: Sam Thompson		28	Speaker 2 Name: Thompson		29
Speaker 3 Name: Khan			Speaker 4 Name: Levin		

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: __ Pro ✓ Con	Winning Team/Code: Potomac TL	Low point win?
	Judge's signature:	

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:
very good round and the biofuel angle is interesting, however the this point is hard to defense when opponent asked evidence, hence you did not response to two of the questions in crossfire. 2nd speaker speaks very well.

Comments to debaters:
answers questions clearly and precise, covered each opponents argument well, and over cross fire, you both speak well and response well. second speaker ~~could be~~ was a bit nervous but recovered well.

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):
Aff team raised a good point on biofuel, however failed to answer when asked during crossfire. both team asked questions well, however neg team ~~answered~~ answered better.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* **The first question is asked by the earlier speaker**