


VPD

FLIP: 9 Quah - Gupta v. 3 Crusa - Agarwal

Varsity Policy Debate				Thomas Willis (4)			
Round 3				LL102		Fri 12/02/16 07:20PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Isaac Quah</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28.5</u>	1st	<u>Agarwal</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>15</u>
2nd	<u>Animesh Gupta</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>29</u>	2nd	<u>Crusa</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature <u>Arizona State</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							


Comments & Reason for Decision:

IN - Clipped cards in the INR. Hence, low speaks

Oval critique given

VPD

FLIP: 15 Wescott - Roehrich v. 9 Wagoner - Yousefelahi

Varsity Policy Debate				Colin Redman			
Round 3				LL103		Fri 12/02/16 07:20PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Yousefelahi</u>	2	29	1st	<u>Roehrich</u>	3	28.5
2nd	<u>wagoner</u>	4	27.5	2nd	<u>Wescott</u>	1	29
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature <u>ASU</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative		Negative					
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Not enough answers on framework -
 Neg ends up winning that the aff creates an
 echo chamber that hurts aff Solvency.

Perf con is underdeveloped and doesn't
 outweigh framework.