


NPF

FLIP: 38 Danciu - Hunt v. 35 Gadiyar - Shih

Novice Public Forum			Taylor Miller (*9)		
Octo-Finals			Room 322		Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Shih	25	1st	Danciu	29
2nd	Gadiyar	28	2nd	Hunt	22
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>YES</u>			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Judge provided high level feedback post-round to teams
- Must maintain an air of civility in debate - key
- Both teams performed rather well, difficult to choose
- Con team won based on volume of content, clarity of points in contentions
- Pro team strong in relaying impacts/importance
- Both teams strong in signposting, final focus

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.	

Team Feedback - Con

- Good: De-linking value of other team's contentions
- Good: Clarifying inferences made by other team
- Good: Asking a "re-set" question to identify the agreed value / underlying aim (of promoting democracy)
- Good: Fully addressing contentions of other team
- Good: Clarity of articulation (speaker 1 summary)
- Improvement areas: work on interrupting, degrading speech, escalation of voice in crossfire

PROP TIME	CON	PRO
0:42	0:20	0:49
		0:42
		0:30 (Full)

Team Feedback - Pro

- Good: Polite conduct, debate sportsmanship
- Good: Passion, emotional appeal, assertive tone
- Good: De-linking of value of claims ("conditions haven't been met, but embargo hasn't worked"); ("EU is different economic region than Cuba"; ("We don't know what 2018 holds"))
- Good: Responding to questions / interruptions with composure
- Good: Crystallization points ("Con position risks human lives" as central) (in speaker 2 summary)
- Improvement areas: Repetition of main points w/o further support / rebuttal quality

NPF

FLIP: 58 Massimi - Borchardt v. 20 Lenhart - Rascon

Novice Public Forum		Joseph Mooney (*57)			
Octo-Finals		Room 324	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM		
Speaker	Pro 2	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con 1	Points (20-30)
1st	Rascon Borchardt	27	1st	Rascon	27
2nd	Massimi	21	2nd	Lenhart	21
The winner of this debate was			Judge's Signature <i>ChSee</i> School / Affiliation / Occupation <i>hamelton</i>		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					

200
40
1.20
1.05

7
43
50
1.10
32
40


Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Pro better expanding
and explaining
ideas - more
developed.
also good with
protecting their
argument*

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.	

NPF

FLIP: 40 Warrior - Exum v. 46 Durado - Perez

Novice Public Forum			Julia Dowell (*50)		
Octo-Finals			Room 328		Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Exum	28	1st	Dorado	26
2nd	Warrior	26	2nd	Perez	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Catalina Foothills High School School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Pro Con Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Exum - Your start was great with an explanation of what is happening and a definition of embargo. Specific microsoft ban was good. Thank you for putting a U.S. price tag on the embargo. Thank you for clarifying espionage proof. Your summary was excellent!

Dorado - Great examples of what's non-compliance will require to lift embargo. I don't know if the proof of what espionage was strong enough. Did you have a third contention? Great question about being spent on the embargo! You were great on cross. You asked questions that really cornered the other team. Your summary just seemed like a reiteration of your original points. You didn't really answer warrior's question on embargo.


Warrior - Great job of being and speaking to me and not reading to me. The status quo is the embargo was a great line. Good for stating that North Korea and China are already friends of the US. Explain how the embargo has cost for the US. Good point about the embargo creating jobs for US. You were strong on cross by asking yes/no questions.

Perez - I agree that ^{the Aff} ~~the Aff~~ has provided no proof Cuba will behave if the embargo is lifted. Provide proof that Cuba's allies are threatening the US. Work on your presentation skills a little. You read a lot and kind of went back and forth a lot. You were a little disorganized. Good for you for asking for proof of Raul's commitment to democratize Cuba.

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.		

NPF

FLIP: 41 Martinez - Yu v. 9 Carney - Olson

Novice Public Forum		Bob Morken (*20)			
Octo-Finals		Room 323	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Yu</u>	<u>30</u>	1st	<u>Olson</u>	<u>28</u>
2nd	<u>Martinez</u>	<u>29</u>	2nd	<u>Carney</u>	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature <u>CFHS</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:


Con had good attacks on Pro.
 Pro effectively defended.
 Pro attacks on Con were more convincing and not adequately defended.
 Both teams articulate, great arguments, professional presentation!
 Both teams had good # and quality of evidence.
 Ultimately, Pro's argument @ ineffectiveness of Embargo, growing democracy under the embargo, benefits to the U.S. economy of lifting it and benefits to all by trading Cuban vaccines was more effective than Con's argument that economic benefits inconsequential, and opposition would increase.

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.	

NPF

FLIP: 57 Narayanan - Mooney v. 9 Frindell - Reaves

200

Novice Public Forum			Brett Mallette (*19)		
Octo-Finals			Room 326		Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Sadirse Mooney	24	1st	Courtney Reaves	25
2nd	Adiri Narayanan	25	2nd	Talia Frindell	25
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Shadow Mountain Hs. Teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? _____					

Base
1:20
1:32
28
14

Comments & Reason for Decision:

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.	

Pro

- Great work on establishing framework.
- Make you sure you connect how trade and democracy correlate.
- Great public speaking.


Con

- Great work on rebuttal.
- Frindell, slow down and speak clearly. You had fantastic thoughts/ideas to share.

FD: While the initial frame was agreed upon was mutualism, the con pointed out that if there are more negatives, yet positives exist, there's still more negatives. Pro could not show that it was in the best interest of both countries to trade as Cuba struggles to pay back debt (Russia included). From now, the con side was able to prove that Cuba already has trading partners and the people have yet to see real benefits.

NPF

FLIP: 30 Matejsek - Stabilito v. 20 Varghese - Moore

Novice Public Forum		Sidharth Kulkarni (*43)			
Octo-Finals		Room 327	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM		
Speaker	Pro 1	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con 2	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Stabilito</u>	<u>29</u>	1st	<u>Moore</u>	<u>27</u>
2nd	<u>Matejsek</u>	<u>27</u>	2nd	<u>Varghese</u>	<u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			<u>Hamilton</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

oral RFD given

Make sure to address contentions directly - both sides were weakened by that

Really good match, you both did well. Thanks for debating!


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.	

~~DISIMONE, LUKE~~

Ryan-Rojas, Jacqueline

NPF

FLIP: 35 Choi - Sung v. 5 Callies - Diaz

Novice Public Forum			Luke DiSimone (#46) <i>Jacqueline Ryan-Rojas (*)</i>		
Octo-Finals			Room 728		Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Diaz</u>	<u>29</u>	1st	<u>Choi</u>	<u>30</u>
2nd	<u>Callies</u>	<u>28</u>	2nd	<u>Sung</u>	<u>26</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Valley Vista Speech & Debate School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Diaz - Too fast! Remember the judge has to hear/understand your claim. Look up at the judge when possible.

Choi - Not as fast, good I can follow. Eye contact is made, thank you for holding the computer rather than leaning down.
 • Cigar claim is a bit inflated...
 • Good - addressing of health benefits

Crossfire - Diaz, good 1st question re: cigars. Choi; good response.
 • Cuba cigars are currently legal → cigar contention failed

Callies - "Cuba is not communist - it is a socialist state"
 Good eye contact - better pacing than partner.
 Russia forgives Cuban debt - but Cuban people suffer from their own gov. ~~heard contentions~~ *heard contentions & understood framework.

Sung - Cuba is Communist not socialist ← claim
 Cuba was forced to have good medical/health care because of the embargo. Lifting embargo will help Cuba's gov.

~~2nd~~ Cross - Cigars discussion, communist vs socialist,

~~Pro~~ - Pro - Human Rights → Summary → Con - Gov control

Grand Cross - very engaging - economic gov structure discussed
 Callies - ~~spus~~ spus, no evidence, drugs - cigars, good healthcare, Truman Doc.
 Song - Cuba v China, organized crime, illegal drug trade, pharmaceutical - medical innovations

Final Thoughts:

Diaz got stronger as debate went on.
 A difficult choice between two talented teams in the end the team that had the more compelling evidence was the Pro team.

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.	

29 sec | 27 sec
 29 sec | 27 sec
 30 sec

38 used
23
1 min

BRAUN, TED

Bobcat Bonanza 2017

Pro NPF

FLIP: 46 Prouty - Heyman v. 25 Adelberg - Callahan

Novice Public Forum		Ted Braun (*16)	
Octo-Finals		Room 321	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Speaker	Pro <u>Littemburgo</u>	Points (20-30)	Speaker
1st	<u>Heyman</u>	29	1st <u>Callahan</u>
2nd	<u>Prouty</u>	29	2nd <u>Adelberg</u>
The winner of this debate was		<u>Ted Braun</u> Judge's Signature	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)		<u>Desert Vista</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			

con #1
 unconstitution Harm int relations
 6k^{prouty} detained unfairly
 speech Travel medical care
 forced labor in prison
 Tariff act 1930 forced labor
 agents Human rights
 trying it into our constitution
 Harboring Terrorists - Proof?
 They get tech equipment which is used
 increases in prices of tobacco if lifted

Pro #1
 1 cost benefit impact
 Great financial impacts
 \$1.2 bill ^{to a} year impact to US
 \$655 mil annually impact to Cuba
 impact to us jobs
 2 failing to do its job
 isolationism doesn't foster
 change
 Has made things worse
 Castro has used to his advantage
 N.F. professor says not
 impact

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.	

LCF #
 4.8 econ recovery over-exaggerated how reliable?
 AP is low
 Generalistic both ways
 Q¹ Are prisoners slaves?
 - No
 why were they arrested?
 USA vs Cuba law
 Raul Castro stepping down
 Q² is cuban cigars going to impact lives

30 sec
1:05
37
9 sec