


NPF

FLIP: 38 Danciu - Hunt v. 41 Martinez - Yu

Novice Public Forum		Shuyan Hong (*37) Mikkaela Salamatin (#5)			
Semi-Finals		Room 321	Sat 02/11/17 03:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Martinez	25.5	1st	Danciu	27
2nd	Yu	26	2nd	Hunt	26.5
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			Mohave High School (S) School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:



<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Pro</u></p> <p>M: work on being more confident & aggressive in CX both when asking + answering</p> <p>Roundabout way of fixing: remove then fix vs. gradual then remove</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Con</u></p> <p>H: work on being a little more calm + being OK</p> <p>D: work on signposting during summary</p> <p>consider experimenting w/ switching speakers</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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.	

RFD: Con ultimately did a better job explaining the harms of lifting the ban right now vs. Pro.

NPF

FLIP: 38 Danciu - Hunt v. 41 Martinez - Yu

Novice Public Forum			Levi Rubin (*16,20)		
Semi-Finals			Room 321		Sat 02/11/17 03:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Martinez	30	1st	Danciu	29
2nd	Yu	28	2nd	Hunt	27
The winner of this debate was					
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>			 School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- all ~~the~~ ^{aff} econ arguments (one of their key voters) played into neg rebuttal that all econ benefits flow to Castro regime



- I don't buy aff's militarism contention

Very solid 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.	

NPF

FLIP: 38 Danciu - Hunt v. 41 Martinez - Yu

Novice Public Forum		Craig Mick (*19)	
Semi-Finals		Room 321	Sat 02/11/17 03:30PM
Speaker ^{Right} Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker ^{Left} Con	Points (20-30)
1st <u>Martinez</u>	<u>28</u>	1st <u>Danciu</u>	<u>30</u>
2nd <u>Yu</u>	<u>28</u>	2nd <u>Hunt</u>	<u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			

Helm-
Burt

Comments & Reason for Decision:


Both side presented a number of facts
 Con side was better able to cite specific facts and put thing in context. Putting into context was key.
 Con asked better questions
 Con side got a little loose with ~~facts~~ relating points to facts towards the end.

~~_____~~

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.	

NPF

FLIP: 9 Frindell - Reaves v. 40 Warrior - Exum

Novice Public Forum		Luke DiSimone (*46)			
Semi-Finals		Room 322	Sat 02/11/17 03:30PM		
Speaker	Pro 2ND	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con 1ST	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>EXUM</u>	<u>26</u>	1st	<u>REAVES</u>	<u>24</u>
2nd	<u>WARRIOR</u>	<u>25</u>	2nd	<u>FRINDELL</u>	<u>23</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature <u>HAMILTON</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Comments MADE VERBALLY

→ Disagreement on framework means working your own framework rigorously and providing a reason why a judge agrees with you flows within your framework.


→ Impacts as important - find credible quant features for impacts - benefits for your position, harms for opponent's
 PRO had beneficial impacts for change vs. CON's ~~non-unique~~ non-unique position of PRO.

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.	

REF: PRO stayed within framework. Successfully argued for failure of status quo. Presented specific benefits for change. CON failed to present solvability of status quo. CON failed to present risks and associated impacts for change.

NPF

FLIP: 9 Frindell - Reaves v. 40 Warrior - Exam

Novice Public Forum		Kat Grilliot (*38)	
Semi-Finals		Room 322	Sat 02/11/17 03:30PM
Speaker	Pro (2)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (1) Con
1st	EXUM	27	1st REAVES 25
2nd	WARRIOR	28	2nd FRINDELL 24
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
(Circle Winner) Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con		HAMILTON / ENGINEER School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			

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.	


◦ WORK ON PRESENTATION / DELIVERY
 STRONG PRESENCE THAT IS NON-DISRACTIVE
 MAKES IT EASIER TO LISTEN/COMPREHEND
 ARGUMENTS. (LOW)

◦ ~~ALWAYS~~ ALWAYS DELIVERED TO OPPONENTS WITH
 RESPECT (PRO) A FEW TIMES ATTITUDES
 APPEARED A BIT DEFENSIVE AND HARSH

- OVERALL - PRO POSITION MADE MORE OF A SOLID
 ARGUMENT THAT WAS NOT CONTESTED ON SEVERAL
 POINTS BY CON.

NICE JOB BY BOTH TEAMS!

1st CON NPF 2nd PRO
FLIP: 9 Frindell - Reaves v. 40 Warrior - Exum

Novice Public Forum		Mrs. Joseph (41) JON COHEN (30)			
Semi-Finals		Room 322	Sat 02/11/17 03:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Warrior	(2) 26	1st	Reaves	1 25
2nd	Exum	(9) 27	2nd	Frindell	3 24
		53			49
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature 30 Scottsdale Prep. School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- ① Logic a bit thin - you assume that the embargo is aimed at redressing human rights of Cubans. Why is that a valid assumption? Delivery was not crisp... work on diction would be helpful
- ② Voice was rough due to illness - but still a good presentation w/ good logic ~~and~~
- [Note - Pro seems to agree with that construct, so no harm done]
- ③ Bent over laptop + playing with leggings and hair = very distracting. Presentation not at all clear - please slow down and try to clarify (concentrate) on fewer points. Quality is better than quantity
- ④ Good to focus on US interests. Nice presentation
- ⑤ S - rough

- CON**
- oppression will continue
 - progress has not been made
 - trading profits will not help Cuban people only the state
- PRO**
- Liberalization has been occurring - reward progress
 - embargo is hindering progress in tech, etc.
 - medicine, food availability
 - * US will benefit... starve costs of bad policy new US jobs - + to US economy

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.	

RFD - PRO made a clearly better + more comprehensive case - and it was presented better.