# NPD

**Novice Policy Debate**  |  **Judge**  |  **Room 923**  |  **Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM**
---|---|---|---
**Round 1**  |  |  |  
| **Speaker** (circle)  | **Affirmative**  | **Rank** | **Points** |  |  | **Speaker** (circle)  | **Negative**  | **Rank** | **Points** |
| 1st 2nd  | Justin Perillo  | 4  | 20  |  |  | 1st 2nd  | Alina Wang  | 2  | 25  |
| 1st 2nd  | Rachel Mason  | 3  | 21  |  |  | 1st 2nd  | Sushin Dahal  | 1  | 26  |

29 Desert Vista High School  
35 Hamilton High School

The winner of this debate was

- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  |  
No

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Justin:** Rapid delivery requires that argument be such that you can be understood.

- You were confident in defending your argument, but it is evident you know your topic better because of your delivery in 1st Aff.

1st

**Sushin:** Careful of proper word pronunciation!

- Overall: good, understandable delivery.

2nd

**Rachel:** Some good counter-points that were fairly strong but the links between quotations were not always clear.

(Justin) - Your participation in team mates presentation and cross did not enhance what she was doing. You interrupted and contradicted your partner.

2nd

**Alina:** Good bit of your team points (yet you deducted from effectiveness somewhat with "like" and "in my opinion"  and "you know")

(Justin) - Talking too fast near too loud while 2nd Jay was giving her presentation.
Novice Policy Debate
Ryan Ferdowsian (*'29)
Room 924
Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Suhan Kacholia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Vivian Nguyen</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gayathri Donepudi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Juhi Khandelwal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - Case flowed through, not rebutted at all.

Neg - Distinction between education and schools is specious. Also, the notion that allowing for debate about funding to schools would explode the research burden of the IAG is ridiculous. That is the ordinary interp. of the word. The opposite if the AFF took the veg. interp. of "education." That would explode the veg. research burden.

Also, this could have been better handled by AFF by, for instance, asking how anything could be funded in cross.

Aff - I bought that apocalyptic discourse. Likelihood of apocalypse, also esp. that long link chains are improbable. I would have been better convinced by the addition of a non-unique-ness argument - this kind of funding is the norm in our system, which takes out their IAG undue claim. Also, the veg. interp. was really quite bad esp. at a neo-colonial position. Ignoring that claims that these are incompetent people who will, necessarily, ape our actions w/o real agency or volition. That is really the Veg. claim - call it out.

Mid-terms - China won - Long link chains aren't believable. Could have been better turned at building momentum for a Dem. victory - own.
RFD -
Aft case flanks through. Solver for structural

ray-CP - not possible, can't give block

g rants. Perm.

mid-terms - dropped, improbably

Small few likelihood, fairly well vetted.

ray - improbable, most federalism

not zero sum. Block grants don't

I weighed probability of long-chain

hypotheticals at low, no immediate

benefits from plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Afsan Karim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaac Matti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Peter Sungwon Kim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Acunin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*fort*
### Novice Policy Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Ruby Gao</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Kenneth Wang</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Ria Bhatti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cole Brown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- If IEC - you made your argument to me, she won't tell you you're right, so just move on once you've made your arguments.
- IEC - good analytics but taking too long - you made good arguments so you can move on. Take more time before the round/diving prep to make sure your off case positions (e.g., text, disc link) are strong and clear instead of improv.
- Change on - need to have blocks to these discards.
- Need blocks to feed/argue to make decision before it rand. Finish your time, let yourself party speak.
- Need a consistent strategy, go to each flaw once. A stable no will fix this.

Notes given in round.

@ brophybraves.org