**School / Affiliation / Opponent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. C. Ramos</td>
<td>20-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. Zhou</td>
<td>20-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Heyman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments / Reason for Decision:**

Is this a low point win?

(Circle Winner)

**Pro / Con**

The winner of this debate was

**Finals**

Varisty Public Forum

Xavier Hennes (3)

**Date / Time:** SAT 03/03/18 05:30PM

**Judge's Signature:**

*Signed*

**1st Speaker**

**2nd Speaker**

**1st Speaker**

**2nd Speaker**

**Comments / Time Per Side:**

- Grand Crossfire (1 & 4) - 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary - 2 min
- Speaker 1 Summary - 2 min
- Speaker 2 Crossfire (2) - 2 min
- Speaker 1 Crossfire (2) - 2 min
- Speaker 2 Crossfire (3 & 4) - 2 min
- Speaker 1 Crossfire (3 & 4) - 2 min
- Speaker 2 Focus - 2 min
- Speaker 1 Focus - 2 min
- Speaker 2 Final Focus - 2 min
- Speaker 1 Final Focus - 2 min

*Signed*

**ATF VELI**

**Q2:** You may not use outside evidence.

**Q2:** Don't just state your position. Renounce your first support.

---

Hennes, Xavier

SWDIT 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>A211</th>
<th>FLIP: 36 Pattapati - Zhou v. 42 Ramos - Heyman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finals</strong></td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pattapati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A211</strong></td>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>Pattapati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order/Time Limits</strong></td>
<td>Speech 1</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Affiliation / Occupation</strong></td>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judge's Signature</strong></td>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remarks</strong></td>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remarks</strong></td>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remarks</strong></td>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remarks</strong></td>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**
- Con wins Fun argument.
- Con speech clearly and confidently.
- Pro speech fully addresses your argument.
- Pro loses degree of oversight argument.
- Pro loses degree of oversight argument.
- Con speech contains key arguments.
- Con speech is well-structured.
- Con speech is clear and easy to follow.

**RFD:**
- Con wins Fun argument.
- Con speech clearly and confidently.
- Pro speech fully addresses your argument.
- Pro loses degree of oversight argument.
- Pro loses degree of oversight argument.
- Con speech contains key arguments.
- Con speech is well-structured.
- Con speech is clear and easy to follow.

**RFD:**
- Con wins Fun argument.
- Con speech clearly and confidently.
- Pro speech fully addresses your argument.
- Pro loses degree of oversight argument.
- Pro loses degree of oversight argument.
- Con speech contains key arguments.
- Con speech is well-structured.
- Con speech is clear and easy to follow.

**RFD:**
- Con wins Fun argument.
- Con speech clearly and confidently.
- Pro speech fully addresses your argument.
- Pro loses degree of oversight argument.
- Pro loses degree of oversight argument.
- Con speech contains key arguments.
- Con speech is well-structured.
- Con speech is clear and easy to follow.
FJF: 36 Pattison - Zhou, 42 Banpais - Heyman

HENDEN, KYLE

VPF

Finals
Speaker
Points
Pro/Con

Zhou
Patihast

Pro
Con

A211

Kyle Henden (1)

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 1: 4 min
Speaker 2: 4 min
Crosfire 1 (1 & 2)*: 3 min
Crosfire 2: 4 min
Speaker 3: 3 min
Crosfire 3 (3 & 4)*: 3 min
Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
Crosfire 1: 2 min
Speaker 2: 3 min
Crosfire 3: 2 min
Speaker 4: 2 min

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the first speaker.

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

School/Affiliation: [Affiliation]

Basis: [Basis]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Is this a low point win?

Pro: [Pro]

Con: [Con]

(Circle Winner)

ND

The winner of this debate was

Zhou

Patihast

The framework was

A Pro: [A Pro]

Con: [Con]

decisions. [A Con]

policy. [B Con]

caused. This means we actually evaluate

checks & balances as a framework, not a

framework. A better justification would

boom, it's outcomes! [A Pro]

measure the types of "pro" efficacy.

To better your argument, weigh impacts, not "pros" and then the potential

"not sure, " and then the potential

"not sure, " and then the potential

"not sure, " and then the potential

"not sure, " and then the potential

"not sure, " and then the potential