<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice CX Debate</th>
<th>Brandon Sumner ('9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 5121</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker (circle):</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Tyler Matome Busby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Kayla Marie Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Desert Ridge High School</td>
<td>10 Desert Ridge High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was**

**Affirmative**  |  
**Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

**Negative**

**Is this a low point win?**  

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**AC:** Please be sure to read all of the highlighted parts of the LAC. Some of your evidence seemed awfully short.

**NC:** Have a counterplan and a complete T shell. If you had a complete topical shell then the debate would have been over by the 3rc.

**AC:** Go on each flow and answer each argument instead of just reading cards for 8 minutes.

**NC:** work on clarity and brevity.

**AC:** Make it clear.

**NC:** Again, don't just read cards. I have no idea what the argument you're trying to make is.

Other comments given in round.

I vote negative on the disad that's generally uncontested throughout the debate.
bsumner 16 @ brophy broncos.org
### Novice CX Debate

**Room 5120**  
**Fri 10/04/19 07:00PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Venkataramana-Suggula (<em>7</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Kaushik Kandala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Sansita Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Hailey DeWolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Sarah Hamm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

*Affirmative*:

- Positive: Amis sales to Saudi Arabia

1 AC: Good, detailed, vertical of reasons for the case

1 AC: Passionate and forceful

2 AC: Good cases anti-terrorism

Both Aff speakers had good command of the content

2 At: Good summary

*Negative*

- Weak rebuttal to question if whether Saudi Arabia would go to other nations for arms supplies

1 AC was confusing & weak

2 NC: Reasons the argument is mechanically without conviction or emotion

NC appears that some of the material is well understood
The United States Federal Government should reduce Foreign Military Sales and/or Direct Consumer Sales of military arms.
## Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

### NCX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice CX Debate</th>
<th>Abby Karlin (*'13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 5118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Aditi Sathe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Tanvi K Sathish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Rohan R Chintham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Dae kyung Kim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

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

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. **Affirmative**
   - Aditi Sathe
   - Presented statistics to back up evidence.
   - Presented many facts.
   - Organized
   - Lacked eye contact but great posture
   - 3 actions presented.
   - Slight overtime.
   - Unable to provide a clear answer to Rohan’s questions.
   - Finished strong!

2. **Tanvi K Sathish**
   - Great solvencies.
   - Executed roadmap.
   - Great posture, but lacked eye contact.
   - Stayed within time.
   - Answered questions effectively.
   - Challenging questions to Rohan.

3. **Rohan R Chintham**
   - Brought up very challenging questions to Aditi.
   - Reflected great teamwork.
   - Great posture and confidence.
   - Lacked eye contact.
   - Presented many facts.
   - Presented statistics.

**Summary:** It was a rocky start for the "Affirmative" Side, but they finished strong. It is what helped me decide along with providing more statistics to back up facts. The "Negative" team didn't provide card that was requested. It was pretty close.
KARLIN, ABBY

Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

NCX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice CX Debate</th>
<th>Abby Karlin (*'13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 5121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Jai Mahant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Kaushik Kandala</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Faizan You'suf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Sansita Singh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was 

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Judge's Signature

McLintock

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Great job, guys! Policy is so hard and you guys were amazing!

Ultimacy dis won because: it's more compelling.

AFT: was more compelling.

Only one person during first CX at a time plz!

Don't ask questions during speech

Say "my opponent has no way of knowing that Russian weapons are as objectively dangerous as US weapons.

Don't direct questions at your opponent.

Don't read new evidence in your last speech.

Don't quote your opponent's case specific cards if you can look at their case or use my packet!

General

Would recommend CX drills! Having questions prepared before you have to ask them (writing while someone reads their case)

Don't prep what questions you might be asked! Knowing your case well enough to answer quickly makes for better debate.

Look at your opponents (esp. during CX)

Don't fall into the trap of asking questions!! Look at the judge

Use all of your time!!

Key voters: ANTHONY!!

plz state your impact

Key voters: ANTHONY!!
**NCX**

**Novice CX Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Matome Busby</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayla Marie Hernandez</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aditi Sathe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanvi K Sathish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was**

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

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Neg concedeed way too much ground. Hold your opponent accountable to their args. Great Job everyone.

Aff. Well done. I would like more organization on top of cards. But I love your arg system! Keep at it!

Aff wins!
NCX

Novice CX Debate
Armando Montero (*'11)

Round 2
Room 5119
Fri 10/04/19 05:00PM

Speaker (circle)
Rank Points
Affirmative
1st 2nd Ishani Abha Sahoo 3 29
2nd Siddhant Urunkar 1 29
5 BASIS Peoria

Speaker (circle)
Rank Points
Negative
1st 2nd Hailey DeWolf 4 27
1st 2nd Sarah Hamm 2 28
13 McClintock High School

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? √

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Don't look at each other during the round.
- You need to impact some arguments better—why do they matter in this round?
- Get on track.
- Keep your last ideas concise.
- Spend more time on your case and extemporaneously. Some of your points were too broad.
- Please stay focused during timeelts.
- Good job analyzing the HR cards.
- Don't bring up new arguments in the last speech.

- About make arguments more for your next speech. Make sure to ask questions.
- Make sure to warm up your great ideas. Places to cut.
- Get more analytical and place the case in your rebuttal.
- More emotion! More emotional.
- You make me go down the flow and respond to each of their arguments. You focus too much on &'em and run out of time to respond to their arguments.
- Give me a roadmap before each speech.
- You focus a lot on the keenen and not explain how this helps your case.

RFP: I vote aff. Aff is the only one with clearly extemporaneous and weight in the round. The one that went arguments, then more focused but that was not an answer or brought up in the last rebuttal.
Novice CX Debate

Round 2

Speaker (circle)
Affirmative Rank (1-4)
(1-4) (25-30)
1st Long
Roh Chinthan 2 26
1st 2nd
Ja Mahant 4 25
2nd 3rd
Doc Kung Kim
5 BASIS Peoria
The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1AC/1CX: You need to have your case better so you can answer questions about it. Work on clarity.

AFC: You both should automatically start pulling new cards as soon as you see a new stance. You conceded key points in Cross Examination.

2AC: You have good clarity. You need to sign post, tell me exactly where you are on the flow. Be careful of what cards you choose out of prepared files, you pulled a few that are easy to turn. Don't be so mobile when answering in CX. You admitted you had no solvency in CX.

AFF: Your conceded solvency in CX ultimately lost you this round. Being unable to solve + access your impacts is why this is a neg ballot. Also for the 2AR you can pass notes but standing next to each other is unnecessary.

2NR: You can't read new evidence in the rebuttal. I didn't flow these because they were illegible. Varsity could run theory + end up giving you a DQ. Thats a no-no. The extensions + attacks were effective throughout.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 5118</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle) 1st 2nd</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Rank (1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishani Abha Sahoo</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Sansita Singh</td>
<td>5 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle) 1st 2nd</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Rank (1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Matome Busby</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Kayla Marie Hernandez</td>
<td>10 Desert Ridge High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Tyler & Kayla didn't show up to round 1 (bc of posting) went to round in 119. Team that was supposed to show up according to posting never came - resulting in Aff win.
### Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**NCX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice CX Debate</th>
<th>Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>Room 5119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>(1-4)</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dae kyung Kim</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jai Mahant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>(1-4)</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayla Hernandez</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Busby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Lynn Joast Haag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Desert Ridge High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

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

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both Teams presented topics very nicely. Some more prep is needed for both teams. Notes were captured to a greater extent. Affirmative Team forfeit.
Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

Novice CX Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 5120</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Hailey DeWolf</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sarah Hamm</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Rohan R Chintham</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pae Kyung Kim</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  ♦  Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Make sure to clearly tell me author names, etc.
- Good job clearly mentioning & impacts
- Good questions during CX
- Make sure to take your Prentice before rebuttals
- External - bring up prior argument that Neg did not respond to (there was a lot)
- You have a lot of great points. But you need to weigh them. Tell me why they matter more than Neg's.
- Make sure to narrow to their case (esp terrorism)

RFD: I vote Neg. They clearly extend their theme. DA can prove how the econ impacts will have more impact than what Aff brings up. Aff appeals
Drew an offensive fund to vote off of.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice CX Debate</th>
<th>Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td>Room 5121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td>(1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Aditi Sathe</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Tanvi K Sathish</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td>(1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Kaushik Kandala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Siddhant Urunkar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1AC: Well spoken speech. Slow down on taglines & make them distinct from evidence.

CX: Try not to succeed on questions as quickly. Both sides need to look at judge.

2NC: Great flow as speaker, task problems were troublesome, make sure it doesn't happen. Work on condensing some cards to fit cut-in speech.

2AC: Fine content, lack of focus & sign posting make speech hard for flow. Cards should be organized.

CX: Questions need immediate answers

2NC: A lack of focused line by line, warrants, & acknowledgment of Aff work in 2AC lead to a sloppy speech with some cards blocked & extended but some flowed through inks

1AR: No line by line or cross application of cards or analysis

2NR: Warrants claims but fair analysis of lack of extension work by Aff