Great debate! It was really tough to judge!

While both sides featured some really compelling speaking, I ultimately had to vote in favor of con. I felt our cost/benefit analysis argument was better structured and that the team effectively challenged the cost and purpose of UBI.

For the pro side, I responded really positively to your arguments on the inefficiencies of current welfare programs. But I felt you needed to better address the progressive-tax structure that would pay for the program.

As a note for the con side, Trump and his welfare proposals are super controversial so tread lightly.
Thank so much for letting me judge your debate. Both teams did a fantastic job.

The Pro side made some strong arguments with respect to UCI’s effect on poverty. I felt that leading with the automation argument may not have been the best choice, as it seemed a bit weak and counter to the Pro’s direct address of the costs.

Ultimately, I felt that the Con side effectively raised questions about the costs, effects on inflation, and potential damage to the economy. UCI went unchallenged. As a note to Con, I’d think about the comments made about poor people gambling on lottery tickets. It seems like a stretch unless you are really prepared in the speech.
Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 105</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shanker</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? UND

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very robust & polite debate. You are all excellent debaters with a bright future. I feel that throughout the debate both sides lacked a full understanding of the issues, and this significantly muddled the debate. The recession, marriage, and SNAH argument were all very confusing on all sides. Bill, you are a very good speaker and debater, be sure not to interrupt your opponent in their speech. Never a good idea. It is very difficult to choose a winner here. I am casting my ballot for the Pro because you were more persuasive speakers and I feel you had the preponderance of the evidence overall.
**NPF**

FLIP: 38 Cehajic - Haveman v. 22 Bora - Burns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2 Forum</th>
<th>Jen Groman ('41)</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Andrew Burns</td>
<td>Riley Haveman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Rishab Bora</td>
<td>Kinan Cehajic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points (20-30)

26  
27  
28  
29

The winner of this debate was:

Pro  
Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I really admire the level of collegiality and professionalism shown in this debate by both sides. You all are bright, skilled debaters with a bright future.

Rishab - you are an excellent speaker with a bright future. Be careful not to talk over your opponents and interrupt them when they ask questions or respond to yours.

Kinan - nice job keeping your cool and using steady analysis. You have improved so much and did a great job.

Andrew - also a very compelling speaker with great use of persuasion and analysis. They had a lot of evidence and good job attacking it.

Riley - you too maintained decorum and did an excellent job as a speaker and presented solid argumentation.

I am voting for the Con. I think they had the preponderance of evidence and flowed through their arguments the best. Also, good use of analysis and overall understanding of the topic. But both sides were excellent!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Mike Webb (*9)</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 107</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Deshpande</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Great job everyone! Good eye contact. Very clearly matched. Huffman: clear, concise, to the point, in opening!

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 | 3 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary | 3 min |
| Grand Crossfire (all) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |

3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
Each team was evenly matched.

Jain & Kainpuri were both very strong.

match your socks with suits

wet - work on confidence through speaking - you know the info don't worry about what others are thinking.
**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 103</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Moreno</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Venkatachalam</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner) [V]

**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 | 3 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary | 3 min |
| Grand Crossfire (all) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |
| 3 minutes of Prep Time per side |

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

**Negotiation Team, was slightly better spoken & presented a cohesive well laid out argument. I think not asking questions really hurt the AFF side.**

1. **Chekanov**
   - Clear concise speech
   - Well developed flow
   - "ums & ah's" during question & answers
   - Liked the Jeff Bezos example

2. **Moreno**
   - Clear concise speech slightly faster
   - Did not ask any questions during first cross.
   - 2nd speech was fantastic, will put together, clear concise & easy to follow.

3. **Schmidt**
   - Slightly fast some "ums & ah's" in the beginning.
   - Clear, well defined argument
   - Good questions
   - Used facts gained during crossfire to strengthen case.

4. **Venkatachalam**
   - Well spoken, good rate of speech
   - Did not ask any questions during second crossfire.
   - 2nd speech was much better.
### NPF

**FLIP: 22 Curtis - Flores v. 44 Higuera - Subbaraman**

#### Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2 Forum</th>
<th>Muzaffar-Khan ('35)</th>
<th>MENSINGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Room 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>H. Higuera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Subbaraman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Flores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro  **Curtis**  Con

(Circle Winner)

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation: [Signature]

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. **Curtis**
   - Clear voice
   - "Yeah" + "um"
   - Good use of data/quotes to back up your speech

2. **Higuera**
   - Too fast
   - Stumbled over words & couple of times
   - Too many quotes made argument hard to follow
   - "Um yeah"
   - Speech slowed later in speech, making it easier to follow

3. **Flores**
   - "Yeah"
   - Great rate of speech
   - Excellent use of data to back up speech
   - Good questions
   - Wrapped up speech well

4. **Subbaraman**
   - Lots of "um"
   - Face the judge when speaking
   - Good rate of speech
   - Answered questions well
   - Your questions were for clarification and did not help to backup your case

---

Great job with both teams. The Neg team did a better job of making a cohesive and coherent argument. Try and use questions that will help your case.
### Round 2 - Flight 1 - Room 106 - Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Naina Shaik</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sabha Suthar</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pauline Kousoulas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Eric Alfaro</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was:**

- **Pro**

*(Circle Winner)*

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Both sides did a very good job focusing on the basic questions in a complex topic. Con had a very clear opening statement — evidence was a bit stronger than Pro, which was better presented.

Pro argument was too fast — slow down. Notice your preference can be appreciated. Continue your treatment of evidence is bad.

Distinction — well posed indeed.

---

**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: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 3 minutes of Prep Time per side

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*
### Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Laura Beeson ('28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Charlie Bisson</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophie Piraino</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Eagan Vaidyanathan</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Anmao Yuan</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**.

Is this a low point win? __________

---

**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: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 3 min of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

Novel arguments presented on both sides; the con brought very good evidence at times but the presentation was too fast and not enthralling.

The focus on women and the economy shed a new light on the case while I think the con team was unprepared for a vigorous effort by the con team, but the pros' more measured approach was more effective. Great hard work by both sides.
**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 110</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Thirumurugan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Pro** (Circle Winner)

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

**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: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro** - original case with structural unemployment, elderly workers - inflation & wages prices decreasing. After 1st speech more definitive. Make sure to show you care through use all time allotted. Make sure to use time. Nice rebuttal on FT Jobs. Summary & final focus need to flow together; great reason why. Need more impact? Cannot bring in new facts. Final Focus - Domestic snap

**Con** - good counter-arguments, strong, detailed case. Make second speech rebuttal - had good statistics used Finland less. Nice work. Had good framework - cost & benefits - flowed costs of 2-4 trillion.

Overall con did well - flowed the debt/impact issue & large statistics - more impact on con.
# NPF

**FLIP: 39 Leger - Murthy v. 5 Dheman - Chiravuri**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Julie Farbarik (*26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Chiravuri 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Chiravuri 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Leger 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Murthy 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? **nd**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro** - Student debated alone. Chiravuri did both speakers—good contentions. Would both speakers’ good contentions. Good use of study about adding 4 trillions in $ good point on Alaska only $2000/yr—good debater.

**Con** - Good contentions on EITC $4 out of 30 points, good with debt, Alaska example as highest within cost of program, good team—work well together.

**Pro** had impacts, mentioned Jamaica, pro had student loan debt, reduction of poverty, and had student loan debt + reduction of poverty, and had student loan debt + reduction of poverty, and had student loan debt + reduction of poverty, and had student loan debt + reduction of poverty, and had student loan debt + reduction of poverty. While Con had EITC flow as well as lack of incentive, Con had EITC flow as well as lack of incentive. Large impacts with Pro—Con on defenses in cases dropped some contentions.
**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 101</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>O'Connor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Monteii</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? __________

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Saisssan: Please do eye contact than just ready. Out from laptop. Higher points as you were very convincing. Good work.

O'Connor: Please provide examples or cards starting your contention.

Andrews: Please work on speed. What you say judge needs to understand.

Montei: You are thorough and a good speaker.
**Round 2 Forum**

**Debani Mukherjee (5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 101</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Chun</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Tackitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kumar</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Hurthy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ______

**Judge's Signature**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

* Tackitt: Please make more eye contact. Not reading from laptop screen.

* Kumar: You had good points. Scope to improve delivery skills.

For Chun & Kumar: I con mentioned in Alaska. UBI did not work. But you might have understood they said UBI worked. So misinterpretation.
Aff (pro)

1st Speaker - Well done. Try to be familiar enough with material to make eye contact. Try not to Rock Back & Forth - it's distracting.

and Speaker - Great eye contact. You were committed to your points. Ensure you have more than 1 main channel.
Con -

1st - Amazing Material -

convince me.
### Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 109</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Utkrish Mowry</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Vidhunya Ramkumar</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1st - Amazing job!

2nd - Support how they would pay for education? UBI well fund it here? Great job! What programs would it eliminate?

Con 1st - Great point. Very well spoken, your planning down to make parents keep.

Don't get intimidated

2nd - You got this - stay confident. Talk - convince me what you believe!

Final focus - much better.

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: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min

3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
Novice Public Forum | Keely Moran (*'34)
---|---
**Round 2** | **Flight 2** | **Room 102** | Fri 02/07/20 06:30PM
---|---|---|---
**Speaker** | **Pro** | **Points (20-30)** | **Con** | **Points (20-30)**
1st | MUNIA AHMED | 20 | ISAAC CHER | 25
2nd | MATTHEW JIANG | 27 | ERIK TRAN | 24

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

Is this a low point win? ________

Comments & Reason for Decision:

---

**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: 3 min  
Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min  
Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min  
Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min  
Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min  
3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
# NPF

**Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020**

**FLIP: 35 Goon - OhLee v. 50 Chambers - Gomez**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 102</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>OhLee, Emry</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Goon, Abigail</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? __________

Judge's Signature: Keely Moran

School / Affiliation / Occupation: [Signature]

**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: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
**VPD**

GALLUP, CHRISTINE  
Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Debate</th>
<th>Christine Gallup (*22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Jeffrey Hsu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Shirley Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Rohan Chintham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Jai Mahant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**.

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff had a more developed understanding of their case. They also developed a stronger causal argument.

Need to have evidence when making assertions — it's likely if arms were renewed — need to make sure you can back assumptions.

Aff: Sino-US: economically dependent / strong	 tariff war: have ended arms deterrence: Trumpy at clear weak

Aff: good explanation of cause + effect.

China-N Korea: but causation.

Aff too much of Neg rests on "nuclear". Reduces strength of nuclear over-
simplifies the argument.

Judge's Signature:

Carlisle High School
## NPF

**FLIP: 49 Jones - Montoya v. 5 Fang - Chaudhary**

### Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 123</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Michael Fang</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shrey Chaudhary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? __________

**Judge's Signature**

_Basis, Ahwatukee_

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Both teams had good data.
- The con team should focus on directed questions.
- The pro team needs to be more assertive. Keep their answers in crossfire concise & crisp.