Round 1

Judge Nicholas Thomas ballot code 13

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Aff dropped a China disad that both turned the case (more environmental damage) and outweighed the case (deaths & human rights abuses).

1ˢᵗ Aff Debater: Eva

Feedback: Ask your coach about "permutations," and at least learn to argue that a counterplan isn't an "opportunity cost."

2ⁿᵈ Aff Debater: Eva

Feedback: above

1ˢᵗ Neg Debater: Daniel

Feedback: Talk to your coach about splitting the block (the 2NC and 1NR) instead of just repeating yourself.

2ⁿᵈ Neg Debater: Mariah

Feedback: Go harder on the China disad--it was the biggest difference between the plan and counterplan.

Round 1

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: I ended up siding with the affirmative team in this round because I felt that the affirmative speaker's case more directly engaged with this specific resolution and upheld their burdens in the round. The affirmative right off the bat argued that "major step forward" refers to events like the Chauvin verdict and gave a strong description of the history of Black America's relationship with the police and made a strong appeal as to why this event is so significant in that history. Meanwhile, the negative side argued that this verdict is only significant in the case of one individual and doesn't change any of the larger ongoing problems within the institutions of the country. This is a great point! However, the negative team didn't really engage directly with the affirmative speaker's arguments about why this is so important and that this will lead to addressing larger injustices in society. So, while I agree with the negative speaker's initial point, it was hard to vote against the affirmative, because they offered more argumentation and detail as to what the impact of this case will look like down the road, which I think is more in line with the specific resolution.

1st Aff Debater: Rebecca Li

Feedback: You spoke wonderfully throughout the round. All of your speeches were well organized and very clear. I also thought your refutation of your opponent's case was really well done.

You did a great job of establishing what impacts we're already seeing in the world because of the conversation surrounding this case and verdict and I thought you did a great job of pointing out that this verdict itself doesn't directly change larger systemic issues, but does serve as an important event that will inspire more conversation and change down the road.

If I were to suggest something, I'll say that I think you should make sure to keep your arguments focused on the specific resolution that you're debating. You spoke a lot about why we need to hold police accountable and what this ongoing problem looks like in the Black community and you included statistical data and personal accounts from people. While this is an important issue, and relevant to the topic of the debate, I'm not sure all of this information was very relevant to your case. Work on using this evidence within your contentions

2nd Aff Debater: N/A

Feedback: N/A

1ˢᵗ Neg Debater: Laura David

Feedback: Like I said when I gave you both verbal feedback, I thought you did a great job of driving the focal point of your case home that the real issue with the justice system involves the major institutions in this country that weren't impacted at all by this verdict. You seemed very knowledgeable on this topic and discussed a number of different examples, stories, and issues that I didn't know about before the round and that was awesome.

However, engaging with your opponent's arguments and definitions a little more directly really would have helped you in this round. It seemed like you and your opponent were arguing with two different definitions of "major step forward", but you didn't point that out or give me a counter definition, so I had to take the affirmative's.

2ⁿᵈ Neg Debater: N/A

Feedback: N/A

Round 1

Judge April Kidd ballot code 10

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The AFF built a solid case using specific evidence arguing for an increase in solar power with benefits of renewable energy and climate change that would only get better as more resources are devoted. They absorbed the NEG's counterplan and continued to respond to critiques to their own such as 27% sufficiency by comparing it to the stats available for fossil fuel at only 33% after years of use and research.

1st Aff Debater: Bella

Feedback: Nice job reminding me of the word "increase" from the resolution. I would have liked more information on how you plan to specifically increase the use of solar power.

2nd Aff Debater: Arunav

Feedback: For me, the way that you were able to explain a potentially confusing topic in layman's terminology made it easier to follow your argument. You had a great answers in your cross even numbering your answer "point 1" and "point 2." I wish that you would have addressed the Neg's point of waste.

1st Neg Debater: Abigail

Feedback: Your last speech was stronger than your first. You built up your case for wind and emphasized the net harms of their case. I wonder about the credibility of your source You Matter.

2nd Neg Debater: Joseph

Feedback: You shone in cross because you focused your questions to incorporate how the AFF answered into your next speech. I felt that your single country can't make a difference argument was weak and consequently attacked well by the AFF.

Round 1

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The Affirmation forgot to set up a weighing mechanism for the round, which allowed the Neg to set one up of economic benefits. The Aff's plan was to continue generating energy as we do in the status quo with the added benefits of increased solar production. Using the weighing mech and the Aff plan, the Neg's contentions of problems with availability, loss of fossil fuel infrastructure, and increased cost to fossil fuel reliant communities didn't stand. The Aff's benefits of improved health and world relations also didn't stand, but the Aff's increase in jobs won the round.

1st Aff Debater: Gabriella

Feedback: Great communicator - very clear, calm, and well thought through. Excellent use of cx. Make sure to always cite the sources for your evidence and never bring up new evidence in the last speech.

2nd Aff Debater: Joe

Feedback: Very courteous, good roadmaps, and good CX. Make sure to front load your case with plenty cited evidence. That's what you should fill in your harms, links, and solvency with. Be less reliant on those specific terms and instead present evidence and analysis that prove the same.

1st Neg Debater: Madalyn

Feedback: Phenomenal resolutional analysis and great rebuttals. Good job debating by yourself! Make sure to always cite your sources and get as much information out in the first speech as possible. It is always better to refer to the other team as "the Affirmation" or "the Negation" rather than "my opponent."

2nd Neg Debater: na

Feedback: na

Round 1

Judge Diane Carter ballot code 11

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Neg wins on several arguments: Nuclear can address national need; solar requires many panels vs. relatively few SNRs, solar has great potential for waste. Most importantly, NRC recently approved SNRs, thus negating AFF's arguments against safety. Excellent support for most claims!

1ˢᵗ Aff Debater: Courtney

Feedback: Nice resolution analysis & case set-up. Guard against ceding ground in CX. This would have been a different debate if you hadn't opened the door for NEG's nuclear argument.

2ⁿᵈ Aff Debater: Joshanne

Feedback: Passionate argumentation! Emotion needs to be supported with claims when an argument hinges on an increase of this magnitude.

1ˢᵗ Neg Debater: Hans

Feedback: Great work catching, identifying, and then refuting errors in AFF's case! Be careful about offering policy options beyond the scope of the resolution. If AFF had not opened the door in 1st CX, your argument would not have prevailed!

2ⁿᵈ Neg Debater: None

Feedback: n/a

Round 1

Judge Stella Chang ballot code 24

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The Aff presented the topic with full energy and showed they truly believe that US should increase the use of solar energy. The Neg team explained the health, cost, and waste issues, and provided the detail data, but the Aff team was able to rebut with the advantages that outweigh the disadvantages.

1st Aff Debater: Caleb Spires

Feedback: Good work on responding to the disadvantage of solar power from the Neg team. Good presentation. Showed energy and belief in the topic.

2nd Aff Debater: Katie Rockhill

Feedback: Excellent work on responding to the disadvantage of solar power from the Neg team. Strengthen the key points and don't repeat which resulted in time loss. Good presentation.

1st Neg Debater: Mohamed Elmostafa Elfaki

Feedback: Good work on defining the disadvantage of solar power and referencing the health, cost, and waste issues. Overall presentation flows well.

2nd Neg Debater: Srijan Chakraborty

Feedback: Good work on defining the disadvantage of solar power and referencing the health, cost, and waste issues. Overall presentation flows well, there were glitches, write down keywords on your thought process to smooth out the delivery. Good job!

Round 1

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Voted Affirmative on presumption- affirmative wins that there are significant harms associated with the status quo, that the aff has a risk of avoiding/solving for. The benefits of implementing the affirmative case outweighs the disadvantages. Negative makes compelling defensive arguments about solvency (plan not feasible because of lack of enforcement, cost, etc.) , but does not provide enough argumentation about the harms associated with affirmative implementation.

1st Aff Debater: Grace

Feedback: Grace gave clear speech and is an articulate speaker, and made very compelling and clear arguments. One area of improvement is getting more confident as a speaker, and cultivating a stronger sense of ethos! Finally I think Grace should have used the rest of their time (ended 1AC with a minute remaining) to flesh out the impact scenario and make a compelling case of aff solvency for those harms.

2nd Aff Debater: Oscar

Feedback: Oscar was a confident speaker, and decisive in their answers to negative argumentation. I thought that Oscar does a great job in articulating defensive arguments against their opponent. One area of improvement that we talked about after the round was extending their case throughout the debate, and have very clear explanations and "stories" about their impact scenario (time, magnitude, probability.)

1st Neg Debater: Elizabeth

Feedback: Elizabeth is an awesome speaker; lots of ethos, made smart arguments, and were highly compelling in their speech. Elizabeth also does an excellent job at making defensive arguments against the affirmative, that ended up winning decisively. One area of improvement that we talked about after the round was that Elizabeth needs to make more offensive arguments (why the plan specifically causes harms, in addition to the arguments they already make that the plan might not work.) Once we have established a coherent impact scenario associated with Aff implementation, an overview explaining the impact scenario (timeframe, magnitude, probability).

2nd Neg Debater: Elizabeth

Feedback: Above

Round 1

Judge Damayanti Sanusi ballot code 19

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Aff won on job loss, cost arguments.

1ˢᵗ Aff Debater: Laurel

Feedback: Confident, clear speaker. Work on carrying through all arguments (Canada). No need to thank everyone every speech.

2ⁿᵈ Aff Debater: Devin

Feedback: Strong questions during crossfire. Don't drop arguments (Canada, funding).

1ˢᵗ Neg Debater: Logan

Feedback: Strong, well organized 1NC. Make sure to flow all your arguments through to the end so they are not dropped.

2ⁿᵈ Neg Debater: na

Feedback: na

Round 2

Judge Robert Campbell ballot code 44

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: AFF's interpretation of the topic was unique (Oscar for films of all time), but I think a more reasonable interpretation was NEG's 2020 films. Nevertheless, I treated AFF's "definition" as ok, so it boils down to the argumentation of Flubber (1997) vs. Minari (2020). AFF conceded the Round before 2nd AFF speech.

1st Aff Debater: Logan

Feedback: Pleasant delivery. Improvement will come with forming clear, multiple contentions in support of proposition. Opening speech was a little disorganized and tough to follow your main arguments.

2nd Aff Debater: xx

Feedback: xx

1st Neg Debater: Rebecca

Feedback: Outstanding fluency. Well-organized case in support of your chosen film; clear, multiple contentions.

2nd Neg Debater: na

Feedback: na

Round 2

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Both teams did well. However, U Idaho clearly dominated this debate session. The Aff team was knowledgeable and clear with their view and belief in the US presence in Afghanistan. Excellent presentations and cx. Loved the Aff closing remark focusing on the purpose of US presence is to promote democracy!

1ˢᵗ Aff Debater: Daniel

Feedback: Excellent capture on the past and current situation/government in Afghan. US's presence in the Afghan country. Smooth delivery, brought opponents points to closure.

2ⁿᵈ Aff Debater: Mariah

Feedback: Excellent presentation, showed knowledge of the topic. Brought in the global view of the situation. Pulling US troops out will bring in Russia and China. Focused on military support is crucial. Excellent points and great closure! Democracy is the US goal!

1ˢᵗ Neg Debater: Oscar Martinez

Feedback: Spoke clear, good use of historic statistics and applied the data for pulling out of Afghanistan. Identified the threats. Excellent response during Cx.

2ⁿᵈ Neg Debater: Grace Ji

Feedback: You know your material, just need to deliver with confidence. List out each point from the Aff team and do your best to focus.

Round 2

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Aff is dropping Neg points about negotiation, US needing troops elsewhere.

1st Aff Debater: Jenna

Feedback: Great 1AR arguments, just needed to come sooner.

2nd Aff Debater: Joshua

Feedback: Strong confidence, but needed to make connections clearer.

1st Neg Debater: Caleb

Feedback: Very professional and proficient on flow; needs to make no voter is a new argument.

2nd Neg Debater: Katie

Feedback: Best explained her way through craziness and helped me understand what was happening. Could explain impacts a bit better (what happens if we don't send extra troops to N Korea or Yemen?).

Round 2

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: I sided with the Neg for this round because they convinced me that the status quo was sufficient with their 70 cases stat and the fear that adding supreme court seats would be a never-ending solution.

1ˢᵗ Aff Debater: Elizabeth

Feedback: You spoke with ease and confidence. Great eye contact and gestures when showing your 8/2 court split. Your first two points in your rebuttal (each side benefits and implementing) were essentially the same.

2ⁿᵈ Aff Debater: n/a

Feedback: n/a

1ˢᵗ Neg Debater: Joshanne

Feedback: I loved your emphasis on creating a precedent that we don't want to continue. One thing to improve is to move your notes closer to your camera so that you don't have to look away at them. You moved off camera to access your notes, and I couldn't see you.

2ⁿᵈ Neg Debater: Courtney

Feedback: I loved how you introduced your Michael Mckinley source in your first speech by telling me his credentials building source credibility. Your stats in your first speech resonated with the entire argument (2019 court decisions and examples of adding justices in the three countries. In your rebuttal, you also convinced me with your 200 year reminder! One thing to improve: your first and second voters were very similar.

Round 2

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Aff team able to establish tha more people around the world will benefit from the AOC plan

1ˢᵗ Aff Debater: Abigail

Feedback: Abagail excellent emphasis on the Climate Change being the biggest factor in improving world life sustainability

2ⁿᵈ Aff Debater: Joseph, excellent speaking style by speaking to the audience and not reading from notes. Great pickup on the Neg team not addressing free education and not enough resourse to accomplish the stated plan addressing Free Education and

Feedback: see above

1ˢᵗ Neg Debater: Eva Excellent point on the ability to increase the quality of life

Feedback: Eva Excellent definition of terms... the that the Biden plan is more effective, not bitting off more than you can chew Slow and steady wins the race

2ⁿᵈ Neg Debater: see above

Feedback: see above

Round 2

Judge Robert Hockema ballot code 39

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The core issue question in the debate become whether a resurgence of the Taliban will occur without the presence of US troops. Affirmative claims that the war is essentially over, and that US troops are necessary to continue to train the Aghani military, but fails to provide sufficient enough reasoning or evidence to win this key claim.

(1) Negative argues against the evidence used by the affirmative, which primarily sourced the overall opinion of the US military (and I believe a general) saying that the Taliban would soon takeover the country if we left. Neg criticizes this by saying that generals are entrenched in the conflict and want to keep the war going, and shouldn't be trusted as sole sources. Affirmative only engages with this response after it is reiterated in the late rebuttals.

(2) Negative provides reasons why US training is a bad link and thus fails to uphold the argument. They are that (a) Aff fails to prove that training is the key activity being provided by the US military, (b) its unclear if training is actively improving Afghanistan's chances of keeping the Taliban back, and (c) other actors/technology can take the place of the US -- namely, drones to fight and NATO to train.

(3) Negative gives me analysis persuading me that the US's presence is impeding on the effort to end the war on terror. They claim that (a) US presence overall in the region has disproportionately killed many civilians causing resentment, and that (b) the Taliban uses this to get stronger. Though the argument needs development, Affirmative responds by denying the false equivalence of US military:Taliban, which while generally true is unresponsive to the claim that the US feeds into extremist sentiments and makes it harder to fight.

Instead of being comparative with the contents of the evidence, affirmative relied on the preponderance of evidence debate criticizing Negative's lack of sources. While the Neg needs more sources overall to meet their constructive claims, Aff's evidence fails to meet the very burden imposed by their own claims. Simply, the notion that the US leaving would be bad because it would cause (x) was not proven because Aff's key link -- training = prevent resurgence --- was not credibly proven.

1st Aff Debater: Burch

Feedback: 1. You do a great job of illustrating why the Taliban, should they takeover, would be dangerous for Afghanistan. Excellent analysis on trustworthiness.

2. Strong, direct responses to the Negative with clear transitions and organization.

2nd Aff Debater: Donnie

Feedback: 1. Your last speech was the closest I got to changing my ballot. Great response about bringing new evidence into the debate (I didn't take into consideration the "Afghan military strong enough" argument as a result)

2. Negative's explicit attack on your evidence needs to be met forcefully. Neg spent two minutes on the "military generals untrustworthy" analysis, which if defeated, makes your evidence stand stronger relative to your claim -- which you need to win on to win the round.

1st Neg Debater: Zach

Feedback: 1. Great extemp instincts and responsiveness. Your strengths are in casual warranting of arguments.

2. You spent a lot of time on the Affirmative case, whereas it is better to integrate rebuttal so that you have time to reach all of your substantive matter. I almost missed your first point, and your second had too little time to develop.

2nd Neg Debater: Zach

Feedback: previous

Round 2

Judge Laurie Rowland ballot code 41

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Region is unstable with the US there but without the US there, chaos would reign.

1ˢᵗ Aff Debater: Mohamed

Feedback: Good wrap-up and 1st AFF speech organization; be very clear in distinguishing what makes this a fact vs. value round - it was somewhat murky in the argument set-up

2ⁿᵈ Aff Debater: Srijan

Feedback: Great linkage of evidence to contentions; work on overall organization

1ˢᵗ Neg Debater: Gabriella

Feedback: Good linkage with your own evidence; work on organization and hitting each AFF contention overtly

2ⁿᵈ Neg Debater: Joe

Feedback: Great clash with AFF, excellent rebuttal; work on organization

Round 2

Judge Nick Sitzman ballot code 40

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: This was a great round and a tough decision! I ended up voting for the negative, because I wasn't sure the affirmative's plan would really lead to all the net benefits the affirmative promised. I came to this conclusion for a couple of reasons.

First, the affirmative plan was vague in a lot of really important areas like specifying how this will be actually enforced, who would be exempt, and what good this will actually do.

Second, I found the negative team's argument on vaccine efficacy concerns to be really convincing and the affirmative team struggled to overcome that.

1st Aff Debater: Madalyn

Feedback: I thought you did a great job of interacting with your opponents' case. You did a great job of responding to questions about discrimination versus your ethical imperatives. You're a very organized speaker and didn't drop any of their arguments.

However, I think you can work on your case construction. I thought this was a tough resolution for the AFF from the beginning, so I think putting some more thought into your definitions and criteria could be really helpful competitively.

2nd Aff Debater: N/A

Feedback: N/A

1st Neg Debater: Devin

Feedback: You did a great job of introducing argumentation that ended up winning you the round like the problems surrounding the vagueness of the affirmative's plan. I do think you could work on communicating impacts of different pieces of evidence or logic on the round. You mentioned that the affirmative side could discriminate against religious people who don't want the vaccine, but I think some more discussion of how this affects how I should weigh the round would be great.

2nd Neg Debater: Brooke

Feedback: You did a great job of driving your sides' arguments home like the arguments about vaccine efficacy. I do think you could work on explaining pieces of evidence a little more clearly. It took me a little while to understand what the polio vaccine example was and how it connected to the debate.

Round 3

Judge Sam Hendricks ballot code 60

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Neither side presented hard evidence, so it turned to a "possibilities vs status quo" debate. The Neg caught the Aff conceding that there is a risk of war with Turkey if the US imposes sanctions, when in the status quo there are no comparable harms.

1st Aff Debater: Zachary

Feedback: Absolutely great speaker. Good passion, inflection, and courteous CX. Make sure that you keep your contention tags and weighing mechanism short, sweet, and easy to understand so we aren't caught in a definitions battle and the debate will be simple to flow. Don't bring up any new arguments in the last speech, save your time for voters.

2nd Aff Debater: //

Feedback: //

1st Neg Debater: Brooke

Feedback: You had the winning argument! Great job sticking to your guns and giving a full analysis of the round. Work on managing your time in your speeches, as sometimes you were .20 over and other times you had a full minute left.

2nd Neg Debater: Devin

Feedback: Great speaking style, and good job pulling the threads of the argument. Appreciated the net benefits weighing mechanism. Make sure you ask the judge before using an off-time roadmap and tag each of your contentions to clean up the flow.

Round 3

Judge Nicholas Thomas ballot code 51

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Aff had too many drops and new arguments, and the highly proficient Neg picked them apart.

1ˢᵗ Aff Debater: Oscar

Feedback: Great arguments--but too late in the 1AR.

2ⁿᵈ Aff Debater: Grace

Feedback: Good 1AC case. Gotta work on flowing, extensions.

1ˢᵗ Neg Debater: Abigail

Feedback: Great case and coverage. Don't tell me they didn't have a definition when they did.

2ⁿᵈ Neg Debater: Joseph

Feedback: Proficient just about everywhere. Might've considered a cap bad or Baudrillard K.

Round 3

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Neg wins on 2 points: the AFF never gave a criteria, and the NEG did better with linking the evidence with the contentions. Specifically, AFF made assertions of hospitals will cut Board of Directors' salaries rather than cutting care/corners without any evidence of that.

1st Aff Debater: Bella

Feedback: Good rebuttal and you showed great passion for your argument; work on linking evidence with contentions and making sure yo cover the parameters of the debate

2nd Aff Debater: Arunav

Feedback: Your rebuttal was excellent - very passionate and you cited sources; please work on linking the evidence with your contentions and always try to plug any holes the 1st speaker left if you are the 2nd speaker

1st Neg Debater: Daniel

Feedback: Good organization and thank you for providing some definitions; work on pointing out any holes in the opposing teams definition of the parameters of the debate

2nd Neg Debater: Mariah

Feedback: Fabulous rebuttal!; work on pointing out any holes in the opposing teams definition of the parameters of the debate

Round 3

Judge Damayanti Sanusi ballot code 61

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Canada and military arguments won the debate, as well as impacts.

1ˢᵗ Aff Debater: Mohammed

Feedback: Good job humanizing and talking about real world impacts. Make sure to carry all major arguments through to last speech.

2ⁿᵈ Aff Debater: Srijan

Feedback: Military money strong argument and good job weighing arguments in final speech. Make sure to carry all major arguments through to end of debate (military, quality of care)

1ˢᵗ Neg Debater: Laura

Feedback: Strong constructive and crossfire. Focus on impacts. Show us why hospitals losing money is bad, who does it affect, how will it hurt our society, etc.

2ⁿᵈ Neg Debater: na

Feedback: na

Round 3

Judge Ned Silver ballot code 59

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: 81% of US prefer Netflix over Disney +

Diversity and Orginal content is much stronger with Netflix vs. Disney+

1st Aff Debater: Katie

Feedback: excellent points of contension

ease of use

diversity

orginal content

2nd Aff Debater: Caleb

Feedback: Netflix has interactive content

excellent rebuttal using old Disney movies are racist

1st Neg Debater: Rebecca

Feedback: Excellent rebuttal

Netflix poor portrayal of Women

Netflix hyper-sexualization of children

2nd Neg Debater: Rebecca

Feedback: racist movies are the reflection of the times of 1950

Disneys acknowledgement of guilt

Use of a trigger statement

Please decrease the use of "and um and um and um"

causes a lack of flow of your speach

Round 3

Judge Rachel Carlson ballot code 52

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Voted affirmative on the question of probability regarding the resolution (Biden's promise to cut 50% of carbon emissions by 2030 will not happen.) The affirmative wins the argument that political and economic backlash will be ensure that Biden will not be able to ensure that the high precedent of 50% cutting of emissions is met in the timeframe before 2030. Negative wins argument that many global trends are pushing in the direction of decreasing climate emissions, but does not prove that there is enough force to overcome political and economic problems articulated by the affirmative.

1st Aff Debater: Courtney

Feedback: Courtney you are such a confident speaker- clear, articulate, and well warranted points! One area of improvement is that we you could do more preemptive analysis of what your opponents might say, and begin an impact analysis.

2nd Aff Debater: Joshanne

Feedback: Amazing impact analysis and framing of the debate. You did an excellent job of overviewing the debate in the 2AR and giving a wonderful impact calculus and framing the debate in terms of probability. One thing to work on is continuing to extend case, and use it offensively to answer your opponents case.

1st Neg Debater: Eva

Feedback: Eva, you are a confident and clear speaker, your warrants were on point, and you made really smart and strategic cross applications. I though that the decision to reorient the framework to a question of if emissions could be reduced internationally was smart, one thing to improve on is extending those arguments as a reason that outweighs the affirmatives arguments.

2nd Neg Debater: Eva

Feedback: Stated above

Round 3

Judge Stella Chang ballot code 63

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Both teams did well on the topic with lowering Medicare eligibility age to 60. Each debater provided ample reasonings from their perspective. The Neg team presented the facts well and provided the workaround hence the decision for winning this round.

1ˢᵗ Aff Debater: Madalyn Bond

Feedback: Good analogies and approached to the matter of 60 year old receiving Medicare from a personal observation. Speech delivered compassion and concern to the poor and needy.

Ethics and human rights, the 60-64 year old group had supported the country and should be eligible for early Medicare benefit was also a good prospective.

A better understanding of the Medicare system would help better explain how the poor can receiver a cheaper health plan.

Good job on the presentation !

2ⁿᵈ Aff Debater: N/A

Feedback: N/A

1ˢᵗ Neg Debater: Jenna

Feedback: Bringing up the life expectancy was a good point. Also, noted that the amount contributed from the working folks will be impacted when lowering the Medicare age limit. Good points and approach, need a smoother delivery of the presentation to make this stand out.

2ⁿᵈ Neg Debater: Joshua

Feedback: Good analogy on seniors are more financially stable than younger folks. Explaining the Medicare will be funded by the working younger folks. Good approach and well presented. Concise and to the point! Good job!

Elims

Judge Stella Chang ballot code 212

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Wow, great competition with excellent debaters! It was a difficult decision. Both teams did excellent. Aff brought everything to an excellent closure and that helped me determine the winner! Great job everyone!

1st Aff Debater: Courtney Chan

Feedback: Excellent approach on fruits and veg from a biological view. Good comeback on opponent's generalization on fruits causing diseases. Good time control on responding all of Neg's assessments.

2nd Aff Debater: Joshanne Chiang

Feedback: Excellent point of view with accessing fruits and veg with health benefit based on personal wealth. Good response on opponent's comment on carbon emissions. Well done on the responses from cx. Excellent response to opponent's assumptions, and great closing remark!

1st Neg Debater: Joseph Tyler

Feedback: Well defined the net benefits of all fruits and veg. Good analogies on accessibility of fruits and vegetables can be made available for both rich and poor. Excellent response to cx. Nice closure and thorough with the neg explanation.

2nd Neg Debater: Abigail Vaughn

Feedback: Clear definition, covered the health benefits on both fruits and vegetables. Good response on cx. Not sure if it is true that diseases only links to fruits. But good closure on having a balance diet.

Elims

Judge Damayanti Sanusi ballot code 212

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Framework (net benefits), unopposed definitions, and access argument goes to the aff.

1st Aff Debater: Courtney

Feedback: Good job setting framework and definitions. This won the round. Work on "tags", shorthand for your contentions that make it easier to flow.

2nd Aff Debater: Joshanne

Feedback: Good job breaking down what the round comes down to (accessibility, suprefruits). Better together, no apart argument could be explained in more detail.

1st Neg Debater: Abbey

Feedback: Strong cross. Work on developing your framework argument

2nd Neg Debater: Joseph

Feedback: For framing argument, better to bring up list of evidence before final speech. Strong argument on negligible cost differences.

Elims

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Aff conceded Neg contentions, claimed not-new arguments were new, made new arguments themselves, and dropped almost everything in the 2AR.

1st Aff Debater: Mohamad

Feedback: Good case; needed more efficiency in 1AR where the first three arguments took you over 2 minutes to finish.

2nd Aff Debater: Srijan

Feedback: Had some good arguments, but too late in debate. 2AR had way too many drops.

1st Neg Debater: Caleb

Feedback: Good case. Answers to students of color arguments sounded heartless.

2nd Neg Debater: Katie

Feedback: Good all the way around, especially voters. The spending trade-off argument isn't Aff's burden, but your burden to prove (which is why it is such a tough disad to win). You've got to lay out arguments showing that the most likely scenario is a cut in, say, Medicare budgets, etc.

Elims

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: NEG did a great job arguing harms of AFF's position: resolution would lead to educational inflation, would not solve trades job crisis (not enough workers), and would be unfair to those who had already paid for college. NEG also pointed out several flaws in AFF's argument i.e. inconsistency between Dept. of Labor claim RE new startups and need for college, lack of clarity RE jobs that are being lost to China & India.

1st Aff Debater: Srijan

Feedback: Nice job keeping your cool when pressed by NEG at times, advocating for your position. Take care, in the future, to consider as many implications of your position as possible, particularly in a policy argument. You lost me when you said, "It doesn't matter where we get the $604 billion from..."

2nd Aff Debater: Mohamed

Feedback: Good job identifying a weakness of the NEG position after the 1NC, namely that NEG did not address those who want to go to college but cannot afford it. (NEG later answered this point). For next time, make sure to use all of your time, especially in your final rebuttal. This was your team's last opportunity to reinforce your position and refute your opponent's position!

1st Neg Debater: Caleb

Feedback: Great job identifying weaknesses in your opponent's case (e.g. "American needs all students to go to college" countered with "Not all careers require college" & cited a source of support). For next time, given the choice between offering your own contentions or countering more of your opponent's claims, I suggest leaning a little more heavily on your opponent's case. Don't be afraid to address the moral contention.

2nd Neg Debater: Katie

Feedback: Great argument that free college undervalues degrees and strong contention that POC equity already being addressed with Pell grants, promise programs in 17 states. In the future, be careful to keep a respectful tone and volume in your speeches.

Passion is fine, but you still need to allow that your opponent may be making good faith arguments. You didn't cross the line, but at one point, it was close!