

Judge: Christensen

Ballot Code: 13

Round: 0

St Anselm Stankewicz & Monahan versus UW Bothell BadgleyMaverick

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: They showed up for the test round and this was a sufficient argument to earn the win in test round

First Aff: Stankewicz

Way to go! Great signposting.

Second Aff: Monahan

Your powerhouse argument that dogs are indeed affable when compared to cats is very solid

First Neg: Badgley

Great of you to be kind to the opponent -- pleasantries are always appropriate.

Second Neg: Badgley

Having your cat walk across the keyboard may have been considered an unfair visual aid, but that's a beautiful kitty!

Judge: David Trumble

Ballot Code: 12

Round: 0

CSI versus Idaho State

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: We did not have time to do a debate. But we did check everyone's technology.

First Aff: Evy Jones

Thank you for coming today to the tournament. Good luck today!

Second Aff: Gwenn Shutt

Good luck at the tournament today!

First Neg: Corgatelli

It was nice to chat with you and your partner before the round started. Good luck today!

Second Neg: Tyler

Good luck to you and your partner today!

Judge: Sam Hendricks

Ballot Code:

Round: 0

U Idaho Aranda*Aranda* versus Idaho St BarkerBarker

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: //

First Aff: Aranda

Good job!

Second Aff: //

//

First Neg: Barker

Good job!

Second Neg: //

//

Judge: Sam Hendricks

Ballot Code: 11

Round: 0

St Anselm AilishNathanial versus U Idaho Manuel *Manuel*

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The Neg has proven that wind energy is a bad investment, especially when compared to other forms of clean energy that are making constant changes and progressing actively, when wind's harms have remained stagnant. The Aff did not adequately address the localized harms to individuals, wildlife, and ecosystems that the Neg brought up.

First Aff: Nathanial

Awesome speaker! Great inflection, good rebuttals, and you're very quick on your feet. Citing your sources will help credibility and make it harder for your opponent to refute your claims. Please show up on time to prep rooms and please don't speak with your partner out loud during the opponent's speech.

Second Aff: Ailish

Great job! Thank you for standing during your speeches. Awesome eye contact and speed. Your organization was amazing as well and made it easy to flow. Please cite your sources and show up on time to prep rooms.

First Neg: Manuel

Couldn't even tell you hadn't done teams before! Good CX. Your point about localized issues with wildlife and rural communities largely went unaddressed, and you did a great job of always coming back to that point as an example. Make sure you're making eye contact with the camera rather than your computer screen if they are far apart.

Second Neg: //

//

Judge: David Trumble

Ballot Code: 13

Round: 0

Colter-Colter versus Julie-Julie

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The debate came down whether the USFG would be able to and would take effective action to keep Church services from being public health threats due to COVID. The AFF calls for State action. The NEG calls for Federal action.

AFF says let's do cooperative federalism.

NEG argues this is not what the topic says. The topic calls for giving States "full latitude."

This argument in the 2nd NEG Constructive is a great argument.

NEG argues that the States (many states) are abdicating their responsibility on this issue.

AFF says that the Federal government will never pass legislation on this issue.

NEG says that the CDC and Biden's Executive Orders can solve the problem.

This is what the round comes down to. I am convinced that Biden is trying hard to use his Presidential powers to solve COVID and that is a reasonable policy option. Not a perfect policy option, but a reasonable policy option, especially given that Governor's are not doing enough.

First Aff: Colter

That was an excellent AFF case. Well organized and well evidenced. Very persuasive speaker. The one thing that needed more development in the 1AC was the topic of States should be the actor. It was just a small point and it would have been beneficial to have more development. Great presentation and organization!

Second Aff: Colter

I liked that you identified the round as an "actor" round. Good way to start the 2AC. Also, good having a three point overview on this aspect. The only suggestion I have for improvement would be about the collective federalism position. That opened you up to the NEG argument that the topic called for States getting full latitude, not shared federalism. Well done! Very good speaking skills and analysis!

First Neg: Julie

Very good constructive speech. You laid out your main case, which was about federal vs. state. The one suggestion for improvement would be to spend a little more time going through the AFF case. Even though you wanted to round to become all about the states vs federal, there were some things in the original 1AC that you could have spoken about that would have helped your off-case position. For example, his use of potential "regulation" including ventilation and hygiene and distancing. That would have helped your argument that the Federal government could be effective through regulation (without going adopting a full lockdown). Excellent speeches!

Second Neg: Julie

That was an excellent 2NC. You really hit the AFF in key areas - -collective federalism is not what the topic calls for, that Biden is taking serious action, that the CDC could be effective

(we are already seeing scientists giving press conferences, good point!), and States are abdicating responsibility. Well done. In your rebuttal you made your best arguments as a kind of overview, and then said here are my voting issues. They seemed to be overlapping. It would have been easier to follow if you kept with the overview and as you hit each voting issue, said that is voting issue # 1, etc. Or that other way around - just go through the voting issues one at a time. That would have allowed you to get a bit more in-depth with each of them. Good work in both speeches!

Judge: Andy Christensen

Ballot Code: 14

Round: 0

DanielMariah versus GwenEvy

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: I awarded the win to the Aff because the neg CP didn't create net benefit over the proposition, particularly with respect to the solution for minority and disadvantaged populations.

First Aff: Daniel

A compelling case in the opening (remember to lay out the framework really cleanly) and well-delivered with reasonable tidbits of support. Very sorry you took ill during the round, but your partner had your back!

Second Aff: Mariah

Mariah does a great job with the big-picture without leaping to the two-worlds view to communicate it. I like your style, typified by no-nonsense views. For example -- immediately dismissing your own plan as not mutually exclusive went a long way toward earning you the win early in the round.

First Neg: Gwen

Great job in the 1NC rolling out a TON of preemptive refutation after the 1AC (though remember that comment from the oral RFP about time management). You had a little less than a minute when you rolled out the CP, which was a reasonable plan but needed more uniqueness and support.

Second Neg: Evy

You have a great presentational style -- very calm and very sincere (ice water in the veins!). You offer a lot to the technical debate and have room to grow when showing impacts. Show me how we can see NET BENEFIT from the counterplan -- how it not only does what the proposition would do but does BETTER. A little more "persuasiveness" in delivery, I think, would get you a little farther; don't be afraid to get in their face a little when refuting the opposition -- have FUN with this.

Judge: Elyse Blanch

Ballot Code: 10

Round: 0

McDonald-Newland versus Fageeri-Fageeri

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Gave detailed feedback during RFD after round, but my recap is: neg won on the burden of proof (listed several instances in which money doesn't necessarily change a certain situation, and aff conceded most of those instances - e.g. aspirations). neg also won all race args (aff argued that race is separate from money and that the debate should be focused on the income of an incarcerated person and not their race, but race was very applicable with aff's health and justice system contentions). however, aff's household income and education contentions largely flowed through, even though they didn't end up being the main focus of the debate. aff also didn't provide definitions, and the weighing mechanism was ultimately provided by neg, which neg won as well. great job to both teams!

First Aff: Josephine

Wonderful contentions (disease was especially well-constructed). You have a very positive and upbeat tone, which is great! Just a comment on race - race was a very applicable topic throughout the debate, and I would suggest next time focusing on the *correlation* between race and money instead of saying race shouldn't be the main focus in terms of those incarcerated or arrested. That way you can turn neg's argument to flow on your side. But you did a good job overall, and I think everything will come more naturally with practice :)

Second Aff: Elizabeth

Did very well addressing neg's arguments, and you speak very clearly and had great organization! Just remember to stick to one position within your arguments, and if you're not sure or not comfortable giving an exact answer to your opponent's question in cross-ex (for examples, the aspirations question), don't be afraid to say "I (or my partner) will address that in my/their next speech."

First Neg: Omar

You did a great job! Very polished, used all advanced terms correctly, had a clear vision for the aff/neg burden. your strongest arg by far was that you only have to prove one instance of money not changing something and you dismantle the affirmation of the resolution. I always appreciate a good impact calc, although for more philosophical resolutions like these, I think maybe a better way to title that would have been "Final Focus" or "Voters". again, awesome job!

Second Neg: Omar

(see first neg speaker notes)

Judge: Diane Carter

Ballot Code: 23

Round: 0

College So Idaho EvyGwen versus St Anselm AilishNathanial

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The Neg side seemed to have a better grip on the details of impeachment, particularly the difference between "impeachment" and "conviction." A very strong argument against Aff's claim in 1 CX that the Republicans should be expected to prevent the former president from running again, to wit: there is no precedent for the "cult of personality" surrounding former President Trump so we cannot expect similar results from previous impeachments.

First Aff: Evy

Clear, easy to understand delivery. Be careful to avoid assumptions, which may be inaccurate.

Second Aff: Gwen

Excellent, winsome presentation of your case. Work on incorporating credible support for your claims.

First Neg: Ailish

You are a very gracious person to allow me to interrupt because I thought you were making an error in timing based on the schedule in our debate room. You didn't let my error damage your very positive presentation.

Second Neg: Nathanial

Great work challenging shortcomings in Aff's case while remaining positive and utilizing solid delivery practices. I was also very impressed that you didn't back down in ensuring that your team received all the time you were entitled to use! You could work on supporting claims and accuracy in claims (e.g. the issue of sanctions that accompany impeachment and conviction.)

Judge: Sam Hendricks

Ballot Code: 24

Round: 0

St Anselm AlyssaKathryn versus U Idaho ColterColter

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: I voted for the Neg based on a mixture of preponderance of evidence, CBA, and resolutional analysis. The Neg had multiple, more recent studies that adequately demonstrated the costs didn't exist to the same degree the Aff's earlier studies suggested, and that the benefits of new games outweighed these existing harms. The resolutional analysis provided by the Neg was also important, and only had to prove that costs of video games could easily be mitigated by parental involvement.

First Aff: Alyssa

Awesome speaker! You were extremely organized, well-spoken, and thorough. Great job hammering through points the Neg neglected. Your points in CX were top notch. Please keep an eye on your partner and make sure you both show up to prep on time.

Second Aff: Kathryn

Awesome job setting up the round. You're a great communicator and I really appreciated your use of studies and citations. Please keep an eye on your partner and make sure you both show up to prep on time.

First Neg: Colter

Phenomenal speaker! Your tone and inflection are great, and you came very well prepared for this debate. Good job picking out the most important arguments to address, and wonderful use of the resolution. This was weighed heavily in favor of Neg and you utilized that well. I'd recommend taking a step back and explaining the big picture when using the resolution.

Second Neg: //

//

Judge: Andy Christensen

Ballot Code: 14

Round: 0

ElizabethJosephine versus JulieJulie

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Aff delivers on net benefits framework, and presents three args that the neg doesn't engage with or entirely skirts.

First Aff: Julie

Great case! Nice work delivering on the extent to which the USPS is really a service and really not a free market operator. Be nice in CX (clearly novices -- no battleship needed to sink a canoe).

Second Aff: Julie

Oral critique provided

First Neg: Elizabeth

The case was solid and would have been even more delicious with backing research. You speak well, but left a little time on the clock. Come on strong, and aim to light my fire for the neg. Qualify your sources, and have a few more points even if they're just countermeasures to confuse the aff.

Second Neg: Josephine

Solid round, and way to call out the Aff when she was being a little abrasive -- way to stand your ground! You, too, should support and qualify your statements so that if you are wrong about a fact, it's on your source and not on yourself. DROP no arguments :-)

Judge: Andy Orr

Ballot Code: 20

Round: 0

Bothell Omar versus U Idaho Daniel Mariah

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: This round was weighed on net impact/preponderance of evidence/on-balance. There were arguments on both sides of potential conflict and benefits of Biden's foreign policy - these balanced out, and meant that the AFF did not sufficiently meet the burden of proof for the resolution.

First Aff: Omar

Avoid providing off-time road maps - just make those part of your introduction.

Second Aff: Omar

Be sure your last rebuttal clearly builds your case around the most important issues that have come up in the round. Avoid trying to go line by line.

First Neg: Daniel

Be sure to make your own arguments in the first negative rebuttal - avoid just reiterating your partners arguments.

Second Neg: Mariah

Good work providing reasoning counters to the affirmative analysis. Work to bring in more empirical examples that disprove analysis.

Judge: Andy Orr

Ballot Code: 12

Round: 0

Idaho St. AlysonJoseph versus St Anselm AlyssaKatheryn

Won Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: RFD: While this round could have been much more meaningful in terms of framing, the decision I was asked to make was based on cost-benefit-analysis. There were benefits to wind were not contested by the aff- economic improvement (neg did not say wind harms the economy), environmental improvement (neg did not say it harms the environment). The costs to wind were answered effectively by the aff - noise (only some), land consumption (towers are far apart), transmission (offshore turbines will help) and inconsistent production (but we have storage). Further, the only offence from the neg was a counter plan of conservation to which the aff said that wind is still essential, and we can do both by supporting wind and reducing our consumption.

First Aff: Joseph

work to make your case more strait-forward. If it is policy, just run a policy. Further, if you are going to do fact, just pick one criterion. Avoid relying on evidence/quality in limited prep. debate.

Second Aff: Alyson

work to slow your pace by building in pauses. You speak clearly and quickly - which is fine, we just need pauses for emphasis to drive home your points.

First Neg: Kathryn

when you are in your speech, work to identify your opponents argument in one sentence - don't repeat their whole claim. Similarly, in cross-ex avoid asking restating their argument and asking them if is correct. You follow up this with your actual question - so just save the time. "You say correct?"

Second Neg: Alyssa

Work to be more organized in your speech. Specifically, use signposting "Where my opponent says..., we say..., and it means...." You started off your rebuttal by talking about the criteria, be sure to say there and avoid explaining the "how" Instead, focus on the outcome (the costs and benefits).

Judge: David Trumble

Ballot Code: 21

Round: 0

U Idaho - Manuel versus Idaho State - Joseph and Alyson

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The debate came down to the wording of the topic which called for parents to not allow their children to play video games. That topic is so absolute that it is near impossible for the AFF to win this round. Aff and Neg both had great arguments on the pros and cons of video games. Both teams had good evidence on the physical, social and mental health aspects. But the AFF could not prove that there is enough harms to ban them completely, which is the paradigm that the NEG contended the topic called for and AFF never successfully refuted.

First Aff: Manuel

I like the first aff constructive. Very well put together. Well organized. Good evidence. Only suggestion is in your 1st AFF rebuttal, try to hit on the key issues - keep it organized. You bounced around a little bit from topic to topic.

Second Aff: Manuel

You had good answers to everything the NEG argued on the case. You defended the evils of video games very well. My one suggestion, as I mentioned after the round, would be to re-organize the round. The NEG's 3 off case points were exactly the same three points as you raised in your case (in different numerical order). You could have organized the round by pulling it all together and discussing each of the issues one at a time. I think that would have helped your case. You did a great job, especially with such a hard topic to go AFF on!

First Neg: Joseph

Great speech. You have a gift for organizing your arguments. You provided great evidence on each contention. My one suggestion to you, would have been to directly apply your off-case the case, as it matched up exactly, point for point. Excellent job in this round!

Second Neg: Alyson

Excellent speech. I was impressed with your ability to argue framework and apply that framework to the specific contentions. Also, you did a good job of breaking down some of the specific arguments (for example, good rebuttal point about Animal Crossing having social aspects even though it is a single player game in its design). One suggestion would be to provide a quick summary in rebuttal giving me the RFD from your point of view. Great debate!

Judge: Denise Vaughan

Ballot Code: 34

Round: 0

Affirmative College So Idaho EvyGwen versus Negative St Anselm AlyssaKathryn

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Utilitarianism. Negative did an excellent job of demonstrating how they met the affirmatives criteria. The negative explained the negatives of reopening schools outweighing the positives which they demonstrated would be for few.

First Aff: Gwen

Lots of good points on students dropping out, etc. I would really have liked to see where that information is from. That would bolster the argument. Good press that this is already happening in classrooms. I feel like you are covering a lot of ages. That is both impressive and too much work. Consider a single example. The case structure is good.

Second Aff: Evy

Good use of sign posting. The layout of the case was clear from the start and the whole debate followed that structure. Connects everything to the value. Lots of the argument pushes the negative to solve. I would avoid that. I think the construction you work on is better and sticking to your case puts your argument in a stronger location.

First Neg: Kathryn

Clear signposting. Keep that up in both speeches. Good breaking down of the burdens. You do a good job covering what you need to cover and leaving other arguments for your partner.

Second Neg: Alyssa

Clear connection to utilitarianism. This is clear in your first and in your final speech. Weighing health against possible loss of learning is excellent. You are right, it is not a double-bind. Do cite the specifics like the bill you said passed. You did great. I would encourage you to avoid getting in the weeds. You want to win every argument. I hear you. Do go ahead and strategically sacrifice some you don't need to win.

Judge: Sam Hendricks

Ballot Code: 31

Round: 0

UW Bothwell Julie*Julie* versus Idaho St AlysonJoseph

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The Aff did an amazing job at proving that Joe Biden is not doing enough for climate change. It's true that we need to do more. However, the Neg demonstrated that the benefits of more aggressive climate action are outweighed by the immense harm of Republican backlash in the future.

First Aff: Julie

Incredible job, especially by yourself in a team debate! Great attitude, speaking style, and great use of emotion. Good job in CX. My only recommendation would be to brush up on the specific roles of the President and the Senate when entering international treaties, though I'm not sure how applicable that will be to future debates. :)

Second Aff: //

//

First Neg: Alyson

Great roadmap, organization, and utilization of time! You are an extremely clear communicator, and you were very effective at picking out the specific arguments that you needed to drive home for maximum impact. Just make sure to watch your time at the end!

Second Neg: Joseph

Great job laying out your case, burdens, and awesome use of resolutorial analysis. Your rebuttals were extremely effective. You're a great speaker! Try to become more concise during CX so you don't have to waste time arguing.

Judge: Diane Carter

Ballot Code: 33

Round: 0

College So Idaho Elizabeth*Josephine* versus Idaho St ColterColter

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Neg successfully challenged Aff's case analysis/value/criterion after Aff opened the door to frame the debate around political parties. Aff's case was weakened by inclusion of pop culture and Cuban Missile Crisis and Neg did a good job exploiting those weaknesses.

First Aff: Elizabeth

Excellent delivery! Focus on developing a case in which all points hang together.

Second Aff: Josephine

A pleasure to listen/watch your speeches--confident, positive delivery! Be careful to avoid mischaracterizing your opponent's positions/claims

First Neg: Colter

Excellent job identifying and challenging your opponents' arguments. It took some time for you to clearly characterize some of the excellent material you used to support your claims. Having introduced the material, you were able to return to it, but your argument would have been even stronger if you had started with more detailed explanation of the implications right off the bat.

Second Neg: No second speaker

No second speaker

Judge: Thomas Hyatt

Ballot Code: 30

Round: 0

U Idaho DanielMariah: versus St Anselm AilishNathanial

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Resolution was that bipartisanship is greater than action. I'm persuaded by negative argument that action and impact is important and that the 2 examples given of bipartisan action were bad and 2 examples of unilateral action were good.

First Aff: Daniel

Constructive case was built and delivered well. Rebuttal did not effectively deal with Neg arguments - respond to arguments in 1ar and let you partner do the summarizing in the end

Second Aff: Mariah

2ac was organized and had good clash. You need to start with aff case and spend a little time there in 2ac rather than spending all you time on neg ground.

First Neg: Nathaniel

Good examples given and good neg case. You should apply your arguments from neg case to aff case rather than completely argue offcase.

Second Neg: Ailish

You make good arguments and voting issues are good in the rebuttal. You should work a bit on organization so I know exactly where the arguments are applied.

Judge: Andy Christensen

Ballot Code: 32

Round: 0

OmarOmar versus ManuelManuel

Won Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Neg went global in impacting the argument and the aff does not engage. Aff carries the horrible burden of attempting to show "more aggressive action" for a plan that has only been in effect for *literally* days. Neg rightly tests the aff on "how much is (ever) going to be enough?" Neg offers complete clash -- aff dropped the implication of the global argumentation.

First Aff: Omar

Really well-spoken and a solid case. In the aff we really need just a little more solid research to back the claims (or being more aggressive).

Second Aff: Omar

Great extensions to the top of case, although signposting in the 2AC are absent.

First Neg: Manuel

Great speaker in the 1NC. I think you raise some really astute points right off the bat which the aff seems to dismiss and in so-doing eventually drops one. I wish you better luck with the AV woes. As for improvement, the oral RFD mentioned research and citation for your case, too.

Second Neg: Manuel

The work here is rich in logic based-claims and while the aff didn't like that, the judge did. Remember -- the neg is to test the claims of the warrants the aff provides. As for a recommendation in this portion of your speech, I say please deliver impacts more deftly.