

Round: Round 1

Judge Saisri Gajavalli

Aff Team: Idaho Ciara-Issac vs Neg Team: U Washington-Griffin

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The contentions of plagiarism, Bias were strong and there is no strong debate from the opponent. The explanation and construction of their speech is such a way that the opponent couldn't make arguments further.

1st Aff: Ciara Gaches

Feedback: **She did her best in this debate. Her delivery of speech is so good. Can add more sources of information to add more value to her speech**

2nd Aff: Issac Brambilla

Feedback: **Overall its a good performance and cross-examination is good. While answering cross-examination of the opponent he can show a little more confidence because the content he is delivering is clear, if he could do with some more confidence it will be the best.**

1st Neg: Griffin Hehmey

Feedback: **Did with good confidence. Sources of information is required and contentions can be clear.**

2nd Neg: One speaker only was there

Feedback: **One speaker only was there**

Round: Round 1

Judge Shri Swaminathan

Aff Team: Seattle U Ed Strok vs Neg Team: Murray St Garrett Kieser-Kyle Heideman

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Neg wins for refuting the resolution that privacy is better than safety -- by stating that liberty is necessary to guarantee privacy itself. Aff did not have a clear definition of liberty and had only one major contention of safety that was not properly reiterated in rebuttals.

1st Aff: Ed Strok

Feedback: **Compliment -- very good listener, willing to hear what the opposition is trying to say!**

Room for Improvement -- make sure to define the values you are basing your contentions on and being more persuasive.

2nd Aff: -

Feedback: -

1st Neg: Garrett Kieser

Feedback: **Compliments: clearly articulated contentions and cross-examinations, and very persuasive speaker**

Room for improvement: while doubling down on your contentions, bring up newer arguments.

2nd Neg: Kyle Heideman

Feedback: **Compliments: clearly stated road maps of their speech and the debate, well structured speeches and contentions**

Improvement: More participation in the constructive speeches.

Round: Round 1

Judge Beth Cole

Aff Team: Ben Carey-DiGregorio/Chloe Cobos vs Neg Team: Sonia James/Jacob Labar

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The aff's case on plagerism and contract CHAT/can't cite sources did not have much interaction by the neg, whose case involved benefits to students/teachers as a classroom tool, which aff points out is outside the resolution. The aff definitions, value of academic integrity and criteria of preponderance of evidence was also conceded by neg so this was how I weighed the round. Good job today!

1st Aff: Ben Carey-DiGregorio

Feedback: **You had a great case; may want to slow down delivery a bit. 2nd speech very good and pointed out main issues; may want to cover your own case a bit more.**

2nd Aff: Chloe Cobos

Feedback: **Both speeches were excellent! Great speaker and grasped key issues well. In 1st speech may want to attack neg side a little more; be sure to label 'voting issues' clearly.**

1st Neg: Sonia James

Feedback: **Great effort today! You had a good case; try to follow the aff format of providing definitions, value and criteria. You are a clear and persuasive speaker. Try to interact more with the arguments the aff provides; this comes w/ time and experience.**

2nd Neg: Jacob Labar

Feedback: Good job today! You are a clear and persuasive speaker. Try to interact more with the arguments the aff provides; this comes w/ time and experience. Your speech did bring up some valid points.

Round: Round 1

Judge Brad Phelps

Aff Team: U Nevada Reno Hannah Branch-Hannah Branch vs Neg Team: Tennessee Tech Sara Owens-Logan Brock

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The debate came down to an argument between moral reason for instituting sanctions vs the negative economic benefits. The NEG made a good argument the negative economic impact to US citizens and to the citizens of China outweighed the moral reasons for doing them.

1st Aff: Hannah

Feedback: **Great job! Excellent points and cross X. Economic arguments for sanctions would have made case even stronger.**

2nd Aff: Same.

Feedback: **Same.**

1st Neg: Sara Owens

Feedback: **Great job! Great arguments and points. Would have recommended emphasizing how sanctioning China would impact Russian tensions and conflict in Ukraine.**

2nd Neg: Logan Brock

Feedback: **Great job! Awesome first time debating! Would have recommended emphasizing how sanctioning China would impact Russian tensions and conflict in Ukraine.**

Round: Round 1

Judge Bob Glenn

Aff Team: Nevada Reno Jasmine -Melaina Fox vs Neg Team: Seattle U Chris

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The Negative had better justification for why AI Chat should be allowed for use in school assignments and classrooms. The lack of evidence by both teams made this a tough round to decide, but AFF has the burden of proof and lacked significant documentation to support their claims. Neg argues that AI chat is like google and safari in terms of cheating-Aff counter they are not. The arguments that student learning is aided by the templates provided and the benefits for learning challenged and physically challenged students are solid and go unanswered by AFF. Neg's analysis is more solid. But both teams need to cite sources and be more organized. Aff offered no resolitional analysis or definitions so that needs to be amended in future rounds.

1st Aff: You are a very fluent and articulate speaker. Use all your time and work to research sources during prep to back up your claims. Good questions in cross exam. Add signposting and resolitional analysis to your Aff cases next time.

Feedback: **Excellent delivery and a solid rebuttal. Add more organization and structure to case.**

2nd Aff: Mailaia Fox- Good delivery. Use all your time. Your rebuttal was the comeback of the year and almost won the round for the AFF. Cite sources to back up your major claims.

Feedback: **Fluent delivery. Don't argue in cross exam. Ask questions and wait for the answer.**

1st Neg: Seattle Chris Ebube

Feedback: You did an excellent job of countering the thesis of Aff case. Try to add sources to back up your major claims in the round. Seek to explain how your argument beats Aff claims. Your last rebuttal almost cost you the round. Stay strong and fluent and explain voting issues you won in that last speech.

2nd Neg: You clashed well with Aff. The cross exam got taken over by you. Just answer questions till they stop you and they didn't so good for you. That helped you a lot in this round.

Feedback: Good job in cross exam. Impose more numbered structure and signposting upon your arguments. Run Disadvantages in the 2nd constructive.

Round: Round 1

Judge Brett Feinstein

Aff Team: UNR--Brandon-Lowe/Brown vs Neg Team: Seattle U--Jamaale

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Aff team wins across a number of contentions including accuracy of ChatGPT results, its impacts on learning and the potential for plagiarism. Neg did not really rebut these. While I found Negs arguments about creativity strong and especially found Neg's late argument about the fact that part of education is learning how to effectively use current technology since it is not going away, by not undercutting aff's points, they met their burden and won my ballot.

1st Aff: Saiya Brandon-Lowe

Feedback: **Impressive first debate. A number of well-supported contentions in a speech that was well-paced for a regular audience. Your delivery will be even stronger if you focus on eye contact with the camera. Often times you were looking away (not down to read but just off in the distance) which can be a little offputting. While you made some excellent arguments with well-cited research, you should focus on the organization of your speech to drive the audience through it in a logical and direct fashion so I can see how all the arguments come together in a coherent case for your side of the resolution.**

2nd Aff: Hunter Brown

Feedback: **Impressive first debate. As was the case with Saiya, you made a number of well-supported and persuasive contentions about the negative impacts ChatGPT can create on education through cheating and misinformation. Your speeches were delivered with good pace. You use your voice nicely to create emphasis of key points which helps draw the audience in. While you are listed as the 2nd speaker here, you actually did**

speak first in the round. As we discussed, you can make your position stronger as the first speaker for the aff by defining the terms of the debate to control the parameters and playing field of the debate. I would also focus on the organization of your speech to make sure that there is a logical path through your arguments to reach the conclusion that your position on the resolution is the right one.

1st Neg: Samira Jamaale

Feedback: You did a great job, not only for your first debate, but also having a partner drop at last minute made it that much more difficult. That's a lot for your first event and you carried it off nicely. You made some strong arguments--especially the argument that this is not going away and that we need to train students how to use it appropriately rather than ban it from them. If this had come in earlier AND had not been rebutted, it would have made this a lot closer. But it was a very clear and strong contention. One area to focus on for improvement is making sure you are rebutting from the first speech as the negative (second speech as the affirmative). Don't let their arguments go unchallenged and dug-in.

2nd Neg: Samira Jamaale

Feedback: See above

Round: Round 2

Judge Phil Sharp

Aff Team: UW Griffin Hehmeyer-Griffin Hehmeyer vs Neg Team: UCSD Zijia Zhu-Amanda Sun

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The aff reads a VERY specific aff. The neg does not push back against that approach. As a result, the neg claims are mostly dispelled easily. The carbon tax as proposed has a bunch of exemptions that attempt to prevent the DAs from occurring. The neg is winning that there is positive progress now and that the shift to renewables is a good approach. They do not win that the tax hurts the economy or that it won't work. I think they could make headway here, but they are not able to do so.

Note: In a world where I am not choosing a winner based on arguments, I would happily vote neg based on the demeanor and approach of the aff.

1st Aff: Griffin Hehmeyer

Feedback: **I would have preferred to hear a well-organized case rather than a laundry list of warrants with "next" in-between them. I enjoyed the use of warrants. Perhaps it is from a policy case. I was put off by your demeanor and approach. It felt very curt and assertive.**

2nd Aff: Griffin Hehmeyer

Feedback: **You do a good job of leveraging the specifics of the case (including the research) to address the Neg claims. At some times it feels like you are dismissive and/or not responding to the core claim of the Neg. I would suggest that you be less dismissive of the claims of the neg and show some respect to the warrants, but show how they don't win the claim.**

A lot of redundancy between the first and second rebuttals.

1st Neg: Amanda Sun

Feedback: **You presented excellent arguments against the topic and cited supporting evidence.**

In this debate, it would help to respond to the specific arguments of the Aff.

2nd Neg: Zijia Zhu

Feedback: **Excellent speech. You do a good job of reiterating your sides claims and defending against the aff refutations. I think it would be a good idea for you to add some depth to the debate with another DA or reason the plan is bad.**

Round: Round 2

Judge Jack Bradley

Aff Team: Pro Tennessee Tech Sara Owens-Logan Brock vs Neg Team: Con Seattle U Ed Strok-Ed Strok:

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: So much top weight in these speeches full of road map. You don't have time for that in such a short debate with such limited prep. Get straight to the refutation and clash.

At the end of this debate, framed through the lens of cost benefit analysis, I am left questioning how the affirmative team can solve for their harms through the passage of a carbon tax. I think that the aff rebuttals start to clarify this. They address the negatives harms somewhat. But the problem that the neg highlights is that they have little to no proof that the implementation of a carbon tax would solve their advantages/harms, and they don't do much work on the solvency flow of this debate.

As a result, I vote Neg on the negative harms that the economy could experience with the implementation of a carbon tax. The only real refutation that the aff provides here is that some supposed shift will occur from fossil fuels to cleaner energy with jobs. That is pretty vague, and the final neg speech points that out very well. Too little too late for the refutation of this argument. 1.7 Trillion dollar decrease from the Congressional Budget Office is a substantial argument, and the Neg supports this claim with some strong, well developed warrants.

I don't think that this "should" argument suggesting that we don't pass the plan until we're ready to doesn't address the Neg harms on the economy. This argument sure felt like a new in the 2AR argument as well.

Good job ya'll! I enjoyed your take on this classic debate.

1st Aff: Sara Owens

Feedback: **1AC is Sara Owens: I don't understand why you want to split your advantages and your harms between speeches. Stylistically that doesn't seem strategic to me. Why not just have harms or advantages**

instead of both? Harms, solvency, etc. should all be in the 1AC especially in a policy framed sort of round.

However, I think the arguments are articulate, well developed, and communicated well.

You had a strong 1AR from a content standpoint! I wish you would have condensed down to the key issues a bit quicker though. Where should I be evaluating this debate?

2nd Aff: Logan Brock

Feedback: Great speech overall! Especially for your first debate tournament ever. I would focus on extending and utilizing your partner's arguments more strategically. Also... I would spend most all of this speech on the solvency question in your constructive. How does implementing a carbon tax solve these problems?

This "should" argument in your final rebuttal is too little too late. Why don't you contextualize this throughout the debate? In your constructive speech you could have tossed aside all of his arguments right out of the gate.

1st Neg: Ed Strok

Feedback: Power outage in California every single day since 2022? That's a gross exaggeration. I think your first two arguments in your case can be grouped. People lose jobs, the economy goes down, bills increase with a carbon tax. That all feels like the same argument to me personally.

I really wish you would haven't gotten to that Carbon Tax CP that you teased in the first neg constructive. They technically don't have a plan of what this implementation would even look like at this point in the debate, so that would generate you a ton of offense.

2nd Neg: Ed Strok

Feedback: What a fantastic 2nd neg constructive! Great breakdown of their solvency issues throughout, great extension of harms, and I really enjoyed

your refutation. I think your 2NR was superb. Great breakdown of the crux of the debate.

Round: Round 2

Judge Shri Swaminathan

Aff Team: ISU Ciara-Isaac vs Neg Team: UPortland Gavin-William

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The affirmative wins primarily because their contention of using carbon emission taxes to invest in climate change agreements such as the paris accords; and to fund renewable, clean energy technology is the most logical and statistically supported argument to the resolution.

1st Aff: William Heyler

Feedback: **As the first speaker, there was a clean, well-laid out start and plan for the debate in their speech! It would be great if you cited your sources within your speech when presenting factual and statistic information (example: "according to a guardian report from 2019")**

2nd Aff: Gavin Sutherland

Feedback: **Great preparation on compiling data to support and present your argument, I really appreciate that and your great use of debate vocabulary. If anything, be a little more persuasive in your arguments!**

1st Neg: Isaac Brambilla

Feedback: **Well refuted arguments in the cross-examinations! Your speeches were well structured and delivered, but more direction and clarity would help a lot.**

2nd Neg: Ciara Gaches

Feedback: **A really persuasive speaker, and well-researched and cited sources in all of your speeches which I genuinely appreciate. If anything, try bringing up newer arguments in your rebuttals rather than doubling down on your constructive points.**

Round: Round 2

Judge Elliot Payne

Aff Team: Daniel-Daniel vs Neg Team: Branch-Branch

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Negative's Solvency argument was the most strong as it crossapplied to advantage 1 and 2 and showed how both logically and historically we cannot see the money having the impact the aff says it needs to in order for aff to win.

1st Aff: David Daniel

Feedback: **compliment: good road mapping and organization. Improvement: focus less on evidence unless that is the one exclusive judging criteria that you are using in this round.**

2nd Aff: n/a

Feedback: **n/a**

1st Neg: Hannah Branch

Feedback: **compliment: good work on flowing each advantage very well, and providing logical connections to stand against aff's good sourcing, impressive job. Improvement: roadmap more, with your pace of speaking it can be challenging to keep up with where you are.**

2nd Neg: n/a

Feedback: **n/a**

Search for your comments typing in your name (noting that judges will misspell your name).

Round: Round 2

Judge Ariel Brennan

Aff Team: Chris Uzochukwu vs Neg Team: Saiya-Hunter

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: AFF won in the "universal basic income is better than federal jobs guarantee".

He framed in the argument in a consistently strong and cohesive manner throughout--placing emphasis on the "what would be better for the people" as opposed to the business-like perspective that the NEG was illustrating. This is not to say that the business-like lens was ineffective, just less cohesive and persuasive than the AFF's ethical/moral/idealistic supports.

Specific arguments include:

- 1) emphasis on the importance of equity--particularly in times of universal hardship (ie. COVID-19 pandemic) where we all need universal/equal support. In those pandemic cases, working wouldn't provide everyone with equal opportunities to earn.
- 2) build up the notion of, "UBI is more reliable and *better* for the people as it provides individuals with basic financial mobility to live."

1st Aff: Chris Uzochukwu

Feedback: **Illustrated argument extremely clearly + was consistent in his framing.**

Could have expanded much more on essential points such how the means by which UBI would be implemented. His lack of doing this left room for the NEG to easily try and tear his argument down. (Luckily his framing and support was sufficient)

2nd Aff: Chris Uzochukwu

Feedback: **Illustrated argument extremely clearly + was consistent in his framing.**

Could have expanded much more on essential points such how the means by which UBI would be implemented. His lack of doing this left room for the NEG to easily try and tear his argument down. (Luckily his framing and support was sufficient)

1st Neg: Saiya Brandon-Lowe

Feedback: **Spoke very clear and persuasively. Was supportive with her speeches.**

Again, left much un-said. Should be more inclusive (or at least expanded on inclusiveness).

2nd Neg: Hunter Brown

Feedback: **Strong ideas.**

Needs to work on idea articulation.

Round: Round 2

Judge Wesley Loofbourrow

**Aff Team: Pro U Nevada Reno Jacob Labar-Sonia James: vs
Neg Team: Con U Portland Ben Carey-DiGregorio-Chloe
Cobos:**

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The line by line on Democratic Process as the framework for the round resoundingly supports siding with Neg. Once this "Value Criterion" is established, all the impacts in the round are now necessarily controlled and filtered in terms of how each argument furthers or detracts from advancing Democratic Process. Lack of pre-existing and overtly clear legal standards, unfair assumption of guilt, etc.; these arguments, and several more that were made in this round, all constitute viable offense under the Dem Process standard, so that is where I place my vote.

1st Aff: Sonia

Feedback: **Increase overall # of arguments SIGNIFICANTLY (at minimum, make double the amount of answers on the line by line); educated & articulate delivery of speech**

2nd Aff: Jacob

Feedback: **Increase overall # of arguments SIGNIFICANTLY (at minimum, make double the amount of answers on the line by line); educated & articulate delivery of speech**

1st Neg: Ben

Feedback: **Increase overall # of arguments SIGNIFICANTLY (at minimum, make double the amount of answers on the line by line); OUTSTANDING**

strategic decision to make your main voter the criterion (Democratic Process)

2nd Neg: Chloe

Feedback: Increase overall # of arguments SIGNIFICANTLY (at minimum, make double the amount of answers on the line by line); OUTSTANDING strategic decision to make your main voter the criterion (Democratic Process)

Round: Round 2

Judge Bob Glenn

Aff Team: Idaho State Jonathon Staneback/Trey Mitchell vs Neg Team: UC-San Diego Claire Dickens/Yiquan Liu

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The Affirmative clearly shows some net benefits from their policy. Negative needs more evidence to show economic impacts upon the poor FROM the policy of carbon tax. The DA's were not bad at all, but make it clear your flopping positions. All 4 of you did a good job. Work on signposting and clashing more with the plan.

1st Aff: Jonathon Stoneback

Feedback: **Good organization and structure. Work on talking about voting issues more cleanly in rebuttal**

2nd Aff: Trey Mitchell

Feedback: **Fluent delivery style, good macro analysis of what's going on. Talk about numbered voting issues in rebuttals and cite more sources. Your rebuttal was very well done.**

1st Neg: Claire Dickens

Feedback: **I liked your three DA's. Just make it clear your flopping roles to be fair to the AFF. Good questions in cross exam. Be more specific and cite more evidence to back up major claims.**

2nd Neg: Yiquan Liu

Feedback: **Good clash with case. Go more line by line as you go through the case. if you want to argue that the AFF is the focus of the solvency issue do it as a procedural and have Claire cite it in the 1NC to be fair to AFF. Good analysis. Good rebuttal. Don't take over cross exam for your partner.**

Round: Round 3

Judge Jack Bradley

Aff Team: Jacob Labar and Sonia James UNR vs Neg Team: Seattle U Chris Uzochukwu-Chris Uzochukwu

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: There was very little clash in this debate, which made it very hard to evaluate. I think the negative was trying to argue a counterplan, suggesting that we should make it mandatory with an opt out option, but doesn't explain why that is beneficial to the affirmative. The clarification of how the debate should be framed was lacking as well.

I vote Aff because they save more lives. They have great evidence suggesting one organ donor could save as many as 75 lives, and the neg doesn't really refute that in anyway.

1st Aff: Jacob Labar

Feedback: I enjoy your personal touch to this 1AC. Great delivery. However, your case seriously lacks organization. How are we supposed to be framing this debate? Are you defending a plan, a value/criterion, or something else?

You agree that it is unfair to make it mandatory, but you also say it is selfish to not donate your organs. huh? That was a confusing point to make in the 1AR.

2nd Aff: Sonia James

Feedback: I think this 2AC was great overall! I really think you made some strong arguments throughout. Once again, the organization on the aff side of the debate feels lacking. I also wish Jacob would have included these pieces of evidence/articles in the first constructive instead of the second.

Be careful with explaining your arguments in the cross-examination period. That isn't the time for it.

Fantastic refutation of the 2NR.

1st Neg: Chris Ebube

Feedback: Your communication skills are fantastic. The problem is you don't clarify how you want to frame this debate. How are we going to evaluate this debate, and what arguments are you trying to make here? Your organization needs work. Enjoyed your cross-examination skills as well!

Please don't start a rebuttal speech by saying, "I've already said everything I wanted to say about this resolution"

2nd Neg: Chris Ebube

Feedback: I think your refutation of your opponent's arguments is largely missing. You do a good job of reiterating your arguments from your last speech, so I'm glad you extended those. You need to call this Opt Out argument what it is. A CounterPlan. That's a great Counterplan! I just wish you would identify it as such.

Good clarification in your last speech, but where are your voters? Why should I vote neg in this debate?

Round: Round 3

Judge Saisri Gajavalli

Aff Team: U Portland William-Gavin vs Neg Team: UC San Diego Zijia-Amanda

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Winning team contentions are strong. Topics like unaffordability, real wages, and inflation are strong. Even though the negative team has so many grounds to argue they couldn't argue instead they focused on one topic "community colleges"

1st Aff: William Heyler

Feedback: **Very good delivery of speech and clarity of debate. Could have debated strongly as you have all the strong points.**

2nd Aff: Gavin

Feedback: **The information you are giving is good but the way of delivery and use of words can be checked.**

1st Neg: Amanda Sun

Feedback: **Good delivery. Clarity of information can be improved while delivering the speech.**

2nd Neg: Zijia Zhu

Feedback: **Overall a good performance. Can be little more confident.**

Round: Round 3

Judge Elliot Payne

Aff Team: Stonebeck-Mitchel vs Neg Team: Hehmeyer

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Of the three main points: Quality music, Success, and quality of person, the Aff wins on at least success (due to systemic injustice Drake had to overcome) and quality of person (based on Drake's support for larger interest groups), the point on music is subjective but could swing to negative.

1st Aff: Trey Stoneback

Feedback: **compliment: good pacing and organization. improvement: do not lead with talking about hiding Jews from Nazis**

2nd Aff: Jonathan Mitchell

Feedback: **compliment: Good job holding your own in cx and maintaining a calm energy. Improvement: keep more balanced in 2AC, you focused most of the speech on the music point.**

1st Neg: Griffin Hehmeyer

Feedback: **Compliment: good quick teardown of aff points. Improvement: approach cross-x less aggressively, use cx to get short simple answers from your opponent that you will use in your case, don't barrage them with the same question.**

2nd Neg: n/a

Feedback: **n/a**

Round: Round 3

Judge Brad Phelps

Aff Team: Idaho State Ciara Gaches-Isaac Brambilla vs Neg Team: UC San Diego Claire Dickens-Yiquan Liu

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: RFD primarily around the way the AFF framed the decision as a Value round based on quality of life. The NEG mostly spoke about quality of education and at times debated it more as a policy round. The AFF made really strong arguments that providing a 4 year degree would increase quality of life for minorities.

1st Aff: Ciara

Feedback: **Great job! Great arguments and presentation. Third point could have been worded in a way to better support the case.**

2nd Aff: Issac

Feedback: **Great job! Great arguments and presentation. Third point could have been worded in a way to better support the case.**

1st Neg: Claire

Feedback: **Great job! Excellent arguments and presentation. Make sure to keep debate arguments focused on the type of round and how it is being argued.**

2nd Neg: Yiquan

Feedback: **Great job! Excellent arguments and presentation. Make sure to keep debate arguments focused on the type of round and how it is being argued.**

Round: Round 3

Judge Bob Glenn

Aff Team: Hannah Branch vs Neg Team: Ed Strok

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The Aff overwhelms the Neg with a preponderance of evidence and analysis. By the time we get to rebuttals there is not a lot of Neg extension or argument building. There are lots of apprentice programs now via unions, community colleges, and employers so I'm not sure the concept of these programs being new is the issue-it is that many don't want to work in blue collar jobs like plumbing, construction, and electrical because they are gritty and tough jobs physically. The benefits to minorities, the in-state limits, and the advantages to growing a qualified work source all flow AFF.

1st Aff: Hannah Branch

Feedback: **You did an amazing job in this round. -you were fluent and well organized and really clashed over every major Neg argument. Great job. Just cite fallacies when they occur as there many in the Neg quiver of arguments**

2nd Aff: Hannah Branch

Feedback: **Good clash with Neg arguments, excellent cross exams. Very effective signposting. Number your voting issues in the rebuttal and write my ballot for me.**

1st Neg: Ed Strok

Feedback: **Great opening constructive. Good analysis and clash with case. Try to ask questions in cross exam instead of posing arguments.**

2nd Neg: Ed Strok

Feedback: **Keep building on the argument chain beyond your constructive. Use time wisely as you ran over a few times. Number your voting issues in that last rebuttal. Great fluency and good clash with 1AC.**

Round: Round 3

Judge Shri Swaminathan

Aff Team: Seattle U Samira Jamaale vs Neg Team: U Nevada Reno Jasmine Arrison-Malaina Fox

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Aff wins primarily on the fact based contention that student debt is a regressive problem to the country due to unaffordable tuition and that better access to education at higher levels can guarantee a better standard of living

1st Aff: Samira Jamaale

Feedback: **I really appreciate the value based contentions! Please time your speeches so you can make sure to offer proper conclusions to them.**

2nd Aff: -

Feedback: -

1st Neg: Malaina Fox

Feedback: **I appreciate the contention based private colleges becoming less accessible if free public tuition is implemented! That said, your team's definition of merit-based exclusivity could've used more explaining.**

2nd Neg: Jasmine Arrison

Feedback: **Great questions during cross-examinations! If anything, I would recommend bringing up multiple, newer arguments to support your contentions in rebuttal rather than doubling down on one point.**

Round: Elims

Judge Shri Swaminathan

**Aff Team: Tennessee Tech Sara Owens-Logan Brock: vs
Neg Team: U Nevada Reno Hannah Branch-Hannah Branch**

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The Aff wins the resolution that the death penalty should be banned based on their policy contentions of the illegitimate and discriminatory use of the penalty against marginalized groups in the US

1st Aff: Sara Owens

Feedback: **Great speeches with well thought-out contentions! Be confident in your arguments, especially since based on policy and you have the evidence to back them.**

2nd Aff: Logan Brock

Feedback: **Wonderful job for a first-time IPDA tournament, and I really appreciate you reiterating the US as the scope of the debate! If anything, structure your constructive speeches to be more precise and articulate.**

1st Neg: Hannah Branch

Feedback: **Extremely persuasive arguments and your speeches were incredibly well-structured and delivered, but make sure to fact check! (re Hitler and Mussolini)**

2nd Neg: -

Feedback: -

Round: Elims

Judge Brad Phelps

Aff Team: San Diego Claire Dickens-Yiquan Liu vs Neg Team: Idaho State Jonathon Stoneback-Trey Mitchell

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The AFF did not set a weighing mechanism so the NEG set it as policy and created a counterplan. Based on this framework the NEG won the round as the AFF was argued more for a value or net benefits round.

1st Aff: Claire

Feedback: **You did an AMAZING job debating this topic without any prep time using some old notes, outstanding job!!!!**

2nd Aff: Same

Feedback: **Same**

1st Neg: Jonathan

Feedback: **Great job! Well done picking a weighing mechanism in the absence of one and a counterplan. Also, great arguments!**

2nd Neg: Trey

Feedback: **Great job! Well done picking a weighing mechanism in the absence of one and a counterplan. Also, great arguments!**

Round: Round 3

Judge Beth Cole

**Aff Team: Owensboro CTC David Daniel-David Daniel vs
Neg Team: Murray State Kyle Heideman-Garrett Kieser**

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: RFD: The neg won this round---I felt the neg cast enough doubt on the aff's plan (who funds/agency/etc.) for me to say they affirm the resolution. The debate between including D1 schools only vs including D2/D3 was interesting and I think the neg won this point as well, also focusing throughout the round that only 12% of D1 schools have profitable athletic programs. The aff brought up a good voting issue of fairness, but as the plan did not hold up I couldn't vote on this issue. Everyone is a terrific speaker, great round!

1st Aff: David Daniel

Feedback: **You are an eloquent speaker! and very persuasive. I thought you had a good case. In 1AR I would have tried to attack the neg case more directly.**

2nd Aff: David Daniel

Feedback: **went maverick/spoke both positions**

1st Neg: Kyle Heideman

Feedback: **You had a good case with direct clash and also your rebuttal was a solid speech as well. In your 1st speech you may want to start on your neg case a little sooner.**

2nd Neg: Garrett Kieser

Feedback: **You are a terrific speaker! You had great arguments and stayed on point for the neg throughout both of your speeches. I would have liked to have heard more on the neg side for disads but it ended up working for you in this round.**

Round: Round 3

Judge Brett Feinstein

Aff Team: Murray State--Kyle Heideman and Garrett Keiser vs Neg Team: Owensboro--David Daniels

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The neg carried the day for a couple of reasons. They pointed out that the aff could not show meaningful data about the impact of their plan on reducing the wait for transplants. And while aff contended that all that was being lost was 3 hours to remove organs from a corpse that no longer needed them, the neg effectively countered that by showing that even a corpse has agency via their will--people are still invested in outcomes related to their lives, even after death. While aff made some strong and clear ethical arguments that were salient, they were unable to meet neg's critique/rebuttal of them and so my ballot is with the neg.

1st Aff: Kyle Heideman

Feedback: **I thought you did a really nice job with this round. You did a solid job of laying out the case, stating the problem and why you felt the policy needed to change. I thought your first stab at solvency was good although it came apart some in rebuttal. I think you got a little cornered on the net benefits argument when you were unable to produce meaningful change relative to a major change in policy and one that may not go down easy, Some stronger stats on the impact of the policy could have made a real difference here.**

2nd Aff: Brett Feinstein

Feedback: **Nice job today. You made a solid point about neg talking about ethics and then seeming to drop it. I think you could have made more headway by continuing that line of attack and keeping neg on the defense on the value because, as you noted, saving life is ethical. I did not**

however, think neg needed a counterplan and I might not have pushed on that.

1st Neg: David Daniels

Feedback: Cannot say I was surprised to see you take home the top speaker award. You are VERY good. Your arguments on the agency of the deceased in terms of wills was a strong argument as was the points you made on the lack of any data to show how much impact the policy would have if enacted. Your delivery was outstanding in every respect from pace to tone to gestures. The one improvement I might recommend is to be certain you want to get bogged down in a debate about the debate (the Kentucky issue). Often it doesn't end up really impacting the flow of the debate and the was the case here, The limitation was really inconsequential in the end but you let it use up a lot of your time refuting it.

2nd Neg: David Daniels

Feedback: See above

Round: Elims

Judge Elliot Payne

Aff Team: Chris Uzochukwu vs Neg Team: Hunter Brown

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Negative provided definitions in this round because the aff did not, this meant that the strongest point from AFF (HEALTH) was not able to flow through the case as well, thus the negative points on parasocial experience and enjoyment lead to their victory

1st Aff: Chris Ebude

Feedback: **Compliment: Good points on Health and depression, they were strong. Improvement: you need to provide and argue definitions more, the negative gave definitions which hurt your case.**

2nd Aff: n/a

Feedback: **n/a**

1st Neg: Hunter Brown

Feedback: **Compliment: good use of analogies, they were very helpful in making your case engaging. Improvement: elaborate more when using terms like "capitalist mindset" Socialists can also value productivity! The question is why productivity is important and who is it for, this elaboration could have helped that point hit hard.**

2nd Neg: n/a

Feedback: **n/a**

Round: Elims

Judge Wesley Loofbourrow

**Aff Team: Seattle U Chris Uzochukwu-Chris Uzochukwu vs
Neg Team: U Nevada Reno Saiya Brandon-Lowe-Hunter
Brown**

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: AFF proves binge watching constitutes a viable threat to health and well-being, as neuro-transmitters are released during binges that reinforce the addiction pathways in the brain, in addition to the ever-present risk of losing out on your sleep.

1st Aff: Chris

Feedback: **In rounds like this where the topic selected is a more relaxed, low on the "formalization" meter, a far cry from our usual obsession with extinction, the importance of explicitly labeling debate terms to provide overt structure, perhaps counter-intuitively, is nearly at its highest point.**

2nd Aff: Chris

Feedback: **In rounds like this where the topic selected is a more relaxed, low on the "formalization" meter, a far cry from our usual obsession with extinction, the importance of explicitly labeling debate terms to provide overt structure, perhaps counter-intuitively, is nearly at its highest point.**

1st Neg: Hunter

Feedback: **In rounds like this where the topic selected is a more relaxed, low on the "formalization" meter, a far cry from our usual obsession with**

extinction, the importance of explicitly labeling debate terms to provide overt structure, perhaps counter-intuitively, is nearly at its highest point.

2nd Neg: Hunter

Feedback: In rounds like this where the topic selected is a more relaxed, low on the "formalization" meter, a far cry from our usual obsession with extinction, the importance of explicitly labeling debate terms to provide overt structure, perhaps counter-intuitively, is nearly at its highest point.

Round: Elims

Judge Bob Glenn

Aff Team: Seattle U Chris Uzochukwu- Winner vs Neg Team: Nevada Reno Jacob Labar-Sonia James

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Aff does a better job of showing impacts regarding climate change. Neg could have won if Prima Facie issues with case were cited and noted in the constructive speeches. Good use of evidence and analysis by Aff. Neg needs to use all their time and be sure to equally divide duties for cross exam and speeches.

1st Aff: Chris

Feedback: **Solid analysis and use of evidence. Be sure all parts of your case are presented in 1AC (e.g. your plan).**

2nd Aff: Chris

Feedback: **Solid analysis and strong summary of your key arguments in the rebuttal.**

1st Neg: Jacob

Feedback: **Excellent use of evidence. Try to also clash directly with case in that first speech. I liked your delivery and organization.**

2nd Neg: Sonia

Feedback: **Good delivery style. Try to run DA's in your speech and take your turn doing cross exam without being prompted by your judge.**

Round: Elims

Judge Bob Glenn

**Aff Team: Sara Owens and Logan Brock Tennessee Tech vs
Neg Team: Kyle Heideman and Garrett Kieser Murray State**

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Neg proves that the two approaches are equal in value and benefits. Mass production costs emphasize the need and value for binging. I liked Aff case but cover all contentions in 1AC rather than across two constructives. Good use of evidence by Negative and a solid link to the value criteria of Quality of Life.

1st Aff: Sara Owens

Feedback: **Excellent organization. Solid delivery style. Get all 4 contentions in 1AC. Good answers in CX.**

2nd Aff: Logan Brock

Feedback: **You were very organized. Provided some excellent analysis. Work to highlight voters in your last rebuttal. Nice job in your first debate.**

1st Neg: Kyle H

Feedback: **Excellent analysis and clash with Aff Case structure. Sorry your camera didn't work.**

2nd Neg: Garrett Kieser

Feedback: **Calm and thoughtful approach to attacking case. Your rebuttal was excellent. Number your voting issues in 2NR.**

Round: Elims

Judge Brett Feinstein

Aff Team: Idaho State--Ciara Gaches and Issac Brambilla vs Neg Team: William Heyler and Gavin Sunderland

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The sheer weight and quality of the aff case prevailed here and had good linkage to their value of equity. Aff brought strong evidence of deep problems in the death penalty system by noting the number of botched executions that may have resulted in cruel and unusual punishment, and by noting that some individuals who were executed were later found to be innocent. Aff also did a good job of rebutting negs claim of the deterrent value of the death penalty and pointing out that the neg's position on the death penalty being favored in areas with inherently higher crime rates lacked data.

To neg's credit, they had some solid contentions including putting forward the idea that the death penalty can be improved rather than scrapped, including through finding methods that reduce the chance for painful and extended deaths, but neg was unable to provide any extension of that argument. And to be honest, I think the neg side of the resolution is very difficult to successfully debate on logic and data with support of the death penalty being driven far more by emotion than reason it seems.

Finally as I noted in my oral comments, I gave my win to the aff with reservation. I observed some unsportsmanlike giggling and other similar behavior when neg was speaking, Aff is comprised of two very talented debaters--and I say that seeing a LOT of rounds--and has no need to engage in these sort of rude behavior to be successful. They have the chops to compete with grace and sportsmanship. On a closer ballot and with another judge, these things might have dropped them on a ballot they would have otherwise won.

1st Aff: Ciara Gaches

Feedback: You are a very talented debater and have all the skills necessary to compete successfully at the open level. Your opening speech was well-organized and delivered persuasively with good use of voice and gestures.

Your questions in cross examination were on target and harvested additional information that you used effectively in rebuttal. I especially liked how you smoothly integrated your strong use of sources into the body of the speech in a way that gave them the needed context.

In addition to working on the sportsmanship issue noted above--which you are WAY too talented to use--I would make sure you are boring in consistently on the key issues. When you are clearly outpacing an opponent, focusing on the sample size of the Pew survey is just not a productive use of speaking time. There were far bigger fish to chase. Stay focused on the material that make or break the outcome.

2nd Aff: Issac Brambilla

Feedback: You made a very strong opening speech, laying out the themes and contentions that drove your teams arguments through the entire round. You hit on all the key themes to win--the botched executions, the innocent man executions, the racial disparities in the death penalty, and more. You walked the case through perfectly leaving few holes for the neg right out of the gate. In rebuttal you continued to do what needed to be done. You pushed aside the arguments from the neg and restated a case that did not get attacked hard and brought it home.

As I mentioned in your teammates comment, in addition to working on the sportsmanship issue noted above--which you are WAY too talented to use--I would make sure you are boring in consistently on the key issues. When you are clearly outpacing an opponent, focusing on the sample size of the Pew survey is just not a productive use of speaking time. There were far bigger fish to chase. Stay focused on the material that make or break the outcome. Also, I would pay attention to your focus relative to the camera. Many times while speaking you were looking away from both your camera and any notes...as if you were talking to someone in the room. That can be a little disconcerting and offputting. Won't cost a round, but it might undermine the persuasive impact of your speech.

1st Neg: William Wyler

Feedback: You had some good arguments in spite of being on the tough side of the debate. Your discussion of public opinion remaining in favor of the death penalty was salient and you made a novel and interesting point about the relative merits of seeking equity for an individual on death row

versus seeking the equity of justice and punishment that society often demands. It was worthy of extention.

I do think the aff was able to rebut the deterrence argument effectively and that created some real problems. I also know that some of the behavior of the aff was distracting and that was unfortunate although I don't think it really changed the outcome. I know this was your last round as a college debater and I wish it could have closed out on a better note. I wish you luck in your future endeavors.

2nd Neg: Gavin Sunderland

Feedback: Fighting on the tough end of the resolution you made some really interesting points. In particular, your argument that the death penalty can be improved to reduce errors in administration had some value--while I did not vote on this since it was not mentioned in the round, I would note that Oklahoma is looking at a new method to address this.

I disagree with your statement under CX that you do not have a burden in the neg to show data. You always have the burden to substantiate your contentions with evidence to back up your analysis. And you did have the Pew data which got tangled up unnecessarily on all sides over the sample size question. Finally, I am aware that some of the antics from the aff may have impacted performance although I also think it was not the deciding factor.

Round: Elims

Judge Brett Feinstein

Aff Team: Tennessee Tech--Sara Owens and Logan Brook vs Neg Team: Murray State--Kyle Heideman and Garrett Kieser

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: I have to give it to the aff. They made the most out of the side of a resolution that was almost impossible to win--or at least I cannot see a way through it. But once the neg brought forth the analysis that a "<" creates an all or nothing scenario--and the analysis was on point, aff didn't have anywhere to go. "<=" (I don't know how to type the actual symbol for greater than or equal) would have opened up a lot more avenues for aff to battle on a more equal footing, but they gave it their all.

But that analysis from neg sealed the deal for them. Once aff was thrown in that box, there was no way out. Ballot for neg.

1st Aff: Sarah Owens

Feedback: The fact that you came up with four contentions to open the round (albeit with two of them fully argued in the 2AC), you came in with more ammo than I would have either anticipated or could have done myself. The problem becomes that realistically the serious impacts you lay out either don't really exist or are such outliers to reality. And that is the problem with this kind of resolution for the aff. You are grasping at straws for something that is sort of murky and inherently not that impactful on most people. I think you and your partner did all that you could do with this, but when the other side holds a trump card that basically shuts down any real avenue to rebut, the game is over. No need to be sad over your performance. I am not sure you could have done much more--and even if you had, I don't think there was a way to win once the neg did the obvious analysis that made this an all or nothing proposition.

2nd Aff: Logan Brook

Feedback: It is very hard for me to wrap my arms around the idea that this was your first tournament. You were really good. And its a little sad that you will soon graduate making this your ONLY tournament. Four years of competition would have made you a force of nature in this discipline. I would have enjoyed seeing what kind of debater you could have been with a couple of season of gametime under your belt, because you started at a very high level of performance.

With the tough side of the resolution I think that you, like Sarah, did what you could. I really thought your argument about savoring the individual episode to really appreciate it was an unexpected take that had some resonance. And I do think you made an interesting point about cliffhangers needing that time and space to boil while you wait for the next season. But there was no real way to answer negs' analysis that turned the resolution into an all or nothing proposition. You fought as well as you could, but there was no way out of that trap. I wish you every success in your post-college endeavors.

1st Neg: Kyle Heideman

Feedback: Nice job in this round. You did everything you needed to do in your constructive and rebuttal. I thought tying this to personal choice and making it a value round was unexpected, but it worked very nicely, especially when coupled with the analysis that the resolution was an all or nothing proposition for the aff. You also made a strong tactical choice when you pushed aff to show some examples of their harms to move them from the theoretical to reality.

I know I am supposed to give you something to work on--other than getting your camera fixed :)--but I just don't see a lot in my notes for this round. Once you and your partner trapped the aff in your analysis, you did exactly what you needed to in order to bring it home.

2nd Neg: Garrett Kieser

Feedback: Nice to have your last round of your college career a tournament title. Congratulations. I don't have much to say that would differ from the comments I gave to Kyle. You were both in sync in terms of applying the all-or-nothing analysis that made the round a done deal fairly early. As

most of my comments to Kyle apply to you as well, here are the relevant pieces:

You did everything you needed to do in your constructive and rebuttal. I thought tying this to personal choice and making it a value round was unexpected, but it worked very nicely, especially when coupled with the analysis that the resolution was an all or nothing proposition for the aff. You also made a strong tactical choice when you pushed aff to show some examples of their harms to move them from the theoretical to reality.

I know I am supposed to give you something to work on but I just don't see a lot in my notes for this round. Once you and your partner trapped the aff in your analysis, you did exactly what you needed to in order to bring it home.

Best of luck as in your post-college endeavors.