

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

OakPar CB	POINTS (20 - 30)
Chase Bezonsky	29

NEG

Valenc NR	POINTS (20 - 30)
Nia Rasul	27

Winner: OakPar - Bezonsky debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: C. Goodman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The aff case was more logical & focused more on values. The neg offered no evidence of public health involvement increasing or not improving the problem. Aff had ample citations and evidence. Neg evidence was vague and generalized. Aff clearly said that criminal activity would still be punishable, but the neg didn't accept that. Neg said public health wouldn't deal with items like housing, but they do offer more than just rehab services. Neg used Colorado as an example of increased crime, but there's no evidence to show that it's the result of legal drugs versus illegal drugs. No evidence that the status quo has been effective by the neg's own admission. Aff offered examples from other countries - Neg had no evidence to show that public health involvement contributed to higher crime. Aff had evidence that deterrent is not a factor. You're both very capable and knowledgeable. Good debate

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

OakPar CN	POINTS (20 - 30)
Charlie Nicks	27

NEG

Valenc MM	POINTS (20 - 30)
Mason McBride	27.5

Winner: Valencia- McBride School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: C. Goodman

Comments & Reason for Decision: I didn't take many notes during the aff construct because it was almost verbatim the same argument as your teammate I had just judged. It was unfortunate that one of you lacked originality. I object to my student telling & questioning my review with statements like "I if you believe morality..." Don't tell me what I HAVE to do. I'll make that decision. I also found the aff somewhat rude by talking over the neg in cross & rebuttal every letting him finish a sentence. The aff had some good points about the neg addressing Big Pharma and not the ~~users~~ users. But the neg won on a few points - that declaring opioid abuse a public health emergency has not abated the problem and structural racism by public health, which cannot be dismissed.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

Valenc AS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Alexander Swift	27

NEG

LaCana PK	POINTS (20 - 30)
Paul Kang	27.50

Winner: LaCana PK School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Joshua Qin

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:

speaking too fast with hiccups during speaking
Slow in responding to Neg
Went over time twice
Weak in cross-examination
Contention point dropped during cross-examination

Neg:

Questions in cross-examination to the points
Contention 1 about drug cartel is persuasive
Singapore example is very compelling
time management is good & very ~~clear~~ clear in speaking

Point Scale:

30	... Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24	... Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL

Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

LaCana SH	POINTS (20 - 30)
Stephanie Hwang	27

NEG

LyceeFra VS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Victoria Simeran	26.50

Winner: LaCana SH School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Joshua Qin

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:
 speaking pace is ideal
 evidences support the contentions
 need to manage time better

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Neg:
 Not well prepared in this round or topic
 used only about 4 mins of 7 in the Negative Constructive
 used only 2 and half mins of 6 in Negative Rebuttal
 No supporting evidences or value criteria for the contentions.

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

LyceeFra IR	POINTS (20 - 30)
Isabella Ranzlov	27

NEG

Valenc AC	POINTS (20 - 30)
Aljohn Cabuang	28

Winner: Valenc AC debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Thirupethi Melipedi

Comments & Reason for Decision:

DR: → should have prepared case, do more homework
 not having much evidence.

AC: - Prepared case very well.
 has evidence prove his points.
 countered all Aff reasoning for the topic.

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes	✓
Cross-Examination 3 minutes	✓
Negative Constructive 7 minutes	✓
Cross-Examination 3 minutes	✓
First Affirmative Rebuttal	. 4 minutes	✓
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes	✓
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes	✓
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater	

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

OakPar AR	POINTS (20 - 30)
Anusha Rao	29

NEG

GraHil SA	POINTS (20 - 30)
Susanna Andriasian	29.5

Winner: GraHil debating on the NEG Low point win? _____
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)
Signature: Andrea Francis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Arguments very strong for both AFF/NEG. AFF had difficult burden by defining mutual exclusivity of criminal justice vs. rehabilitation and lacked evidence showing why this dominates blended/status quo; Also, subpoint that drug use doesn't harm that is, it's victimless outside user-can't be supported - thus, NEG's arguments supporting criminal justice flow on these points. NEG's rebuttal of \$ resources was not clear and conflating already existing public and private health care systems. Both contentions well supported. Criteria for CJ evident and response to maintain both not addressed by AFF.

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

OakPar KZ	POINTS (20 - 30)
Kristyn Zhang	29

NEG

Brentw PS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Paola Santos	29.5

Winner: Brentw PS School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
 Signature: Andrea Francis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF's no harms assumption in contention one against criminal justice not supported. NEG's Colorado example provides opposite and evidence of increased crimes/harm resulting from decriminalization. NEG meshes and argument against exclusivity well supported. AFF gives limited evidence supporting public health paradigm superior/ Supp. value criteria over combined system/status quo.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

LaCana NC	POINTS (20 - 30)
Nadia Chung	28.5

NEG

Acaof NY	POINTS (20 - 30)
Nicole Yamachika	28

Winner: Nadia Chung School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Nishita Bhinde

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good Rebuttals and clarity in dissection of Neg's case.
Neg had good Criteria's and contentions
however both could have had more depth in ~~case~~ the case.

Point Scale:

30	... Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	... Excellent.
28	... Above average.
27	... Average.
26	... Below average.
25	... Significantly below average.
20-24	... Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive	... 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

Brentw MS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Michelle Shirzadnia	26

NEG

LaCana AL	POINTS (20 - 30)
Ashly Lam	27

Winner: LaCana AL School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Nishita Bhinde

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff had a good case but read her case from laptop. Rebuttals were weak. More consistent approach to entire case is needed.

Neg - had good cross examination and had a more structured case.

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

LyceeFra SA	POINTS (20 - 30)
Satya Amin	27

NEG

SieCan JP	POINTS (20 - 30)
Jonathan Pfeffer	28

Winner: Jonathan Pfeffer debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:
She had a very calm way of speaking and emphasized key points in order to better convey her arguments. She also spoke at a good pace, not too fast or too slow.

Neg:
The negation debater had stronger evidence and displayed more understanding and organization of his contentions.

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL

Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

LaCana WJu	POINTS (20 - 30)
Winnie Jung	28

NEG

Taft AH	POINTS (20 - 30)
Alex Honcharenko	26

Winner: LACANA WJU School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF - RELEVANT & LOGICAL CLAIMS REINFORCED; EFFECTIVE SUPPORT IN CITEs & NARR OF POSITION

NEG - COULD HAVE OWN CLAIM ~~REINFORCED~~ REINFORCED; TRY TO USE ^{MORE} FACTS, NOT CONJECTURE

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.

Half-points are allowed.

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

OakPar KM	POINTS (20 - 30)
Komal Masipeddi	28

NEG

Taft MG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Masina Garonzik	27

Winner: OakPar KM School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF- VERY PERSUASIVE, EFFECTIVE USE OF CITATIONS
NEG- VERY GOOD CASE; TRY TO SUPPORT YOUR POSITION
RATHER THAN OPPOSE OPPONENTS

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

OakPar DL	POINTS (20 - 30)
Denham Lipetzky	27

NEG

ValInt JP	POINTS (20 - 30)
Jackson Paluck	29

Winner: JACKSON PALUCK - VALINT debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: 

JACKSON DID A GOOD JOB OF MAKING HIS CASE WHILE ALSO SUMMARIZING

Comments & Reason for Decision:

HIS OPPONENTS. HE WAS EXTREMELY CONFIDENT, VERY ON POINT AND ON TIME. HE QUESTIONED HIS OPPONENT AND ASKED FOR SUBSTANTIATION

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

DENHAM STARTED OUT STRONG ALTHOUGH SPOKE WAY TOO FAST. I UNDERSTOOD HIS POINTS MORE WHEN JACKSON REBUTTED AND QUESTIONED. HIS MAIN POINT WAS THAT THE WAY TO STOP ILLEGAL DRUG USE WAS TO DISCONNECT DEALERS FROM USERS

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

OakPar FD	POINTS (20 - 30)
Frank Ding	28

NEG

LaCana RGu	POINTS (20 - 30)
Rishi Gupta	27

Winner: FRANK DING - OAKPAR debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

FRANK WAS VERY WELL ORGANIZED, EASY TO FOLLOW. HE MADE SEVERAL GREAT POINTS AND WAS VERY GOOD DURING CROSS-EX.

RISHI DIDNT SEEM TO BE AS ORGANIZED. ALSO SPENT MORE TIME TALKING ABOUT WHY FRANK'S ARGUMENTS WERENT VALID INSTEAD OF MAKING HIS OWN POINTS.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes	✓
Cross-Examination	3 minutes	✓
Negative Constructive	7 minutes	✓
Cross-Examination	3 minutes	✓
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes	✓
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes	✓
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes	✓
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater	

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
OakPar HH	POINTS (20-30)
Hadia Hamza	29

NEG	
LaCana CL	POINTS (20-30)
Connor Lee	28

Winner: Hadia Hamza debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Deborah Gerber

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Hadia - Good definitions, confident, well thought out arguments
 arguments make sense, prepared!
 to keep drug user out of jail
 and receive assistance instead
 good speaking speed/eye contact
 Criminal justice isn't working
 - examples where criminal justice is
 working in other Countries.
 - examples of rehabilitation helping
 6 minute time exactly achieved - good timing!

Cross - good come back answers, questioned sources & (nice!) definitions

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.

Half-points are allowed.

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

Connor - Cross questions thoughtful
 discussion of retribution done well

perfect timing

prep time: 1:45
 2:15

- speech speed rate too fast
- majority must be helpful, not just individuals
- must realize illegal drugs must be treated as such.
- emphasized public health not criminal justice, both important
- Not reason for criminals to stop if no punishment - good point!

Hadia (rebuttal)

- refuted source reliability
- advocates for life for every individual
- drug use will continue in jail
- Criminal justice is immoral, aggravates

Connor (rebuttal)

- points made not rebutted on Aff. side - point made
- evidence given from Portugal redefined
- jail / rehabilitation debate presented again
- solving issues for each individual not possible not economical, not enough space available in jail and/or rehab facility.

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
Acaof SJ	POINTS (20 - 30)
Soren. Jensen	28

NEG	
OakPar HD	POINTS (20 - 30)
Harshitha Dasari	28.5

Winner: Harshitha Dasari debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No
 School/Team

Signature: Deborah Gerber

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Soren - good definitions, public health approach
 - ~~only~~ 11% become addicted to illegal drugs
 - overcrowding in jails, families suffer
 - not cost effective, not fair to multiple races
 - people coming out of jail can't get jobs
 economic, philosophical benefits
 addiction, sellers are addicted too
 treat everyone equally
 drugs can't be taken away but users should
 get treated to minimize it.
 Crimes should be dealt with too not just drug
 charge.

Harshitha - rebuttal: racism ^{is} in system, not laws
 (don't interrupt)
 7 min: good definitions and examples for criminal justice
 - combination of jail and rehabilitation works

pain killers are not a choice

Prep time:
 1:42
 2:58

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

Preptime:
 2:00
 2:00

passionate
 - best protect innocent against taliban, drug cartels
 - good sources stated to present case
 - rehab does not work as most relapse (30% relapse)
 - lives matter more than money
 Racism exists everywhere, not just in laws and system
 rebuttal: people are racist not laws themselves
 children suffer greatly due to drug user parents
 Applying policies from other countries won't work
 due to different cultures, economic ability, etc.
 Stopping source of drug problem is the
 answer.

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

LycFra MS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Muna Shamee	27

NEG

OakPar NA	POINTS (20 - 30)
Nitin Ankareddy	27

Winner: Muna Shamee debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative gave good evidence with passion, and was good at not only rebutting but integrating the rebuttal into her further arguments, and turning them on their heads. A bit of stumbling over words in the ~~beginning~~ ^{start} but became more confident as the debate continued. A few "uhs" during cross, but very passionate speaker, with great body language and eye contact. Great use of evidence!

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.

Half-points are allowed.

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

Negative seemed to read many definitions, but spoke so fast and only in one tonation that instead of helping his cause, the effect was lost. Great evidence, e.g. Taliban, etc. but ~~debat~~ ^{debate} speeches would benefit from pausing after major "hurt" points (murder, rape, etc) and change in inflection to drive points home. I can see the beginning of a great debater! Good eye contact and confidence was not consistent, and speech lacked passion. Mechanics of the debate were great and the road map was appreciated.

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	POINTS
Valenc AC	(20 - 30)
Aljohn Cabuang	27

NEG	POINTS
OakPar CB	(20 - 30)
Chase Bezonsky	30

Winner: Oak Par CB/Bezonsky School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This was an interesting subject & you both had a solid argument but I feel there was a clear winner here. The Neg went largely unrefuted on the contention that "no criminal justice" meant no incarceration. I was waiting for the Aff to address this but did not hear it. All in all, the Neg just had a stronger, more well-thought out case. I want to commend Chase on a nearly flawless round. You understand you are attempting to convince a judge rather than debate your opponent. Excellent engagement, eye-contact, body language. You have a calm, measured yet persuasive tone. Excellent cross-examination. Your questions did not allow him to promote his side. Excellent work!! Aljohn, I would urge you to slow down on your constructive especially when you are making a contention. There were several times when you were speaking so fast that I could not understand you. Stop to make eye contact on your main points! I know you have a lot to get in, but if I can't follow, your point is lost anyway. Good luck moving forward!

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding, likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.

Half-points are allowed.

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
LaCana CL	POINTS (20 - 30)
Connor Lee	28

NEG	
OakPar AR	POINTS (20 - 30)
Anusha Rao	29

Winner: Oak Par AR / Rao debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Excellent round and very strong arguments on both sides, but the Neg had an important point that I felt was not refuted. It is the contention that the Aff's case included the fact that any criminal prosecution must be removed. (By definition). I did not hear Aff refute this + because it came up in a earlier round I was listening for it. Aff, when you are making a contention (Point A, B, C, etc.) slow down and make eye contact! I need to hear it clearly or I will struggle to catch up to the point you are trying to make. Also don't say "I don't know." during a round. Your opponent had information that Portugal had a public health care system + appeared more well informed. Neg -- great job on this and on your cross examination. You did an almost perfect round except for one thing: when the timer goes off, don't ask for permission to wrap up. Just do it quickly + with confidence. Good luck with the rest of your rounds!

Point Scale:

30	... Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	... Excellent.
28	... Above average.
27	... Average.
26	... Below average.
25	... Significantly below average.
20-24	... Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.

Half-points are allowed.

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
Brentw PS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Paola Santos	28

NEG	
LaCana SH	POINTS (20 - 30)
Stephanie Hwang	27

Winner: Brent w Paola Santos debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: T. Meyer

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

- Good speaking
- For me the observation is useless. ~~For me~~ saying spec. examples aren't required, but using them is contradictory. If you want to delink from the burden of providing a policy/plan then just run a simple obs. saying that.
- Work on extending the arguments you are winning on to more impacts to flow through.

Neg

- Good vocal variety and organization
- Work on cross Ex. questions. Instead of going line by line asking what you need to rebut, try to trap your opponent with your questions.
- Almost non response to racism, focus on how it happens in both worlds, so it isn't a justification to affirm

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.

Half-points are allowed.

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
LaCana RGu	POINTS (20 - 30)
Rishi Gupta	26

NEG	
Valenc AS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Alexander Swift	28.5

Winner: Valenc Alexander Swift debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Tim Meyer

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

- You really need to work on organization. In your constructive you move all over the places bring up Portugal like 5 times outside of your Portugal contention, and in rebuttals you constantly shift to different arguments.
- Get a new approach to CX. Don't just ask if he rebutted an argument, try to trap him logically
- The case needs more solvency. You bring up a lot of impacts in your second contention, but don't extend any solvency for it.

Neg

- Decrim. argument was primary wter.
- Work on framework debate - address theirs and link your case back to yours
- Slow down and make sure you are clear.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
Valenc NR	POINTS (20 - 30)
Nia Rasul	26

NEG	
OakPar PS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Prisha Suresh	28

Winner: Prisha School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Nia - Overall I think you had solid arguments. Issues were presented and delivery the counter argument. Neg introduced an argument that this was a black or white debate that covered consequences of drug use and you never challenged that notion. It should have been clearly challenged early and often. You also never challenged on Neg's argument of ineffective treatment. Your overall arguments were good, but by not effectively challenging, you let Neg's arguments carry more weight. Lastly, you have a tendency to talk faster and louder as your arguments suffer. It undermines your points.

Prisha - Very solid in delivery + argument. While I didn't personally agree with your arguments, you stated them very clearly, supported them well and never allowed Aff to undermine them. I thought you had the more difficult position to defend but handled it very well. You also spoke consistently and clearly, so you were easy to understand. You figured out a clear position and supported it well.

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:


Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
ValInt JP	POINTS (20 - 30)
Jackson Paluck	28

NEG	
LaCana NC	POINTS (20 - 30)
Nadia Chung	27

Winner: Jackson School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No
 Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I thought you both did a really solid job. I think Nadia had the better overall presentation style, but Jackson had the better overall argument. He was able to establish his position and defend it well. I thought he also did a better job challenging Nadia's contentions and making his case.

Jackson gets a little too fast paced and goes heavier on facts than I personally prefer. He could spend more time on his logic and arguments and become even more effective.

Nadia speaks very well and calmly and better communicates her points. I just think in this case the arguments were not the best and did not hold up well to Jackson's arguments.

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

LyceeFra IR	POINTS (20 - 30)
Isabella Ranzlov	27

NEG

Acaof SJ	POINTS (20 - 30)
Soren. Jensen	28

Winner: Soren, Jensen debating on the Neg. Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Mr. Patin

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- The affirmation case was well structured. The links to the criteria are mostly present within the case.
- Informative statistics.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

- The negative case offense was solid with the benefit of additional affirmative points offered.
- Arguments were clear and to the point - strong logical evaluation.

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.


AFF

Valenc MM	POINTS (20 - 30)
Mason McBride	28.5

NEG

LycFra MS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Muna Shamee	28

Winner: Mason McBride debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- ~~Negative~~ Great Presentation -
- The issue of clean needles and relationship to Criminal Justice was not well addressed.
- Nice job on value of Justice in Providing Safety for the families and Community. Nice Pace.
- The ~~negative~~ ^{affirmative} Criterion of Slavery and its relationship to Criminal Justice was not clear.
- The needle contention was well presented and defended well.
- Great Speed and fluency - Try not to appear too aggressive when rebutting.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.

Half-points are allowed.

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
OakPar HD	POINTS (20 - 30)
Harshitha Dasari	28.5

NEG	
Brentw MS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Michelle Shirzadnia	25

Winner: OakPar HD School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Susan Baggs

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: AFF countered and rebuilt arguments more effectively
 Neg dropped several points, and did not maximize time (1 min. cross, 3 min. rebuttal)
 Notes: Neg could have defended point on Dropout rates in voluntary rehab (which AFF glossed over), but did not

** Ideas: Social contract → need to define WHICH version is most appropriate
 Neg → may want to use broken windows theory
 → also, attacking "no harms" with evidence that many in for "drug crimes" have pled down from more serious crimes
 Aff → assumes JAIL = criminal justice → this can be opened up

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	... 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	... 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
Taft AH	POINTS (20 - 30)
Alex Honcharenko	26

NEG	
OakPar CN	POINTS (20 - 30)
Charlie Nicks	27.5

Winner: OakPar CN School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Susan Baggs

Comments & Reason for Decision:

REF: Surprisingly close, as the AFF conceded too much too early. NEG had trouble fully articulating arguments → mitral tags were usually clear, but then fell apart by the end. AFF did defend some, but really couldn't dig out of the hole (also needed utilize time more)

Point Scale:	
30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Notes: AFF → argument of 'we don't know it doesn't work until we throw it at it doesn't work without evidence to connect it'

Speech Times:	
Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

NEG → most opponents will not cede that much in the definition → it's kind of non-refutable
 → Delivery → CAREFUL, especially in cross-x → way too aggressive for room and opponent and arguments given
 → need to listen to questions (or at least pretend to), otherwise A telegraphs not as strong so much as rude.

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

GraHil SA	POINTS (20 - 30)
Susanna Andriasian	27.5

NEG

LyceeFra SA	POINTS (20 - 30)
Satya Amin	26

Winner: GraHil School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both debaters were very prepared & passionate. Great energy.

Aff's arg's were detailed & supported by facts. Neg's arg's did not have a lot of factual support & she spent more time stating historical facts, for example, about cartels, then using those facts to support any argument.

Aff - could have used more eye contact in constructive part & was a little bit condescending & over-aggressive w/ opponent. But overall very positive energy & devotion to the position.

Neg - to avoid being distracted, you might want to keep your hair back. Develop arguments more fully. Dealt very well w/ aggression from opponent - kept your ~~self~~ cool.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.


AFF

OakPar NA	POINTS (20 - 30)
Nitin Ankareddy	27

NEG

LaCana WJu	POINTS (20 - 30)
Winnie Jung	28

Winner: LaCana School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides had a lot of good research & made compelling arguments.

Aff did not make great responses to Neg's attacks, using facts. But the passion & the reasoning were good.

Neg was very dialed in & made good points & in particular used facts effectively to refute Aff's arguments. I think you should work on not interrupting during the cross. Let them answer, then argue! But overall, very good organization & demeanor.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater


DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
Taft MG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Masina Garonzik	29

NEG	
GraHil AS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Ayush Saha	28 1/2

Winner: GraHil AS School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Y

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF DID NOT ADEQUATELY REFUTE
NEG'S COMBO APPROACH. to ^{deal with} illegal use of drugs

NEG stressed repeatedly unregulated nature of PWT treatment facilities. AFF did not adequately rebut early enough a challenge hard enough

NEG used an anecdotal horror story of an unscrupulous rehab operator that AFF did not expose as being an appeal to fear & ~~not~~ ^{not} challenge the implied "zero" tolerance to abuses in P.H. route.

Both spoke quickly;
NEG spoke more than quickly, made ^{repeatedly} citation absences a distraction to subsequent arguments

Nevertheless, NEG's advocacy of a Combo approach, drug treatment and prison, not "or," was not overcome by AFF.

Point Scale:

30	... Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	... Excellent.
28	... Above average.
27	... Average.
26	... Below average.
25	... Significantly below average.
20-24	... Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019


Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

LaCana PK	POINTS (20 - 30)
Paul Kang	28

NEG

OakPar DL	POINTS (20 - 30)
Denham Lipetzky	27

Winner: OakPar DL School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? X
 Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF DID NOT ADEQUATELY REFUTE NEG'S COMBO APPROACH to illegal use of drugs

~~NEG~~
 NEG Asserted a combined approach, Criminal Justice system with a treatment component.

AFF did not counter combo approach effectively, instead asserted that the neg has an unfair advantage if AFF's argument can be incorporated into NEG's Combo argument

NEG argued heavily for CJ to address profiteers (cartels, terrorist drug sellers, etc) which was off topic since "use" is the topic.

AFF did not challenge NEG's error but attempted to refute it as if it were on topic

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

NEG'S Advocacy of a combo approach, drug treatment AND prison, not "or," was not overcome by AFF.

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
SieCan JP	POINTS (20 - 30)
Jonathan Pfeffer	28

NEG	
OakPar FD	POINTS (20 - 30)
Frank Ding	28.5

Winner: OakPar FD School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: v. Nyh

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Frank
 + Efficient construct of debate points
 + to see layout of debate coverage.

Improvements

- Can calm down in the Rebuttal. Focus energy on the respective Rebuttal sections.

Jonathan

+ Excellent articulation
 + Effective cross questioning.

Improvements

- Can work on the sequencing of construct

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
Acaof NY	POINTS (20 - 30)
Nicole Yamachika	28.5

NEG	
OakPar KM	POINTS (20 - 30)
Komal Masipeddi	28

Winner: Acaof NY School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: V. Nyl

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Komal M

- + Great articulation & construct
- + Very crisp and clear. Eyecontact

Improvements

- Repetitive definition points.
- focus on addressing gaps in opponent construct.

Nicoley

- + Great construct, excellent articulation
- + clear Eyecontact & focus
- + Empathy towards the opponent.

Improvements

- Keep going well, more energy can take heights.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

LaCana AL	POINTS (20 - 30)
Ashly Lam	27

NEG

OakPar HH	POINTS (20 - 30)
Hadia Hamza	28

Winner: OAK PAR HH School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF VERY GOOD DEBATER. GOOD RESEARCH ON A DIFFICULT SUBJECT. SPEAKS A LITTLE FAST. A LITTLE SLOWER WOULD BE NICE. REVIEWING WITH TEAM MEMBERS, OUT LOUD, WOULD HELP.

NEG VERY GOOD DEBATER. GOOD RESEARCH ON A DIFFICULT SUBJECT. GOOD JOB FOLLOWING OPPONENTS POINTS. GOOD KNOWLEDGE OF L.D. DEBATE CRITERIA

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

LyceeFra VS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Victoria Simeran	27

NEG

OakPar KZ	POINTS (20 - 30)
Kristyn Zhang	28

Winner: OAKPAR KZ School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF GOOD DEBATER, EXTENSIVE RESEARCH ON DIFFICULT SUBJECT, THINKS QUICKLY ON HER FEET. REPEATED REVIEWING SUBJECT WITH TEAM MATES WOULD MAKE THE INFORMATION MORE FAMILIAR TO THE SPEAKER. STANDING WITH COMPUTER SCREEN IN FRONT OF FACE MINIMIZES EFFECT.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.

Half-points are allowed.

NEG. GOOD DEBATER. QUICK THINKING ON FEET. A LOT OF GREAT RESEARCH. ABLE TO GLEAN INFORMATION ON THE SUBJECT FROM SOURCES. GOOD LISTENER, SAW THAT OPPONENT COULDN'T PROVIDE DEFINITIONS.

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

Brentw MS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Michelle Shirzadnia	27

NEG

LaCana CL	POINTS (20 - 30)
Connor Lee	28

Winner: LaCana CL School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Thirupethi Masipeddi

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Connor: → Very good speaker. He has lot of evidences for his case. Well prepared.
 Able to counter opponenit with examples why his case is better than opponit.

Michelle: - Should have prepared her case better, good at the information that she has.
 she has not used her allocated ~~pre~~ time in couple of rounds.
 Should counter opponenit with more examples.

Point Scale:

30	... Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24	... Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes	✓
Cross-Examination 3 minutes	✓
Negative Constructive 7 minutes	✓
Cross-Examination 3 minutes	✓
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes	✓
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes	✓
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes	✓
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater	

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
Valenc AS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Alexander Swift	27

NEG	
Brentw PS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Paola Santos	28

Winner: Paola Santos debating on the Neg. Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
 School/Team
 Signature: Bryan Palbaum

Comments & Reason for Decision:

It was difficult to follow the AFF's initial constructive debate due to the speed with which it was delivered. The neg. was ~~at~~ better able to articulate her points and did a strong job of eliminating the Portugal example. The AFF did a good job of pointing to items that the negative did not clearly refute such as Mexico. The Negative won due to her ability to focus on a specific theme of using all aspects of the justice system, some of which do provide treatment.

I would suggest both debaters slow down their talking speed to make sure the judge fully understands all of their arguments.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
Acaof NY	POINTS (20 - 30)
Nicole Yamachika	29

NEG	
LaCana SH	POINTS (20 - 30)
Stephanie Hwang	20

Winner: Nicole Yamachika debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Bryan Palbaum

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides did an excellent job in establishing their positions.

The AFF was very clear and logical in her position and her argument that the criminal justice system forces drugs to be distributed by gangs was very compelling. The AFF point that Travis harsh drug punishments yet increasing rate of drug use compelling and not refuted by the Neg. AFF also did a good job in refuting the Singapore example which the Neg. seemed to accept.

The Neg. made strong arguments by pointing out historical references that demonstrate when drug use is legalized, drug use actually increases and therefore is not a moral solution. The Neg also made a strong point by mentioning that the number of drug criminals is actually decreasing.

I would suggest both debaters slow down their talking speed to make sure the judge fully understands their arguments.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive . . .	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal . . .	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal . . .	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

VallInt JP	POINTS (20 - 30)
Jackson Paluck	29

NEG

OakPar PS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Prisha Suresh	28

Winner: Jackson Paluck debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: P. Suresh Kumar

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The arguments made by AFF was more persuasive with more evidence. Both presented their case well.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

LyceeFra IR	POINTS (20 - 30)
Isabella Ranzlov	27

NEG

OakPar NA	POINTS (20 - 30)
Nitin Ankareddy	28

Winner: Nitin Ankareddy debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
 School/Team

Signature: P. Suresh Kumar

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~AFF~~ - ~~no show~~ Provided lot of data but the presentation ~~and~~ was long and hard to follow. Cross examination Neg was not very effective. closing argument were clear and concise

Neg: Provided ~~and~~ evidence of the discussion points, cross examination questions were good. statistics ~~about the dis~~ and argument presented were more persuasive

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

School/Team	POINTS (20 - 30)
LycFra MS	
Muna Shamee	27

NEG

School/Team	POINTS (20 - 30)
Acaof SJ	
Soren. Jensen	29

Winner: Acaof SJ School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Joshua Qin

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:

Contention 1 has wrong definition
Affirmative constructive opening used
only 3 mins of 6 mins, less prepared.
Was not able to address Neg's combined
approach of using Public Health and Criminal
Justice system together

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

Neg:

perfectly used ~~the~~ and managed time
was able to convince Aff's contention 1 is wrongly defined
All contentions are strong and persuasive
Combining Public Health and Criminal Justice System seemed
more effective and compelling.

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

Valenc NR	POINTS (20 - 30)
Nia Rasul	27

NEG

Taft AH	POINTS (20 - 30)
Alex Honcharenko	27.50

Winner: Taft AH School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win?

Signature: Joshua Qin

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:

Speaking with pauses
forgot to do cross-examination
Affirmative rebuttal is weak and not fluent
forgot one card brought up by Neg in the opening.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

Neg:

Speaking is very fluent
More supporting evidences & they are persuasive
Compelling points in negating the Aff's comparison of jail to slavery

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

LaCana WJu	POINTS (20 - 30)
Winnie Jung	28.5

NEG

OakPar HD	POINTS (20 - 30)
Harshitha Dasari	28

Winner: Winnie Jung/LaCana WJu debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision: Did a more thorough job w/ Rebuttal and challenging opponent's digressing from topic statement. Presented more compelling arguments

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

OakPar AR	POINTS (20 - 30)
Anusha Rao	28.5

NEG

LaCana AL	POINTS (20 - 30)
Ashly Lam	28

Winner: Anusha Rao / Oak Par AR debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

more succinct, offered more sources for her argument. Successfully rebutted opponent. Case was more clearly presented and argued

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

Room: MB 186
Flight 1 Start: 1:15 PM
Lincoln Douglas

3

Cristiano, Keiko

Oak Park

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL

Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

Taft MG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Masina Garonzik	28

NEG

LyceeFra VS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Victoria Simeran	27.5

Winner: Masina Garonzik debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team
Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both debaters were equally good.
However, the affirmation had more evidence making her case stronger.

Point Scale:

- 30 . . . Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
 - 29 Excellent.
 - 28 Above average.
 - 27 Average.
 - 26 Below average.
 - 25 Significantly below average.
 - 20-24 . . . Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
- Half-points are allowed.

Speech Times:

- Affirmative Constructive . . 6 minutes
- Cross-Examination 3 minutes
- Negative Constructive 7 minutes
- Cross-Examination 3 minutes
- First Affirmative Rebuttal . 4 minutes
- Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
- Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
- Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL

Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
LaCana PK	POINTS (20 - 30)
Paul Kang	28.5

NEG	
OakPar KZ	POINTS (20 - 30)
Kristyn Zhang	29

Winner: OakPar KZ debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Susan Baggs

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: Family even debate → nice!
 It ping-ponged fairly well, and both sides held ground
 At the end, NEG handled rebuttal better than
 AFF, especially in Aff's 2nd round not reestablish
 argument on illegal drug use vs. neglect as separate
 issues → probably the strongest argument, and brought
 in new argument (drug prices)

Point Scale:	
30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Notes/Ideas: Neg needs to bring up that many drug
 crimes are pled down from more serious crimes
 → When arguing that Portugal isn't practical
 to apply and that AFF applies it too broadly →
 kind of doing the same thing with the
 combo approach

Speech Times:	
Affirmative Constructive	... 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

AFF → Contention 2 = C + D (participating in society + minorities
 incarcerated disproportionately) → need to connect more to
 value

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
Valenc MM	POINTS (20 - 30)
Mason McBride	27

NEG	
OakPar FD	POINTS (20 - 30)
Frank Ding	27

Winner: Mason McBride debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This was tough to decide. Both presented good arguments that still missed major points in this debate at the national level.

However, I felt the Neg, while passionate and well researched on the evidence he used, was not as effective in countering the Aff's points. Aff was careful to point out & rebut all of Neg's main points, and reiterate his stance.

Aff - slow down initial speech. I know you want to fit it all in under the time limit, but not at the expense of being understood. However, you were passionate when it was appropriate and had good body language.

Neg - great job, though far too fast in some spots, making it hard to follow logic. Cross examination: instead of saying "what?" to questions, ask for clarification. However, I see beginning of a great debator - very passionate and well researched.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
Valenc AC	POINTS (20 - 30)
Aljohn Cabuang	28

NEG	
OakPar KM	POINTS (20 - 30)
Komal Masipeddi	28

Winner: Aljohn Cabuang debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
 School/Team

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This debate was interesting because both sides seemed to argue for the need for ~~the~~ the integration of public health and criminal justice system. However, the affirmative side had a better arsenal of evidence & was able to specifically rebut the negative more effectively.

Point Scale:	
30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Notes on speakers:

Aff: you went over time several times, ~~but~~ but in each speech and cross exam, you were clear and specific in your arguments. Nice body language and eye contact.

Speech Times:	
Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

Neg: You started so strong but seemed to lose confidence as the debate went on, and began to fidget by playing with your earrings. However, your voice was strong! Two phrases stuck out - "we don't need evidence" and "because this is important" without any evidence to support - always have some sort of evidence, and a strong way to end your argument. But, you were great at picking out value points with a lot of emotional for your audience - e.g. child welfare, maximizing lives.

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
School/Team	POINTS (20 - 30)
OakPar HH	
Hadia Hamza	28

NEG	
School/Team	POINTS (20 - 30)
GraHil AS	
Ayush Saha	27

Winner: OakPar HH School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff has a very clean, clear delivery

Neg = stand for CX. ~~Why are you~~
 why are you talking about
 solvency? This is LD.
 You say you'll weigh on
 morality → where is this?
 How does solve

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

RFD! Okay - let's start with weighing values. The values of morality and justice seem to equate to the same thing. So, you force me to weigh between utilitarianism and bidding life of critical harms. I was surprised by the practical arguments but they applied overall in terms of working out who provides best for life. I buy the aff argument that ~~we~~ we need to decrease critical harms since neg util is pleasure based but not absent harm. I think the aff and neg are working in two different arenas. Aff not solely looking at violent crime - ie smoking a joint vs. neg which is solely looking at crime committed leading to incarceration. That being the case aff actually covers more ground. Yes, private rehab is expensive, but both agree treatment is necessary beyond incarc. which weighs public health more moral.

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF	
LaCana NC	POINTS (20 - 30)
Nadia Chung	29

NEG	
OakPar CN	POINTS (20 - 30)
Charlie Nicks	29

Winner: OakPar CN School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Eleanor Nishioka

Comments & Reason for Decision:

overall, great debate. Both solid speakers so RFD comes down to just argument.

RFD: The debate focuses on the criminal justice system. The neg seems to establish that CJIS is forced rehab, and the aff seems to focus solely on the harms with incarceration itself whereas the neg. repeatedly attributes criminal justice to forced rehab. Because of this distinction that isn't truly refuted until the very end, there seems to be a distinction with voluntary on aff and forced on neg. The aff didn't refocus my attention on contention 3 forced rehab until the rebuttals, so it seemed new again. Hard decision. Had to really contemplate the details of this round. Yairs both great! But decision is neg.

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

OakPar CB	POINTS (20 - 30)
Chase Bezonsky	29

NEG

GraHil SA	POINTS (20 - 30)
Susanna Andriasian	28.5

Winner: Susanna Andriasian debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: Case was well structured with good references.
in an
Rebuttal was addressed in an organized manner.
Excellent Pace and Presentation

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.

Half-points are allowed.

Neg: Solid offense, good arguments against aff. contentions.

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

Feasability of Public Health approach was analyzed well.

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.


AFF

SieCan JP	POINTS (20 - 30)
Jonathan Pfeffer	28

NEG

OakPar DL	POINTS (20 - 30)
Denham Lipetzky	27.5

Winner: SieCan School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both debaters had very good constructive arguments + good facts + quotes to support them. Aff used logic quite well (If you say this, then you have to agree on that).

Neg's refutations of Aff's points were not as strong as Aff's refutations. However, the points about defining "use" as criminal traffickers "using" drugs to make money + the harm that drug use does to family members were great - very creative + convincing.

Aff's passion + ability to explain his arguments won the debate for him.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

AFF

LaCana RGu	POINTS (20 - 30)
Rishi Gupta	27.5

NEG

LyceeFra SA	POINTS (20 - 30)
Satya Amin	27

Winner: Rishi Gupta School/Team debating on the AF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Nishita Bhinde

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff- did well under cross examination and his rebuttal was good with an emphasis on technicalities of the case.

Neg- presented a good detailed contention and a moderately good rebuttal.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:


Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

OakPar AR (Anusha Rao) vs Vallnt JP (Jackson Paluck)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

OAK PAR AR _____ VALLNT JP _____
AFF NEG
Winner: Vallnt JP debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)
Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Eleanor Nishioka, Alan Roulston. Please do not start until all judges are present.

NEG argued for combined CJ & PH (rehab).
AFFIR ARGUED forced rehab doesn't work
& leads to 2x number of deaths but
~~did not indicate~~ answer how treatment
happens if left to low voluntary rates,
& did not sufficiently counter Sweden
vs Australia argument.

NEG DID NOT SHOW SUPPORT HOW TO SUPPORT
DETERENTS CURRENTLY WORK IN FACE
OF HIGH Drug use incarceration rates,
but filled the gap with hitting both
CJ & Rehab (PH) combo.

NEG Combined approach

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

Both well prepared, &
both made each other work

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

OakPar AR (Anusha Rao) vs ValInt JP (Jackson Paluck)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

OAK PARK AR

VALINT JP

AFF

NEG

Winner: VALINT debating on the NEG.
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Alan Roulston

Other judges on panel: Eleanor Nishioka, George Simeran. Please do not start until all judges are present.

AFF

Knowledgeable. Good Listener.
Well prepared. Good SPEAKER.

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

NEG.

Very Confident. Well researched.
Knowledgeable. QUICK Thinking on his feet.
Well prepared. Better facts. Good speaker.
MORE BELIEVABLE FACTS.

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

VallInt JP (Jackson Paluck) vs OakPar AR (Anusha Rao)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

OakPar AR

AFF

VallInt JP

NEG

Winner: Val Int. JP debating on the neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Eleanor [Signature]

Other judges on panel: Alan Roulston, George Simeran. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Aff seems to be arguing on a different pg from the neg. Neg has a very clear cut delivery.

Solid evidence on both. Comes down to details.

RFD - I think the neg takes this debate because of the weighing of the actual advantages of drug courts. Drug courts prevent people from going to jail and force rehab so drug users don't go to jail. That does eliminate the aff harms of prisons + drug use. The Taliban argument stems from decreasing drug use, so by its nature it's a harm either way. So the harms come from whether we get them to rehab. The voluntary method as ineffective seems a compelling argument when it's in isolation.

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

GraHil SA (Susanna Andriasian)

OakPar CB (Chase Bezonsky)

AFF
Winner: Susanna Andriasian debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)
Signature: [Signature]

Other judges on panel: Jamie Cato, Michael Tu. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Both of the debaters did a good job in establishing their arguments. The judges ~~asked~~ asked them to speak slowly but I don't think that request was effective as you both went a bit too fast for me to understand all of your arguments and counterpoints. The Negs did a nice job by pointing out that the AFF had nothing specific in the Healthcare system ~~to~~ to point to that would reduce drug use. The Negs also did a good job in establishing that the frames of the question did not define it as a debate ~~just~~ just about "users". A strong point was also made by the Negs when she pointed out that every benefit noted by the AFF could be accomplished by the criminal justice system. The AFF last rebuttal was ~~was~~ convincing. She was able to undermine most of the Neg arguments and specifically did a nice job in rebutting a mixed system by stating the high rate of recidivism and the fact that putting drug abusing parents in jail only leads to more neglect and abuse when the parents come home from jail. The AFF also made a strong point by stating the ~~war~~ war on drugs has only fueled the growth of drug cartels.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

GraHil SA (Susanna Andriasian)

OakPar CB (Chase Bezonsky)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Susanna School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Michael Tu

Other judges on panel: Jamie Cato, Bryan Palbaum. Please do not start until all judges are present.

- Aff. case was well structured. the links to the criterion are mostly present with the case

- The Neg. case offense was solid. but the arguments to the affirmative were not necessary.

- At the end of the round. the affirmative is writing

1. the affirmative pointed out the negative did not attack the points of the first rebuttal.
2. the affirmative extended and show how the arguments

So I voted "AFF"

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.		

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	... 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

Room: MB 186
Start: 4:30 PM
Lincoln Douglas

Quarters

Cato, Jamie

Valencia

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

GraHil SA (Susanna Andriasian)

OakPar CB (Chase Bezonsky)

AFF

NEG

Winner: GraHil SA - Susanna Andriasian debating on the Side (Aff or Neg)
School/Team

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Bryan Palbaum, Michael Tu. Please do not start until all judges are present.

presented a more compelling argument, rebutted opponent's key points successfully. Presented more statistics to support her case.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

LaCana WJu (Winnie Jung) vs OakPar HH (Hadia Hamza)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

LaCana WJu

OakPar HH

AFF

NEG

Winner: OakPar HH debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Ted Kim, Timothy Meyer. Please do not start until all judges are present.

I thought this debate was very even and difficult to decide. In general, I felt that Hadia had a better presence and was more polished in her skills. I felt Winnie made the stronger argument however that argument hinged on the definition of "illegal ^{use of} drug". If I accept either sides definitions then their further points flow from that accepted definition. I thought Hadia relied on her interpretation of how she would structure a criminal justice system to prevent consumption of drugs but that was not reflected in any evidence. In the end, I felt Hadias overall skill as a debater proved to be the difference. While I didn't personally agree with her position, she very skillfully presented her case in a clear and articulate way giving her the win.

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

OakPar HH (Hadia Hamza) vs LaCana WJu (Winnie Jung)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

LaCana Winnie Jung AFF Oak Park Hadia Hamza NEG

Winner: Oak Park Hadia Hamza debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Tim Meyer

Other judges on panel: Ted Kim, Adam Stuczynski. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Aff

Neg

- Don't focus on PV if you have the same one
- Be more efficient in 2nd AR
- Don't bring up new args in 2ar.
- A lot of your 2AR responses could have won you ground if brought up earlier.
- Make sure to address all args in the 2AR so you can still rebut in 2AR

- You are basically running a counter plan when you specify what does / doesn't get taken care of by CJS. This is an issue if 1) the tournament's CHSSA rules, and 2) You don't have a clear text. Either ways your opponent failed to bring it up, so it still flowed your way.
- Don't conflate Soc. welfare with Util. They aren't the same thing

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

OakPar HH (Hadia Hamza) vs LaCana WJu (Winnie Jung)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

LaCana WJu _____ AFF
OakPar HH _____ NEG

Winner: OakPar HH _____ debating on the Neg _____
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____

Other judges on panel: Timothy Meyer, Adam Stuczynski. Please do not start until all judges are present.

RFD

AFF ran ~~the~~ headfirst into NEG's CP/Advocacy: Do Both PH/CJS. Outside of questioning in 2nd Cross, nothing was brought up on abuse of topicality ~~of the topic~~ against the advocacy until 2AR, which is way too late. If excluded from 1AR, AFF had a good chance of ~~winning~~ winning this debate, seeing as how Neg's strategy primarily was deriving from All's harms.

The criterion debate wasn't clarified too much, but it just boiled down to lives to me. On topicality of "use" definition, outside of the DoD citation, All provides no real reasoning on why "use" as distribution is inherently ill-T. I bought Neg's counter-definition.

At this point, Neg's advocacy is clearly out-impacting on central solvency, child negligence, and absorbing All's impacts of solving mass incarceration and reducing structural violence.

I voted Neg.

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL

Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

29.5

Valenc MM (Mason McBride) vs Brentw PS (Paola Santos)

28

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Brentw PS (Paola Santos)

Valenc MM (Mason McBride)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Brentw. PS

debating on the AFF

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: JM LS

Other judges on panel: James Lipetzky, Allison Schmidt. Please do not start until all judges are present.

This was so fun to watch, but for me there was a clear winner, the AFF. I completely agree with her contention that the resolution is use. Big Pharma, while they should be held accountable is not a user. They distribute. I feel that Neg has hinged his entire case on the opioid crisis and this was risky + a mistake.

Neg, slow down and take your time when you make your point. We need to understand what you are trying to say.

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

Room: 301 Math and Writing Center
Start: 4:30 PM
Lincoln Douglas

Quarters

Schmidt, Allison

Crescenta Valley HS Independent

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

Valenc MM (Mason McBride) vs Brentw PS (Paola Santos)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Paola Santos (Brentw PS) 28.5 Mason McBride (Valenc MM) 27

AFF

NEG

Winner: Paola Brentw PS (Paola) debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Allison Schmidt

Other judges on panel: Jennifer Catalano, James Lipetzky. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

Valenc MM (Mason McBride) vs Brentw PS (Paola Santos)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Paola 29.5 Mason 28
AFF NEG

Winner: Paola debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Other judges on panel: Jennifer Catalano, Allison Schmidt. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Aff was a clear communicator who presented a clear case that was easy to follow + backed up with good ref

- Neg faltered on its main contention by connecting pharmaceutical to public health - did a good job of refuting some examples of aff - but failed by not defining public health - his criticism of rehab centers should have been more main point - too rushed a speech difficult to follow

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

Room: MB 280
Start: 5:00 PM
Lincoln Douglas

Semi Cho, Joo

Newbury Park

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL

Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

Brentw PS (Paola Santos) vs GraHil SA (Susanna Andriasian)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Brentwood Granada Hills
AFF NEG

Winner: Granada Hills School/Team debating on the neg Side (Aff or Neg) Aff

Signature: Ronald Blanc

Other judges on panel: Megan Noel, desiree tisdale. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Point Scale:

30 . . . Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 . . . Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive . . 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal . 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

Room: MB 280
Start: 5:00 PM
Lincoln Douglas

Semi

tisdale, desiree

Global Prep

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

GraHil SA (Susanna Andriasian) vs Brentw PS (Paola Santos)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Susanna Andriasian Paola Santos
AFF NEG

Winner: Susanna Andriasian debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: dbm

Other judges on panel: Joo Cho, Megan Noel. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Very good both sides, slow down

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

283
Room: MB-280
Start: 5:00 PM 5:30
Lincoln Douglas

Semi

Noel, Megan

De Toledo

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

Brentw PS (Paola Santos) vs GraHil SA (Susanna Andriasian)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below


Susanna Andriasian

AFF

Paola Santos

NEG

Winner: Paola Santos debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Joo Cho, desiree tisdale. Please do not start until all judges are present.

My decision came down to who presented better evidence.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
 Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

OakPar HH (Hadia Hamza) vs VallInt JP (Jackson Paluck)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Jackson Paluck Hadia Hamza

AFF

NEG

Winner: Jackson Paluck/VallInt debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____

Other judges on panel: Andrea Francis, Julia McBride. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Jackson: I really like your delivery. Your CX answers & questions are great! The way you handled rebuttals was great, however I have some issues. You should extend that she dropped your "Defense of the squo" argument. You should also address that the resolution is assumed to be true.

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Voted Aff because of offense generally outweighs overall

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

Hadia: I like your case. Your rebuttals don't answer his points effectively. How do you not defend the squo? You conceded to his observations. Don't use generic answers to Util, they're not always applicable. How do you not jail people if you defend the squo? Your answer to the Philippines is flawed. You should assume the resolution passes & is followed. LD isn't about feasibility. You misconstrue a lot of his rebuttals. You keep saying he dropped things when he didn't. He only conceded PV.

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL
Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

Vallnt JP (Jackson Paluck) vs OakPar HH (Hadia Hamza)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Vallnt JP

OakPar HH

AFF

NEG

Winner: Vallnt JP debating on the AFF

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Andrea Francis, Levon Ghanimian. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Pronouns: Judge Ghanimian pronouns: He, Him, His

Both sides made great eye contact & connection w/ audience & had excellent grasp of facts. Neg stayed very calm under extreme pressure from Aff. Aff kept up the challenges & never had to defend himself overly, due to being on the offense.

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	.. 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.. 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

I would say both could benefit from obtaining more facts to support their position. Although they both had more than any other debaters I judged today, there was more to be found.

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL

Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

OakPar HH (Hadia Hamza) vs VallInt JP (Jackson Paluck)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

VallInt JP _____ OakPar HH _____
AFF NEG

Winner: OakPar HH debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Andrea Francis

Other judges on panel: Levon Ghanimian, Julia McBride. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Pronouns: Judge Ghanimian pronouns: He, Him, His

Value Criteria was better supported but by NEG argument → integrated approach reaches more harms thus protecting the most innocent lives

AFF'S contention one hard to flow as examples given don't derive from countries that are respecting rule of law and "Criminal justice" is not clear. Since definition of criminal justice unclear and shifting, hard to follow argument. Speaker style of AFF tended into condescending/belligerent, thus undermining

Point Scale:

30	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater

position in this judge's opinion.

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

NEG AFF
GraHil SA (Susanna Andriasian) vs Vallnt JP (Jackson Paluck)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Vallnt Jackson Paluck
AFF

GraHil - Susanna Andriasian
NEG

Winner: Susanna Andriasian debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Bryan

Other judges on panel: Nishita Bhide, Steve Bloom. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Excellent job by both sides. Both were articulate and were able to effectively cross and they also hold their own when under cross examination. I felt the AFF did a really good job in the second rebuttal by distilling the debate to one simple issue. However, I was not persuaded when the AFF argued that criminals would not commit other crimes ~~when~~ ~~resources~~ because they would not have the resources available. I was also swayed by the NEG comments ~~at~~ that the Phillipines was not an example of criminal justice system ~~because~~ because it is run by a dictator. It was very close and both the AFF & NEG were excellent!

Point Scale:

30 Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29 Excellent.
28 Above average.
27 Average.
26 Below average.
25 Significantly below average.
20-24 Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.	

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	... 6 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
Negative Constructive 7 minutes
Cross-Examination 3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	... 4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes
Preparation Time 4 minutes per debater

Room: ASK TAB 280
Start: 6:05 PM
Lincoln Douglas

Finals

Bloom, Steve

Global Prep

DE TOLEDO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL Mar 24 - 24, 2019

Resolved: The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

ValInt JP (Jackson Paluck) vs GraHil SA (Susanna Andriasian)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Jackson Paluck Susanna Andriasian
AFF NEG

Winner: Jackson Paluck debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Other judges on panel: Nishita Bhinde, Bryan Palbaum. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Point Scale:

30	...	Outstanding; likely to win the tournament.
29	Excellent.
28	Above average.
27	Average.
26	Below average.
25	Significantly below average.
20-24	Rude, offensive, or grossly unprepared.
Half-points are allowed.		

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	..	6 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	.	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Preparation Time	4 minutes per debater