

# CARDINAL CLASH

## Middleton Cross-Plains High School

January 6, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Middleton GJ Circle Side: Pro Con *for college*

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 30 for Jen Grooms

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 30 for Hayden Johnston

Team: Appleton East CN Circle Side: Pro Con *against college*

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 30 for Sydney Courtney

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 30 for Isabelle Ngo

|                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 29-30 Outstanding   | 22-23 Below Average |
| 27-28 Above Average |                     |
| 24-26 Average       |                     |

The team that won this debate is GJ Middleton representing the PRO CON

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

Comments to Debaters:

Hayden Johnson: Cost outweighs benefits

① Negate - technology, basic technology, global information education essential, information revolution, research

② Poverty - this economy, college degree best safeguard, social class mobility, children break cycle of poverty

③ Higher quality of life ↓ Divorce, stability

Cross Examine: Debt, resources, advantages, scholarships, grants, benefits of college education, knowledge, argued for knowledge

Jen Grooms: ① Critical thinking skills % of error

These are the reasons for my decision:

① ↑ Loans, Agrees benefits outweighs, good investment

② Debt: Lower Cost, options able to afford,

③ Jobs, below level, 22% growth technology society,

④ U.S. Census ↑ 2.1 million ↑ Long-term benefit not rich right away

⑤ Technology for nation,

2 Crossfire

Technology complexity, more knowledge of world

Depression, not divorced, healthier food

Free colleges

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: \_\_\_\_\_

55% don't graduate, Higher

HJ: Keep college, debt - options, help or help self

AP classes, Drop outs, not the cost, effort of student,

Comments to Debaters:

~~Jen Grooms~~ Sydney Courtney: Core Mission, Cost, instruction vocational technical

① 45% no gain in thinking skills

can't measure how students learn, college high cost

② ↑ cost ↑ debt loans, \$17 billion in private loans

\$1 trillion debt, interest, work during college

③ Does not guarantee a job, can't pay debt

Isabelle: ① Technology:

② Poverty: unemployed

③ Higher quality of Life: Depression college degree not happier, divorce?

④ only facts not opinion

⑤ not many go to Yale or Harvard

⑥ Stake Out: not future?

⑦ Debt,

College not improve mental skills

Only 55% do not graduate

Debt and Failure

⑧ \$1 trillion debt postpone

SC: Technology, HS, Cost - Benefits

Poverty - hard workers don't need college

Debt - Costs, Debt rest of lives?

Not benefit of college

| Order/Time Limits of Speeches |       |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 2                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 3                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 4                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary             | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary             | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All)         | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| 2 minutes prep time per side  |       |

# CARDINAL CLASH

## Middleton Cross-Plains High School

January 6, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Madison West HS Circle Side: Pro Con  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Monica Hellmer 1  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Libby Scholz 3

Team: Sheb North KG Circle Side: Pro Con  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Molly Knoedler 4  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 25 for Maggie Gentine 2

aver: 27

aver: 27

|                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 29-30 Outstanding   | 22-23 Below Average |
| 27-28 Above Average |                     |
| 24-26 Average       |                     |

The team that won this debate is Sheb North Kg representing the PRO CON  
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)  
Low Point Win? ( ~~Yes~~ - ~~No~~ ) same

Comments to Debaters:

S1: good clarity, but make sure to look up during your first speech

S3: strong voice, good eye contact

Comments to Debaters:

S2: same

S4: good clarity + organization

make sure not to interrupt each other during the Grand Cross!

These are the reasons for my decision:

Although the pro side did not necessarily prove a majority, in my opinion, they were persuasive enough in their arguments to have not needed to. This was a great debate in that every point was argued and debated, but unfortunately the con side this was done a little better by the pro team. They especially swayed me on their underemployment argument where they showed that people were not satisfied as well as in their low graduation rates where 1/2 of 2yr. students did not complete their course. To me, it seemed that their arguments of the debt and unhappiness after graduation depleted the value of a college education (much to my dismay).

| Order/Time Limits of Speeches |       |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 2                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 3                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 4                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary             | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary             | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All)         | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| 2 minutes prep time per side  |       |

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Amber Krisp Appleton East

# CARDINAL CLASH

## Middleton Cross-Plains High School

January 6, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

*Second*

*First*

Team: Rhineland High CZ Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 25 for Kayla Cook 2

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Gabby Zastrow 1

Team: Appleton East LL Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Elisabeth Laboy 2

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Sarah Larson 1

*length avoid anecdotal evidence*

|                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 29-30 Outstanding   | 22-23 Below Average |
| 27-28 Above Average |                     |
| 24-26 Average       |                     |

The team that won this debate is A East LL representing the PRO CON

*we really shouldn't concede that college does not increase critical thinking skills.*

(Team Name for the Winning Team)  
Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

(Please circle the winning side)

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

*Your 2nd & 3rd contentions seem to say the same thing. You should make these more distinct. Also, you should give me some evidence to show that a degree holder is more likely to get a job than someone who doesn't have a degree.*

*Your first contention is too long and is very repetitive. Very good organization and arguments in your 2nd construction. Try to bring in some evidence and use all time. Your point on college professors not knowing what their students learn is pretty important, but you spent half of Grand Cross on this.*

*You need to provide more persuasive reasons for me to reject pro contentions. You bring in a lot of irrelevant points in your summary.*

### Order/Time Limits of Speeches

|                       |       |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1             | 4 min |
| Speaker 2             | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2)       | 3 min |
| Speaker 3             | 4 min |
| Speaker 4             | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4)       | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary     | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary     | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |

2 minutes prep time per side

*I agree with pro in that we should assess the resolution in the present tense b/c con did not give a compelling reason to reject this.*

*Pro made a very strong argument that although college grads have a lower rate of unemployment, they are often underemployed and have a huge debt burden which undermines con's satisfaction contentions. Pro also showed that societal benefits are non-unique is a null point.*

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: \_\_\_\_\_ Middleton

# CARDINAL CLASH

## Middleton Cross-Plains High School

January 6, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Appleton East SW Circle Side: Pro Con  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 23 for Ariella Saulneir 1  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Austin Wittman 3

Team: Rhinelander High KS Circle Side: Pro Con  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Tamarah Krueger 4  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Alex Sarkauskus 2

|                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 29-30 Outstanding   | 22-23 Below Average |
| 27-28 Above Average |                     |
| 24-26 Average       |                     |

The team that won this debate is Rhinelander High KS representing the PRO CON  
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

Comments to Debaters:

Speaker 1: clear statement,  
1) point of college not guarantee a job.  
3) need aggressive during crossfire.

Speaker 3:

Comments to Debaters:

Speaker 2: very clear good statement.

Speaker 4: good at identifying the weak point.

These are the reasons for my decision:

- 1) Questioning interest rate of student loan
- 2) college student has more advantage to get job.
- 3) more other benefit.

| Order/Time Limits of Speeches |       |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 2                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 3                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 4                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary             | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary             | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All)         | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| 2 minutes prep time per side  |       |

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Cai Zhiyong USDA Scientist

# CARDINAL CLASH

## Middleton Cross-Plains High School

January 6, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Madison West JZ Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Peter Ji

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Tianchi Zhao

Team: Rhinelander High DL Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Gabrielle Dutton 42

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 25 for Luke Lenard 4

|                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 29-30 Outstanding   | 22-23 Below Average |
| 27-28 Above Average |                     |
| 24-26 Average       |                     |

The team that won this debate is Madison West JZ representing the PRO CON

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

(Please circle the winning side)

45

Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

Comments to Debaters:

Tianchi - Need to be much more efficient with your argumentation. I only had you making arguments in 4 minutes. Not good - you need to get more ink on the flow! I didn't write anything down during the 1st min of your speech.

Comments to Debaters: Really good IAZ, ~~Gabrielle~~ Gabrielle!

Gabrielle - Have to get through all of case - so cut your 1st contention down so you get to your 3rd with more than 3 seconds!  
Good job in cr! You stood your ground w/o being offensive or rude - more debaters need to do this!  
Luke - Do not read new ~~contentions~~ contentions in ZAC. If your partner didn't get to it, you have to let it go. Also, you have to use all your time. ~~Compare~~ Really only 2 mins of argumentation in ZAC. That's far too short.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Both sides put themselves in a bad position by not being efficient with their argumentation. This hurts the pro's more, however.

In the end, I think too many of the arguments the pro wants to win are new in the rebuttals. On the contrary, cons have hammered home the 86 v. 64 statistic, the fact that people in the workforce are going back to school, and that the investment of college does pay off in the long run. There's too

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

*Tim Maylander*

many arguments won by the neg for me not to free land party ~~member~~ vote that way.

| Order/Time Limits of Speeches |       |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 2                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 3                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 4                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary             | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary             | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All)         | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus         | 2 min |

2 minutes prep time per side

Please don't turn the grand crossfire into the grand catfight! ★

# CARDINAL CLASH

## Middleton Cross-Plains High School

January 6, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Appleton East DS Circle Side: Pro Con *2nd*  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Kevin Du  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Nick Strong

Team: Madison West LT Circle Side: Pro Con *1st*  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Joaquin Lara  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Lloyd Tripp /

|                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 29-30 Outstanding   | 22-23 Below Average |
| 27-28 Above Average |                     |
| 24-26 Average       |                     |

The team that won this debate is LT Mad West representing the PRO CON  
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)  
Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

Comments to Debaters:

*He refuted the corrupt point in Grand X - please dont harp on him*

Comments to Debaters:

These are the reasons for my decision:

*It was never solidly decided on the cost - neither was "proven" or "negated" so going on the coverage of contentions alone 3/4 of colleges are not corrupt + therefore a majority of people get the benefits never disproved by pro*

| Order/Time Limits of Speeches |       |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 2                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 3                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 4                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary             | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary             | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All)         | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| 2 minutes prep time per side  |       |

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

*Brit Newman - Hired*

*Corruption was basically the pro sides only contention - van these so you don't get*

# CARDINAL CLASH

## Middleton Cross-Plains High School

January 6, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Middleton LL Circle Side: Pro Con  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Carly Lundt 4  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Caroline Liu 2

Team: Madison Memorial LW Circle Side: Pro Con  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Daniel Li 3  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Edwin Wu 1

|                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 29-30 Outstanding   | 22-23 Below Average |
| 27-28 Above Average |                     |
| 24-26 Average       |                     |

The team that won this debate is Madison Memorial LW representing the PRO CON  
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? ( Yes NO )

Comments to Debaters:

1. Costs too high to participate  
 2. Increasing costs → increasing debt  
 3. Value of bachelor's decreasing  
 4. Quality of life in college  
 Interesting contentions. Definition of college is limiting. Prostitution ~~and~~ reference may not be helpful to your case.  
 Good question → what about college causes better health, etc.  
 Debate focussed a lot on employment / mal employment / underemployment not  
 These are the reasons for my decision: enough on costs & other benefits.

Comments to Debaters:

1. Higher chance of job + higher \$  
 2. Better std living + kids chances better  
 3. Benefits to society.  
 well constructed & delivered 1st speech  
 → answer: Higher employment & higher \$!  
 Nice rebuttals.  
 work on crossfire answers - they are in your own contentions.

| Order/Time Limits of Speeches |         |
|-------------------------------|---------|
| Speaker 1                     | 4 min ✓ |
| Speaker 2                     | 4 min ✓ |
| Crossfire (1&2)               | 3 min ✓ |
| Speaker 3                     | 4 min ✓ |
| Speaker 4                     | 4 min ✓ |
| Crossfire (3&4)               | 3 min ✓ |
| Speaker 1 Summary             | 2 min ✓ |
| Speaker 2 Summary             | 2 min ✓ |
| Grand Crossfire (All)         | 3 min ✓ |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus         | 2 min ✓ |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus         | 2 min ✓ |
| 2 minutes prep time per side  |         |

Pro side made good, well-constructed arguments but seemed to be implicitly conceding that college does have benefits, but not everyone can have them. Thus for those without college education, it's costs would seem worthwhile. Con's arguments were solid and persuasive. Both teams did very well.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: John Rademacher Madison West

# CARDINAL CLASH

## Middleton Cross-Plains High School

January 6, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Middleton SR Circle Side: Pro  Con  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Hitesh Sarabu  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Claire Rossmiller

Team: Sheb North CY Circle Side:  Pro  Con  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 25 for Maitzeng Chang  
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 21 for William Yang

29-30 Outstanding  
27-28 Above Average  
24-26 Average  
22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Middleton SR representing the PRO  CON  
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)  
Low Point Win? ( Yes  No )

Comments to Debaters:

William: Nice speech! Very well structured, though a stronger direction for your framework would be great.

Hitesh: Good speech, but poor presence. Work on controlling your movements.

Comments to Debaters:

Maitzeng: You need do better structure your case. It is very awkward

William: Unfortunately, much of what you said had no point. You needed prep time. Use it. "I think" isn't a great way to start every sentence

These are the reasons for my decision:

Con won the framework at the contentions.

| Order/Time Limits of Speeches |       |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 2                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 3                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 4                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary             | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary             | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All)         | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| 2 minutes prep time per side  |       |

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: \_\_\_\_\_

# CARDINAL CLASH

## Middleton Cross-Plains High School

January 6, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Sheb North GW Circle Side: Pro ~~Con~~  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Taylor Garbe 2  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 24 for Sam Wang 1

Team: Middleton ES Circle Side: Pro ~~Con~~  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Justin Essert 2  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for David Sun 1

|                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 29-30 Outstanding   | 22-23 Below Average |
| 27-28 Above Average |                     |
| 24-26 Average       |                     |

The team that won this debate is Sheb North GW representing the PRO ~~CON~~  
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)  
 Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

Comments to Debaters:

ice job - prep: :21  
 :18  
 its pretty intense go there - don't let your nerves get the best of you. You know your topic - gather your points  
 Taylor - great speaker - nice tone & volume. Don't allow other team to talk you - get your point in

Comments to Debaters:

well done - prep: :15  
 :53  
 Try to prove your points further - I feel too much time spent on arguing their point or definitions. convince me you are right  
 keep looking for more evidence - the pro team had a good point that your quotes from people are very personal & are opinions. need hard facts.

These are the reasons for my decision:

The team that wins this round is the pro team: one of the arguments was job placement. The con team stated that degree acts as a screening device - they will get jobs, but pro team came back with the statistic that 33% of college grads are working jobs that do not require a degree. They got his point. Another argument was health - con stated that grades healthier - pro stated that due to stress students are bring eating & expenses make for cheaper less healthy diet. Lastly the con team states that there are 2-year colleges to help with dropout rates - but pro team had statistics that 33% drop out after the

| Order/Time Limits of Speeches |       |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 2                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 3                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 4                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary             | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary             | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All)         | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| 2 minutes prep time per side  |       |

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

*[Signature]* Middleton East HS

# CARDINAL CLASH

## Middleton Cross-Plains High School

January 6, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Middleton RR Circle Side: Pro Con 1  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Mitchell Reller 3  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Ariella Rader 1

Team: Madison West CF Circle Side: Pro Con 2  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Cindy Cai 2  
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Rachel Furlow 4

|                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 29-30 Outstanding   | 22-23 Below Average |
| 27-28 Above Average |                     |
| 24-26 Average       |                     |

The team that won this debate is Middleton RR representing the PRO CON  
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)  
 Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

Comments to Debaters:  
 remember to keep phone off.  
 After your speech, get ready with questions so the other side can't monopolize.  
 Speaker 1: good summary  
 don't just reread statistics, interpret them and make them relevant.  
 statistics are easy to attack, they listed several with questionable interpretations.  
 These are the reasons for my decision:

Comments to Debaters:  
 Note: Returns on stock market ~~are~~ not called interest. -\$100,000, is accrued over 4 years and is debt. So borrowing \$100,000 to invest in stock market can be really bad... not that your opponents point this out so I'm not counting this.  
 That said, they did point out it was unrealistic even if they didn't elaborate why very well.  
 Speaker 4: you speak well, but need to address the benefits listed by consider and weigh them against your costs.

There was a big focus on statistics in this round, and not as much on neutralizing the statistics. Just because numbers clash, doesn't mean that's the end of the debate.  
 That said, the societal benefits of having the doctors and other specialized degrees seem to outweigh the mostly financial harm caused.

| Order/Time Limits of Speeches |       |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 2                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 3                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 4                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary             | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary             | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All)         | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| 2 minutes prep time per side  |       |

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: [Signature]

# CARDINAL CLASH

## Middleton Cross-Plains High School

January 6, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Madison West AS Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Annabelle Arney 2

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Maddie Schumacher 4

Team: Sheb North AR Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 24 for Claire Andreason 1

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 24 for Morgan Ross 3

|                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 29-30 Outstanding   | 22-23 Below Average |
| 27-28 Above Average |                     |
| 24-26 Average       |                     |

The team that won this debate is Madison West AS representing the PRO CON  
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? ( Yes No )

Comments to Debaters:  
Annabelle - good eye contact - good questions in crossfire - your math is flawed - they said \$840,000 - not \$84,000 - but their #'s are still insignificant - you're correct

Comments to Debaters:  
Claire - Well organized first speech - work on fluidity of summary - you need to demonstrate more conviction / confidence

maddie - Avoid saying "pretty sure" - speak with more certainty - decrease audible pauses - good eye contact - good evidence - good composure in crossfire

Morgan - good eye contact - work on organization - engineering was just an example - focus on their overall argument - not the specific analogy - focused on wrong issues in final focus - defend your case too

These are the reasons for my decision:

Con fails to defend their case in final focus - and counters arguments that aren't really voting issues - you need to address how college is unarguably responsible for your health, voting, childrearing benefits, etc. - In addition, in our current economy, experience does outweigh education in non-degree required positions - The biggest question in the round is "what part of college provides you with these skills?" - And it went unanswered

| Order/Time Limits of Speeches |       |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 2                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 3                     | 4 min |
| Speaker 4                     | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4)               | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary             | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary             | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All)         | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus         | 2 min |
| 2 minutes prep time per side  |       |

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Angela R. Schaffer - BHS/Coach

Good luck all!



Tournament Date:

Tournament Location:

|  |            |                            |  |
|--|------------|----------------------------|--|
| Round: 4                                   | Room: 2104 | Judge Name: Michael Thorne | Affiliation/Occupation: Stcb. N. Stoen |
| Resolution/Topic: Education in Les College |            |                            |  |

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left is the one that speaks first, and should sit to the judge's left):

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Code: App East EP                 | Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con |
| Speaker 1 Name: Mira Ensley-Field |  |
| Speaker 3 Name: Heli Peterson     |  |

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Code: Mod FH                     | Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con |
| Speaker 2 Name: Madeline Friemel |  |
| Speaker 4 Name: Casey Henderson  |  |

Team Points (use one, whole number): 26

Speaker 1 - Useful suggestions for improvement: 25

USE TIME - 3:50  
Show me how your benefits are important + influential. Pretty solid analytics of ev. @ beginning of summary. 15.2% investment is a bad state to drop in summ. If... then... in GCF was great. Awesome GCF.

← Award team points →

|       |               |
|-------|---------------|
| 29-30 | Outstanding   |
| 27-28 | Above Average |
| 24-26 | Average       |
| 20-23 | Below Average |

Team Points (use one, whole number): 26

Speaker 2 - Useful suggestions for improvement: 27

Show me why it not going to ed. is bad, what are its negative impacts? Fair to compare US + Canada? not sure about that. Res is about US. Majors may still result in benefits even if they are mal-employed.

Speaker 3 - Useful suggestions for improvement:

Way to go line-by-line + get through everything. Solid bc speech. Still, can always extend args more. Good analysis of state benefits + \$

Great GCF

Speaker 4 - Useful suggestions for improvement:

Good response. Gotte get back to your case. Past + extenl args. Does cost of ed in ppl's minds mean that it has less benefit? I don't think "other factors" helps you, it might hurt them, but how does that show cost outweighs? Larger problem of difficulty to get to college, I think they get you on motivation + qualifications.

Reasons for my decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

- Costs Paid Back - good ev + stats. 15.2% investment return is a pretty convincing statistic. I think the Canada ev. flows thru. Con evidence is really good on this cont, all combated → CON
- other benefits - not discussed much, but flows through. gov't doesn't spend bc of ed makes this cont + PRO cont 2 w/
- Opportunity of Ed - I agree that this sucks, h/w, if you make a claim to steal benefits from Con bc of motivation, they de
- Countered w/ analytics of 80-140,000 students ev.
- Ed costs state \$ - wash GCF analysis
- Overstated - awesome ev, but once again, I need to know what this means
- bc of evidence for 15.2% return on investment, as well as turn on motivation. Must go CON

| Order/Time Limits of Speeches  |        |
|--|--------|
| Speaker 1  | 4 min. |
| Speaker 2  | 4 min. |
| Crossfire (1 & 2)  | 3 min. |
| Speaker 3  | 4 min. |
| Speaker 4  | 4 min. |
| Crossfire (3 & 4)  | 3 min. |
| Speaker 1 Summary  | 2 min. |
| Speaker 2 Summary  | 2 min. |
| Grand Crossfire (all)  | 3 min. |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus*   | 2 min. |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus*   | 2 min. |
| 2 minutes of Prep Time per side  |        |
| * New arguments must be ignored; this speech must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate. |        |

The team that won this debate is (write code): App East EP representing the (check):  Pro  Con