

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Nov Round 1 Room 2055 Date _____ Judge Kim Wasser School Muk. High School

Aff Team/Code Rhineland

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Jordan Kaster</u>	_____	<u>(29)</u>
<u>Dylan Wendt</u>	_____	<u>(27)</u>

Neg Team/Code Janesville Parker

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Samuel Schendel</u>	_____	<u>(25)</u>
<u>Cristal Flores</u>	_____	<u>(23)</u>

Decision: The winning team is the (Circle) Affirmative Negative Team/Code Rhineland
 Low Point Win (Circle) Yes No

Comments for 1st Aff
Very clear + articulate. Nice job!

Comments for 1st Neg
Need to announce a little more. Sometimes understanding was difficult. ~~Other~~ Otherwise a good job.

Comments for 2nd Aff
Very good, clear + composed. Good use of time.

Comments for 2nd Neg
Please practice your arguments more! Not being able to pronounce words will throw off the rhythm of your argument + distract from the point you are trying to make.

Reasons for Decision:

Negs did not prove that more spending was a detriment to the economy. They also failed to address all of the ~~issues~~ ^{events} that would lead to the extinction of mankind. Affs clearly proved that their plan is not only good for the economy but also the entire human race.

The Negs' counter plan of space debris removal was disregarded. The Negs should also try harder to avoid agreeing + proving affirmative arguments. That never looks good.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Nov Round 1 Room 2001 Date 1/6/12 Judge CALDWELL School MAD. MEMORIAL

Aff Team/Code Mukwonago AFF

Neg Team/Code Rhinelanders Neg 1

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Nicole Phelps</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(4)</u>
<u>Jophis Dolan</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Azif Sadik</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>
<u>Mike Grunst</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(3)</u>

Decision: The winning team is the (Circle) Affirmative Negative Team/Code Rhinelanders Neg 1
 Low Point Win (Circle) Yes No

Comments for 1st Aff
 IAC was too quiet
 pause btw contentions and subpoints so I
 get tags clearer
 if you're gonna say they broke the rules, you
 might as well make a big deal out of it

Comments for 1st Neg
 Very slow, can certainly speed up if you need to
 Don't let opponent talk too much in C-X, if
 you have a point to make, bring it up ASAP

Comments for 2nd Aff
 "private sector doesn't solve as well" is not
 an argument for your inherency. Need
 evidence that private sector is not solving
 is squo, not theoretical. empirical
 Good C-X

Comments for 2nd Neg
 Questions appeared not to be leading anywhere
 Need better roadmaps. ex) where do I flow 'analysis'

Reasons for Decision:

This round ended up being all about inherency and solvency.
 The AFF has focused primarily on winning that space debris is
 a problem, but has almost no evidence by the end of the round
 saying NASA should be the one fixing space debris
 Impact debate done poorly, but no real need b/c AFF and Neg are
 going for the same impacts w/ almost all the same links.
 ZAR is right that there's nothing solving space debris in squo, but
 doesn't show that leaving it to the private sector and DARPA
 wouldn't solve faster and w/ fewer problems, which the Neg is strong on.
 Neg should have done more w/ DAs. It's not clear that the AFF
 plan will cause more harm than squo.
 Neg solves better than AFF, even w/o a CP.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division N Round 1 Room 2003 Date _____ Judge "Agrawal" School App. East

Aff Team/Code <u>Janesville Parker</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Rhinelande</u>																		
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Names</th> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Points (10-30)</th> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Rank (1-4)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Brandon Reed</u></td> <td><u>25.5</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Bruce Kennel</u></td> <td><u>26.5</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Brandon Reed</u>	<u>25.5</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>Bruce Kennel</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Names</th> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Points (10-30)</th> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Rank (1-4)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Ben Eversman</u></td> <td><u>25.5</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Matt Bloch</u></td> <td><u>26</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Ben Eversman</u>	<u>25.5</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>Matt Bloch</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(2)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Brandon Reed</u>	<u>25.5</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	
<u>Bruce Kennel</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Ben Eversman</u>	<u>25.5</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
<u>Matt Bloch</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	

Decision: The winning team is the (Circle) Affirmative Negative Team/Code Rhinelande
 Low Point Win (Circle) Yes No

Comments for 1st Aff
 Why didn't you extend your econ advantage in your 1AR??

Comments for 1st Neg
 Allen DA is pretty stupid with the rest of your strat

Comments for 2nd Aff
 I'm relieved that there are at least some responses on the DA flows where's the econ advantage extension??

Comments for 2nd Neg
 INC is a near-complete departure from the INC - that's bad
 Allen DA is really stupid

Reasons for Decision:

This round came down to the DST DA. Aff batch extends their responses in the 1AR & drops them altogether in the 2AR. They would have won had they extended the aerospace advantage throughout the round.	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Aff Prep</th> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Neg Prep</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>- 0:30</td> <td>- 0:40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>- 1:00</td> <td>- 0:50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>- 3:30</td> <td>- 3:30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Aff Prep	Neg Prep	- 0:30	- 0:40	- 1:00	- 0:50	- 3:30	- 3:30
Aff Prep	Neg Prep								
- 0:30	- 0:40								
- 1:00	- 0:50								
- 3:30	- 3:30								

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Novice Round I Room 2002 Date 1/6/12 Judge Devine School Janesville Parker

Aff Team/Code Rhinelanders 2

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Catherine Brown</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>(3)</u>
<u>Stephanie Belanger</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>(4)</u>

Neg Team/Code Mukwonago

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Brynne Reilly</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(1)</u>
<u>Andrew Paterson</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>(2)</u>

Decision: The winning team is the (Circle) Affirmative Negative Team/Code Mukwonago
 Low Point Win (Circle) Yes (No)

Comments for 1st Aff: The Harvling card would hit better under solvency. Otherwise, pretty good IAC in terms of structure. It is too late in the IAC to raise new solvency arguments.

Comments for 1st Neg: Good application of the Mars DA. It sort of turns affs' solvency on its head. The STEM DA seems more tenacious. Excellent CX answers. Good job extending STEM argument.

Comments for 2nd Aff: You have some good solvency cards, but it's important to address the specific attacks on solvency made by the negs. Good moonquake card.

Comments for 2nd Neg: Good follow-through on the Mars DA you draw a stark contrast between Mars and the moon. You explain your evidence very clearly.

Reasons for Decision:

There were really three issues debated in this round:
solvency - affs convince me that the technology exists to make a moon colony feasible, despite the legitimate concerns raised by the negs → **[AFF]**
DA-STEM - I will admit to being less than impressed by this DA. It requires quite a chain of events to reach the impact. However, the affs really don't contest it, so it stands → **[NEG]**
DA-Mars - This was the deal-breaker for me. Negs convince me the SQ can solve if we can colonize Mars, and further that if we go to the moon, we will miss out on the far more likely solvency we will get from Mars. → **[NEG]** This more than offsets aff solvency. So D vote **[NEGATIVE]**