

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division _____ Round _____ Room _____ Date _____ Judge _____ School _____

Aff Team/Code <u>Mukwonago</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Parker</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>Nicole Phelps</u></td> <td><u>28</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Sophia Nolan</u></td> <td><u>29</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Nicole Phelps</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>Sophia Nolan</u>	<u>29</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>Samuel Schendel</u></td> <td><u>26</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Cristal Flores</u></td> <td><u>20</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Samuel Schendel</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>Cristal Flores</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>(4)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Nicole Phelps</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	
<u>Sophia Nolan</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Samuel Schendel</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
<u>Cristal Flores</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 Be more cautious with adding onto your evidence. She didn't call you on it, but she should have.

Comments for 1st Neg
 You have a strong voice, but need to be a little quicker. You kicked your most useful card. Good job calling out their lack of planks. Awesome.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Affs don't have DAs. You mean advantages. Good line-by-line arguing, but you may have hurt yourself. Don't let him blow your cool. "I have a card, I just didn't read it!"
 No.

Comments for 2nd Neg
 You need to understand your arguments better. Practice the words. You mispronounced almost every other word. You should be first speaker, not second.

Reasons for Decision:

20
00

Please review the Burden of Proof. I played a bigger role here than it should have. Also, review the difference between constructives and rebuttals. ~~By not calling out some of the abuse of the Neg, you allowed it into the round.~~ Oh thank god! You did it after proachy cards though so you still open the door. Next time say "NO!" right at the bat. 10 sec vs. 1 min. Why wasn't the DA extended in the QJR? You just re-read fiber optics evidence.

:15
1:40
1:00

I hate how I had to vote. The Affs killed themselves despite being much better.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division ^{Source Policy} Round 3 Room 2002 Date 1/6 Judge Krishna Agrawal School _____

Aff Team/Code Rhineland

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Catherine Brown</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>
<u>Stephanie Belanger</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(4)</u>

Neg Team/Code Rhineland

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Asif Sadik</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>
<u>Mike GRUNST</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff

- Work on prioritization of issues
- Good job in CX

Comments for 1st Neg

- Great articulation of impacts
- Nice job weighing

Comments for 2nd Aff

- work on prioritization of issues

Comments for 2nd Neg

- Nice, logical explanations for arguments
- Good job extending args that were dropped

Reasons for Decision:

OST DA & Spending DA were a wash; Topicality was dropped by the Aff; Neg adequately refuted the "Establish Lunar Colony" advocacy on many levels.

∴ Neg won.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Nov Round 3 Room 2001 Date 1/6/12 Judge CALDWELL School MAD MEN

Aff Team/Code <u>Rhineland AFF 1</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Rhineland Neg 2</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 style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Jordan Kaster</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>28</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Dylan Wendt</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>29</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Jordan Kaster</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>Dylan Wendt</u>	<u>29</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 style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Matt Bloch</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>28</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Ben Eversman</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>27</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Matt Bloch</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>Ben Eversman</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(4)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Jordan Kaster</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	
<u>Dylan Wendt</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Matt Bloch</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
<u>Ben Eversman</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 speech is slurred, may be rushing
 could argue for probability based on # of scenarios

Comments for 1st Neg
 Didn't catch a lot of card tags or names
 A lot more could have been done in the 1NR, 2NR was too focused on solvency as it is, you need a more versatile set of args to go into the 2NR w/.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 2AC was solid as far as strategy and time allocation goes

Comments for 2nd Neg
 Don't need to summarize card, need to explain how card works (i.e. "this takes out solvency (K...")
 I'm pretty sure when you say "unitarian" you mean "utilitarian"

Reasons for Decision:
 The fact that the Neg urged an Affirmative ballot will weigh in on my decision. [Note to Tab: this was not a slip up, apparently it's better for their team]
 AFF has 16 extinction scenarios that it conceivably solves for. Close call on the solvency but the 1AR does much more work to win it than the 2NR.
 Even if I give the Neg the Aliens DA, that's only one scenario.
 All the magnitude is the same and no reasonable probability can be established. To # of extinction scenarios seems to be the only impact weighing mechanism b/c it would theoretically effect probability.
 OST DA could've helped if it had decent evidence and any sort of probability on it.
 AFF wins

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division N Round 2 Room 2055 Date 4-6-11 Judge Toiling School MVHS

Aff Team/Code Janesville Parker

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Brendan Reed</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>(4)</u>
<u>Patrick Conkol</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>(3)</u>

Neg Team/Code MVK-wanogo

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Brynne Reilly</u>	<u>28.5</u>	<u>(1)</u>
<u>Andrew Patterson</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 Need to extend case offense in IAR.

Comments for 1st Neg
 Need more offense in the IAR. All arguments on case are defense. Read terminal defense.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Talk more about case in 2AC. Too many cards in the 2AR.

Comments for 2nd Neg
 Good work extending offense at the end of 2NR. (Money should be spent on earth) Find more specific DA.

Reasons for Decision:

A/N
 424/4.20
 1110 2:50
 risk of the dropped impacts.

No offense in the IAR. Case is not mentioned, it is therefore dropped, without offense the neg wins a risk of the spending DA which outweighs the dropped impacts.