

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division NA Round 1 Room 1126 Date 10/7 Judge Robinson School RUBS King

Aff Team/Code Mukwonago

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Nicole Phelps</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>
<u>Sophia Dolan</u>	<u>27.5</u>	<u>(1)</u>

Neg Team/Code Janesville Parker

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Samuel Schendel</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>
<u>Cristal Flores</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(4)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 not a good job knowing the answers to her unfair questions on timeframe.
 New evidence isn't abusive, the 1AR is a hard speech it takes practice to do a great 1AR even when they read new args in block.

Comments for 1st Neg
 No need to read extra uniqueness cards in the INC. Keep a constant tone. Your INR was decent you need to take care instead of the disads in the block b/c DA's take more time to answer.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Don't explain each card; just read and compare ^{each} evidence. It's not abusive for the neg to do case in the 2nd NC b/c it's a constructive. Good ^{mpx} analysis in the 2AR

Comments for 2nd Neg
 Be louder, you are competing with the heater and your back is turned towards me. Use your 2NC time effectively, by giving more argument variety. Read entire cards, not just tags. Use all of your speech time.

Reasons for Decision:
 Everyone needs to better utilize the cards they are reading earlier in the debate. You're in the right direction, but evidence comparison earlier in the debate. The best way to compare evidence is by reading your opponents.

FD: I vote aff because the neg dropped the spending DA, which isn't a bad thing, but you should kick it instead of just not talking about it. The politics disad was extended, but as a judge I'm not comfortable doing the work and creating arguments that weren't in the round. The case arguments weren't enough to create a solvency deficit and there is nothing in this round to outweigh the aff.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Nov. Round 1 Room 1125 Date 1/7/12 Judge Mark School WB.

Aff Team/Code <u>Janesville Parker</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Mukwanago</u>																		
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; width: 60%;">Names</th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 20%;">Points (10-30)</th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 20%;">Rank (1-4)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Brandon Reed</u></td> <td><u>25</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Davis Kendall</u></td> <td><u>27</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Brandon Reed</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>Davis Kendall</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; width: 60%;">Names</th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 20%;">Points (10-30)</th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 20%;">Rank (1-4)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Bryanne Reilly</u></td> <td><u>29</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Andrew Peterson</u></td> <td><u>28</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Bryanne Reilly</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>Andrew Peterson</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Brandon Reed</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	
<u>Davis Kendall</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Bryanne Reilly</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
<u>Andrew Peterson</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 You were a little quiet in your constructive, but you were still clear. Also, you had a minute left to use - use it up!

Comments for 1st Neg
 I liked your speaking style - nice use of analysis as well.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Your speaking style was alright, but you had a minute left at the end of your constructive. You should've analyzed your arguments more and used that minute up.

Comments for 2nd Neg
 Pretty good arguments/analysis brought up. You seemed a little disorganized in your constructive, though.

Reasons for Decision:

I guess I'll start with the Future of Humanity advantage. Both teams brought up cards on Moonquakes and Gravity Problems, and those arguments seemed like a wish... The Affirmative argument that diseases won't be a problem seems okay, except for the fact that their card talks about how if a serious disease arises on the moon, it will kill everyone on the moon, and with no hosts to live off of, the disease will then die off as well. This clearly shows (in their own card) that extinction could be a very real threat while still on the moon, so I buy the Neg's arguments that the Affs can't win on that advantage...

The Affs claimed that they brought up cards about how agriculture is possible on the moon, but that was the extent of their analysis. Thus, I'll have to flow Neg on that, so the Moon Base wouldn't be self-sufficient.

The biggest part of the debate was the debris Dilemma. The Affs claim that they could aim satellites to avoid the debris, but they fail to combat the Neg's point that by stationing things into space, they then create more debris, furthering the problem. Also, they ceded the point that debris removal processes are only in the research phase now, so by doing their plan, they can't solve for any additional debris created as of now. So, I have to give the Dilemma to the Neg. Therefore, I buy the Neg, which means that we wouldn't be able to load things into space, and thus the Affs cannot solve anything.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Nov Round 1 Room 1130 Date 12/7/12 Judge Surprenant School Muskego

Aff Team/Code West Bend Aff

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Alex Kopish</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(4)</u>
<u>Emma Sarbohn</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(3)</u>

Neg Team/Code Rhineland Neg 2

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Matt Bloch</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>
<u>Ben Everzman</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>

Decision: The winning team is the (Circle) Affirmative Negative Team/Code Rhineland Neg 2
 Low Point Win (Circle) Yes No

Comments for 1st Aff ~~You~~ You seem a little unsure of your aff case. Familiarize yourself with your evidence. Use all of your CX time. You should have addressed 25% space debris and ground nodes in your 1AR. Use more analysis in 1AR.

Comments for 1st Neg Good DA. You spent a lot of time on 1NH and not much time on solvency. You should have brought up cost in this speech → CX doesn't count.

Comments for 2nd Aff Don't forget to cite your cards. You need a cost estimate for your plan, but negs didn't bring it up in their constructions so not an issue. Use all of your CX time. Use more analysis in rebuttal. There

Comments for 2nd Neg Good CX questions, but look at the judge instead of the aff and get rid of the gum. Use all of your CX time! Your partner should refer to your CX in his 1NC. Good weighing of round in 2NR. Also OST wasn't brought up until

Reasons for Decision: is no need to read more cards. Don't bring up new arguments in rebuttal.

rebuttals, so you could call abuse.

This debate lacked clash. Both teams presented good arguments, but they need to develop them more and let me know why their argument outweighs the other team. The negative was able to provide some solvency arguments that the affs didn't respond to. The affs could not answer how their plan would protect the ground nodes when the negs said that the ground nodes were susceptible to ground attacks. The affs even admitted they were reducing ground forces. The negs also had stronger evidence that space debris would become a problem if ASAT's were used.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division N Round 1 Room 1127 Date 1-7 Judge Oswald School Honestead

Aff Team/Code <u>Rhinlander 1</u>			Neg Team/Code <u>Muskego</u>		
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Jordan Kaster</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>Harrison Wendland</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>
<u>Dylan Wendt</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>Willa Tsao</u>	<u>25</u> **	<u>(4)</u>
			<u>** work on your volume</u>		

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 Strong 1AC, well-delivered - good volume & speed. Good C-X. You were assertive & clever without being bullying or sneaky.

Comments for 1st Neg
 Nice 1NC - good interpretation of Cards. In the CX, it didn't appear that you knew your privatization argument well enough to defend it. In rebuttal, your arguments would have been stronger with cards to support your cost and pollution arguments. Watch pronunciation.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Good 2AC, but you spent some time anticipating arguments they have not presented. As a result, time was up before you could get to your harms arguments. Be careful in your analytics & some of your arguments seemed specious*.

Comments for 2nd Neg
 Work on your speaking ^{volume} ~~more~~. I'm not sure I got all of your arguments on the flow in the 2NC. You can just tell judge to pull thru a card read earlier rather than reading it again in your speech.

Reasons for Decision:
 Aff clearly has prepared evidence for all of the negative arguments against moon base. While the negative teams had some good arguments, the aff team was well-prepared to extend their arguments. So win goes to aff because all arguments were answered and supported with good warrants.

* like taking all Americans up to moon base & having a five to ten year time frame for moon base. Bacteria isn't fought by bacteria in humans. It's fought by white blood cells, so be careful with that argument.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Novice Round 1 Room 1127 Date _____ Judge Sam Hope School _____

Aff Team/Code <u>Appleton East</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Homestead</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>Mican Anderson</u></td> <td><u>27.5</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Molly Courtney</u></td> <td><u>26</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Mican Anderson</u>	<u>27.5</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>Molly Courtney</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(4)</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>Andrey Rainchik</u></td> <td><u>28.5</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Tej Bindra</u></td> <td><u>27</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Andrey Rainchik</u>	<u>28.5</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>Tej Bindra</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Mican Anderson</u>	<u>27.5</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	
<u>Molly Courtney</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Andrey Rainchik</u>	<u>28.5</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
<u>Tej Bindra</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	

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

Comments for 1 st Aff <p style="text-align: right; margin-right: 100px;">316</p> Your made arguments and explained them well but never clashed with neg args	Comments for 1 st Neg <p style="text-align: right; margin-right: 100px;">423</p> <p style="text-align: right; margin-right: 100px;">200</p> <p style="text-align: right; margin-right: 100px;">36</p> Very good weighing and wasn't explanation
--	---

Comments for 2 nd Aff Don't stop the 2AC with 2 mins left and not address a discred	Comments for 2 nd Neg Spend more time explaining warrants not just tags
---	--

Reasons for Decision:

The Aff dropped a discred that linked into the Chapman analysis
 * The hegemony argument the aff won depends on humans
 on the moon, and the Aff only advocates robots. The neg wins
 that lunar dust affects robots and easily won
 the discred.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Nov Round 1 Room 1128 Date 11/7/16 Judge N. CHARLES School NISCOLET

Aff Team/Code <u>Rhinelanders AFF 2</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>West Bend Neg</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>Catherine Brown</u></td> <td><u>27</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Stephanie Belanger</u></td> <td><u>27.5</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Catherine Brown</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>Stephanie Belanger</u>	<u>27.5</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>Becca Graven</u></td> <td><u>26.5</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Timothy Pitt</u></td> <td><u>26.5</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Becca Graven</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>Timothy Pitt</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>(3)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Catherine Brown</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	
<u>Stephanie Belanger</u>	<u>27.5</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Becca Graven</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	
<u>Timothy Pitt</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	

Decision: The winning team is the (Circle) Affirmative ~~Negative~~ Team/Code RHINELANDER AFF 2
 Low Point Win (Circle) Yes ~~No~~

Comments for 1st Aff

The IAR needs to be more efficient in covering both the whole line-by-line and in laying out overview concepts as to why you win.

Comments for 1st Neg

The block splitting was done poorly, and you ended up repeating yourself and your partner a fair amount. It's also not helpful that the INC has no offense.

Comments for 2nd Aff

Your 2AC coverage is pretty good, but the rebuttals don't continue this pattern. Rebuttal tags in the 2AR is useless; make an overview. Make analytics in the 2AC - they're efficient and very useful.

Comments for 2nd Neg

Analytics should be efficient; don't get into the habit of rambling. Your 2NC should have expanded the general arguments you made in the 1NC, not just reiterated them.

Reasons for Decision:

This decision is made very easy by the lack of any negative offense. That said, neither team is doing some simple work which would be enormously beneficial. Evidenciary claims should be refuted not just w/ evidence, but with comparison analytically. A lot of the authors on both side very likely agree, but w/o any means of comparing them I'm left to just think the case flow is a wash.

If anything, I lean aff on moonquakes, dust, and disease. I don't think the negative authors characterize these as insurmountable problems, and there must be far better evidence out there about why a moon base would fail.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division _____ Round 1 Room 1129 Date 1/7/12 Judge Garnerdinger School West Bend East

Aff Team/Code <u>Muskego</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Rhinelanders 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>Jack Williams</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>24</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Dell Graf</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>20</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Jack Williams</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>Dell Graf</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>(3)</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>Asif Sadik</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>28</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Michael Cronst</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>27</u></td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Asif Sadik</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>Michael Cronst</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Jack Williams</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	
<u>Dell Graf</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Asif Sadik</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
<u>Michael Cronst</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 speak louder - especially in your first speech

Comments for 1st Neg
 try not to interrupt your partner during cx

Comments for 2nd Aff
 • good job on your speeches & cross x
 • try not to use time as an excuse for not covering points

Comments for 2nd Neg
 watch timing on your speeches but overall you did very well organizing & delivering

Reasons for Decision:
 I have 3 main reasons for voting ~~Aff~~ Neg in this round:

1. the Negs prove the Affs are colonizing the moon for US gain & thus violate the UN treaty
 → Affs claim its for all society but benefits are US specific & would otherwise be not topical
2. the Affs never present an actual cost or how it would be paid for
3. neg solvency greatly out weighs Affs - health, aliens, economy, habitability, radiation, moon quakes etc.

With this topic theory & logic must be used thus these are effective argument.
 Good job neg team

Also the Negs didn't drop poverty it was covered when they talked about an economic impact of only .3 → .5%.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division _____ Round 1 Room 1124 Date 1/7/12 Judge Rachel Greenen School West Bend

Aff Team/Code Homestead (N)

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Sean Zacharias</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>
<u>MARK USATINSKY</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>

Neg Team/Code Appleton East (N)

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Myra Medina</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>(3)</u>
<u>Justin Struobing</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>(4)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff

- 1st constructive you read very fast, however you are a very clear speaker so I was able to understand everything.
- You had great explanation during your rebuttal. It was clear, ~~well~~ organized, and you made good use out of your time.

Comments for 1st Neg

- In your 1st constructive you were very unorganized. make sure to organize your cards/thoughts before, so use your prep time.
- good rebuttal, but try to use more of your time to either touch on more points or better explain ones that were already said by you (2.5 min left)

Comments for 2nd Aff

- very clear, good use of time, and great explanation
- You had a great rebuttal that really helped to sum up the round
- Make sure not to bring new cards in at the rebuttal.

Comments for 2nd Neg

- just work on being louder a little bit.
- ~~It was~~ It was a little hard to hear you but luckily I was able to, however some judges might not.
- organize your speeches better. Your rebuttal sounded very repetitive with you repeating the same thing within that speech.

Reasons for Decision:

Great debate all of you! ~~For~~ Both sides brought up great arguments with good clash.

I ended up giving the win to the Affs because even though the Negs brought up a great point about possibly destroying another ~~countries~~ country's debris, the Affs not only proved that this issue is inherent since recently there has been a Russian satellite crash on Earth and guidelines already in place since it's a threat, but the Affs also won on the Economy point. The Negs tried to bring up good arguments, but considering it will only cost less than .5% of NASA's budget, ~~and~~ ^{it} will actually be a great way to improve the economy since the satellites help with ^{internet,} ^{ATMs, military...}